

**Environmental Citizenship, Natural Resource Governance and Politics of Sustainability:
The Case of Forest Resources**

Juha Kotilainen

University of Joensuu, Faculty of Social Sciences and Regional Studies

PO Box 111, FI-80101 Joensuu, Finland

Email juha.kotilainen@joensuu.fi

Introduction

Land use that concerns natural resources often tends to raise contradictory opinions and become contested. This is also the case with forests. A traditional source of debate is how to balance forest management that follows economic principles with forest ecosystem and landscape preservation. Transitions between forest land and agricultural land are another contested endeavour. Recently, systems of management have been created that seek to build bridges between economic use of forests, conservation of forest biodiversity and social sustainability. These systems are represented most clearly by voluntary forest certification schemes, such as Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and Pan-European Forest Certification (PEFC).

The issues related to forests are always questions of who has rights and obligations towards specific forests environments. Theories of environmental citizenships – including those named as ecological citizenship and sustainability citizenship – have sought to explore the ways in which cosmopolitan and post-cosmopolitan citizens would have rights and obligations towards environments or other citizens living in environments in locations close and remote. It is my aim in this paper to explore the conceptions of theories of environmental citizenships in terms of their applicability for analysing issues concerning land use and sustainability in forest issues.

Therefore, by focussing on the intersection of the conceptions of environmental citizenships and natural resource governance, this paper seeks to build a framework for analysing transformations in citizen participation in the sustainability of the use of natural resources. The paper specifically addresses the issue of environmental citizenships – in its various forms – in the politics of forest utilisation. Forest utilisation is taken to mean both commercial use of timber resources and forest conservation. In more detail, the paper focuses on public procurement policies and voluntary forest certification systems that both have been spreading rapidly across Europe. The impacts of the transformations in the sphere of environmental politics for understanding environmental citizenships are explored. The paper seeks to explore the question of what is the role of citizenship and citizens in enhancing sustainability within the system of governance of forest management.

The discussion is based on a presumption that policies for sustainable development are formulated in the interface of three spheres: state, civil society and business. Each of these spheres is multi-scalar in nature. I wish to argue that environmental citizenships, as well, must be seen as a situated phenomenon that evolves within this field of interaction. The paper follows two threads. First, a current phenomenon within European societies is the increasing interest in the transnational effects of forest governance. Following these social transformations, the substantial focus of the paper is on forestry issues and the ways in which sustainability discourse and practice are being shaped within this sector. Second, I wish to explore the theories of environmental citizenships, including those of ecological and sustainability citizenship and their premises, with the aim of finding ways to elaborate on these approaches in order to analyse the transformations in forest governance. I draw from previous empirical studies on forestry concerning the interconnectedness of forestry activities with issues of sustainability. The issues concerning the principles and methods of forest exploitation and conservation are currently being shaped by actors, institutions and processes in various interlinked locations worldwide. It is clear that forest issues are being defined as global issues in many senses: the industry seeks to follow the principles of global location strategies –diverse contexts, such as Europe, South-East Asia, the Americas or Russia, at the same time, posing different contextual challenges for the industries; the actors representing the sphere of civil society perceive the issues as global not only in transnational non-governmental environmental organisations, but through networked activities, also within more local movements; and the states through their sustainable procurement policies also focus on these issues as global or transnational.

This paper is an attempt to see the problems of transforming global forest governance through the lens of the conception of citizenship with a special focus on its relations with political ecology (cf. Dobson 2006a). In what follows, I will first explore the setting of current forest governance and the issue of sustainability in forest management. I will then go through theories of environmental citizenships and evaluate their different aspects in terms of what they could offer for an exploration of introduction of sustainability into forest governance.

Forest governance, sustainability in forest issues and transformations in the sphere of transnational forest governance

It is safe to maintain that natural resource governance incorporates a multitude of actors and institutions, the compositions of which depend on the specific resource in question as well as the scale and local context for its utilisation (e.g. Nystén-Haarala & Kotilainen 2009). Governance can also be seen as something leading to good practice in natural resource utilisation (e.g. Dengler 2007) or to less desirable outcomes that exclude groups of people that should be essentially involved (e.g. Duffy 2006).

It is commonplace to assume that systems of governance consist of actors with power and relevant institutions. But what is the role of citizens in decisions regarding the utilisation of natural resources? In other words, how do people as citizens, not that much as members of powerful actor groups, participate in the processes of natural resource governance? The question can also be put the other way: given the debates on various forms of environmental citizenships (e.g. Dobson 2003; Dobson & Bell 2006; Hayward 2006; Latta 2007), how can environmental or ecological citizens be positioned in relation to the systems of natural resource governance? While the role of individuals and groups as consumer decision makers through which they act as citizens has been discussed to some extent from various perspectives (Carter & Huby 2005; Seyfang 2005; Clarke et al. 2007), there is still need, however, to situate citizens in the field of natural resource governance.

We can start positioning citizens in relation to institutions and actor groups by drawing from the perspective provided by theories of governance. Van Kersbergen and Van Waarden (2004, 151-152) have investigated the use of the notion of governance in various disciplines. They argue that while the main principles of multi-disciplinary research vary, most of them have certain characteristics in common. The governance approach is pluricentric rather than unicentric. Networks, whether inter- or intraorganizational, play an important role. These networks organize

relations between relatively autonomous, but interdependent, actors, and hierarchy or monocratic leadership is less important. Importantly, the government may be involved, but only as one actor among many. Furthermore, there is an emphasis on processes of governing rather than structures. These processes are relatively similar in the public and private sectors, and they concern negotiation, accommodation, concertation, cooperation and alliance formation rather than coercion, command and control. Moreover, the relations between actors pose specific risks and uncertainties, and different sectors have developed different institutions to reduce these in order to make cooperation easier. Finally, many approaches are normative, prescribing an ideal as well as an empirical reality.

It has also been argued that even if governance has been interpreted in many ways, it has been implicit in the use of the term that the focus is on systems of governance in which resources are allocated and control and coordination are executed in a way that state actors are not the most important ones (Bulkeley 2005, 877). In the paper at hand, natural resource governance is taken to mean discourses and practices that are formed in the interaction of various actors and concern specific natural resources. Through these discourses and practices the actors aim to influence the utilisation and management of natural resources by positioning themselves in relation to other actors and building coalitions with them. Consequently, each of the actors representing the state, business firms and civil society, seeks to affect the utilisation of human and natural resources from their own standpoints (e.g. Dengler 2007; Duffy 2006). It has to be noted that the actor groups are in no way internally homogenous, and, furthermore, essentially different types of actors are related to forest utilisation. In addition, their different types of interactions incorporate market relations, hierarchies and social networks which are formed as different sociospatial combinations. Some of these types of interaction can be more clearly put under the term governance, while others represent a tendency for control rather than cooperation. In addition to actors, there is another dimension to governance, that provided by institutions, for a governance system includes regulations and rules such as laws, contracts and mutual agreements (Nystén-Haarala & Kotilainen 2009; Van Kersbergen & Van Waarden 2004; Dengler 2007). It seems to be feasible to place environmental citizens into this framework of forest governance, since we can assume them to operate and make decisions on environmentally responsible consumption, for example, in social situations in which the actor groups are also involved, especially by providing information on natural resource utilisation and its environmental and social justice effects to other citizens. Environmental citizens are therefore related in many ways to the actor groups of the civil society, state and business as well as various institutions.

Governance concerning forest resources clearly deals with the problems of sustainability. There are different perceptions of sustainability in forest use that are not always easily advanced in parallel: economic, ecological and social. The dimensions of sustainability in forestry differ essentially with respect to the time-scale they have been applied since their inception. The origins of the earliest of these sustainability categories, economic sustainability of forestry, can be traced back to the 19th century. The notion of sustained yield was developed within German forestry and transferred to contexts worldwide in varying complex phases, with the aim of increasing efficiency in forest management in the industrialising forestry sector (Prudham 2007; Vandergeest & Peluso 2006; Kotilainen & Rytteri 2009). A second notion that falls under sustainability stands in stark contrast to the first one, for while the conception of sustained yield aimed at reducing diversity, the ecological sustainability of forestry is best represented by the notion of biodiversity. Biodiversity in forestry is a much more recent addition than sustained yield, as it saw its rise in the 1990s (e.g. Kotilainen 1996). While the notion of biodiversity in forestry was initiated by the conservation community (a section of scientists and non-governmental organisations), the discourse of biodiversity has essentially been adopted by the industry for the purposes of marketing its products as sustainable, even if its success in terms of actual forest landscapes has been contested. While there has been discussion in this field on the third general category, social sustainability, it has not been institutionalised to the same extent as the two other forms of sustainability. When environmental citizens participate in these debates, processes and practices concerning sustainability, by for instance making their consumer decisions, they are faced with the problem of balancing between the above mentioned dimensions of sustainability.

There have been recent transformations in the field of transnational forest governance. These have concerned the balance of the state, non-governmental organisations and the industry in sustainability issues. It has become commonplace that business firms and non-governmental organisations form occasional partnerships on issues concerning forest conservation and logging methods (e.g. Hayter 2003; Kotilainen 2004; Kortelainen & Kotilainen 2006). Moreover, these transformations are illustrated by the introduction of public procurement policies on the scale of nation states (UNECE/FAO Policy Forum 2006) as well as the European Union (Commission of the European Communities 2003), therefore re-strengthening the role of the state. Curiously, however, the state has become dependent on standards set by NGOs (Albrecht 2009; e.g. CPET 2009).

Environmental citizenships

Citizenship has been invested with various qualities. It has been suggested that citizenship is a concept that involves four dimensions: rights, responsibilities, participation and identity (Valencia Sáiz 2005). Hayward (2006, p. 435), in turn, argues that the idea of citizenship normally refers to a status which arises with membership of a polity and confers on citizens a set of reciprocal responsibilities and rights. It has also been argued that visibility is an essential ingredient of citizenship (Szerszynski & Urry 2006; Szerszynski 2006). There are also views on citizenship that challenge these traditional perspectives. Most notably, such a view is Dobson's (2003) theory of ecological citizenship. Furthermore, to illustrate the variation within the notion of citizenship, Barry (2006, p. 25) writes that 'Citizenship in general can be viewed as a continuum from minimalist, liberal notions of passive citizenship to full-fledged civic republican ones of active and participative citizenship. Likewise, green citizenship can be viewed as a continuum from passive environmental to active sustainability citizenship.'

Regarding sustainability issues, it is significant that debate on environmental aspects of citizenship, with its different variants, has seen a rise recently (e.g. Dobson & Bell 2006; Dobson 2003). Some scholars make a difference between environmental citizenship, ecological citizenship, and sustainability citizenship (e.g. Dobson 2003; Barry 2006). Environmental citizenship has been taken to mean situations in which environmental issues are incorporated as a new component in the otherwise unchanging every-day behaviour of individuals or groups of people. In the most limited sense, this would mean for example that workers are trained certain efficient and environmentally-friendly behaviour in their workplaces (Barry 2006). Such a practice has partly become routine within of the forest industry and its logging operations (e.g. Eden 2008; Kotilainen 1996). Barry (ibid.) introduces another conception, sustainability citizenship, that would be a more holistic notion guiding people's lives and, importantly, would not be limited to environmental issues but cover social and justice issues as well. Regarding forest exploitation and conservation, such aspects are related to the behaviour of concerned citizens through their consumer choices and activities of non-governmental organisations.

Furthermore, it has been argued that ecological citizenship can be defined as significantly different from environmental citizenship. Valencia Sáiz (2005; see also Dobson 2003) argues that ecological citizenship consists in three aspects. First, an ecological citizen would have rights and responsibilities without any necessary reciprocal relationship between the two. Second, whereas for the traditional understandings of citizenship citizen activities are located in the public sphere, in ecological citizenship the private and the public spheres would both be key

arenas for activity. In terms of the private sphere it is important to note the role of an individual as an ecologically conscious consumer (Seyfang 2005; Carter & Huby 2005; Clarke et al. 2007), with labels indicating sustainability of forestry products as one element. Third, it has been suggested that the connection between citizenship and any given specific political territory is not important for this version of citizenship theory. This derives partly from the absence of the nation-state as a provider of political space for ecological citizens. Transnational certification schemes provide an example from the world of forestry, though they, although being politically de-territorialising, produce new territorial divisions in terms of communities and landscapes (cf. also Reed 2007). In addition, ecological citizenship has also been argued to be post-cosmopolitan, with the responsibilities of citizens towards each other becoming more important than the relations of citizen and the state or citizen and the non-human environment (Dobson 2003). In sum, the idea of ecological citizenship seeks to stretch the notion of citizenship in two respects that are important from the perspective of forestry debate: the idea that there are other political spaces than nation-state that provide the context for citizen activities, and that the private and public spheres are equally important as locales for citizen activities (cf. Dobson 2006a).

For my purposes, however, I will use the term environmental citizen to refer to citizens' interactions with the natural resource governance system. In my reading, an environmental citizen may nevertheless participate in the various ways described above in affecting natural resource governance. In other words, I do not make the distinction to environmental, sustainability and ecological citizenships as predetermined categories, but rather seek to analyse the different ways in which the contents of these citizenships might be seen in forest exploitation and conservation issues.

In the discussions of the environmental aspects of citizenship, there has been debate on the relations of state, civil society and private businesses, which makes a connection to the perspective provided by natural resource governance illustrated above. The roles of civil society and the state have been debated with considerations of the direction of activity within environmental or sustainability citizenship. In principle, such citizenship could be promoted by an intervention of the state, or it could be led by the civil society (e.g. Barry 2006). Furthermore, the role of private business is an issue for the environmental dimensions of citizenship. This is illustrated, for example, by Læssøe's (2007) analysis of the transformation of the forms of participation towards commercial mediation during recent decades in Denmark; it is also demonstrated by the discussions on the impacts of ecological consumption on the behaviour of

businesses (Seyfang 2005; Carter & Huby 2005); and it is also taken up in Barry's (2006) analysis of the range of citizenships with relations to environmental issues.

Participation as an ingredient of citizenship

Citizenship, therefore, includes several aspects, and I will discuss some of them here in more detail. First of all, it can be stated that participation clearly is a foundational component of citizenship. As Læssøe (2007, p. 233) puts it, 'Citizen participation as a constitutive part of democracy is one of the strongest positive values in modern societies', and furthermore, 'Sustainable development is another ideal that is hard to reject. But how do these ideals fit together?'. Indeed, as Dobson (2006a) points out, the challenges of the encounter of the conceptions of citizenship and political ecology are not straightforwardly unravelled. In order to get an idea of what participation in sustainability politics within forest issues could be, we first need to explore what participation generally means. Various forms of participation can be differentiated. In his historical analysis of the transformation of public participation in Denmark during recent decades, Læssøe (2007) categorises public participation to have taken place differently in three historical phases, incorporating grassroots participation, government supported participation and commercially mediated participation.

By generalising from this perspective of historical analysis, we can differentiate various forms of participation. In each of these cases, the citizen is positioned in relation to the state or the industry, or both. Some of these are evidently present in issues related to forest exploitation and conservation. First, participation can occur through the institutions of democracy on the scale of the nation-state or at the local scale. This is illustrated by public procurement policies seeking to ensure the sustainability of purchases of wood products by governments and administrations on nation-state, regional and local scales (UNECE/FAO Policy Forum 2006; Albrecht 2009). Second, grassroots participation often emerges or intensifies in tensed societal and political situations, challenging the established institutional political system. There are numerous examples of conflicts on forestry methods, locations of loggings, threatened biodiversity and indigenous peoples' rights (e.g. Hayter 2003; Raitio 2008; Tysiachniouk 2009). As a matter of fact, it seems that over the last decades, forestry has been especially prone to conflicts. Third, related to the previous point, there can be participation through the representation of professionalised non-governmental organisations. This can occur by people joining voluntary associations, thereby legitimising their activities. Fourth, people can act as consumers and, following advice provided by NGOs, purchase products with ecological labels and certificates

(cf. Seyfang 2005; Carter & Huby 2005). The impact of such consumer behaviour on forestry firms has been identified (e.g. Kortelainen 2008).

There may be even more variation in potential citizen participation that, however, seem not to have been that much evident in forestry issues. There may be citizen involvement supported by government. In the case of Denmark this meant that as the systems of environmental control and regulation became institutionalised and technological solutions began guiding environmental protection, the government began supporting educational tools for the advancement of environmental protection, and promoting the shift of grassroots activists to professional agents funded by the state (Læssøe 2007, pp. 237-246). Finally, there may be commercial mediators for public participation. Drawing again from the Danish experience, this dimension of participation has been characterised by the introduction of private consultancy firms and advisory companies as mediators for citizen participation, reflecting the declining trust of citizens in public sector officers as well as a general trend towards outsourcing public services to private firms (ibid., pp. 242-246).

There is variation in the opportunities for an environmental citizen to participate in activities affecting global and national forest governance systems and their discourses and practices. These ways for participation illustrate the various dimensions of environmental citizenships. In some cases, the patterns for participation follow more the logic of sustainability citizenship as defined above, sometimes environmental or ecological citizenships. I will now seek to explore how the opportunities for different forms of participation are formed.

Transnational ecological space and citizenship

I will now focus more closely on certain aspects of the relations of citizenship and the environment, especially those provided by the conception of ecological citizenship (Dobson 2003). There are some significant elements put forth by this theoretical perspective for the purpose of investigating citizen participation in sustainability politics concerning forestry operations.

Perhaps the most interesting of these is the idea that citizenship is to be understood in a non-territorialised fashion. This point is related to the suggestion that footprints across ecological space would be the main defining principles for inclusion within the political community. These points draw from the post-cosmopolitan idea that citizenship is not confined by territorial

boundaries, such as the nation- or city state, but defined in relation to fellow citizens, irrespective of their territorial location (Dobson 2003, 67-80, 97-117). The notion of ecological footprint is centrally linked to this point of view, since it is debt to others not consuming natural resources over their quota in ecological terms that counts. Instead of administrative boundaries it is the ecological space that is burdened by the acts and consumption habits of each citizen that becomes important for analysis. This ecological space is suggested to consist of the pattern produced by the material connections that a particular citizen has through her/his daily activities worldwide.

In this framework, the question about how political community is formed, is closely linked to the idea of ecological footprint. Dobson (2003; 2006b; see also Hayward 2006) suggests that the relevant political community is created by resource consumption and waste assimilation requirements of a defined human population or economy in terms of a corresponding productive land area. The ecological footprint gives rise to relationships with those on whom it impacts. Therefore, instead of territoriality as a frame of reference for ecological citizenship it is defined by ecological space, which is constituted by the relations that ecological citizens have to those providing them with natural resources, or to whom they are distracting their waste. Hence, the community of citizenship has been argued to be created by material relations of cause and effect (Dobson 2006b, p. 447).

Such a situation could be illustrated by the processes of transnationalising forest governance, where the material relations of wood trade connect citizens in consuming and producing locations, and where these relations are sought to be made visible through labels and certificates indicating the origin and management methods of timber products. It has to be noted, however, that while ecological citizenship might well be defined with reference to a political space that is defined on the basis of ecology, not politically demarcated boundaries of nation-states, there is an important aspect of re-territorialisation in the processes in which the ecological citizen participates (cf. Reed 2007; Kotilainen et al. 2009). Most notably, these processes are dependent on territorial definitions such as forest certification areas in certain locations. To put this in another way, the effects of the relations created by citizens' activity seem to take territorial forms. Therefore, even if the political community would not be defined in territorial terms per se, there seems to be an essentially – even unavoidably – territorial side to ecological citizenship.

Another idea within ecological citizenship, that of the inclusion of the private sphere in addition to public, also resonates with forestry politics. Politics on the sustainability of forestry are carried

out by individuals when they make their decisions on purchasing products with labels claiming to ensure their sustainability. Such voluntary labels include those initiated by non-governmental organization, most notably the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), but also those that, although non-governmental organisations, have been initiated by the industry, such as Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI). In others, like the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification Schemes (PEFC), governments have central roles, as the process incorporates multi-stakeholder involvement through governmental coordination.

Multiple locations in global context

As it has been stated that in ecological citizenship, citizen responsibilities are not defined according to territories, but footprints, the ways in which material relations find their way across the ecological space become important. Consequently, the community of citizenship is created by material relations of cause and effect. Therefore, citizenship participation in any given place has impacts on the opportunities to participate in other places. Citizen activities affect occurrences elsewhere, not only through the material relations in question, but also through the related discursive practices. Furthermore, questions of inclusion versus exclusion are introduced, since citizenship can be argued to be as much about exclusion as it is about inclusion. Latta (2007, p. 389, italics in original) argues that ‘The existence of a polity implies conflictive practices, which continually reshape its *inside* and *outside*, as well as the rules that govern relationships with it’, and ‘while it might seem natural to think of citizenship in terms of an inclusive practice, as that which binds together a diverse multitude, inclusion is only comprehensible in terms of its opposite: *exclusion*’.

With the decline of the importance of a territorially defined polity, this question might bear less relevance. However, it might similarly be questioned whether the relational nature of citizenship incorporates a risk of exclusion as well, as the networks of material and discursive relations are always biased in multiple ways regarding individuals’ and groups abilities to participate. If a citizen’s ecological space is defined with respect to that individual’s actions, then a question concerning the overlap of ecological spaces arises. While on a theoretical level perspective of ecological citizenship is all-inclusive (Dobson 2003), in practical terms there are questions of who will be able to participate in the processes in which sustainabilities are defined (cf. Hayward 2006).

A problem also arises concerning the effects of participation in one place for the potentials to participate in those places with which it is linked through material and discursive relations across ecological space. Although the theory of ecological citizenship emphasises the consequences that material relations have over ecological space, it is worth stressing that a purely material relation over ecological space is hardly possible. There are necessarily discursive elements at play each time material relations are exercised. Such discursive relations concern the definitions of sustainability and they operate, for example, within transnational trade activities. An example are the multiple discourses of sustainability that are embedded in the relations of consumers and businesses today (Seyfang 2005; Carter & Huby 2005). Hence, citizen participation in one location or context has implications for participation in another.

This can be illustrated through forest governance. If, for example, citizens in Western European countries participate by acting towards the goals of sustainability according to their ecological spaces, this affects the discourses and practices of forest management in peripheral locations where the forests are managed as daily activities. Citizens' purchasing decisions may be guided by their will to, for instance, prevent the use of unsustainably produced timber. Citizens may also promote the activities of non-governmental organisations with a similar aim, or they may participate by voting in elections in favour of candidates they believe to promote sustainable public procurement policies that have become common in some member-state of the European Union as well as on the level of the European Commission (e.g. Commission of the European Communities 2003; CPET 2008).

Discussion

It seems that the notions of environmental citizenship become more complicated if the focus is widened to observing simultaneous situations in multiple local contexts, and the impacts that participation in one place has for the opportunities to participate in other, interlinked places. Consequently, the potentials for affecting sustainable local policies are strongly guided by transnational influences that blend with intentions, cooperation patterns and conflict situations at various scales. The pattern that is formed by the activities of the citizens of one community towards the citizens of other communities is highly complex, and the impacts are of course not evenly spread, but different for different communities. The pattern is also fragmented; elsewhere, it has been maintained that such an environmental political process is producing 'islets' of environmental politics and policies (Kotilainen et al. 2008), and it is clear that issues related to inclusion and exclusion within citizenship (cf. Latta 2007) become considerable in such

situations. While nation states do play important roles in these processes, partnerships between businesses and non-governmental organisation have become increasingly important regarding the politics of forest environments. Consequently, in sociospatial terms, the processes of citizen participation are transformed along two main lines: while environmental politics are spreading through networks, they also result in new territorialized forms of environmental management. Paradoxically, these developments seem to lead simultaneously, on one hand, towards more homogenised and, on the other hand, uneven sustainability politics, in effect producing new social and spatial divisions.

Overall, question concerning polity, territory, membership, inclusion/exclusion as well as participation, that all are vital issues for debates on environmental citizenships, are essentially present in forest governance. For instance, the relations of citizens to forest politics can be seen to occur in many ways. For example, regarding public procurement policies, they are, as members of their respective polities, participating through elections, and thus affecting the decisions of their respective governments. In this case, however, the impacts of their acts as citizens are not confined to a territory that would be identical with their political territory. Citizens may make choices as consumers by purchasing products that are marked with for example certification labels or otherwise are somehow believed to be sustainable in terms of origin of the wood. Consequently, issues such as ethical consumption (Clarke et al. 2007), as politics of choice, as well as ethical investment (Carter & Huby 2005) that seeks to influence companies to adopt responsible policies that benefit society and environment, would be important subjects for further reflection within the field of issues concerning forest governance. Moreover, it is clear that there is great dependence on the activities of intermediary actors, such as non-governmental organisations, advocacy groups, and social movement organisation. Therefore, environmental citizenships and citizens, as well, are related to institutions and actor groups, and the multiple ways for this would require further reflection.

In each of the types of participation, the citizen is positioned in relation to the state or the industry, or both. There have been transformations in the relations of citizens with the state, and this is related to transformations in citizens' relations with the industry and business enterprises. These transformations have scalar characteristics, and it is necessary to recognise that citizens operate in an essentially multi-scalar context. The significance of the nation-state is actually even on the increase with the introduction of public procurement policy schemes for sustainable forestry products. Yet in other respects, the post-cosmopolitan scheme, with the material relations of footprints seems to gain foothold as well, as consumer-citizens exert their power

through their consumer decisions. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasise the multi-contextuality of the world in which the environmental citizen participates and makes decisions in terms of his/her relations with natural resource utilisation.

Finally, empirical evidence from the politics of forest exploitation and conservation scenes support the suggestion that the concept of citizenship, when applied to citizens' relations with the environment, should be broadened to include other scales of interaction (such as local, regional, transnational and even bioregional) than the nation-state (cf. Dobson 2006a). The idea of footprints determining the ecological spaces merits further consideration. What is important for the question of transnationalised forest governance is the discussion of the transnational elements for citizen participation in ecological citizenship. Moreover, on the basis of forestry issues, citizenship should clearly encompass the private as well as the public realm.

References

Albrecht, M. (2009) Political flanking mechanisms for forest certification systems in Germany. Manuscript.

Barry, J. (2006) Resistance is fertile: From environmental to sustainability citizenship. In Dobson, A. & Bell, D. (eds.) *Environmental Citizenship*. MIT Press, Cambridge & London.

Bulkeley, H. (2009) Reconfiguring environmental governance: Towards a politics of scales and networks. *Political Geography* 24, 875-902.

Carter, N. & Huby, M. (2005) Ecological citizenship and ethical investment. *Environmental Politics* 14:2, pp. 255-272.

Clarke, N., Barnett, C., Cloke, P. & Malpass, A. (2007) Globalising the consumer: Doing politics in an ethical register. *Political Geography* 26, 231-249.

Commission of the European Communities (2003) Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT). Proposal for an EU Action Plan. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, COM (2003) 251 final, Brussels, 21.5.2003.

CPET (2008) The Central Point of Expertise on Timber Procurement.

[Http://www.proforest.net/cpet](http://www.proforest.net/cpet), accessed August 25, 2009.

Dengler, M. (2007) Spaces of power for action: governance of the Everglades Restudy process (1992-2000). *Political Geography* 26, 423-454.

Dobson, A. (2006a) Citizenship. In Dobson, A. & Eckersley, R. (eds.) *Political Theory and the Ecological Challenge*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Dobson, A. (2006b) Ecological citizenship: a defence. *Environmental Politics* 15:3, pp. 447-451.

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

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

Duffy, R. (2006) The potential and pitfalls of global environmental governance: the politics of transfrontier conservation areas in Southern Africa. *Political Geography* 25, 89-112.

Eden, S. (2008) Being fieldworthy: environmental knowledge practices and the space of the field in forest certification. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26:6, 1018 –1035.

Hayter, R. (2003) 'The war in the woods': Post-Fordist restructuring, globalization, and the contested remapping of British Columbia's forest economy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93:3, 706–729.

Hayward, T. (2006) Ecological citizenship: justice, rights and the virtue of resourcefulness. *Environmental Politics* 15:3, pp. 435-446.

Kortelainen, J. (2008) Performing the green market – creating space: emergence of the green consumer in the Russian woodlands. *Environment and Planning A* 40:6, 1294-1311.

Kortelainen J. and Kotilainen, J. (eds.) (2006). *Contested Environments and Investments in Russian Woodland Communities*. Kikumora Publications, Helsinki.

Kotilainen, J. (1996) Between the global and the local in environmental politics: The social construction of the biodiversity issue in the context of the Finnish forest question. *Nordisk Samhällsgeografisk Tidskrift* Nr. 23/October 1996, 61-68.

Kotilainen, J. (2004) Shifting between the East and the West, switching between scales: Forest-industrial regimes in Northwest Russian borderlands. In Lehtinen, A., Sæther, B. & Donner-Amnell, J. (eds.) *Politics of Forests: Northern Forest-industrial Regimes in the Age of Globalization*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Kotilainen, J. & Rytteri, T. (2009) Defining sustainable forestry: Forestry regimes in Finland since the 19th century. Manuscript.

Kotilainen, J., Kulyasova, A.A., Kulyasov, I.P. & Pchelkina, S.S. (2009) Re-territorializing the Russian North through hybrid forest management. In Nystén-Haarala, S. (ed.) *The Changing Governance of Renewable Natural Resources in Northwest Russia*. Ashgate, Farnham.

Kotilainen, J., Tysiachniouk, M., Kulyasova, A., Kulyasov, I. & Pchelkina, S. (2008) The potential for ecological modernisation in the Russian context: Scenarios from the forest industry. *Environmental Politics* 17:1, pp. 58-77.

Læssøe, J. (2007) 'Participation and sustainable development: the post-ecologist transformation of citizen involvement in Denmark', *Environmental Politics* 16:2, pp. 231-250.

Latta, P. A. (2007) Locating democratic politics in ecological citizenship. *Environmental Politics* 16:3, pp. 377-393.

Nystén-Haarala, S. & Kotilainen, J. (2009) Institutions, interest groups and governance of natural resources in Russia. In Nystén-Haarala, S. (ed.) *Changing governance of renewable natural resources in Northwest Russia*. Ashgate, Farnham.

Prudham, S. (2007) Sustaining sustained yield: class, politics, and post-war forest regulation in British Columbia. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25, pp. 258-283.

Raitio, K. (2008) *You Can't Please Everyone" – Conflict Management Practices, Frames and Institutions in Finnish State Forests*. Social Scientific Publications of the University of Joensuu 86, Joensuu.

Reed, M. G. (2007) Uneven environmental management: a Canadian comparative political ecology. *Environment and Planning A* 39, 320-338.

Seyfang, G. (2005) Shopping for sustainability: Can sustainable consumption promote ecological citizenship?. *Environmental Politics* 14:2, pp. 290-306.

Szerszynski, B. & Urry, J. (2006) Visuality, mobility and the cosmopolitan: inhabiting the world from afar. *The British Journal of Sociology* 57:1, 113-131.

Szerszynski, B. (2006) Local landscapes and global belonging: toward a situated citizenship of the environment. In Dobson, A. & Bell, D. (eds.) *Environmental Citizenship*. MIT Press, Cambridge & London.

Tysiachniouk, M. (2009) Conflict as a form of governance: the market campaign to save the Karelian Forests. In Nystén-Haarala (ed.): *The changing governance of renewable natural resources in Northwest Russia*. Ashgate, Farnham.

UNECE/FAO Policy Forum (2006) *Public Procurement Policies on Wood and Paper Products and their Impacts on Sustainable Forest Management and Timber Markets*. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome; Proceedings, Geneva, Switzerland, 5 October 2006. Available at <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/A0914e/A0914e00.pdf>

Valencia Sáiz, A. (2005) Globalisation, cosmopolitanism and ecological citizenship. *Environmental Politics* 14:2, pp. 163-178.

Vandergeest, P. & Peluso, N. L. (2006) 'Empires of forestry: Professional forestry and state power in Southeast Asia', Part 1 and Part 2. *Environment and History* 12, pp. 31-64 and 359-93.

Van Kersbergen, K. & F. Van Waarden (2004). 'Governance' as a bridge between disciplines: Cross-disciplinary inspiration regarding shifts in governance and problems of governmentality, accountability and legitimacy. *European Journal of Political Research* 43, 143-171.