TRANSNATIONAL PRESS® LONDON

Journal of Ecohumanism
January 2024
Volume: 3, No: 1, pp. 1 – 11
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
journals.tplondon.com/ecohumanism

Received: 27 October 2023 Accepted: 1 December 2023
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33182/joe.v3i1.3166

Introduction: "Who Cares for the Carers?": A Feminist Approach to Ecological Citizenship

Dipanwita Pal[1]

This special issue has chiefly four components to focus upon—citizenship, ecological responsibilities, ecofeminist approach and politics of care, among whom the primary component is citizenship. The recent discourse on citizenship is domineered by the liberal and the civic republican frameworks. T. H. Marshall defines citizenship as "a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community" (1950, 14). Disparagingly, some other critics cite Aristotle's definition of a citizen as one who "shares in decision and office" with the capacity "to rule and be ruled finely" (1984, 87, 91). Teena Gabrielson sums up this issue with the explanation: "… the liberal model emphasizes citizenship as a public status that ensures the holder of civil, political and social rights; while the civic republican model, renewed by the communitarian challenge to liberalism, emphasizes the public duties, virtues and practices of citizenship" (2008, 430).

Recent conversations on citizenship have foregrounded the comprehension of the issue as emphasizing upon duty, virtue, self-governance (Steenbergen, 1994; Dobson, 2000). Even a large number of green critics accept Dobson's argument that "one of ecological citizenship's most crucial contributions to contemporary theorizing is its focus on the duties and obligations that attend citizenship" (2000, 41). Gilbert and Philips's approach to "socio-ecological citizenship" avoids the objectification of nature and its plausibility of exclusion (2008, 328). The authors advocate that "the dichotomy between nature and society is ineffective in describing contemporary realities: rather, nature and society are both integral to and irreducible to each other" (2003, 320). The most comprehensive development among the recent critics on green citizenship comes from Dobson (*Citizen and the Environment*, 2003). He offers a transnational and associational notion of citizenship where the arena of political obligation is generated by "the material production and reproduction of daily life in an unequal and asymmetrically globalized world" (2003, 21, 30). Dobson's work is noted for its focus upon the enormous inequalities initiated and sustained by globalization, and for the demand for justice he upholds through it. Following Dobson's work, Bullen and Whitehead forwards the definition of sustainable citizenship as: "… a transhuman community of being which crosses time, space and substance… a form of unbounded and relational citizenship—unbounded to the extent that it challenges the traditional spatial, temporal and subjective boundaries of citizenship, and relational in the sense that it requires a keen awareness of the connections which exist between social actions, economic practices, and environmental process" (2005, 504). Curry upholds an "ecological republicanism" and outshines the perception of community applicable to both, the natural and the social. He suggests that all

[1] Dr Dipanwita Pal, Assistant Professor, Galsi Mahavidyalaya, West Bengal, India. E-mail: dipanwitapal@gmail.com

communities need certain practices to sustain them (2000, 1069). Curtin asserts that liberal imperialism "has been used to marginalize both peoples and places, especially those peoples who understand themselves—or are defined by others—as being defined by their connections to particular places" (2003, 296). The acknowledgements of the capricious character of citizenship on the part of Bullen and Whitehead provokes a new direction to the principal focus upon obligation and duty within the citizenship literature.

In his article, *Towards a global ecological citizen* (1994), Van Steenbergen attempts at integrating the issues of citizenship and environment: "Current discussions seem to concern 'two cultures', one dealing with citizenship problems and the other with environmental problems, and so far, these two cultures have not met" (1994, 142). In the *Introduction* to their volume *Environmental Citizenship* (2006), Dobson and Bell find the contributors to the volume concentrating upon a number of issues "as part of an inquiry into the nature, possibilities, and limits of citizenship as a way of promoting sustainability" (2006, 7). On the other hand, Latta argues that "the existing literature tends to treat ecological citizenship primarily as a normative and institutional tool for promoting a greener future" (2007, 379). Based upon the components of duties and obligations in relation to citizenship, Barry builds his concept of "ecological stewardship" upon the model of agricultural stewardship. He proclaims: "The democratic procedures and institutions through which societies debate, argue about, and ultimately organize and regulate their relations (or what I have called elsewhere their metabolism) to the environment are the modern substitutes for direct experience of the 'land' that characterize agricultural stewardship" (2002, 138).

Eventually, the responsibility of this ecological stewardship has largely been bestowed upon the women. In connection to the consequences of gender-blind environmental policies, Beate Littig observes, "… end-of -the pipeline strategy [i.e. separating the waste instead of reducing packaging] of environmental politics usually represents more work for women since they are responsible for reproductive labour" (2001, 23). MacGregor hits at the heart of the problematics of balancing between women's household work and their civic participation: "Many of them [the women] reported being 'burnt out' from taking on three very time-consuming burdens of responsibility: unpaid caring, paid work, and active environmental citizenship" (2010, 11). She goes on, "Clearly this situation should be of concern to ecofeminists. Rather than ask, 'who cares for the carers?', however, celebratory narratives of women's 'earthcare' sweep this paradox under the carpet" (2010, 11).

The recent conversations regarding citizenship in the sphere of social sciences, the feminists argue, are not at all gender neutral. To denote the linkage between women and earthcare, Mary Mellor claims that "women are not closer to nature because of some elemental physiological or spiritual affinity, but because of the social circumstances in which they find themselves" (2000, 114). Carolyn Merchant asserts her position as gender-inclusive (with the proposition that it is possible for men to prove themselves as earth-carers too) to safeguard herself from the allegation of essentialism. Sturgeon (1997) and other critics argue in favour of a "feminine socio-material connection" to nature for the advancement of ecofeminism as a political movement. While addressing these issues, MacGregor introduces the term "ecomaternalism". Moreover, she raises, and tries to find out the answers to some disturbing questions such as: "What does it mean for a woman to invoke the identity of 'mother' to explain her participation in the political sphere? Why seeing activism as an extension of women's private roles rather than a conscious choice to engage in public life that is valuable in itself? What are the risks of

celebrating women's caring at time when their unpaid, life-sustaining labour is under increased demand from both the neoliberal state and from greens seeking harness it to solve the serious threats of global climate change?" (2010, 5-6).

Sherilyn MacGregor expresses her desire to propose a project of feminist ecological citizenship. She argues: "What makes feminist ecological citizenship distinct from other approaches is that it refuses the privatization and feminization of care and calls for public debate of labour (e.g., care) can be recognized to allow for women's equal participation as citizens. Care is thereby *politicized* as a necessary part of citizenship, rather than as a 'natural resource' that sustains action in the public sphere" (13). Plumwood also advocates: "a better integration of democracy with everyday life can provide some of the necessary conditions for a public political morality" (1995, 157). MacGregor perceives feminist ecological citizenship as a discourse that possesses "the potential to provide a common language through which ecofeminists may engage in much needed encounters with other branches of green scholarship that share their interest in sustainable human-nature relationships and yet have understandings of citizenship that are woefully gender-blind" (2010, 14).

MacGregor raises a few basic questions that are worrying the ecofeminist critics: "Are women more 'naturally' connected to nature than men? Do women's gendered roles and experiences give them unique insight into human-nature relationships? Why is it that women around the world seem to demonstrate relatively more concern for the quality of their environments than men? Where do the roots of this concern lie?" (2010, 1). She questions the assertions of the ecofeminists of the 'special role for women as environmental caretakers' (2010, 2). For her, "over-reliance on the discourse of care, mothering" (2010, 2) etc. has never proved to be beneficial for ecofeminism. She pleads in favour of *politicizing* (her emphasis) women's capacity to care rather than *romanticizing* it in a male dominated society. Carolyn Merchant, the author of *Earthcare, Women and the Environment* (1996) eulogizes the role of the women in achieving ecological sustainability. Ariel Salleh (1997) consecrates the "barefoot epistemology" of southern "resisters". Maria Mies and Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen (1999) formulates the "subsistence perspective", whereas Vandana Shiva (1989) focuses on the "feminine principle". Many of the feminist critics believe that women, as mothers, keep worrying about the health of their offsprings. They assure a sense of duty towards the next generation which draws them into environmentalism. According to Joni Seager, "women's environmental activism occurs within the context of, and as a result of, their particular socially assigned roles - roles that in many ways do transcend boundaries of race, ethnicity, and class" (1993, 269).

Feminist ecological citizenship has been upheld as an alternative to ecomaternalist discourse by MacGregor. She identifies the exploitation of unpaid labour by the state with the benefit of decrease in social expenditure (2010, 7). There can rarely be any doubt regarding the fact that the major part of the 'unpaid caring labour' is executed by the women (European Commission 2007, Chen et al 2005). This further leads to unequal distribution of caring labour between genders. According to Brodie (1996a), this is the re-privatization of care. He further observes, "[i]t has become increasingly apparent that new neoliberal state marks a distinct shift in shared understandings of what it means to be a citizen and what the citizen can legitimately ask of the state" (1996b, 130). Nicholas Rose (1996), while trying to theorize neoliberal redefinition of citizenship, has emphasized upon reduction of government responsibilities by the formation of responsible citizens realizing their duties of caring. Some

other theorists advocate the democratic involvement of people in the ongoing process along with active participation (Dobson, 2003).

Beyond Mothering Earth, Ecological Citizenship and the Politics of Care (MacGregor, 2007) (from which the title of this special issue has largely been drawn), is a scholarly work that provides a critical analysis upon feminist and environmental literature (Part One), while Part Two interprets thirty 'conversations' with women activists from Canada. These interviews unfold several issues. MacGregor had the premonition that these conversations would 'complicate' the scenario of women's activism. Her intention behind these interviews was to "disrupt and complicate a particular profile of women engaged in quality-of-life activism that is constructed in the ecofeminist and feminist texts" (2007, 181). Most of the interviewees expressed motherhood and caring as the chief influential motivation. They accepted the fact of taking/commencing the main responsibility in the household chores related to environmental behaviour for "managing their families' participation" (2007, 202). But the interesting fact is that the most successful long-term activists belong to houses where the division of labour has been more equally distributed.

About care-focused feminism, Carol Gilligan (1982) and Nel Noddings (1984) advocates that 'care' is such an element which is never gender-specific and should be adopted by both men and women. Maureen Sander-Staudt reflects, "Although care ethics is not synonymous with feminist ethics, much has been written about care ethics as a feminine and feminist ethic, in relation to motherhood, international relations and political theory. Care ethics is widely applied to a number of moral issues and ethical fields, including caring for animals and the environment, bioethics, and more recently public policy. Originally conceived as most appropriate to the private and intimate spheres of life, care ethics has branched out as a political theory and social movement aimed at broader understanding of, and public support for, care-giving activities in their breadth and variety" (2011, 134).

Now, the issue of abortion is also deeply connected to bioethics. While concentrating upon the receivers of care, we often tend to forget the basic health rights of the caregivers. While discussing the abortion law in New Zealand, Dare and Fletcher are astonished to perceive that "Suddenly and again, women, mothers and activists everywhere were starkly reminded that women's bodies are broadly legislated and controlled historically and currently by States (governed mostly by men)" (2023, 2). Academicians studying abortion controversy see it as fundamental right of the women and voice in favour of legalized abortion. Paul Brest, while reviewing *Roe and Wade* case, observes: "The judges and scholars who support judicial intervention usually acknowledge that the right is at stake… are not specified by the text or original history of the constitution. They argue that the judiciary is nonetheless authorized, if not duty-bound, to protect individuals against government-interference with these rights" (1981, 1081).

The movement for abortion reform started in the United States in 1959. The American Law Institute pleaded for abortion for the sake of the mother's or the child's health, both physical and mental. The issue was defined as 'medical' problem. But the issue of the elective abortion that adheres to the ideological appeals was not paid due attention. During the 1970s and 1980s, activists started connecting abortion to some other social issues like political conservatism, women's rights, and personal morality. Donald Grenberg, one of the most prominent researchers on this issue, finds the public attitude upon abortion betrayed through their impression on homosexuality, sex education extra-marital relations etc. In the 1970s, the

supporters of legalized abortion acknowledged the woman's 'right to choose' an abortion without the interference of the government as a freedom which is equal in status to the Bill of Rights.

The concept of 'multispecies mothering' is another significant issue that deserves mention within this discussion. Mariko Oyama Thomas, within "Multispecies Mothering: Connecting with Plants through Process of Procreation" elucidates: "Narratives that the motherhood(s) and women in all multitudes to environmentalism can consist of tangled, painfully colonized, patriarchal motives bound up in diverse moral codes" (2011, 177). While trying to trace back the origin of such linkings, Merchant traces back the unfortunate proposition forwarded by Aristotle that regulates eggs within ovaries to be passive and material, and the spirit of female as "irrational, hence closer to illogical and wild 'nature'". Thomas perceives: "The legacy of these ideas makes women's connections to birth, domesticity and the more-than-human entirely complicated for those working to subvert old expressions, yet still wishing to engage in ecofeminist conversations and honouring the outstanding possibilities of having a woman's body" (2011, 177). Young (2001) and some other environmentalists find the hidden message regarding the inadequacy of the mainstream environmentalism for the sake of the survival of the more-than-human species. Crittenden (2002) raises the question that should women still choose to procreate/give birth under this pressure? Ray claims, "with all those diapers, and commutes to soccer games and new car seats, I might just start hacking away at glaciers myself" (2011, 83). She continues to register the pressures of 'green motherhood', or the intertwining of motherhood and environmentalism. She advocates a re-evaluation of the heaping of the 'labour-intensive project' of being environment-friendly upon mothers.

Within this context of motherhood, we can ruminate Alaimo's understanding of *transcorporeality* (2008) and Bennett's (2010) vital materiality, because they shred fragments of animacy within the backdrop of contemporary Western thoughts while acknowledging the 'relatability and permeability' of possessing a body upon earth. Bennett argues in her *Vibrant Matter* in favour of considering the 'vital materiality' running through everything, and the consequences (environmental as well as political) of the human ignorance of it. She reflects: "…an active becoming, a creative not-quite-human force capable of producing the new buzzes within the history of the term nature. This vital materiality congeals into bodies, bodies that seek to preserve to prolong their run" (2010, 118). Bennett promotes anthropocentrism to be used as a tool in spite of the aversion of many scholars, as she considers that "too often the philosophical rejection of anthropomorphism is bound up with a hubristic demand that only human and God can bear any trace of creative agency" (2010, 120). For Simard, the trees are extended family to the humans – interconnected and interdependent on each other (2021, 259). Through anthropomorphizing, she tries to show that mothering is not limited within humans of a particular gender, rather it can be performed by the trees too. Simard embraces the concept of maternal labour extended to human people and tree people from the Aboriginal people of the Pacific Northwest (2021, 294). In *Love's Labour* (2020), the care ethicist Eva Fader Kittey raises the issue of the importance/urgency of care needed by the caregivers. To establish her argument, Kittey cites the role of the *doula*, the etymological meaning of which is 'slave' or 'bondswomen'. So, a *doula* is in service to other, but in this context, it refers to a particular type of service. A *doula* "assists by caring for the mother as the mother attends to the child" (2020, 116). So, in a way, a *doula* cares for the caregiver.

Finally, I would like to focus upon Stockholm Syndrome and its existence even within different kinds of relationships, as it has been referred to within one of the articles of this issue. The feminist psychologist Dee Graham promotes the phenomenon of "societal Stockholm Syndrome" (qtd. in Carver) while critiquing detrimental cultural practices of the European society. Joseph M. Carver, a clinical psychologist, investigates into the emotional bonding with the abuser as a survival strategy adopted by the victim of abuse and intimidation. Now, the domain of Stockholm Syndrome is not confined only within the captor-hostage situations. Feminist psychologists like Graham have identified this syndrome to be existing within family, romantic, or interpersonal relationships. For Carver, the abuser may be the husband or the wife, father or mother, boyfriend or girlfriend or other relations within the family or within the society who possess the controlling authority. Among the four situations that Carver advances as foundation for the development of Stockholm Syndrome, two are particularly relevant for the Societal Stockholm Syndrome: 1) presence of trivial instances of kindness to the victim from the abuser, and 2) the victim's perception of his/her inability to escape the situation. Graham also widens the range of the conventional definitions of this syndrome to include the usual reaction of the women within the patriarchal system where they have to live under the direct threat of male violence. To her, it can occur consciously or unconsciously. The development of this syndrome within the relationships is not at all uncommon. Law enforcement professionals often witness such cases where they are called by neighbours for domestic violence, but find the abused partner defending his/her abuser. Its subtle appropriation can be found within the phenomenon of women participating and upholding the beauty standards for which the bodies, behaviour and minds are constantly "violated, altered and reformed" (Holmes, included in this special issue).

While curating this special issue I particularly kept in mind to cater to the diverse issues related to the politics of care, as much as possible within the limited space. Interestingly, the contributors of this issue of the journal are from different parts of the world, hence coming up with heterogenous approaches to ecofeminist citizenship. Within the first article, Jessica Holmes scrutinizes the portrayal of the wild woman/wolf trope that she calls the 'semi-historical, semi-mythological' stories of the wolf-children of Bengal as they have been presented Bhanu Kapil in *Humanimal: A Project for Future Children*. She relates Kapil's engagement with the wild woman/wolf trope with that of intergenerational trauma. Holmes has rightly felt the need to raise the issue of the ecofeminist ethics of care across difference of species, sex, race, class etc in this connection. Holmes makes mention of French researcher Serge Aroles' suspicion regarding the authenticity of the diary of Joseph Singh, the rector of the orphanage where the wolf-girls received shelter. Aroles speculates the girls suffering from some severe neurological disabilities. Holmes finds that throughout the text, the body of the humanimal "acts as a site (or rather many sites) of movement, negotiation, entanglement, attachment, estrangement, memory, power and resistance". The concept of humanimal paves the way to false hierarchy of speciesism leading to granting less humanlike rights to those who are closer to the border between human and nonhuman. This approach helps in shaping the hierarchies of killability, even across human-animal lines to the animal-animal lines. Holmes draws the attention of her readers towards the rendering of the 'humanimals' as 'lifeless, absent or unreal', a ghost-like appearance. She refers to the brutality and violence exercised upon the wolf-girls within the Home (the 'homelessness' of which Kapil exposes) as it is found from the diary of Singh, in order to shed the 'animality' off from them. A parallel has also been made between the behavioural pattern of the wolf-mother and the Father (of the

Home), highlighting the reversal of the conventional perceptions of the human and the animal through Kapils's depiction of the passionate, loving and caring wolf-mother and the brutal objectification of the humanimal by the Father.

Eventually, after the exercising of 'humanification' upon Kamala for a long period, she manages to adopt some of the human habits. Holmes associates this behavioural change within the wolf-girl with that of Stockholm Syndrome. The process of *pathologisation* and domestication of the wolf-girls through 'splitting' and 'correcting' to fit the predominant definition of 'human' has been paralleled by Holmes with the treatments for so-called 'female hysteria' in the nineteenth and twentieth century—hypnosis, electric convulsive therapy, along with medical and marital rape. Holmes finally argues in favour of a constructive rehabilitation of our cultural and ecological relationships and of the urgency to keep today's wolf-girls alive so that they can grow up into the wild women of tomorrow.

The next article, by Chiara Montalti, emphasizes upon the inadequacy of the medical and personal understanding of disability. It is basically a political concept, which is subject to interpretation. Montalti relies on Kafer for defining disability, who advocates that it is "experienced in and through relationships; it does not occur in isolation" (2013, 8). She wishes to examine disability both as a sociocultural trope and as a personal experience. The discourses related to environmental issues tend to downgrade disabled persons as passive. Montalti draws upon two approaches to passivity and minority: a) considering disabled persons merely as the victims of environmental devastation and b) *cautionary tales* in relation to disability and environment. She warns her readers against the probable dangers of associating disability with vulnerability, as it tends to reincarnate the history of marginalization. Rather, the adaptability and the inventive powers of the disabled people can enrich us in terms of skills in disaster management. In this connection, Montalti refers to Haraway's term 'sympoietic' (2016). She also introduces the figuration of 'witness', that helps in the development of productive trajectories. She analyses Cormick's performance of *The Mermaid* in 2018 at the Art, Not Apart Festival in Canberra, where the mermaid has been portrayed as dislocated, out of place as she is taken out of water, upholding the fact that the differences in the environment affect an individual's enability and disability. She speculates this performance as a manifestation of Haraway's concept of witness. For her, *The Mermaid* exemplifies an "embedded, embodied and situated form of *witnessing* the environmental crisis" (Montalti, included in this issue). Cormick herself views *The Mermaid* as a celebration of subjects not aspiring to be autonomous or self-contained, rather accepting limits and inter-dependence. For Montalti, the performance is 'a warning' referring to "both, ourselves and the environment" (Cormick, n.d.). As a solution to the issue of the ambiguousness of the relation between disability and environmental crises, Montalti advocates the formula used by the activists, #TheFutureIsDisabled. Through her article, Montalti has tried to emphasize upon the value of the disabled people in terms of sustaining the challenges posed by the environmental crisis.

For Irina-Anca Bobei, "care is a slippery notion". She believes in Carolyn Merchant's (1983) argument regarding the overlapping of nature with that of womanhood, prolificacy of the Earth with women's reproductive abilities, and caring with mothering. Bobei advocates the concept of 'multispecies recuperation and resurgence' act forwarded by Donna Haraway (2016, 8) for revisiting the potential of care. According to Bobei, the discourse on plant-human relationship must address the identification of the objectifying the nonhuman subjects within the relational character of care for the decentring of anthropocentric prospect.

Specifically, the article probes into the "(dis)continued forms of caring" within "radical gardening" in the urban region. It aims at scrutinizing the plant/human relationships through an intertwining of the economies of the public gardening and collated *response-ability* (Haraway 2016). Bobei aims at finding out an elucidation for MacGregor's projection/proposal of re-evaluation of nature of care within the sphere of ecofeminist cogitations, disrupting the conventional gender roles. She draws on the CPS (Critical Plant Studies) for investigating into plant-human dynamics that questions the notion like agency, intentionality, and subjectivity. She also refers to the practice of 'guerilla gardening' which is indeed "a battle for resources, a battle against scarcity of land, environmental abuse and wasted opportunities" (Raynolds 2014, 8-9). It is, to be precise, a form of civil society activism uplifting social cohesiveness. Thus, guerilla gardening converts not only into an instrument/weapon for intruding into privatised areas but also becomes a means of disturbing the borders between private and public space, nature and culture, motivating people to "invest sites and spaces with new meaning and value" (Pederson 2018, 14). Furthermore, Bobei refers to the almost-turned-into slogan 'Resist like a plant' that has passed into the 'ethos' of the art-botanical interference into urban habitats. Within the final part of the article, Bobei has attempted at investigating into the process of the change of language of care along with the interdisciplinary works of Ellie Iron, the social activist, artist, and educator. Thus, Bobei here has successfully unearthed the complex nature of caring, along with a search for the 'inner plant' (a term used by Myers for vegetablization, 2021) while focusing upon addressing the inequalities and power relations within more-than-human communities.

Finally, Namrata Chowdhury revisits the Bengal Partition of 1947 to probe into the navigation of the migrant East Bengalis into their new identity as refugees and the ecological and culinary citizenships they were aspiring to achieve. To establish her argument, she takes up/chooses a few novels and short stories that were originally written in Bengali and then translated into English (chiefly *A Life Long Ago*, a novel by Sunanda Sikdar and translated by Anchita Ghatak, *Bengal Partition Stories, An Unclosed Chapter*, an anthology edited by Basabi Fraser). She begins the discourse with a story by Shoma A. Chatterjee from Fraser anthology, *The Woman Who Wanted to Become a Tree* where the author narrates the desire of a refugee woman to be metamorphosed into a tree. However strange her longing may sound, the tree, for her, symbolizes the desire for rootedness and for citizenship. Chowdhury cites references from Anita Mannur who enquires into the affective value of food while it becomes both "intellectual and emotional anchor" (Mannur 2007,11) to the displaced and resettled refugees. Culinary citizenship is, as Chowdhury discerns/interprets it, "a form of affective citizenship which grants subjects the ability to claim and inhabit certain subject positions via their relationship to food" (Mannur 13). The essay accentuates the role of the refugees in challenging the traditional gender roles and perplexing the politics of care for a more gender-friendly concept. The refugees as they have been portrayed within these stories are conscious political activists who are thriving at "restoring, sustaining ecological and culinary balance" (Chowdhury). The article's re-search results in bringing out the East Bengali refugees, both men and women, as ecological and culinary carers. Chowdhury wishes to see the East Bengali refugees no longer as victims of the Partition historiography but as establishing their voice in creating individual as well as collective identities through their zeal for culinary citizenship.

So, it shows that the articles that are included within this special issue are engaged with diversified topics like 'humanification', 'sympoietic', 'radical gardening' 'culinary citizenship' and such others. Holmes attempts at exploring the anthropocentric and patriarchal models of

'care', while Montalti focuses on the challenges posted upon disability within the realm of environmental activism. Bobei draws upon the interdependencies between artistic manifestation of urban activism and plant specificities through a vegetalised approach, whereas Namrata Chowdhury approaches to a very engaging and unique aspect of citizenship through the culinary practices of the respective people. Thus, the articles included within this issue provide the readers the scope to rethink over the problematics of citizenship, ecological stewardship, ecomaternalism, care ethics and so on which again, paves the way for revolutionary discourses to germinate in future.

References

Alaimo, S. (2008). Trans-Corporeal Feminisms and the Ethical Space of Nature. In S. Alaimo & S. Hekman (Eds.), *Material Feminisms*, (pp. 237–264). Indiana University Press.

Alaimo, S. (2010). Bodily Natures: Science, Environment, and the Material Self. Indiana University Press.

Aristotle, (1984). *The politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Aroles, S. (2007). *L'Enigme des Enfants-Loups*. Publibook.

Barry, J. (2002). Vulnerability and Virtue: Democracy, Dependency, and Ecological Stewardship. In B. A. Minteer, & B. P. Taylor (Eds.), *Democracy and the Claims of Nature* (pp. 133-152). Rowman & Littlefield.

Bennett, J. (2010). Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things. Duke University Press.

Brest, P. (1981). The Fundamental Rights Controversy: The Essential Contradictions of Normative Constitutional Scholarship. *Yale Law Journal*, 90. pp.1063-1109.

Brodie, J. (1996a). Restructuring and the New Citizenship. In Bakker, Isabella (ed.), *Rethinking Restructuring*, (pp.126-140). University of Toronto Press.

Brodie, J. (1996b). Canadian Women, Changing State Forms, and Public Policy. In Brodie, Janine (Ed.), *Women and Canadian Public Policy*, (pp.1-28). Harcourt Brace.

Bullen, A., Whitehead, M. (2005). Negotiating the networks of space, time, and substance: a geographical perspective on the sustainable citizen. *Citizenship studies*, 9 (5), pp.499–516.

Carver, J. M. (2012). Love and Stockholm Syndrome: The Mystery of Loving an Abuser. http://drjoecarver.makeswebsites.com/clients/49355/File/love_and_stockholm_syndrome.html.

Chatterji, S. A. (2023). The Woman Who Wanted To Become A Tree. In M. Majumdar (Ed.), *No Return Address: Partition And Stories Of Displacement* (pp. 1-11). Vitasta.

Chen, Martha et al. (2005). *Progress of the World's Women 2005: Women, Work and Poverty*. New York: United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).

Cormick, H. (2018). *The Mermaid*, Performance with H. Cormick and C. S. Carroll.

Cormick, H. (n.d.). Current works. https://www.hannacormick.com/current-works.

Crittenden, A. (2002). The Price of Motherhood: Why the Most Important Job in the World Is Still the Least Valued. Macmillan.

Curry, P. (2000). Redefining community: towards an ecological republicanism. *Biodiversity and conservation*, 9, pp.1059–1071.

Curtin, D. (2003). Ecological citizenship. In E.F. Isin & B.S. Turner (Eds.) *Handbook of citizenship studies*. (pp.293–304). Sage.

Dare, A. M., Vail F. (2023). Labors of Love and Loss: Radical Acts of Human, Plant, and Nonhuman Mothering. *Journal of Ecohumanism*. Vol 2, No 1. pp.1-7.

Dobson, A. and Bell, D. (2006). Introduction. In A. Dobson & D. Bell (Eds.). *Environmental citizenship*. (pp.1–17). MIT Press.

Dobson, A. (2000). *Green political thought*. 3rd ed. Routledge.

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

Dobson, A. (2006). Citizenship. In A. Dobson & R. Eckersley (Eds.). *Political theory and the ecological challenge*. Cambridge University Press.

European Commission. (2007). *Report on Equality between Women and Men – 2007*. Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Unit G.1. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Fraser, B. Ed. (2008). Bengal Partition Stories: An Unclosed Chapter. Anthem Press.

Gabrielson, T. (2008). Green Citizenship: A Review and a Critic. *Citizenship Studies*. 12:4. pp.429-446.
Gilbert, L., Phillips, C. (2003). Practices of urban environmental citizenships: rights to the city and rights to nature in Toronto. *Citizenship studies*, 7 (3), pp.313–330.
Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice*. Harward University Press.
Grenberg, D. (1978). Pro-life or Reflection of Conservative Ideology? An Analysis of Opposition to Legalized Abortion. *Sociology and Social research*, 62, pp.414-429.
Haraway, D. J. (2016). Staying with the Trouble. Making Kin in the Chthulucene. Duke University Press.
Kafer, A. (2013). *Feminist, Queer, Crip*. Indiana University Press.
Kapil, B. (2009). Humanimal: A Project for Future Children. Kelsey Street Press.
Kittay, E. F. (2020). Love's Labor: Essays on Women, Equality, and Dependency (2nd ed.). Routledge.
Latta, P.A. (2007). Locating democratic politics in ecological citizenship. *Environmental politics*, 16, pp. 377–393.
Lister, R. (1997). Citizenship: towards a feminist synthesis. *Feminist review*, 57, pp.28–48.
Littig, B. (2001). Feminist Perspectives on Environment and Society, Harlow. Littlefield.
MacGregor, S. (2006). No sustainability with justice: a feminist critique of environmental citizenship. In A. Dobson and D. Bell (Eds), *Environmental citizenship (*pp.101–126). MIT Press.
MacGregor, S. (2005). The Public, the Private, the Planet and the Province: Women's Quality of Life Activism in Urban Southern Ontario. In Hessing, Melody et al. (Eds.), *This Elusive Land: Women and the Canadian Environment* (pp. 169-187). UBC Press.
MacGregor, S. (2010). Earthcare or Feminist Ecological Citizenship? *Femina Politica - die Zeitschrift für feministische Politikwissenschaft*. No. 1. pp.22-32.
MacGregor, S. (2007). Beyond Mothering Earth: Ecological Citizenship and the Politics of Care. UBC Press.
Mannur, A. (2007). Culinary Nostalgia: Authenticity, Nationalism, and Diaspora. *MELUS, 32*(4: Food in Multi-Ethnic Literatures), pp. 11-31. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30029829.
Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge University Press.
Maureen, S. S. (n.d.). *Care Ethics*. Accessed on 17.12.2018, Retrieved from: https:/ /www.iep. utm.edu/care-eth/.
Mellor, M. (2000). Feminism and Environmental Ethics: A Materialist Perspective. *Ethics and the Environment*. Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.107-23.
Merchant, C. (1983). The Death of Nature. Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution, Harper & Row.
Merchant, C. (1996). Earthcare: Women and the Environment. Routledge.
Mies, M., Bennholdt-Thomsen, V. (1999). The Subsistence Perspective: Beyond the Globalized Economy. Zed Books.
Myers, N. (2021). How to grow liveable worlds: Ten (not-so-easy) steps for life in the Planthroposcene. ABC Religion and Ethics. Retrieved from: https://www.abc.net.au/religion/natasha-myers-how-to-grow-liveable-worlds:-ten-not-so-easy-step/11906548.
Næss, P. (2006). Unsustainable Growth, Unsustainable Capitalism. *Journal of Critical Realism* 5 (2), pp.197–227. DOI: 10.1558/jocr.v5i2.197
Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education. University of California Press.
Pedersen, C. (2018). Subversive weeds: Bio-activist strategies in urban interventions. Nuart Journal, 1(1). Retrieved from: *https://nuartjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/03_Pedersen_Nuart-Journal-1-1-2018.pdf*.
Plumwood, V. (1995). Feminism, Privacy, and Radical Democracy. *Anarchist Studies*. Vol. 3, pp.97-120.
Ray, S. J. (2011). How Many Mothers Does It Take to Change All the Light Bulbs? The Myth of Green Motherhood. *Journal of the Motherhood Initiative for Research and Community Involvement,* 2 (1), pp. 81-101.
Reynolds, R. (2014). On guerrilla gardening: a handbook for gardening without boundaries. Bloomsbury Publishing.
Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing Our Selves*. Cambridge University Press.
Salleh, A. (1997). Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern. Zed Books.
Sander-Staudt, M. (2011). Care Ethics. In Eds. James Fieser & Bradley Dowden (Eds.), *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. https://iep.utm.edu/care-ethics/.
Seager, J. (2003). Rachel Carson Died of Breast Cancer: The Coming Age of Feminist Environmentalism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Vol. 28, No. 3, pp.945-972.

Shiva, V. (1989). Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development. Zed Books.
Sikdar, S. (2012). *A Life Long Ago.* (A. Ghatak, Trans.). Penguin Books.
Simard, S. (2021). Finding the Mother Tree: Discovering the Wisdom of the Forest. Knopf.
Sturgeon, N. (1997). Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, Feminist Theory and Political Action. Routledge.
Sturgeon, N. (2009). Environmentalism in Popular Culture: Gender, Race, Sexuality, and the Politics of the Natural. University of Arizona Press.
Thomas Oyama, M. (2011). Multispecies Motherhood: Connecting with Plants Through Processes of Procreation. In Vail Fletcher et al. (Eds.), *Communication in the Anthropocene: Intimate Relations*. Eds. (pp. 173-196). Lexington Books.
van Steenbergen, B. (1994). Towards a global ecological citizen. In B. van Steenbergen (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship*. (pp. 141–152). Sage.
Young, T. (2001.) Overconsumption and Procreation: Are They Morally Equivalent?. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 18(2), pp.183–192.