
Pioneers of U.S. Ecofeminism and Environmental Justice

Author(s): Susan A. Mann

Source: *Feminist Formations*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Summer 2011), pp. 1-25

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41301654>

Accessed: 24-03-2018 04:21 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Feminist Formations*

Pioneers of U.S. Ecofeminism and Environmental Justice

Susan A. Mann

From the late-nineteenth through the early decades of the twentieth century, women in the United States played important roles in the conservation and preservation of wildlife, as well as in environmental activism that fostered clean air, water, and food in our nation's urban centers. This article examines the contributions of women of different classes and races to these environmental struggles. It not only synthesizes the findings of previous environmental histories, but also focuses more attention on the ways environmental contamination affected the lives of women of color and their struggles against environmental racism. In this way, an environmental justice lens is used to excavate and reclaim the history of our ecofeminist predecessors to better ensure that the visions and voices of marginalized peoples do not remain hidden from history.

Keywords: ecofeminism / environmental history / environmental justice

Ecofeminism refers to the diverse range of women's efforts to save the Earth, as well as to the transformations in feminist thought that have resulted in new conceptualizations of the relationship between women and nature (Diamond and Orenstein 1990, ix). Although this concept was not coined until the 1970s, there were a number of discourses on women and nature in earlier eras that both fostered and emerged from women's participation in environmental activism and their appreciation for nature.¹ Focusing on the period from the late-nineteenth through the early decades of the twentieth century, this article examines how women played important roles in the conservation and preservation of wildlife, as well as in activities that fostered clean air, water, and food in our nation's urban centers. In particular, it highlights the role played by women who were both women's rights activists and environmental activists as precursors to ecofeminism.

©2011 Feminist Formations, Vol. 23 No. 2 (Summer) pp. 1–25

While the term “feminist” was rarely used in the nineteenth century, I will take the liberty of interweaving it with “suffragist” and “women’s rights activist” throughout (Cott 1987, 13–14). It is tempting to use the term “first wave” as shorthand for describing these nineteenth- and early twentieth-century activists. However, a serious problem with wave approaches is that they too often focus on the achievements of white middle-class women and their hegemonic, liberal feminist organizations. This obscures the diversity of feminists and feminisms *within* the women’s movement—particularly the visions and voices of women with more radical politics, as well as those who are marginalized by race, ethnicity, and/or social class (Cott 1987; Giddings 1984; Lerner 1979). In this article, an environmental justice lens is used to provide a more balanced view of the contributions of these women to the environmental struggles of this era.

Although most environmental historians claim that the U.S. environmental justice movement did not emerge until the 1980s, this article highlights how the major focus of this movement—*environmental racism*—has a long history in our country (Washington 2005). Environmental justice activists recognize that both class and race are integrally related to the distribution of environmental hazards; however, particular emphasis is given to race, since it has been found to be an independent variable, not reducible to social class, in predicting the distribution of environmental hazards like pollution and toxic wastes (Bullard 1993, 1994; Taylor 1997, 2002). As such, the environmental justice movement focuses on how the social and health costs of environmental contamination have been disproportionately borne by racial minorities. Compared with other environmental movements, this movement boasts significantly more success in recruiting working-class and poor people of color, and has a disproportionate number of women of color involved as both participants and in leadership positions (Krauss 1994; Taylor 2002). As Celene Krauss explains: “By and large it is women, in their traditional roles as mothers, who make the link between toxic wastes and their children’s ill health” (qtd. in Stein 2004, 3). However, like “womanists” of color in the U.S. women’s movement, these women rarely call themselves “ecofeminists” and take the position that all race, class, and gender issues are women’s issues (hooks 1984, 23; Kaalund 2004, 82).²

The feminist framework of this study draws from both intersectionality theory and poststructuralism. While there are distinct analytical differences between these two approaches, they share important epistemological assumptions.³ They both recognize how different social locations by race, class, and gender result in different vantage points for viewing social reality; thus they acknowledge the existence of multiple social realities. Because no one can view the world from every location, each vantage point is partial and limited. For these reasons they embrace polyvocality, or the inclusion of many voices and vantage points. Here, knowledge is built in a quilt-like or webbed fashion where the social realities from diverse vantage points are interwoven to form a more complete view of the whole.

Because poststructuralists and intersectionality theorists understand the integral relationship between knowledge and power, they recognize how privileged knowledges and discourses can dominate, silence, or exclude others. Thus, they appreciate alternative knowledge claims, such as socially lived knowledge or the knowledge garnered from everyday life. They also recognize the importance of excavating or retrieving subjugated knowledges—namely, the knowledges of marginalized groups that have been buried, silenced, or deemed less credible by dominant groups and their narratives. In *The History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault (1980) refers to these subjugated knowledges as “naïve knowledges,” not because he thinks they are naïve, but rather because they are deemed so by dominant groups (81–82). For him, excavating these knowledges is a critical act. Similarly, in *Black Feminist Thought*, Patricia Hill Collins (1990) documents how privileged knowledges, such as scientific discourses, historically have been used against women of color and calls for feminists to better understand the value of *socially lived knowledge*. For example, she quotes an illiterate woman, who lambastes “educated fools who would take a shotgun to a roach,” to illustrate the difference between socially lived “wisdom” and formal knowledge (208). Thus, both of these perspectives share the view that all knowledge is socially situated and from locations vested with more or less power.

Because this article examines issues of race, class, and gender in a historical era where many subjugated peoples were illiterate, these epistemological assumptions are even more salient. They will guide this study, as well as what it means to write history; that is, because no knowledge can be neutral or value free, any narrative or history makes some voices and concerns inaudible, just as it amplifies others (Darnovsky 1992, 13). History is not simply a record of past events, but rather a social construction that simultaneously silences and gives voice, just as it establishes what counts as history (Haddour 2001; Roberts 2001).

A poststructuralist approach to history as narrative is complemented by a poststructuralist approach to environmental racism. I find particularly useful Sylvia Washington’s poststructuralist analysis in *Packing Them In: An Archaeology of Environmental Racism in Chicago, 1865–1954* (2005). Washington uses Foucault’s concept of “biopower” to discuss the discourses, practices, and regulation of health risks associated with contaminated environments (Foucault 1980, 139). She links this to environmental racism by showing how groups identified as a threat to the existence of the life of the nation or body politic are controlled, managed, and even eradicated with impunity. Below, I document how new immigrants, African Americans, and Native Americans were particularly subject to control and management through segregation, discrimination, and even eradication in the interests of maintaining safer environments for the “white” body politic. Also highlighted is how various discourses arising from the new medical and social sciences of the nineteenth century contributed to depictions of these peoples as health hazards or vectors of disease. While

other subjugated groups deserve mention, it is beyond the scope of this article to address all of them.⁴

Washington's (2005) poststructuralism reminds us that "race" and "whiteness" have been fluid concepts throughout U.S. history, and that what we call "white ethnic groups" today, such as the eastern Europeans immigrants she studied, were constructed at earlier times as "not white" (1–2). However, I shall use some of her own historical data to discuss how these eastern European immigrants were "white" enough to join the Progressive Party and trade unions, which gave them more collective political power. By contrast, African Americans were excluded by these segregated institutions, and their environmental activism generated more violent backlashes. This example illustrates why, in terms of the relationship between theory and political practice, I view intersectionality theory as the feminist framework that best complements the environmental justice movement. While they both focus on multiple, interlocking oppressions, they highlight racism within existing social movements as one of the major sources of difficulty in their political struggles (Bullard 1993, 1994; Combahee River Collective 2005, 316).

To achieve their political goals, intersectionality theorists and environmental justice activists embrace *identity politics* and take the political stance of "speaking for themselves" based on their own socially lived knowledge (Combahee River Collective 2005; Stein 2004, 68). In doing so, they challenge and decenter mainstream groups, as well as expert knowledges that neglect the concerns of peoples on the margins (Bullard 1994; Collins 1990; Taylor 2002). As the Combahee River Collective (2005) put it: "focusing on our own oppression is embodied in the concept of identity politics. *We believe that the most profound and potentially the most radical politics come directly out of our own identity*, as opposed to working to end someone else's oppression. . . . We realize that the only people who care enough about us to work consistently for our liberation is us" (312–13; emphasis added). Such statements emphasize how their identity politics are motivated by necessity and born of neglect; however, they also show how they move from margin to center in both their theory and their political practice (hooks 1984).

Poststructuralists (and postmodernists) have a more nuanced view of identity politics. While some reject identity politics outright, others simply want to render identities as permanently open and contestable as to their meaning and political role (Seidman 2000, 441). Nevertheless, they all reject the notion that there are core features that distinguish any groups, just as they reject the notion that there are core identities. Group concepts and identities are viewed as social constructs—social fictions—that serve to regulate our behavior and exclude others. The goal is to deconstruct or dismantle these fictions and, thereby, to undermine hegemonic regimes of discourse. Hence, rather than viewing the affirmation of identities as politically liberating, these theorists "refigure them as disciplinary and regulatory structures" that reproduce and sustain dominant

discourses (*ibid.*). This is why Foucault saw freedom as “living in the happy limbo of nonidentity” (Foucault, *qtd.* in Grant 1993, 131). Moreover, resistance to identity categories is not seen simply as negative or destructive, but as creative and dynamic—as opening new spaces for the assertion of difference. Judith Butler (1992), for example, argues that resistance to group identities ought to be safeguarded and prized as emancipation from restrictive ontologies and as sites of permanent openness to multiple significations of difference (15–16).⁵

These different political stances also shed light on why intersectionality theorists (and other critics) view postmodernism and poststructuralism as elite discourses that are not garnered directly from concrete experiences of oppression, but rather from theoretically deduced elite discourses. Collins (1998) describes the “new language” of the post-perspectives as a “new form of cultural capital in the academic marketplace” that performs “a powerful gate-keeping function for those who lack access to the exclusionary language.” She characterizes this as “the ultimate postmodern irony. The ability to manipulate exclusionary language becomes yet another standard used to exclude Black women from legitimated intellectual work” (142). Christine di Stefano notes how the post-perspectives were deconstructing the category of human agency “at the moment in Western History when previously silenced populations have begun to speak for themselves and on behalf of their subjectivities” (*qtd.* in Messer-Davidow 2002, 209).

The aim of this article is to decenter environmental histories that emphasize the role of dominant groups. Not only do I compare the environmental activities of women at the center with those who work on the margins, but I also highlight how women working on the margins were the pioneers of both ecofeminism and environmental justice. While I find both poststructuralism and intersectional analyses useful to this analysis, their contributions are different. The contributions of poststructuralism lie in the greater attention this theoretical perspective gives to bio-power and to the power of discourses to control, manage, and even eradicate groups deemed as dangerous to the body politic. The contributions of intersectional analyses and an environmental justice lens lie in the socially lived knowledges they garner from their direct experiences of oppression and marginalization, as well as the collective power they derive from embracing identity politics as the *modus operandi* of their politics. Together, these theoretical perspectives illuminate different though important critical insights into the multiplicity of oppressions entailed in environmental struggles.

The influence of intersectionality theorists’ demand that more attention be given to race, gender, and class is evident in environmental histories written over the last two decades. While these works are written by authors who employ a range of theoretical perspectives, I rely most heavily on those that foreground the environmental concerns of marginalized groups (Alaimo 2000; Darnovsky 1992; Gottlieb 2005; Kaalund 2004; Krauss 1994; Merchant 1995, 2007; Norwood 1993; Scharff 2003; Smith 2007; Stein 2004; Taylor 1997, 2002;

Unger 2004). By piecing together the disparate findings of these works, my goal is a synthetic rendering of the environmental discourses and practices of women of different races and classes in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Coalescing this disparate information into one narrative provides an important pedagogical service to readers. By using an environmental justice lens, I also discuss contributions made by women of color to environmental struggles that are overlooked even by environmental historians who are more sensitive to issues of race, class, and gender.

Historical Grounding

Environmentalism emerged as a prominent new social concern in the United States in the late-nineteenth century as a reaction to how urban, industrial areas were becoming overcrowded, smog-choked, and disease-ridden. The “closing of the frontier” in the late-1800s also generated fear that the vast lands of the public domain were being looted, polluted, and destroyed by commercial interests, such as the railroad, timber, and mining companies (Merchant 2007). While some environmental activists focused on cleaning up the more densely populated areas of the nation, others focused on conserving and preserving a pristine wilderness. Environmental activism during this era was spearheaded by the Progressive movement. The vast majority of these Progressive reformers were white middle-class men and women who simultaneously sought two goals: To use state power to curb the excesses of giant corporations, and to use civic action to improve the harsher features of social life that had been ushered in by industrialization.

From the mid-nineteenth century to the turn of the twentieth century, social and economic conditions in the United States were transformed so radically that some historians have referred to this era as the “second industrial revolution” (Luke 1999, 219). A few examples will illustrate these changes that catapulted the United States into becoming one of the most powerful modern industrial societies of that era. Whereas in 1860 the country trailed England, France, and Germany in the total value of its manufactured output, by 1894 the value of U.S. manufactures almost equaled those of England, France, and Germany combined. Before the Civil War, the U.S. industrial working-class was outnumbered by slaves, but by the mid-1890s, this industrial working-class was the largest in the world. The number of female industrial workers also increased significantly, from 34,000 in 1870 to over two million in 1920 (Taylor 2002, 18). In 1870, half of the nation’s factories were still powered by water and steam; by the early twentieth century, coal and petroleum were fueling much of America’s industry (Luke 1999, 221–22). This rapid increase in urbanization and industrialization was accompanied by a host of environmental problems, from water, land, and air pollution to the devastation of wildlife and natural resources.

Racial and ethnic relations also were transformed. While the Emancipation and Reconstruction offered a brief window of opportunity for African Americans to gain some education and upward mobility, these opportunities were sharply curtailed once federal troops left the South. Indeed, the harsh realities of the Jim Crow laws and the escalation of violence against African Americans went hand-in-hand with increased repression of Native Americans. The South's secession from the Union in 1861 cleared the way for the passage of the Homestead Act in 1862, since powerful southerners had previously blocked this act because they felt it would undermine the viability of slavery. After the Civil War and Reconstruction, federal troops moved from the South to the West. Together, these developments enabled the U.S. government to focus its undivided attention on developing the western frontier. The closing of this frontier heralded the success of U.S. settler colonialism and the transformation of the country into a transcontinental empire.⁶ Yet, because this "frontier" was land appropriated through the Mexican-American War (1846–1848) and the Indian Wars fought intermittently from the 1600s through the 1890s, the racial and ethnic dimensions of these developments were always palpable.

A significant consequence of the second industrial revolution to gender relations was the commoditization of the necessities of everyday life. What was once homemade could now be purchased, so that women no longer had to produce such items as bread, butter, cheese, soap, candles, or clothing. By the early 1900s, four-fifths of the production implemented in the average home in 1850 had vanished, never to return (Ehrenreich and English 1978, 143, 144). Alongside this transformation of everyday life, new gender discourses emerged: The "cult of true womanhood" and the "doctrine of separate spheres." These discourses prescribed the private realm of the household as the woman's sphere, and the public realm outside the home as the man's sphere (Baca Zinn and Eitzen 1993, 56). However, the extent to which women's lives conformed to this ideal varied according to their social-class position (Lerner 1979, 190–92).

While the doctrine of separate spheres freed well-to-do women from much arduous labor, it also constrained them by dictating that woman's place was in the home. Consequently, women of the middle and upper classes who participated in environmental activism had to defend their new activities as extensions of their traditional roles of wife and mother. The term "municipal housekeeping" was used to describe this environmental activism. Under the banner of municipal housekeeping, thousands of women were drawn to home-related issues like ensuring safe air, food, and water for their families or conserving nature to beautify their lives, enhance their recreational activities, and to better educate their children (Merchant 2007).

Urban Environmental Activism

The concerns of the urban municipal-housekeeping movement of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were diverse; they included air and water pollution, garbage and sanitation issues, and safe food, as well as industrial health and safety. Sources of power like coal belched smoke and soot into the air and water and onto city landscapes; not only did such air pollution kill plants and trees, but it also led to serious ailments like asthma, bronchitis, pneumonia, and black-lung disease (Merchant 2007, 120). Women were particularly active in the anti-smoke campaigns not only because smoke affected their families' health, but also because it affected their ability to uphold standards of cleanliness. Environmental historian Carolyn Merchant (2007) quotes one Milwaukee woman: "It is impossible for me to have my laundry done at home. . . . It [smoke] is bad for the furniture, for the clothing, for the health, and for the temper" (120–21).

Household refuse and industrial pollution were other serious environmental concerns. In the nineteenth century, it was not unusual for household garbage simply to be thrown out into alleys where it piled up, causing dreadful odors and serious health hazards (122). Along with household waste, industrial pollution had a far-reaching impact on the quality of water in the country. Years of abuse and neglect had so fouled the waterscapes of urban America that public concern galvanized around the issue of clean water. By the 1880s cities began to install sewer systems to prevent water-related infections, such as yellow fever and typhoid, that had proved so deadly in earlier decades. Many white middle-class women's clubs became involved in local, state, and national waterways committees to promote safe water. As Merchant (1995) describes, "[t]he rationale for women's involvement lay in the effect of waterways on every American home: Pure water meant health; impure meant disease and death" (116).

Most environmental historians highlight Ellen Swallow Richards as the founder of the municipal-housekeeping movement and the "mother of ecofeminism" (Gottlieb 2005, 286–87; Hayden 1985, 153; Merchant 1995, 139–40; Yudkin 1982). She was the first scientist to conduct stream-by-stream water surveys, and her research on staple-food products led to the first food-inspection laws in the country. She championed significant advances in home and workplace ventilation, and was successful in reducing hazardous, spontaneous combustion in the workplace. Richards also created the new field of "oekology"—a field she envisioned as fostering a more scientific and symbiotic relationship between the environment and the home. It became known as "home ecology," and later as "home economics" (Merchant 1995, 139–40). However, with the passage of time and the success of key goals of this movement, such as safer food, air, and water, many people lost sight of its original connection with environmental issues.

Only a few contemporary feminists have contested Richards's title as mother of ecofeminism. The most serious challenge has been leveled by Barbara

Ehrenreich and Deirdre English (1978) in their critique of expert knowledge directed toward women during this era. They argue that Richards never supported women's rights or suffrage, hence she is not a precursor of *ecofeminism*. They also view her focus on enhancing women's scientific skills in running their own households as glorifying housework and as relevant only to middle- and upper-class women who had the time, energy, and resources to center their lives both on their homes and on unpaid volunteer work (153–54, 161, 164). This critique exemplifies the class, race, and gender issues of concern in this article. Below, I focus on urban environmental activists who not only were feminists, but who also addressed issues outside of their own narrow race and class interests. It is these women who should be honored as the pioneers of *ecofeminism* and environmental justice.

Pioneers of Ecofeminism and Environmental Justice in Urban Environmental Activism

While urban environmental problems affected the entire population, they most seriously affected poor and working-class people who lived in the inner-cities—especially new immigrants and African Americans (Merchant 2007, 120). Despite the overwhelming evidence of urban and industrial pollution in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, African Americans and new immigrants often were accused of being the *cause* of health problems in the larger white body politic. This view of blacks and immigrants as “vectors of disease” echoed across the country (Kraut 1994, 78; Washington 2005, 79). For example, the 1850 report of the Sanitary Commission of Massachusetts claimed that “immigrants were primarily responsible for the degradation of the cities and the spread of disease” (qtd. in Melosi 2000, 63). Similarly, even though high mortality and morbidity rates among African Americans were caused by epidemics driven by environmental factors, the scientific and medical communities at that time viewed African Americans as “health hazards” (Washington 2005, 130). Along with other racial discourses that deemed these groups as inferior, these scientific discourses that marked them as health hazards gave additional ideological rationale for racially based urban-planning policies that contributed to their segregation, or ghettoization (131). As poststructuralist and queer theorist Eve Sedgwick (1990) has pointed out, when discourses from a number of different sources come together in one voice, their power is greatly enhanced.

Nevertheless, intersectional and environmental justice analyses would reveal that while eastern European immigrants were treated as social lepers, their whiteness enabled them to politically ally with the Progressive Party, trade unions, and white settlement houses to launch some of the more successful environmental struggles during the Progressive era. They would also reveal how the women who worked on the margins had more critical insights that crossed class and ethnic barriers. Among the white settlement workers

who played prominent roles in these immigrants' environmental struggles, Washington (2005) cites the Hull House women and Mary McDowell in particular as the "grandmother of the environmental justice movement in Chicago" (89). McDowell was a self-taught sanitation engineer who studied waste-disposal practices in Europe and tried to have them implemented in the United States. She was called the "Garbage Lady" of Chicago and was renowned for her efforts to clean up a branch of the Chicago River that literally bubbled from stockyard-refuse dumping (102). Jane Addams was the first woman to be appointed as a municipal sanitary inspector, and her Hull House Women's Club undertook systematic investigations of the city's system of garbage collection, which provided the health department with vast data on the hazards involved (Elshtain 2002, 172). Epidemiologist Alice Hamilton (1869–1970) provided the necessary scientific evidence for Hull House's reforms concerning typhoid and other "filth diseases" (Merchant 2007, 126). All of these women were strong advocates for women's rights.

Women directly involved in labor organizing were among the earliest activists to focus attention upon environmental hazards in the workplace. As Dorceta Taylor (2002) points out, by the late-nineteenth century, the United States had one of the highest industrial-accident rates in the world. From 1880 to 1900, 35,000 workers died and another 500,000 were injured annually. The most serious industrial accident during this era involving women was the 1911 Triangle Factory fire in New York City that killed 146 women garment workers (12). Environmental historian Robert Gottlieb (2005) discusses the pioneering efforts of women activists regarding these workplace issues and highlights the roles of Hull House women like Hamilton and Florence Kelley, as well as socialist feminists Rose Schneiderman and Crystal Eastman (289, 352). After speaking at the memorial for the women killed in the Triangle fire, Schneiderman helped organize the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and led its 1913 strike. She also actively campaigned for women's suffrage and helped pass the New York State referendum that granted women the right to vote in 1917. Eastman was the author of New York's first workmen's compensation law in 1907, which became a model for other laws throughout the United States. She also was a feminist theorist and activist, her most famous book being *Women and Revolution* (1919).

Anarchist Emma Goldman is best known today for her militant support of both women's and workers' rights. Yet, as Stacy Alaimo (2000) points out, Goldman, like other left-wing women, also employed the concept of nature to promote her labor-organizing efforts. In her journal *Mother Earth*, first published in 1907, Goldman forged the metaphorical figure of Mother Earth as one "who cares not for the bourgeois household, but for the people *en mass*" (qtd. in Alaimo, 89). She used this image in vivid attacks against the capitalist system: "Mother Earth, with the sources of vast wealth hidden within the folds of her ample bosom, extended her inviting and hospitable arms to all those who

came to her from arbitrary and despotic lands—Mother Earth ready to give herself alike to all her children. But soon she was seized by the few, stripped of her freedom, fenced in, a prey to those who were endowed with cunning and unscrupulous shrewdness” (90).

Because these activists focused on the concerns of the working class, they were referred to derogatorily as “sewer socialists” and became victims of red-baiting during the years leading up to the Red Scare of 1919–1920.⁷ Even the Hull House women were victims, despite the fact that most of them did not embrace socialism. Addams, Eastman, and Goldman came under the surveillance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Eastman’s radical journal *The Liberator* was banned and she was blacklisted. Russian immigrant Goldman suffered a harsher fate: She was arrested and deported with over 200 foreign-born radicals to the Soviet Union in 1919. This suggests that, along with race, ethnicity, and class, political stances placed certain people in more subjugated positions.

Nevertheless, as environmental justice activists would argue, race was still the most salient issue. African American environmental activists faced the most serious urban environmental problems during this era, in large part because racial segregation exacerbated urban overcrowding. During the first two decades of the twentieth century, approximately 770,000 blacks migrated north in response to Jim Crow laws and escalating violence in the South, in addition to environmental disasters like the boll weevil and the lure of industrial job opportunities (Taylor 2002, 25). In Chicago alone, the black population more than doubled between 1915 and 1919, with women making up a substantial proportion of these immigrants (Giddings 1984, 142; Washington 2005, 141). This rapid increase in black migrants created intense competition not only for jobs, but also for urban space; indeed, most historians have concluded that geographical space, especially housing, was among the important factors underlying America’s bloodiest race riot—the Chicago Race Riot of 1919, which in four days resulted in thirty-eight deaths, 537 injured, and a thousand homeless (ibid., 134, 141). Such violent confrontations suggest that race mattered in terms of the political options available to marginalized peoples. Because the Progressive Party, as well as most trade unions and settlement houses, was segregated during this era, these avenues for urban environmental reform were not available to African Americans (Schechter 2001, 172, 230). While white immigrants could take a more reformist political approach by allying with these segregated organizations, African Americans were forced to take more violent paths of resistance.

Noticeably absent from environmental histories are the role that black women’s clubs played in environmental struggles in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yet, it was these clubs that provided aid to the African Americans who undertook the great migration to northern cities. Even environmental historians who are sensitive to issues of race, class, and gender fail to include black women’s clubs in their discussions of municipal housekeeping.

In turn, feminist historians who discuss black women's clubs in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries rarely make any connection between these clubs' philanthropic activities and their environmental activism (Giddings 1984; Lerner 1979; Shaw 1995).

In the 1890s, black women's clubs in a number of cities began to form federations, and in 1896, the three largest federations were unified in the National Association of Colored Women Clubs (NACWC). The NACWC included over a hundred local women's clubs and predated the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (Lerner 1979, 83; Shaw 1995, 441). Feminist Ida Wells-Barnett helped organize the first black women's clubs in Chicago in 1893, as well as the first black settlement house—the Negro Fellowship League. Barnett came to be known as the “Jane Addams among the Negroes,” although the origin, shape, and destiny of these two women's work were quite different (Schechter 2001, 170). The league could not seek government contracts or social services in the same way as Hull House because it functioned in such a racially hostile city; it also did not have access to the patronage available to the wealthy Hull House women and their social networks.⁸

Important leaders of the black women's club movement included women's rights activists like Josephine St. Pierre Ruffin, Mary Church Terrell, Fannie Barrier Williams, Victoria Earle Mathews, Lugenia Hope, and Margaret Murray Washington (Giddings 1984; Lerner 1979; Shaw 1995). Even though these women of black clubs were middle class, they were far more successful in crossing class barriers to address the concerns of poor and working-class women than were women of white clubs (Gordon 1995, 463; Lerner 1979, 93). Historian Paula Giddings (1984) explains this difference by discussing how middle-class black women recognized that *all* black women were perceived in the light of those who had the least resources. Mary Church Terrell, who was one of the wealthiest and most highly educated black women of that era, wrote that club members “have determined to come into the closest possible touch with the masses of our women . . . through whom the womanhood of our people is always judged” (qtd. in *ibid.*, 98). Other historians concur that there was “less distance between the helper and the helped,” less chronological distance as many middle-class black women's upward mobility had been so recent, and less geographical distance as black women of all classes lived in segregated areas (Gordon 1995, 463).

The black women's clubs' environmental activities were more akin to the white settlement houses than to the white women's clubs. They engaged less in conservation or preservation issues and more in municipal-housekeeping activities, both in rural and urban areas. They undertook home and neighborhood clean-up campaigns and worked to reduce the filth diseases that arose from unsafe air and water (Lerner 1979, 89). One of the more remarkable institutions created during this era was the Atlanta Neighborhood Union. Organized in

1908 under the leadership of Lugenia Hope, it established a nursery, a kindergarten, and a medical center to treat tuberculosis and other filth diseases. By the late 1920s, nearly a thousand children annually were being examined (Giddings 1984, 136). The union also enlisted black college students to conduct surveys on the environmental conditions found in many black neighborhoods, and it addressed such issues as contaminated water, inadequate sewerage, and garbage removal (Lerner 1979, 88–90).

Overall, the black women's club movement had more serious problems to deal with than did their white counterparts. Local governments and social-welfare institutions neglected or excluded blacks, thereby requiring women of black clubs to move beyond traditional charity work to community development (Shaw 1995, 440). Not only were health conditions perilous in the black shantytowns and ghettos of apartheid America, but also issues like child care were far more problematic for the vast majority of black women. As Olivia Davidson remarked, most black women not only were "overworked and underfed," but also "suffered to a greater or lesser degree from sheer physical exhaustion" (qtd. in Giddings 1984, 100). Hence, women of black clubs dealt with social problems that spanned the life cycle, from day nurseries to old-age homes; their activities helped compensate for poorly funded black schools and hospitals and addressed the needs of black migrants by setting up employment centers and shelters for displaced and at-risk women (Lerner 1979, 86, 89). As Fannie Barrier Williams articulated: "The club movement among colored women reaches into the sub-social conditions of the entire race. . . . Among white women the club is the forward movement of the already uplifted" (qtd. in Giddings 1984, 98).

Conservation and Preservation

While urban environmentalists focused on how modernization damaged the social environments in which people lived, conservationists and preservationists focused on how it ruined wildlife and wilderness. To their credit, most environmental historians are careful to highlight how social class played a critical role in the conservation and preservation movements of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, the first U.S. citizens to voice their concerns that wild nature was vanishing under the commercialization of production were those who used nature more for its aesthetic, recreational, and educational features, such as hikers, campers, birders, nature writers, artists, and scientists. Some of the earliest conservation organizations, such as the Audubon Society and the Sierra Club, established in 1886 and 1892, respectively, reflected these more elite concerns (Merchant 2007, 142).⁹

It is well documented that the early conservation and preservation movements generally were led by middle- and upper-class white men. A number of historians discuss how gender issues played a role in these men's appreciation of the wilderness (Gottlieb 2005, 282–83; Nash 2001, 145). Concerns over

masculinity were heightened in the late-nineteenth century for middle- and upper-class men, because urbanization, industrialization, and the bureaucratization of governmental and corporate spheres of work provided new types of white-collar office jobs that were viewed as “soft” and detrimental to rugged notions of manhood. Nash (2001) argues that well-to-do men of this era looked to wilderness adventures to foster “toughness” and “virility” (145).

Many women of these well-to-do classes were active in conservation and preservation, with some even holding leadership positions at the state and local levels. So long as they related their nature interests to enhancing their homes, neighborhoods, and municipalities or their children’s education, nature-related activities were viewed as “proper” (Norwood 1993, 37). Sentimental notions of the relationship between women and nature also attracted women to the conservation cause; not only were women likened to birds and flowers, but also many female nature writers anthropomorphized nature by portraying the domestic arrangements of wildlife as similar to their own. For example, Mary Treat (1830–1923), renowned for her insect collections, portrayed the shedding of baby spiders as disposing of their “baby dresses” (qtd. in *ibid.*, 42). Such sentimental approaches to nature struck a chord with both women and children and fostered their appreciation of nature, as exemplified by the work of celebrated British nineteenth-century author, illustrator, and conservationist Beatrix Potter (Lanchester 2007, 25–27).

Nature studies also fulfilled these women’s obligation to use their class-based leisure time in a nonfrivolous manner that would be beneficial to society—much like other women in these classes did philanthropic work. Homes of the wealthy often had aviaries, conservatories, and extensive gardens to not only enhance their aesthetic ambiance, but also to display their owners’ knowledge and appreciation of birds and plants. This knowledge was coveted for its prestige, since it added to this class’s cultural sophistication and distinguished it from others. Class theorists today refer to this knowledge as “cultural capital” (Bourdieu 1977).¹⁰ Hence, a blend of sentimental, aesthetic, and scientific approaches, along with displays of status and cultural capital, characterized the endeavors of well-to-do white women in conservation and preservation.

In the nineteenth century, amateur interests in botany and ornithology were viewed as particularly suitable endeavors for women, so long as plant and bird sexuality were not explicitly discussed (Norwood 1993, xviii, 46). Women’s garden clubs and women’s chapters of the early Audubon Society played a significant role in building up the membership of the wildlife-conservation movement and in fostering nature studies by women (Merchant 1995, 109–36). Most women began their activities as home-based hobbies, but some turned their skills into service for scientists, educational institutions, and the federal government. Some even undertook challenges that placed them in direct conflict with other women of their classes; for example, the early Audubon societies protested the “abominable” habit of wearing feather fashions and successfully

appealed to the National Federation of Women's Clubs for help in reducing this carnage (123–28).

White women's clubs from across the country also worked to conserve and preserve natural landscapes. Merchant (1995) documents the valiant efforts of women to rescue United States' forests from the West Coast, where California women saved the redwoods, to the East Coast, where the Pennsylvania Forestry Association was founded by women (109–13). Similarly, the Daughters of the American Revolution were key figures in fostering the preservation of the Appalachian watersheds, the Palisades of the Hudson, and Niagara Falls. The Sierra Club afforded women opportunities for wilderness-related activities, and even Susan Anthony visited the Yosemite Reserve in 1871 as the “crowning event” of the California Suffrage campaign (Taylor 2002, 7). Yet, most of these nineteenth-century middle- and upper-class women framed their environmental concerns well within proper female roles, with only a few supporting women's suffrage. Women at the National Conservation Congress (1909) linked their conservation efforts with their traditional gender roles in their slogan, “the conservation of true womanhood, the home, and the child” (Merchant 1995, 128–29).

While most of these white middle-class conservationists and preservationists did not significantly challenge conventional gender roles, some of their discourses and practices resonate well with ecofeminist ideas. Even their sentimental and anthropomorphic depictions of nature fostered what later ecofeminists call an “ethic of care,” or an empathetic approach to nature (Kheel 2008, 218–26). They presented nature as a living reality, rather than as a passive object for humans to control, and made people aware of the interconnectedness of all living things. Their activities gave some women a foothold in scientific studies and nature-related vocations that they otherwise might not have had; they also encouraged women to make links between the personal worlds of their homes and the public worlds of science, government, and industry.

Pioneers of Ecofeminism and Environmental Justice in Conservation and Preservation

Among white middle-class feminists, the major feminist voice in landscape conservationist work was Mary Austin (1868–1934). As Vera Norwood (1993) points out, Austin was a “lone voice” among nature essayists of this era in terms of making connections between the domination of nature and women's oppression. She portrayed women as “invigorated” by contact with wildlife, and created a “free female landscape” in her desert writings (50). Alaimo (2000) describes Austin as “painting the land beyond the borders as a feminist refuge where women can dodge domestic confinement and cast off gender as if it were an ill-fitting shoe” (16). Unlike her contemporaries, Austin also portrayed nature in very sensuous ways: “If the desert were a woman, I know well what

like she would be: deep breasted, broad in the hips, tawny . . . passionate, but not necessitous, . . . you could not move her, not if had all the earth to give, so much as one tawny hair's breadth beyond her own desires" (qtd. in Norwood, 50).

For seventeen years Austin studied Native American life in the Mojave Desert and was a staunch defender of indigenous peoples' rights. Her *The Land of Little Rain* (1903) is a scathing critique of the arrogant development of arid landscapes. While Austin shared with other conservationists a critical approach to the environmental devastation wrought by modernization, her greater sensitivity to oppression by gender and race distinguished her from her counterparts.

The relative invisibility of women of color in the canon of nature lore and nature conservation/preservation has been attributed to the more complicated relationship these women had with nature, as well as to "the dominant group's resistance to their alternative values" (Norwood 1993, 175). Indeed, many intersectionality theorists have discussed the racist stereotypes that negatively positioned African American and Native American women as "closer to nature": Namely, because they were viewed as more "savage" or "animalistic" than white women (Collins 1990, 192). Such racist stereotypes were especially pernicious in regard to their sexuality; in contrast to white women, women of color were viewed as prone to lascivious sexual behavior, because of their "animal nature." Here, race trumped class, given how even black middle-class women had to "defend Black womanhood" due to the view that *all* black women were "steeped in centuries of ignorance, savagery and immoral vices" (Giddings 1984, 82).

Native American women also were portrayed as more sexually promiscuous than white women by missionaries and settler colonists. Poststructuralist and queer theorist Greta Gaard (1997) discusses how heterosexual practices devoid of the restrictions imposed by Christianity were viewed as perverse by white colonizers. Missionaries objected to the heterosexual practices of the Pueblo Indians by calling them "bestial," because "like animals, the female placed herself publicly on all fours" (qtd. in *ibid.*, 129). Indigenous women's relative lack of clothing was viewed as scandalous by settlers, and Native women often were viewed as "sexual beings free for the taking," as Devon Mihesuah's (2003) intersectional analysis documents (59).

Other stereotypes depicted African Americans as "insensitive to nature" (Norwood 1993, xvii). Feminist, novelist, and folklorist Zora Neale Hurston was incensed by such stereotypes that barred any but white voices from classic nature writing. She castigated the white press for refusing to print stories about the "higher emotions" of anyone except the white middle and upper classes, and argued that "it [would] remain impossible for the majority to conceive of a Negro experiencing a deep and abiding love and not just the passion of sex. That a great mass of Negroes can be stirred by the pageants of Spring and Fall; the extravaganza of summer, and the majesty of winter . . . is ruled out" (qtd. in *ibid.*, 174). Hurston's outrage is even more poignant, given that one of the earliest

contributions to romantic nature poetry was written by the first published black poet in the United States, Phillis Wheatley (c.1752–1784). In her poem “An Hymn to Evening” (1773) she eulogized the sunset: “Through all the heav’ns what beauteous dyes are spread! / But the west glories in the deepest red: / So may our breasts with ev’ry virtue glow, / The living temples of our God below!” (qtd. in Merchant 2007, 36).

Contemporary womanists of color also have highlighted how slavery and racial oppression negatively affected African Americans’ attitudes toward nature. Jamaica Kincaid (2001) points to the “unquiet world of the garden” in her critique of the American practice of preserving the gardens of elites as monuments. She exposes how such gardens were often built and maintained by slave labor and/or by the labor of poor people of color (41). This theme, that the beautiful and manicured gardens of white elites represented little more than a place of hard labor for people of color, is also highlighted in a number of environmental and slave histories (Norwood 1993; Smith 2007; Willis 1985). Norwood discusses how Harriet Jacobs’s slave narrative *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*, published in 1861 under the pseudonym of Linda Brent, addressed these issues. Jacobs used garden imagery to contrast the privileged lives of white mistresses to those of slave women. The white mistress in the garden symbolized the female as pampered, pure, and genteel, whereas slave women were treated like uncivilized beasts of burden or breeders (Norwood 1993, 184–85). When Jacobs describes her attempts to escape from slavery, she enters “a natural world of darkness, with swamps, snakes, and mosquitoes threatening her life at every turn” (185). Conservationists’ view of nature as a place of escape into the sublime contrasted starkly with Jacobs’s socially lived experiences.

The view that hard labor makes people view nature as adversarial rather than aesthetic is often used to explain why conservation movements were led by middle- and upper-class individuals (xvii). However, a more nuanced view is derived from oral histories, which reveal how subordinated groups that worked closely with nature viewed the knowledge gained from their work experiences as superior to that of the dominant group. In his study of black folk culture, Lawrence Levine (1977) quotes one black informant who believed that she had a more informed understanding of local flora and fauna than did her master: “White folks just go through de wood and don’t know nothin” (73). Consider a similar refrain by a Native American in reference to other tribe members who returned after being formally educated: “Several of our young people were . . . instructed in all your sciences; but when they came back to us they were bad runners; ignorant of every means of living in the woods; unable to bear heat or cold . . . neither fit for hunters, warriors, or counsellors; they were totally good for nothing” (qtd. in Merchant 1995, 41).

Kimberly Smith’s (2007) study of black discourse suggests that “natural beauty” and other environmental themes were not uncommon, but rather that black writers tended to discuss natural beauty in the context of their *own* homes

and gardens, rather than that in the wilderness (91). Historical studies of African American gardens suggest that black women preferred homegrown plants to store-bought specimens and ornamental flowers over the shrubs more commonly found in white middle-class yards. Often, blacks' yards were swept and beautified with flowers, because they were to be used as outdoor rooms (Norwood 1993, 136). Such preferences also reflect valiant attempts to cultivate beauty under the constraints of poverty, as intersectionality theorists have noted when they discuss gardens and the aesthetics of their elders (hooks 1995; Walker 1983).

The uses of black discourse and oral histories are forms of retrieving both socially lived knowledges and subjugated knowledges. As noted earlier, scholars informed by poststructuralism and intersectionality theory call for the excavation of these knowledges as critical acts that provide alternative-knowledge claims to those derived from formal education and science. However, in the nineteenth century, such scholarly appreciation was rare; when such views are found, they are usually associated with Romantic literature. For example, the concept of the "noble savage," as found in James Fenimore Cooper's *Leatherstocking Tales* (1823) and Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* (1855), reflects an appreciation of socially lived knowledge, especially untutored knowledge derived from harsh life experiences. The noble savage is a human unencumbered by civilization, who lives in harmony with nature and demonstrates both great moral courage and wisdom derived from life experiences. Although this concept was a romanticized, settler-colonial stereotype, it nevertheless fostered an appreciation of indigenous peoples, while simultaneously treating them as the exotic Other.

A similar stereotype can be found in some contemporary ecofeminist writings, such as those of Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993) and Ariel Salleh (1997). Here, indigenous peoples are portrayed as the quintessential environmentalists in their premodern, pre-contact modes of living. Rather than exploiting nature and emptying it of its life forces, indigenous peoples' material livelihoods, spirituality, and culture are depicted as being integrally intertwined with conserving and replenishing nature. This image is then contrasted with those who came later—the modern, commercially oriented colonists, who take from nature but do not give back, and who arrogantly view their own way of life as more advanced, progressive, civilized, and overall superior.

In contrast, ecofeminists better informed by a focus on difference and deconstruction criticize portrayals of indigenous peoples as quintessential environmentalists for being a "demeaning exoticization" (Darnovsky 1992, 21–22). Poststructuralist Noel Sturgeon (1997) highlights how such essentialist portrayals reproduce a subtle form of racism that inherently sets up a modern versus premodern binary that continues to place indigenous peoples "outside of culture" (115). Intersectionality theorists and environmental justice activists tend to view such portrayals as appropriating indigenous spiritual traditions in an imperialist manner, as exemplified in Andy Smith's "Ecofeminism Through an Anticolonial Framework" (1997).

Moreover, the paucity of historical records, the heterogeneity of Native American tribes, and competing views within the vast literature on these tribes preclude the possibility of making any general statements about whether pre-contact Native Americans were conservationists (Mihesuah 2003; Unger 2004; White 1984). However, Nancy Unger (2004) makes the interesting point that one of indigenous women's ecological contributions came from their "nearly universal practice of prolonged lactation," which reduced fertility rates, making tribal populations more sustainable (45, 48). With that aside, it is unclear whether indigenous peoples lived in harmony with nature in the sense that some ecofeminists today suggest.

On firmer ground are those ecofeminists who argue that pre-contact indigenous women often enjoyed more status due to their important economic and spiritual roles, as well as the matrilineal descent patterns of many tribes (LaDuke 1997; Mankiller and Wallis 1993). Tribal religions often included female divine spirits or cosmologies that prominently positioned Native women to reflect the important role of nature in their lives. Mihesuah (2003) discusses how the Navajo term for "mother" symbolized the earth, sheep, and corn—the three major elements of Navajo subsistence. The Apache's earth mother was known as "Changing Woman"—a self-renewing entity whose lifespan as a woman symbolized the growth cycle of plants. Cherokee women believed that they came from the Corn Mother, a female entity discussed at some length by Merchant (1995, 92–96). However, the victory of U.S. settler colonialism meant that such Native "heathenish" practices were prohibited, especially after 1883, when the Indian Religious Crimes Code was introduced. The dominant, patriarchal discourses in this era also meant that U.S. government agencies encouraged males to take over agricultural production, while teaching women to submit to the authority of their husbands and fathers. All of these factors undermined indigenous women's material and spiritual prominence and separated them further from nature (Mihesuah 2003, 42, 47–48).

However, the discourses of settler colonialism were not the only ones that subjugated peoples on the margins. Poststructuralism makes us ever vigilant as to how even progressive discourses can be oppressive and exclusive (Ramazanoglu 1993). Indeed, discourses that appeared to be progressive to environmentalists in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had especially deleterious effects on people of color. The national parks were first envisioned by the renowned painter of Native Americans George Catlin (1796–1872) as a means of saving both the vanishing wilderness and the vanishing Natives (Merchant 2007, 163). However, as Merchant points out, one of the "darker sides of U.S. environmental history" is how the much-celebrated creation of the national parks resulted in the expulsion of most Native Americans from parklands in favor of recreational resources for well-to-do citizens. Merchant concludes that "the past of these indigenous peoples was preserved for posterity, while their actual presence was denied" (168).

African Americans had similar experiences. When construction began on the site for Central Park in New York during the 1850s, over 300 dwellings, including the black community of Seneca Village, were demolished by Frederick Law Olmsted's work crews under the rule of eminent domain (Taylor 2002, 13). Similarly, reservations, ghettoization, and deportation reflect yet other historical means of removal (McKittrick and Woods 2007). That these means of removal most seriously affected people of color's lives suggests that when poststructuralism's insights into bio-power and the power of discourses are seen through an intersectional and environmental justice lens, we become more aware of how groups identified as marginal or dangerous to the life of the white body politic are controlled, managed, and eradicated with impunity.

Conclusion

By interweaving the work of various environmental historians, this article has examined how women of different classes and races addressed environmental concerns in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries through their involvement in the municipal-housekeeping movement and/or the early conservationist and preservationist movements. Most of these women were not feminists, nor did they explicitly challenge traditional gender roles; however, they developed new discourses and practices that helped women and children to better appreciate nature. White middle- and upper-class women also used their networks of women's clubs and organizations to galvanize political support for these early environmental movements. While most of these women embraced traditional gender roles, they managed to cross the private/public divide that constrained their lives in ways that enhanced both nature and social life.

Informed by intersectionality theory and poststructuralism and using an environmental justice lens, this study also highlighted how a number of women made broader and more critical connections between environmental issues and gender, class, and racial oppressions. Women, such as Mary Austin, Jane Addams, Mary McDowell, Emma Goldman, Rose Schneiderman, Crystal Eastman, Ida Wells-Barnett, and Lugenia Hope, were truly "pioneers of eco-feminism and environmental justice," in that they served as advocates for both women's rights and the environmental concerns of marginalized peoples. All of these women worked with working-class and poor people of different races or ethnicities, even those who were middle-class. Austin lived for years among Native Americans in the Mojave Desert, while the labor organizers and/or women connected to Hull House and black women's clubs lived and worked among the poor, immigrants, and/or African Americans. Their everyday lives, work experiences, and socially lived knowledges rendered them better able to grasp the vantage points and environmental concerns of marginalized peoples, thereby giving them more critical insights into addressing social injustices. Yet, because of their focus on environmental classism and racism, they were

red-baited, placed under police surveillance, or deported. Some also remained hidden from environmental histories, as in the case of black women's clubs' contributions to the environmental struggles.

If we are to excavate and reclaim our history as ecofeminists, we must ensure that the vantage points of marginalized peoples are not excluded from that history. In unearthing the contributions of our predecessors whose visions and voices have been buried in history, we must make more serious efforts to decenter dominant discourses and to move from margin to center. Only in this way can we learn from our past to chart a future where we no longer speak of margins and centers.

Susan A. Mann is a professor and associate chair of the Department of Sociology at the University of New Orleans. Her major areas of interest are sociological theory and feminist theory. Currently, she is working on a book titled *Doing Feminist Theory: Paradigm Shifts from Modernity to Postmodernity* for Oxford University Press. She can be reached at samann@uno.edu.

Notes

1. The term "ecofeminism" was first coined in 1974 by the French feminist Françoise d'Eaubonne.

2. Those who criticize environmental justice activists for their "muted" discussion of gender issues (Stein 2004, 6) fail to realize that broadening the notion of feminism to include a struggle against *all* forms of oppression like racism, classism, and imperialism is a position held by feminist frameworks such as third world feminism (Sen and Grown 1987, 19). Intersectionality theorists often refer to themselves as "U.S. third world feminists" and discuss their common ground with this global perspective (Sandoval 1995).

3. Patricia Hill Collins (1998) notes a number of differences between intersectional approaches and those that have taken the postmodern turn. She views their call for the demise of binary thinking as resulting in flattened hierarchies that obscure power relations: "As . . . conceptions of power shifted—talk of tops and bottoms, long associated with hierarchy, were recast as flattened geographies of centers and margins [that] rob the term of oppression of its critical and oppositional importance." She also rejects their focus on local forms of resistance, viewing this as politically impotent when compared with macro-structural social change (129, 136).

4. For a fine study of the environmental struggles of Mexican Americans, see Devon Pena (1998); for a discussion of a wider range of racial and ethnic groups in the United States, see Dorceta Taylor (1997, 2002).

5. Steven Seidman (2000) writes: "Identity constructions necessarily entail the silencing or exclusion of some experiences or forms of life." He uses the example of how "the assertion of a black, middle-class, American, lesbian identity silences differences in this social category that relate to religion, regional location . . . to feminism, age or education" (441).

6. "Settler colonialism," or internal colonialism, is used to describe relations of exploitation between settlers and the indigenous peoples they displaced; it also includes

racial/ethnic groups who were relegated to subordinate labor markets, who faced institutional restrictions that were not imposed upon the dominant population, such as segregation laws or exclusion from citizenship rights, and whose native cultures were destroyed in the process (Blauner 1972).

7. The Red Scare of 1919–1920 resulted in the arrests and deportations of immigrants who were suspected of being radicals; membership in the U.S. Communist Party was reduced by some 80 percent (Schweikart and Allen 2004).

8. The Hull House's annual budget was over \$20,000 in 1900; in flush times, the Negro Fellowship League's was about \$6,000 (Schechter 2001, 189).

9. The Audubon Society was financed in the late-1890s by a woman, Harriet Hemenway (Taylor 2002, 8).

10. Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) concept of cultural capital covers a variety of resources, such as general cultural awareness, aesthetic preferences, and educational credentials (494).

References

- Alaimo, Stacy. 2000. *Undomesticated Ground: Recasting Nature as Feminist Space*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Austin, Mary. 1903. *The Land of Little Rain*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Baca Zinn, Maxine, and Stanley Eitzen. 1993. *Diversity in Families*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Blauner, Robert. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bullard, Robert. 1994. *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club.
- . ed. 1993. *Confronting Environmental Racism: Voices from the Grassroots*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1992. "Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of Postmodernism." In *Feminists Theorize the Political*, ed. Judith Butler and Ann W. Scott, 3–21. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Combahee River Collective. 2005. "A Black Feminist Statement." In *Feminist Theory: A Reader*, ed. Wendy K. Kolmar and Frances Bartkowski, 311–17. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Cooper, James Fenimore. [1823]1984. *The Leatherstocking Tales*. Reprint. New York: Library of America.
- Cott, Nancy. 1987. *The Grounding of Modern Feminism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Darnovsky, Marcy. 1992. "Stories Less Told: Histories of U.S. Environmentalism." *Socialist Review* 22(4): 11–54.

- Diamond, Irene, and Gloria Orenstein. 1990. *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club.
- Eastman, Crystal. [1919]1978. *On Women and Revolution*. Reprint. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, and Deirdre English. 1978. *For Her Own Good: 150 Year of the Experts' Advice to Women*. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 2002. *Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy: A Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1, *An Introduction*. New York: Vintage.
- Gaard, Greta. 1997. "Toward a Queer Ecofeminism." *Hypatia* 12(1): 114–37.
- Giddings, Paula. 1984. *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America*. New York: Bantam.
- Gordon, Linda. 1995. "Black and White Visions of Welfare: Women's Welfare Activism, 1890–1945." In *"We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible": A Reader in Black Women's History*, ed. Darlene Clark Hine, Wilma King, and Linda Reed, 449–85. New York: New York University Press.
- Gottlieb, Robert. 2005. *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Grant, Judith. 1993. *Fundamental Feminism: Contesting the Core Concepts of Feminist Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Haddour, Azzedine. 2001. *Colonial Myths: History and Narrative*. New York: Routledge.
- Hayden, Dolores. 1985. *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- hooks, bell. 1995. "Beauty Laid Bare: Aesthetics in the Ordinary." In *To Be Real: Telling the Truth and Changing the Face of Feminism*, ed. Rebecca Walker, 157–65. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.
- . 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Jacobs, Harriet. [1861]2005. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*. Reprint. Stilwell, KS: Digireads.com Publishing.
- Kaalund, Valerie Ann. 2004. "Witness to Truth: Black Women Heeding the Call for Environmental Justice." In *New Perspectives on Environmental Justice: Gender, Sexuality, and Activism*, ed. Rachel Stein, 78–92. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kheel, Marti. 2008. *Nature Ethics: An Ecofeminist Perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kincaid, Jamaica. 2001. "Sowers and Reapers." *New Yorker*, 22 January: 41.
- Krauss, Celene. 1994. "Women of Color on the Front Line." In *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color*, ed. Robert D. Bullard, 256–72. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club.
- Kraut, Alan M. 1994. *Silent Travelers: Germs, Genes, and the "Immigrant Menace"*. New York: Basic Books.
- LaDuke, Winona. 1997. *Last Standing Woman*. Stillwater, MN: Voyageur Press.
- Lanchester, John. 2007. "The Heroine of Hill Top Farm." *New York Times*, 15 March: 25–28.

- Lerner, Gerda. 1979. *The Majority Finds Its Past: Placing Women in History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levine, Lawrence W. 1977. *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Luke, Timothy W. 1999. *Capitalism, Democracy, and Ecology: Departing from Marx*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Mankiller, Wilma, and Michael Wallis. 1993. *Mankiller: A Chief and Her People*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McKittrick, Katherine, and Clyde Woods. 2007. *Black Geographies and the Politics of Place*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Melosi, Martin. 2000. *The Sanitary City: Urban Infrastructure in American from Colonial Times to the Present*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Merchant, Carolyn. 2007. *American Environmental History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1995. *Earthcare: Women and the Environment*. New York: Routledge.
- Messer-Davidow, Ellen. 2002. *Disciplining Feminism: From Social Activism to Academic Discourse*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mies, Maria, and Vandana Shiva. 1993. *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.
- Mihesuah, Devon Abbott. 2003. *Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, Activism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Nash, Roderick. 2001. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Norwood, Vera. 1993. *Made from This Earth: American Women and Nature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Pena, Devon G., ed. 1998. *Chicano Culture, Ecology, Politics: Subversive Kin*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline, ed. 1993. *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions between Foucault and Feminism*. New York: Routledge.
- Roberts, Geoffrey, ed. 2001. *The History and Narrative Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Salleh, Ariel. 1997. *Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern*. London: Zed Books.
- Sandoval, Chéla. 1995. "Feminist Forms of Agency and Oppositional Consciousness: U.S. Third World Feminist Criticism." In *Provoking Agents: Gender and Agency in Theory and Practice*, ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner, 208–26. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Scharff, Virginia J., ed. 2003. *Seeing Nature through Gender*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Schechter, Patricia A. 2001. *Ida B. Wells-Barnett and American Reform, 1880–1930*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Schweikart, Larry, and Michael Patrick Allen. 2004. *A Patriot's History of the United States*. New York: Sentinel.
- Sedgwick, Eve. 1990. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Seidman, Steven. 2000. "Queer-ing Sociology, Sociologizing Queer Theory." In *Social Theory: Roots and Branches*, ed. Peter Kivisto, 434–55. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Sen, Gita, and Caren Grown. 1987. *Development, Crisis and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

- Shaw, Stephanie. 1995. "Black Club Women and the Creation of the National Association of Colored Women." In *"We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible": A Reader in Black Women's History*, ed. Darlene Clark Hine, Wilma King, and Linda Reed, 433–47. New York: New York University Press.
- Smith, Andy. 1997. "Ecofeminism through an Anticolonial Framework." In *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature*, ed. Karen J. Warren, 21–37. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Smith, Kimberly K. 2007. *African American Environmental Thought: Foundations*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Stein, Rachel, ed. 2004. *New Perspectives on Environmental Justice: Gender, Sexuality, and Activism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Sturgeon, Noel. 1997. *Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, Feminist Theory, and Political Action*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Dorceta E. 2002. *Race, Class, Gender, and American Environmentalism*. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-534. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.
- . 1997. "American Environmentalism: The Role of Race, Class, and Gender, 1820–1995." *Race, Gender & Class* 5(1): 16–62.
- Unger, Nancy C. 2004. "Women, Sexuality, and Environmental Justice in American History." In *New Perspectives on Environmental Justice: Gender, Sexuality, and Activism*, ed. Rachel Stein, 45–77. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Walker, Alice. 1983. *In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens: Humanist Prose*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Washington, Sylvia Hood. 2005. *Packing Them In: An Archaeology of Environmental Racism in Chicago, 1865–1954*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- White, Richard. 1984. "Native Americans and the Environment." In *Scholars and the Indian Experience: Critical Reviews of Recent Writing in the Social Sciences*, ed. William R. Swagerty, 179–204. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Whitman, Walt. [1855]2005. *Leaves of Grass*. Reprint. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, Susan. 1985. "Crushed Geraniums: Juan Francisco Manzano and the Language of Slavery." In *The Slave's Narrative*, ed. Charles T. Davis and Henry Louis Gates Jr., 199–224. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yudkin, Marcia. 1982. "Earth, Air, Water, Hearth: The Woman Who Founded Ecology." *Vassar Quarterly* (Spring): 32–35.