

Ecological Citizenship and the Corporation

Politicizing the New Corporate Environmentalism

Andrew Crane

Dirk Matten

York University

Jeremy Moon

University of Nottingham

This article introduces the concept of ecological citizenship to management theory and in particular to ways of understanding the roles and responsibilities of the corporation. It begins by establishing the case for incorporating citizenship thinking into the literature on organizations and the environment and specifically for developing a greater political orientation to new corporate environmentalism. It goes on to identify the nature of the ecological citizenship concept and the three different understandings that are prevalent in the literature. Applying these perspectives to corporations, it then establishes how ecological citizenship can help us to examine corporate responsibilities for exporting liberal citizenship, rethink the stakeholder set, and reconfigure the community of the corporation.

Keywords: *citizenship studies; environmental policy; business and the natural environment; corporate environmentalism; ecological footprint analysis; management theory; stakeholder theory*

Ecological thinking has had an important role to play in the evolution of thinking about management and organization. This has ranged from considerations about the stake held by the environment in corporate decision making (Phillips & Reichart, 2000) to explorations of new ways of managing based on ecological principles (e.g., Shrivastava, 1995; Starkey & Crane, 2003; Whiteman & Cooper, 2000) and specific contributions in lifecycle analysis (Svoboda, 1999), sustainability (e.g., Bradbury & Clair, 1999; Gladwin, Kennelly, & Krause, 1995; Hart, 1997), and industrial ecology (Allenby, 1993).

More recently, Jermier, Forbes, Benn, and Orsato (2006) in a critical evaluation of the state-of-the-art of scholarship on ecological aspects of corporate management suggested the conceptual framework of “new corporate environmentalism” (NCE). NCE is defined “as *rhetoric* concerning the central role of business in achieving both economic

Authors' Note: Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Andrew Crane, Schulich School of Business, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3; e-mail: acrane@schulich.yorku.ca.

growth and ecological rationality and as a *guide* for management that emphasizes voluntary, proactive control of environmental impacts that exceed or go beyond environmental laws and regulatory compliance” (Jermier et al., 2006, p. 618). One of the key contributions of Jermier et al.’s (2006) analysis is its exposing of the fundamentally political nature of NCE. Corporations are at the core of shaping—some would even argue “hijacking” (Welford, 1997)—the debate on environmental protection. Their voluntary engagement in (or sometimes obstruction of or even disengagement from) environmentally friendly management practices locates them deeply into the broader public debate on a host of normative and highly political processes in societies both local and global. Looking at the rather technical nature of much of the literature on corporate greening, Jermier et al. (2006) thus concluded that “*developing a fuller appreciation of the political content and meaning of the NCE and avoiding reduction of it to technical issues*” (p. 640) is indeed one of the key contemporary challenges in the field. It is from this perspective that we aim to make a contribution to our understanding of the political landscape of the corporation with regard to the ecological environment. To date, the contribution from ecological thinking on management theory and practice has primarily drawn from the perspective of the ecological sciences, but here we turn our attention to political debates about ecology, and specifically to the concept of ecological citizenship.

The article begins with an outline of the nature of citizenship and the corporation, where we make the case for adopting the lens of citizenship to explore some of the political dimensions of the corporation and NCE specifically. Once we have laid this foundation, we turn our attention to the concept of ecological citizenship. Three different conceptualizations of ecological citizenship are introduced to summarise the divergent perspectives evident in the literature. These then form the basis for a set of key implications that we draw in terms of the nature of corporate environmentalism.

Citizenship and the Corporation

Conspicuously, the rhetoric on NCE in business and academia has recently quite heavily resorted to some intrinsically (though rarely explicitly) political language, namely, that of corporate citizenship (CC). This language has initially been introduced by practitioners, with major companies such as Mitsubishi and Xerox locating their Sustainability Report within the context of CC. The debate on the legitimacy, potential, and implications of corporations assuming the identity of good citizens in the academic literature is ongoing and contested. Although considerable parts of the early debate used CC more as a new label for existing notions of corporate social responsibility or sustainability (Matten & Crane, 2005), we can witness a growing attention being placed on the political nature of the corporation among those employing the analytical lens of citizenship (e.g., Crane, Matten, & Moon, 2008; Norman & Néron, 2008; Scherer & Palazzo, 2008b; Wood, Logsdon, Lewellyn, & Davenport, 2006). Although there are understandably some anxieties around attributing corporations with the legal status of citizenship—a concept initially designed for natural persons (Thompson, 2006)—the citizen-like character of corporations becomes more evident if we look at their role in participating in societal governance next to other citizens and their representatives (Moon, Crane, & Matten, 2005). This aspect is particularly relevant in the

context of NCE as corporations indeed participate in the arena of green politics (Jermier et al., 2006). We will come back to this aspect later in the article.

The lens of citizenship, however, not only offers a platform for examining the relevance and limits of corporations' citizen-like qualities. In developing an extended view of CC, Matten and Crane (2005) have argued that corporate involvement in the citizenship arena often is far more similar to that of governments rather than citizens. In fact, the application of citizenship thinking to corporations is far more complex than accounts focusing solely on whether corporations are or should be accorded citizenship status, in particular if we take into account the dynamic nature of the citizenship concept, as discussed in the recent political science literature. Rather than thinking of nation states as the classic arena of citizenship, contemporary notions of belonging, rights, and obligations among individuals tend to focus on citizenship identity (such as gender, sexual orientation, or ethnicity) or cosmopolitan communities. Not only do all of these perspectives offer novel ways of understanding the political nature of the corporation, but—little acknowledged so far—corporations have also played a crucial political role in shaping these dynamics of citizenship (Crane et al., 2008).

In this article, we turn specifically to ecological perspectives on citizenship. Ecological perspectives represent relatively new ways of thinking about and conceptualising relations of citizenship but have become an increasingly popular way of framing debates in environmental politics (Dobson, 2003). It is our contention that ecological citizenship offers some promise for developing our understanding of the changing role of the corporation in society. Such ecological engagements promise a rich vein of insight into issues of community membership and participation, connections with people and places, environmental rights, and spheres of responsibility. To develop these insights, however, we need first to examine in some detail the nature of ecological citizenship itself.

Citizenship and the Environment

At a basic level, ecological citizenship is concerned with the status, entitlements, and processes of participation that citizens enjoy in relation to the natural environment. However, as we shall see, the various terminologies of environmental citizenship embrace a wide spectrum of opinion on the shape and relative importance of these features. In this article, we therefore want to explore these different perspectives and examine their specific implications for our understanding of corporations.

The recognition and development of a form of citizenship appropriate for environmental issues and politics has spurred a growing stream of academic literature across the politics, philosophy, ecology, law, and sociology disciplines. Although some authors seek to make conceptual distinctions between alternative labels here—for instance, Dobson (2003) distinguished between *environmental citizenship* and *ecological citizenship*—for the sake of simplicity we will use ecological citizenship as a catch-all umbrella term in this article.

This stream of literature has been characterised by a considerable degree of heterogeneity, and often a fair degree of imprecision, about what exactly ecological citizenship might constitute. In general, though, it is possible to discern three main strands, each of which characterises ecological citizenship rather differently. First, there is the notion grounded in pre-modern ideas of identity and status being intimately tied to a certain physical territory

or ecological environment rather than to a nation state and/or government (Curtin, 1999). Second, there is the notion of citizenship being grounded in the modern apparatus of liberal or republican citizenship and focusing predominantly on environmental rights (Shelton, 1991) or the common good (Sagoff, 1988), respectively. Third, there is notion predicated on non-territoriality that seeks to establish an entirely new basis for citizenship (Dobson, 2003). Let us briefly examine each in turn.

Ecological Citizenship as Intimate Connection

The idea that citizenship is tied to a physical place largely rests on a view that valorises spatial and community connectedness and that is profoundly sceptical of the enlightenment project of political rights and liberalism. Espousing a form of land ethic, writers in this vein have viewed modern notions of citizenship to be an imposition on the traditional embeddedness of indigenous communities within ecological environments. For instance, for the Maori of New Zealand, citizen power “derives from a connectedness to *whenua* (land), to *marae* (sacred gathering places), to the *papakāinga* (consecrated land) and to their *urupa* (traditional burial grounds)” (Lunt, Spoonley, & Mataira, 2002, p. 356) not from political status based on relations to a sovereign authority. Hence as Deane Curtin (1999) contends, traditional community ties have been threatened by “the increasingly global reach of Western liberal individualism” (p. xi) and the “extension of a calculus of individual preference satisfactions” (p. xiii). Put simply, the importing of Western ideas of entitlements predicated on relations with the state, coupled with the whole machinery of government, capitalism, and scientific progress (see, for example, Merchant, 1989), is claimed to have usurped traditional ecological connections.

As a result, it is suggested that there have been “devastating consequences for pre-modern tribal society,” especially in the colonies, and most acutely in those dominated by white-settler communities (Turner, 2001, p. 205). This has subsequently prompted numerous policy interventions in the twentieth century “designed to acculturate, to assimilate or to accommodate aboriginal peoples”—none of which has proved entirely satisfactory (Turner, 2001, p. 205). What we see then is a picture of pre-modern community ties being supplanted by modern political relations of citizenship, that in turn have been unable to successfully embrace those communities still based on ecological connectivity.

To some extent then it is probably actually a misnomer to label such pre-modern ties as citizenship, because the term itself is intimately connected with the modern project. Curtin (1999, p. xii) in fact has warned of the dangers that have been posed by the dominance of a moral language of liberal individualism for making sense of alternative understandings of culture in relationship to nature. Indeed, most authors are fairly careful to avoid using the language of citizenship to actually describe ties of this kind from the past. However, the language of citizenship *is* typically invoked to label new forms of emerging ecological citizenship that either seek to accommodate aboriginal communities or take inspiration from them.

For instance, let’s take the example of Curtin’s (1999) notable work that urged us to rethink “the question of ecological citizenship.” Curtin traces and critiques Western impositions on eco-communities across the globe, identifying what he calls the “institutional and systemic violence” intrinsic within a range of societal shifts including commercial exploitation, the “green revolution” of industrialised agriculture, and even well-intentioned Western

progressive movements for social justice and deep ecology. Each of these, he contends has contributed to a radical delocalization of social, cultural, and political identity and action.

As an antidote, he offers the possibility of a new form of ecological citizenship that he calls “critical ecocommunitarianism.” In so doing, he argues for a rekindling of a sense of place through cultivating an informed and humble citizenry that is genuinely committed to preservation (Howland & Robertson, 1999), and which begins with the authority of local communities to “define their local values and participate in their transformation over time” (Curtin, 1999, p. 141). In this perspective, then, ecological citizenship represents a profound reterritorialization of citizenship that starts not with the political territory of the state, but with a re-imagining of an intimate relation between communities and an ecological territory. As such, although it emphasises aspects of participation, this form of ecological citizenship roots the will to participate in an emotional and spiritual connection with a natural environment.

Ecological Citizenship as an Extension of Rights and Obligations

The second form of ecological citizenship that we are concerned with is one that primarily focuses on extending the modern apparatus of traditional liberal or republican citizenship to incorporate environmental concerns. In the former case, the issue is one of appending the Marshallian framework of individual citizen rights with a further set of environmental rights (Shelton, 1991). Such entitlements essentially provide for the protection of the individual citizen against the effects of pollution and environmental degradation (Dean, 2001). “Ecological citizenship is expressed as a right to a safe, ‘natural’ environment” (Turner, 2001, p. 205). It is arguable whether an extra category of rights is really necessitated by the environmental entitlements of humans, because “in so far as social rights cater for such basic human needs as clean water, it is possible to reclassify certain social rights as environmental rights” (Dean, 2001, p. 492). However, it would be hard to deny that certain entitlements of citizenship are specifically about environmental issues, whilst others have even gone so far as to include a right *of* the environment itself within the debate (Shelton, 1991).

The latter republican approach focuses more on evaluating the types of obligations towards the common good, and political processes of participation, that are necessary to enable democratic involvement in environmental decisions (Lidskog, 2005; Light, 2003; Sagoff, 1988). These are based on a reconceived idea of the relations of citizenship, as Light (2003) here attests

Citizenship, conceived along classical republican lines, identifies a role for residents of a place by articulating a range of minimal obligations they have to each other for the sake of the larger community in which they live . . . Adding an environmental component to a classical republican model of citizenship becomes then the conceptual basis for a claim that the “larger community”, to which the . . . citizen has obligations, is inclusive of . . . space, place, and environment, as well as people. (p. 51)

As such, the pursuit of an ecologically sustainable society in this view is to some extent about “sacrificing personal inclinations or preferences to the common good” (Dobson, 2003, p. 96) and in having a voice in matters that concern one’s environment (Lidskog, 2005). Thus whether the focus is on rights or obligations, the classic traditions of citizenship

appear to offer a plausible way forward for addressing environmental issues, albeit with several key problematics, as we shall now see.

Typically, variants of either approach have to attempt to tackle the thorny issues of where to draw the boundaries of membership of an ecological political community and who to confer with citizenship status in the context of environmental issues (Hilson, 2001). In the former case, the boundaries of membership are difficult to establish given that environmental problems can be at times very local (e.g., noise) and at others, thoroughly deterritorialized (e.g., climate change). So, for instance, Lidskog (2005) argued that, "Today's environmental problems demand that citizenship must be—at least partly—extracted from its location within the nation-state . . . the meaning of citizenship cannot be restricted to a national context" (pp. 197-198). Alternatively, Light (2003) took a more local approach and applied civic republicanism to develop an ecological citizenship for urban communities. In essence, it would appear that in contradistinction to traditional citizenship where the boundaries of membership are firmly fixed and permanent, the boundaries of ecological citizenship are shifting and issue specific.

Similarly, it is critical to address the question of whether to include future generations and non-human species into the ecological community (Smith, 1998). The concept of intergenerational justice is central to notions of sustainability. Therefore, it is necessary to carefully consider how to extend the obligations of citizens towards their fellow (unborn) citizens in an ecological context. This, as Mark Smith (1998, p. 30) showed, is a question subjected to intense disputes but which, he concluded, must at least lead to new guidelines on acting with restraint to avoid future harms. Equally, obligations to animals, plants, and the ecosphere more broadly are typically promoted by ecological thinkers but again this potentially prompts us to go beyond the traditional communities of citizenship. It is worth noting that the debates here are mainly around the conferring of *rights to*, or *obligations towards*, future generations and non-humans; it is, after all, rather difficult to argue for meaningful *obligations of* animals, trees, unborn babies, and other non-sentient beings. As such, it highlights some of the limitations and difficulties of applying existing concepts of citizenship to the environmental realm. Unsurprisingly, this has given rise to the development of alternative directions for the conceptualisation and application of ecological citizenship.

Ecological Citizenship as a New Non-Territorial Obligation

Finally, then, the third strand of literature on ecological citizenship seeks to go beyond pre-modern and modern forms of citizenship and map out fundamentally new conceptual terrain in citizenship. It primarily does so by focusing on the problem of non-territoriality, and the issues this raises for identifying an appropriate political space. Probably the most well worked out example of this approach is offered by Andrew Dobson (2003) in his book *Citizenship and the Environment*.

Dobson centred his ideas about ecological citizenship on Wackernagel and Rees' (1996) concept of the ecological footprint—"a quantitative assessment of the biologically productive area (the amount of nature) required to produce the resources (food, energy, and materials) and to absorb the wastes of an individual, city, region, or country" (Venetoulis, Chazan, & Gaudet, 2004, p. 7). The ecological footprint is by now a fairly well known tool for estimating the amount of productive land area that is required to sustain a specific human population in terms

of its resource consumption and waste assimilation (Wackernagel & Rees, 1996). So, for instance, it has been estimated that the ecological footprint of the United States is 9.57 global hectares per capita whereas that of Brazil is 2.39, and Bangladesh is 0.5 (Venetoulis et al., 2004). Similarly, footprint analyses have also been conducted for cities such as Almada in Portugal, regions such as the San Francisco Bay area in the United States (Venetoulis et al., 2004), and even development projects and sporting events (Collins & Flynn, 2005).

Calculations of ecological footprints are important if we accept that the amount of nature available to support populations is limited, and that some populations may over-occupy ecological space unsustainably. Thus, from a citizenship point of view, Dobson suggests that the concept of an ecological footprint gives us relevant community of obligation. Because we rely on the productive area of the footprint to maintain our own existence, it is this area that circumscribes our relations of citizenship with those that we affect. Hence

The “space” of ecological citizenship is therefore not something given by the boundaries of nation-states or of supranational organizations such as the European Union . . . It is, rather, produced by the metabolic and material relationship of individual people with their environment. This relationship gives rise to an ecological footprint which gives rise, in turn, to relationships with those on whom it impacts . . . They may live near by or be far away, and they may be of this generation or of generations yet to be born. . . . By definition then, ecological citizenship is a citizenship of strangers. (Dobson, 2003, p. 106)

Crucially then, Dobson also made clear that the relations of citizenship according to his conception differ quite markedly from those articulated in the traditional models of citizenship. First, the principal concern is with horizontal relations between citizens, rather than the vertical relations between the individual citizen and the political authority. Second, status and membership issues are downplayed because the community of citizenship is produced rather than given, that is, citizens are not allocated a fixed membership of a given community but continually constitute their community of obligation through their material impacts. Third, the differential size of footprints suggests that impacts on other citizens are asymmetrical and that therefore one’s relevant obligations are also asymmetrical. This again is in marked contrast to more traditional forms of citizenship that valorise symmetrical relations of reciprocity. Different citizens will have different burdens of obligation depending on the size of their footprints, whereas those who occupy less than their quota of ecological space may have no such duty at all.

Dobson’s theory of ecological citizenship therefore extends and reworks our thinking about the meaning of citizenship in quite challenging ways. This indeed is true—though perhaps to a lesser extent—of all of the three perspectives on ecological citizenship outlined here. Each brings a new perspective to the mapping out of relations of power and responsibility within political communities. The focus on intimate connections seeks to break the connection between responsibility and vertical relations of power. It does this by attaching responsibility (e.g., to the environment) back to emotional, cultural, and spiritual connections rather than simply to political institutions. The approach that focuses on stretching traditional models of citizenship challenges our conventional ideas about community membership and status. It does this by potentially extending the relevant community to encapsulate non-human species and future generations. The final approach that starts with an idea of a deterritorialized obligation is perhaps the only one that seeks to make a radical

break with the past; and here, fundamentally new ways of drawing the political community and of considering horizontal relations of power and responsibility are surfaced.

Such developments may well be significant for our understanding of citizenship, but the question that remains for us to answer is what do they have to do with corporations? This is the question that we will now turn to.

Ecological Citizenship and the Corporation

In the previous section, we set out three quite divergent approaches to ecological citizenship. The question we now address is how do these new views of citizenship help us to rethink the politics of corporate environmentalism? Do they offer any substantial fresh thinking on such debates? In our view, the answer is a qualified yes. Although corporations may be wary of identifying themselves with political notions of citizenship that go beyond the rhetoric of simply being a good citizen, ecological perspectives on citizenship actually open up some important new avenues for thinking about corporations. In all, we distinguish three main areas: responsibilities for exporting liberal citizenship; extending the stakeholder set; and reconfiguring the community of the corporate citizen.

Responsibilities for Exporting Liberal Citizenship

One potential route for rethinking corporate environmentalism can be derived from our discussion of ecological citizenship as intimate connection, where we saw that certain aboriginal cultures were based on a worldview that tied social, moral, spiritual, and political relations to a physical place. The disintegration of these relations could be seen to be associated with the introduction of western models of liberal citizenship, scientific and economic progress, and transformation to capitalist modes of production and exchange. Although this has largely been a political project, corporations have long been implicit (and at times complicit) in such developments, particularly as engines of the Industrial Revolution and, more recently, of economic globalization. To illustrate why this might be the case, let us look at a few examples.

Liberal citizenship is a largely western invention and is “intricately interwoven with the nation-state and welfare institutions” (Elliott, 2001, p. 47). If we trace the exporting of the citizenship model to, say, India, we can see that much of the initial apparatus of liberal citizenship was introduced by the British East India Company, which enjoyed virtually governmental status and responsibilities in the territory. The company operated its own armed forces, maintained civil law, and ultimately introduced westernized judicial and penal systems to India. Moreover, although it remained a dead letter well into the twentieth century, the Charter Act of 1833 provided that no Indian subject of the Company would be debarred from holding any office under the Company by reason of their religion, place of birth, descent, or colour—thereby establishing liberal notions of rights into the country.

A second type of example comes from the role of corporations in influencing the way that liberal entitlements such as property rights become applied to aboriginal cultures. This story has been played out across the former colonies, most notably in conflicts about mining and extraction, and in assigning intellectual property rights to traditional knowledge (Shiva, 2001).

For instance, before the European settlers entered Australia 250 years ago, the Aborigines who inhabited the lands did not specifically characterize their relation to the lands in terms of what we would call property rights. Rather than assign certain territories to individuals, or even certain tribes or families, the main relation of aboriginal communities to their land is via sacred sites, so-called dreamtimes or story places, which are important elements of aboriginal beliefs and rituals. However, the establishment of corporate mining operations on these lands during the 20th century, by companies such as Rio Tinto and BHP, led to the destruction of their spiritual integrity as well as the extraction of billions of dollars worth of resources from Aboriginal lands with little or no form of compensation. This is because, until 1992, Australian law upheld the principle of *terra nullius* (a Latin term meaning empty land), which basically assumes that the Aborigine people did not own the land before the white settlers arrived, despite having lived in the country for more than 40,000 years. Although this principle was overturned in 1993 by the Native Title Act, there is still considerable contestation over various mining projects because of different perspectives on the nature of entitlements, title, and property. However, Aborigine people have little option but to engage in a debate with mining corporations based on the liberal notion of property rights because this is the relevant cornerstone of citizen entitlement in Australia. This reliance on western concepts of citizenship potentially has major drawbacks for Aboriginal interests as Banerjee (2000) contends

The question of cultural sites is a complex one involving multilayered interconnections between country, people, language, kinship, community, and spiritual and political systems. It is impossible to reduce this rich and complex cultural landscape to lines on a map based on Western notions of geography and property. Aboriginal notions of land and country are epistemologically and ethically incongruent with Western notions. The process of accommodating Aboriginal interests into a capitalist, colonial framework is simply an imposition of an alien knowledge system and a subjugation of local knowledges. (p. 21)

In the case of traditional knowledge, therefore, a similar situation has begun to emerge where multinational corporations in the agricultural, pharmaceutical, and biotechnology industries have, through international trade organizations and agreements such as TRIPS (Carolan, 2008), helped to impose the agenda of intellectual property rights onto indigenous knowledge. By traditional knowledge, we mean the knowledge accumulated over time by indigenous communities that is manifested in a range of medicines, know-how, tribal art work, and songs (Ghosh, 2003). This may relate to the extraction and preparation of genetic resources such as plants and medicinal herbs for human usage, for example, in medicines and cosmetics (Cottier & Panizzon, 2004).

Once multinational corporations seek to exploit particular uses of plants that have been known by traditional communities for centuries and patent them as their *own* inventions, such knowledge may pass from the public domain to that of private corporations. This “biopiracy” (Shiva, 1997) can mean that indigenous communities lose their sovereignty over resources as well as entitlements to use specific knowledge. So, to defend against such incursions, many campaigners have sought intellectual property rights protection for traditional knowledge, arguing that the patent system needs to be revised or overhauled to account for traditional knowledge (Anonymous, 2005). One of the more critical problems here is

how to extend a notion of individual property to a collective endeavour and community knowledge accumulated over generations?

Therefore, this again may pose a problem for indigenous communities which do not traditionally share liberal notions of individual property on knowledge (Banerjee, 2003). As Ghosh (2003) contends

The application of intellectual property rights to . . . medicinal know-how is arguably misguided. Scholars have also criticized the increased propertization of intellectual property to the detriment of the public domain and non-market values. For these scholars, protecting traditional knowledge through patent copyright, and trademark is another example of that pernicious trend. The argument is that the treatment of traditional knowledge artefacts as intellectual property, within the same class as pop music, the great American novel, Cipro, Mickey Mouse, and The Terminator subverts the notions of what constitutes traditional and modern. (p. 591)

What we see then, is a complex debate emerging about the best way to ensure that indigenous communities are treated fairly and do not suffer injustice at the hands of multinational corporations—but also a parallel debate about how to prevent these very protections from fundamentally reshaping traditional notions of citizenship and the public good. Corporations may not deliberately seek to export the architecture of individualized liberal citizenship, but insofar as they are the drivers of an expanded and reconfigured property rights regime through their actions, they are necessarily implicated in the process of exportation.

The contribution of ecological citizenship thinking here, and specifically the intimate connection variant discussed above, is that it highlights the constitutive role of corporations within the politics of citizenship. Technical and economic processes of innovating products, assigning copyright, or assessing compensation, even when carried out in ostensibly sustainable ways, may in the aggregate have significant impacts on the way that we understand the nature of citizenship. Corporations do not just inhabit a political space of citizenship but, according to this view, actually transform that space. This clearly raises a number of crucial questions about the appropriateness or otherwise of such a role for corporations, which we shall address later in the article.

Rethinking the Stakeholder Set

The second consideration surfaced by concepts of ecological citizenship is that it urges us to rethink the stakeholder set of the organization. For some time now, there has been an active debate on how to identify legitimate stakeholders for the corporation (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). As part of this debate, the question of whether the environment itself is a stakeholder has been raised a number of times (Driscoll & Starik, 2004; Phillips & Reichart, 2000). From an ecological citizenship perspective, however, the issue is not so much whether the environment is a stakeholder in a general sense but whether actors such as non-humans and future generations should be admitted into a particular moral community (here, of course, we are concerned with the moral community of the organization).

Clearly, corporate decisions about farming or animal testing on one hand or fossil fuel extraction, carbon emissions, and nuclear energy on the other, all raise the potential for considering these additional actors as relevant stakeholders. In a practical sense, the stakes of such groups will obviously have to be articulated by others (such as civil society organizations). But this does not necessarily detract from their potential status as members of

the corporate moral community. We need only consider the case of infants, or adults with severe mental health problems, to realise that an inability to articulate one's stake does not mean that the firm should not consider one's interests.

So if the status of these additional stakeholders in the corporate moral community were acknowledged, what kind of additional responsibilities would it pose for firms? This is a tricky question, but some proposals can be developed by looking to the ecological citizenship literature and adapting it to fit with corporate responsibilities. For instance, responsibilities to future generations could draw on Daniel Callahan's guidelines cited in Smith (1998, p. 31) to give the following principles:

1. Decision makers should not act in ways which jeopardize the existence of future generations.
2. Decision makers should not act in ways which jeopardize the ability of future generations to live in dignity.
3. Decision makers, in defence of their own interests, may have to act in ways which jeopardize future generation, but should do so in ways that minimise this risk.
4. In determining whether corporate activities do jeopardise the existence or dignity of future generations, decision makers should act in responsible and sensitive ways as if each action with uncertain consequences could harm one's own employees.

The key issue here then is that if we adopt an ecological citizenship view based on the extension of rights and obligations, we can begin to derive specific responsibilities for managers and other decision makers towards non-humans and future generations based on their obligations to existing constituencies. This is important because it accommodates an expansion of the sphere of responsibility for managers. It has clear limitations though in that it does not necessarily entail a deepening of responsibility. At best, only an existing level of obligation will be extended to other constituencies. Therefore, if existing obligations to stakeholders are currently lacking within corporate environmentalism, there is little prospect for significant change. Hence this is probably the most practical approach to ecological citizenship from the point of view of the corporation, but it is also the most incremental and reformist route. As such, it fits well within existing NCE ideology, especially in the sense that it can accommodate corporate self-interest, provided risks to future generations are accounted for.

In so far then as concepts of citizenship enable us to think more clearly about status and entitlements with respect to corporations, the extension of citizenship to include non-humans and future generations offers a challenge that can to some degree be accommodated within NCE. However, broader challenges to the politics of corporate environmentalism such as those that were identified in the previous subsection on exporting liberal citizenship are ignored. Moreover, if we take some of the ecological citizenship concepts seriously, then we might go beyond simply including one or two new constituencies into our stakeholder set (however important these might be) and go further in radically rethinking the community of obligation of the corporation. This might entail either a re-localizing, or a deterritorialization, of the corporate moral community as we now discuss.

Reconfiguring the Community of the Corporation

As it has been argued elsewhere (e.g., Moon et al., 2005; Wood & Logsdon, 2001), ideas of location and community membership are important for establishing the citizen-like qualities of corporations. Most notably, for the purposes of identifying their nationality, it

is usually necessary to locate a corporation in the country of its headquarters. Similarly, individual factories, offices, warehouses, and shops are clearly located in a readily identifiable physical environment, and a community of fellow citizens. In general, though, corporations are rather difficult to locate within a meaningful community, especially when they encompass a range of people, buildings, and processes across multiple sites and countries. Ecological citizenship typically seeks to reconfigure the community of citizenship—and so offers some interesting avenues for rethinking the status of corporations in this respect.

If we take a view of ecological citizenship as intimate connection, then it is clear that the location of the corporation in a relevant community would necessitate a greater attention to the immediate local environment. According to this perspective, citizenship is only realized in the intimate connections between people, communities, and their natural environments. One way of applying this thinking to corporations is therefore to consider the importance of embedding corporate members in ecological environments to foster a true sense of responsibility, respect, and reciprocity for nature. For example, Whiteman and Cooper (2000) have explored the implications of ecological embeddedness among indigenous communities for developing a framework for contemporary sustainability management in corporations (see also Whiteman, 2004). They argued that personal identification with one's physical place, adherence to ecological beliefs, gathering of ecological information firsthand, and physical location in the ecosystem will promote more commitment to sustainable management amongst corporate managers than the modernist dislocation of individual, community, and ecology.

This re-localizing of the perspective on corporations would clearly lead to some rethinking of the relevant community of obligation for corporations. Issues of responsibility would, for example, mainly be surfaced within the local ecological environment of factories and offices, rather than played out in the global economy of multinational corporations and international trade. However, there are significant limits to such an approach.

One set of anxieties that has been raised here is in relation to the source of inspiration for the relocalization agenda. For instance, Whiteman and Cooper's (2000) anthropology of the Cree Nation's ecological embeddedness as a source of inspiration for corporate managers has been criticized for its neocolonial assumptions that render its prescriptions reductionist, romanticized, and with little practical relevance (Banerjee & Linstead, 2004). According to this view, we could even be activating a process of expropriation of traditional knowledge to the extent that we are promoting a set of aboriginal values and processes for use by corporate managers.

Another set of anxieties relates to the naivety of extolling relocalization in an era characterised by transnational business. Although small- or medium-sized enterprises might represent the most viable contexts for such a transition, the ontological shift necessary to re-localize corporate responsibility in this way still appears somewhat optimistic in an increasingly globalized economic and political context. Despite increasing attention to food miles and local sourcing, the power, influence, and impacts of multinational corporations are by now so thoroughly non-local that the emotional connections inherent to the re-localizing agenda (as opposed to simply the technical considerations) are unlikely to gain any more than marginal attention from the boardrooms of such companies for the foreseeable future.

Third, any attempts to ignite a greater intimate connection as a basis for establishing deeper environmental engagement from business will need to focus directly on corporate members, not corporations themselves. Only real citizens can experience the kinds of

emotional connections to land that this form of ecological citizenship espouses. Ray Anderson (2000), the poster boy of the NCE movement in recent years, exemplified this form of emotional connection rather strikingly in talking about his conversion into a corporate environmentalist:

I began to read *The Ecology of Commerce* and was not a third of the way through the book when it struck me like a spear in the chest. It was an epiphany; I had never experienced anything like it before. I read the book and wept. I wept for myself; I wept for all the creatures. [. . .] I described myself as a plunderer of the earth and explained how the tax laws are my accomplices in this crime because they totally misplace incentives. [. . .] our tax laws and my crimes both need to change as we need to change. (p. 8)

Anderson suggests that in reflecting on the effect his company (and our civilization) had on the planet, he experienced a radical change in his personal mindset. Even here, though, despite the advances that his company, Interface Inc, has made in environmental management, the prospects for this emotional connection to be locally embedded have clear constraints. Where he speaks of tax laws, for instance, he is clearly engaging with key aspects of citizenship, but where is the locus of citizenship that he refers to? Which tax laws are the accomplices of Interface Inc—those where it is headquartered in Atlanta, GA, those of the United States, those of the seven countries it manufactures in, or those of the 110 different locations it operates from across the globe?

More fruitful for application to the modern corporation therefore may be the delocalization agenda that derives from our third view of ecological citizenship, namely, non-territorial obligation. Insofar as horizontal relations of citizens can be articulated with the concept of an ecological footprint, the boundaries of corporate responsibility could similarly be conceptualised in such a way. Just as countries, cities, and regions have such a footprint, so too do corporations. Hence an environmentally intensive corporation would have a larger footprint—or in Anderson's words, be more of a plunderer—than a relatively benign one, and would have a more substantial set of obligations as a result of such crimes.

This deterritorialization of obligation suggests an alternative model of responsibility than the one proposed, for example, by stakeholder theory. The relevant moral community of the corporation would be those required to sustain its current level of activity at any one time. Although in a similar vein to stakeholder theory, corporations would be responsible to those affected by their actions, the stakeholders or citizens pertinent to corporate responsibility would not be a fixed set of people or groups but would be continually (re)produced according to the material needs and impacts of the company. As a "citizenship of strangers" (Dobson, 2003, p. 106) where the community of obligation is scattered all over the world, and even into future generations, the identification of those to which corporations would owe responsibilities is quite complex even if the principle by which responsibility is established is relatively straightforward.

The idea of responsibility being inscribed by an ecological footprint offers a potentially illuminating way of rethinking the social, political, and moral situating of the corporation. At present, footprint analysis has begun to feature in management texts dealing with sustainable management in corporations (e.g., Hart, 1997) although its uptake by corporations and those that study them has been primarily at the technical level—namely, measuring and perhaps attempting to reduce a corporation's footprint. For example, the British energy

company BP produced a high profile print advertising campaign in Europe in 2005 that headlined, "Knowing your carbon footprint is a step in the right direction." The copy of the advert went on to say, "Here at BP, we're trying to reduce our footprint. Since 2001, our energy efficiency projects have reduced emissions by over 4 million tonnes."

Measuring elements of an ecological footprint in terms of carbon dioxide emissions in this way is an important technical exercise in sound NCE. However, it is a rather different task to that of identifying dimensions of corporate obligations through footprint analysis. Nonetheless, as a heuristic device for conceptualising new forms, boundaries, and counterparts of obligation among corporations and real citizens, the concept of an ecological footprint still offers considerable promise even if much work would remain to be done to see how it could be practically applied to corporations beyond specialist environmental management techniques. Crucially though, we can more readily accommodate corporations within a framework of political obligation in this way than in the liberal tradition because transnational ecological citizenship is not intended to be a citizenship of equals, but one that accords responsibilities according to the ecological space that one takes up. That corporations are larger and more powerful than real citizens is a cause for ensuring they are included in the non-territorial political community rather than ensuring they are excluded.

The obligations suggested by ecological citizenship not only go further than simply minimising one's impact but also extend to participation in the political process with other actors in designing effective solutions to global problems such as climate change. As such, non-territorial ecological citizenship potentially offers an important conceptual underpinning for new forms of "democratic environmentalism" (Jermier et al., 2006, p. 637-639) that identify mechanisms of deliberative democracy at the core of a novel approach to include corporations in the struggle for sustaining the ecological environment. Companies in the thrall of NCE have yet to learn to deal with their "ecological stakeholders" (Sharma & Henriques, 2005) not just as non-market actors that need to be strategically managed but as members of a political community that need to be engaged with through deliberative processes. Non-territorial ecological citizenship suggests how and why this may be a necessary component of more fundamental reform.

Politicizing NCE Through Ecological Citizenship

If the approach of NCE has so far been more attuned to technical rather than political issues, a lens from ecological citizenship can make a number of crucial contributions. This pertains, first, to the ongoing controversy on the status and legitimacy of CC, and more broadly, to the status of the firm as a political actor. This denial of politics (Hanlon, 2008) in much of the business and society domain is fuelled by a reluctance to engage with political notions beyond the limited purview of liberal citizenship. As van Oosterhout (2008) sceptically argued, "It is precisely because corporations cannot sensibly be understood as full and equally entitled members of a political community that the citizenship connotation is misleading in addressing the problem of how to cope with corporate political action" (p. 38).

Such an exclusion of corporations is predicated on notions of liberal citizenship that conceive of the political institution of the nation state as the sole reference point of citizenship. However, these notions have increasingly been replaced by other reference points, a crucially important one of which is ecological citizenship, which envisions alternative forms

of status, entitlement, and obligation. As our discussion in the previous section has surfaced, if we retreat from the liberal view of citizenship towards more ecologically inspired conceptions, a different political space for corporations emerges that enables us to identify, if not resolve, some of the challenges for corporate actors in this arena. As such, the application of ecological citizenship not only contributes a framework for a *political* debate on NCE but it also provides a broader and more solid argument for including corporations into the purview of citizenship in the broader business and society literature.

A second implication of our analysis is that when we look at corporations in the context of citizenship we need to be mindful of the possibility that corporations may actually have material impacts on what we even mean by citizenship. Corporations are not passive players in a stable landscape of citizenship institutions. The dynamics of citizenship are at least partly shaped by the activities of corporations. In our discussion, this has become evident not only in the role of corporations in exporting notions of liberal citizenship and thus eclipsing extant notions of ecological citizenship. We have also seen that ecological perspectives lead us to think of non-territorial obligations for citizens—a phenomenon increasingly debated in the literature on cosmopolitan citizenship (Delanty, 2007; Linklater, 2002). Given that corporations have been a major driver of deterritorialization and globalization (Scherer & Palazzo, 2008a), it is clear that they have also played a role, wittingly or unwittingly, in shaping contemporary understandings of citizenship.

In this context, we would argue that there needs to be a much broader debate also in the neighbouring disciplines of politics, international relations, philosophy, sociology, and law about the impact of corporations on the dynamics of modern citizenship thinking and practice. While the role of corporations has recently received some attention in these disciplines (e.g., Koenig-Archibugi, 2002; Ruggie, 2004), the debate on citizenship has so far shown only limited appreciation of the corporate role in actively shaping and transforming political roles and identities. Journals such as *Citizenship Studies* have published just a handful of articles dealing explicitly with corporations during the past ten years and seminal contributions such as the *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (Isin & Turner, 2002) mention corporations just twice and in passing. A serious debate about corporations and ecological citizenship should ultimately be able to contribute to our understanding not only of corporations but also of the very notion of citizenship itself. It is here that one of the most exciting and challenging paths of theoretical development still waits to be discovered.

A third implication of our analysis draws on the ways that ecological citizenship reimagines communities of obligation and how corporations rhetorically position themselves within this public sphere (Jermier et al., 2006, pp. 637-639). Our analysis suggests that corporations can be located as political actors with obligations to non-humans and future generations (in rethinking the stakeholder set) or to global constituencies within its ecological footprint (in reconfiguring the community of the corporation). If we consider how corporations have actually positioned themselves as participants here, though, their role is identified largely as one of an apolitical mediating institution that identifies and assesses impacts on others (through for example lifecycle or footprint analyses) but downplays any specific obligations. As Sir Terry Leahy, the CEO of UK supermarket chain Tesco argued at the launch of his firm's carbon labelling initiative, "We want to give our customers the power to make informed green choices for their weekly shop, and enlist their help in working toward a revolution in green consumption" (Martin, 2008, para. 5). Although this clearly locates

corporations as an important mediating actor in decision making on how to tackle climate change, it is individual citizens that are left to exercise responsibilities through their consumption decisions. A refusal to acknowledge any political role, either as a self-interested participant in public deliberation on how to tackle climate change, or as an institution that mediates political preferences for real citizens, or as a political actor with real obligations to other citizens that it affects through its resource needs, can be challenged through the lens of ecological citizenship. It identifies real political roles and responsibilities for actors even if the current discourse of NCE remains largely rooted within a technical mindset.

Conclusion

In the preceding discussion, we have shown how ecological citizenship offers a range of different ways to explore the relationship between corporations, citizenship, and the environment. This includes fresh perspectives on the role of corporations in exporting liberal citizenship and the impacts this has on indigenous communities and their knowledge and culture. It also includes new ways of thinking about stakeholders and alternative communities of obligation around the firm. These different perspectives ecological citizenship provides are not, it should be noted, necessarily mutually coexisting perspectives on the corporation—and indeed arise from some quite widely differing accounts of ecological citizenship. However, it is not our intention to suggest that a particular account is superior to another, but rather to explore the implications of thinking about corporations, citizenship, and the environment in particular ways.

First, in relation to responsibilities for exporting liberal citizenship, there is considerable promise in using ecological citizenship to refine our conceptualizations of the role that corporations play in the configuration of the social, political, economic, and ecological landscape of communities. It is crucial for the survival of indigenous cultures and knowledge that corporate environmentalism is not seen as a merely technical exercise in ensuring that communities are effectively compensated for the use of their property but as a politically transformative act that redefines the nature and meaning of citizenship. Although corporations have thus far been unwilling to acknowledge their inherently political role here within NCE, effective resistance to these developments demands the kind of conceptual bridge between the economic and the political that different strands of ecological citizenship seek to provide. Thus rather than using the popular NCE rhetoric of stakeholder dialogue (or similar terms) to describe interventions around such issues, if we frame these processes in political terms, we can unmask them as what they really are: political processes of negotiation aimed at forming a consensus around the allocation of rights and obligations in dealing with ecological commodities.

Second, in terms of rethinking the stakeholder set, our analysis provides further impetus and insight to the debate around stakeholder identification and, as we have shown, this way of thinking about ecological citizenship offers the most unchallenging pathway into NCE. For those seeking incremental advancement of corporate environmentalism to include broader environmental constituencies, ecological citizenship offers significant potential for redefining who the firm is responsible to but is less clear about the specific obligations this poses.

Third, looking at the community of the corporate citizen, we can use ecological citizenship to identify relevant local and/or global communities. In the former case, however, there

are clearly limits to the applicability of a re-localization agenda for particular types of company or industry and even for the corporate form itself. More promising is the political embedding of corporations within a global community through its non-territorial ecological footprint. Here we have a potential way to establish a political responsibility for corporations that does not rely on treating them the same as real citizens but accords them an obligation commensurate with their levels of resource utilisation.

All told then, ecological citizenship offers an important political dimension to the discourse of NCE that is currently absent. To date, the corporation has not tended to feature very prominently in political analyses of citizenship and the environment, whereas similarly, political analyses of citizenship have yet to enter the debate about corporations and sustainability. In this article, we have sought to open up conceptual space for theorising about corporate environmentalism at a time when the political role of the firm is increasingly open to debate (Matten & Crane, 2005; Scherer & Palazzo, 2007; Scherer, Palazzo, & Baumann, 2006). Going beyond the simplistic refrain that corporations simply have too much power, or that they have no place in politics, is essential if we are to adequately analyse the very real roles and impacts that they have had on the environment and on environmental politics. As a key contribution to the ongoing debate on NCE, ecological citizenship provides a set of discrete logics to rethink the political dimensions of corporate responsibility for the ecological environment. Our analysis thus helps to understand and translate issues that have been discussed in an isolated and somewhat anecdotal fashion within a broader and systematic political framework. More research is clearly needed before we can draw more concrete proposals for reform from ecological citizenship thinking, but we have hopefully been successful in showing that there is much to be gained from doing so.

References

- Allenby, B. R. (1993). *Industrial ecology*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Anderson, R. (2000). Climbing mount sustainability. *Reflections*, 1(4), 6-12.
- Anonymous. (2005). TK debate puts pressure on patentees. *Managing Intellectual Property*, p. 1.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2000). Whose land is it anyway? National interest, indigenous stakeholders, and colonial discourses. *Organization & Environment*, 13(1), 3-38.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2003). Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature. *Organization Studies*, 24, 143-180.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Linstead, S. (2004). Masking subversion: Neocolonial embeddedness in anthropological accounts of indigenous management. *Human Relations*, 57, 221-247.
- Bradbury, H., & Clair, J. A. (1999). Promoting sustainable organizations with Sweden's Natural Step. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(4), 63-74.
- Carolan, M. S. (2008). Making patents and intellectual property work: The asymmetrical "Harmonization" of TRIPS. *Organization & Environment*, 21, forthcoming.
- Collins, A., & Flynn, A. (2005). A new perspective on the environmental impacts of planning: A case study of Cardiff's International Sports Village. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 7, 277-302.
- Cottier, T., & Panizzon, M. (2004). Legal perspectives on traditional knowledge: The case for intellectual property protection. *Journal of International Economic Law*, 7, 371.
- Crane, A., Matten, D., & Moon, J. (2008). *Corporations and citizenship*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Curtin, D. (1999). *Chinnagounder's challenge: The question of ecological citizenship*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Dean, H. (2001). Green citizenship. *Social Policy and Administration*, 35, 490-505.

- Delanty, G. (2007). Theorising citizenship in a global age. In W. Hudson & S. Slaughter (Eds.), *Globalisation and citizenship* (pp. 15-29). London, New York: Routledge.
- Dobson, A. (2003). *Citizenship and the environment*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Driscoll, C., & Starik, M. (2004). The primordial stakeholder: Advancing the conceptual consideration of stakeholder status for natural environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49(1), 55-73.
- Elliott, A. (2001). The reinvention of citizenship. In N. Stevenson (Ed.), *Culture and citizenship* (pp. 47-61). London: Sage.
- Ghosh, S. (2003). The traditional terms of the traditional knowledge debate. *Northwestern Journal of International Law and Business*, 23, 589-632.
- Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T. S. (1995). Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 874-907.
- Hanlon, G. (2008). Re-thinking corporate social responsibility and the role of the firm—On the denial of politics. In A. Crane, D. Matten, A. McWilliams, J. Moon, & D. Siegel (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of CSR* (pp. 156-172). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hart, S. L. (1997, January-February). Beyond greening: Strategies for a sustainable world. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(1), 67-76.
- Hilson, C. (2001). Greening citizenship: Boundaries of membership and the environment. *Journal of Environmental Law*, 13, 335-348.
- Howland, D., & Robertson, R. (1999). Review of "Chinnagounder's challenge: The question of ecological citizenship," by Deane Curtin. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 6(3). Retrieved September 16, 2008, from http://jpe.library.arizona.edu/volume_6/howlandvol6.htm
- Isin, E. F., & Turner, B. S. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of citizenship studies*. London: Sage.
- Jermier, J. M., Forbes, L. C., Benn, S., & Orsato, R. J. (2006). The new corporate environmentalism and green politics. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. Lawrence, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organization studies* (pp. 618-650). London: Sage.
- Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2002). Transnational corporations and public accountability. *Government and Opposition*, 39, 234-259.
- Lidskog, R. (2005). Siting conflicts—democratic perspectives and political implications. *Journal of Risk Research*, 8, 187-206.
- Light, A. (2003). Urban ecological citizenship. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 34(1), 44-63.
- Linklater, A. (2002). Cosmopolitan citizenship. In E. F. Isin & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 317-332). London: Sage.
- Lunt, N., Spoonley, P., & Mataira, P. (2002). Past and present: Reflections on citizenship within New Zealand. *Social Policy and Administration*, 36, 346-362.
- Martin, K. (2008, May 6). *Tesco launches carbon label scheme*. Retrieved September 13, 2008, from http://www.edie.net/news/news_story.asp?id=14601
- Matten, D., & Crane, A. (2005). Corporate citizenship: Towards an extended theoretical conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 166-179.
- Merchant, C. (1989). *Ecological revolutions: Nature, gender, and science in New England*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 853-886.
- Moon, J., Crane, A., & Matten, D. (2005). Can corporations be citizens? Corporate Citizenship as a metaphor for business participation in society. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 15, 427-451.
- Norman, W., & Néron, P.-Y. (2008). Citizenship Inc.—Do we really want businesses to be good corporate citizens? *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 18(1), 1-26.
- Phillips, R. A., & Reichart, J. (2000). The environment as a stakeholder? A fairness-based approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23, 185-197.
- Ruggie, J. G. (2004). Reconstituting the public domain—issues, actors, and practices. *European Journal of International Relations*, 10, 499-531.
- Sagoff, M. (1988). *The economy of the earth: Philosophy, law and the environment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2007). Toward a political conception of corporate responsibility: Business and society seen from a Habermasian perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1096-1120.
- Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2008a). Globalization and CSR. In A. Crane, D. Matten, A. McWilliams, J. Moon, & D. Siegel (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of CSR* (pp. 413-431). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (Eds.). (2008b). *Handbook of research on global corporate citizenship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Scherer, A. G., Palazzo, G., & Baumann, D. (2006). Global rules and private actors—Towards a new role of the TNC in global governance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16, 505-532.
- Sharma, S., & Henriques, I. (2005). Stakeholder influences on sustainability practices in the Canadian forest products industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 159-180.
- Shelton, D. (1991). Human rights, environmental rights, and the right to environment. *Stafford Journal of International Law*, 28, 103-138.
- Shiva, V. (1997). *Biopiracy: The plunder of nature and knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Shiva, V. (2001). *Protect or plunder? Understanding intellectual property rights*. London: Zed Books.
- Shrivastava, P. (1995). Ecocentric management for a risk society. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 118-137.
- Smith, M. J. (1998). *Ecologism: Towards ecological citizenship*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Starkey, K., & Crane, A. (2003). Toward green narrative: Management and the evolutionary epic. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 220-237.
- Svoboda, S. (1999). Note on life cycle analysis. In M. V. Russo (Ed.), *Environmental management: Readings and cases* (pp. 217-227). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Thompson, G. (2006). *Tracking global corporate citizenship: Some reflections on "Lovesick" companies* (IIS Discussion Paper No. 192). Dublin, Ireland: Institute for International Integration Studies.
- Turner, B. S. (2001). The erosion of citizenship. *British Journal of Sociology*, 52, 189-209.
- van Oosterhout, J. (2008). Transcending the confines of economic and political organization? *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 18(1), 35-42.
- Venetoulis, J., Chazan, D., & Gaudet, C. (2004). *Ecological footprint of nations, 2004* (p. 18). Oakland, CA: Redefining Progress.
- Wackernagel, M., & Rees, W. (1996). *Our ecological footprint: Reducing human impact on the Earth*. Gabriola, BC: New Society.
- Welford, R. J. (1997). *Hijacking environmentalism: Corporate responses to sustainable development*. London: Routledge.
- Whiteman, G. (2004). The impact of economic development in James Bay, Canada: The Cree Tallymen speak out. *Organization & Environment*, 17, 425-448.
- Whiteman, G., & Cooper, W. H. (2000). Ecological embeddedness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1265-1282.
- Wood, D. J., & Logsdon, J. M. (2001). Theorising business citizenship. In J. Andriof & M. McIntosh (Eds.), *Perspectives on corporate citizenship* (pp. 83-103). Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf.
- Wood, D. J., Logsdon, J. M., Lewellyn, P. G., & Davenport, K. (2006). *Global business citizenship*. Armonk, NY and London: M.E. Sharpe.

Andrew Crane is the George R. Gardiner professor of business ethics at the Schulich School of Business, York University. His research and teaching focus on ethics and social responsibility in business.

Dirk Matten, who has a PhD in environmental management (Dr. rer.pol.) and a PhD in international business (Dr. habil.), holds the Hewlett-Packard chair in corporate social responsibility at the Schulich School of Business in Toronto. His research focuses on the political role of the corporation and the comparative analysis of the global spread of new forms of business responsibility.

Jeremy Moon is professor and founding director of the International Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility and deputy director of Nottingham University Business School. His research programme includes corporations and citizenship, corporate social responsibility and government, comparative corporate social responsibility.