success', mostly written by other authors. Part VI concludes with Palmer's exhortations to use a further iteration of the model she introduced in Part IV as a another step 'towards progress and promise in the 21st century'.

My overall impression of *Environmental Education in the 21st Century* is of a cut-and-paste exercise in which there is too little evidence of a rationale for a great deal of either the cutting or the pasting. Much of what the reader seems to be expected to understand as a rationale does not stand up to close scrutiny. For example, Palmer begins by asserting that environmental education is 'a field characterised by a paradox: Few would doubt the urgency and importance of learning to live in sustainable ways... Yet environmental education holds nowhere near the priority position in formal education programmes around the world that this suggests' (p. ix). Palmer then presents the book as an attempt 'to unravel some of the causes of and tensions involved in this paradoxical situation' (p. ix). There are at least two major difficulties with this formulation. First, what is the book's purpose if we do not accept (as I do not) that there is anything 'paradoxical' about the circumstances Palmer describes? I find nothing absurd about an apparent lack of correspondence between social and educational priorities; such mismatches are commonplace and explicable with even a rudimentary understanding of the politics of educational decision-making. Secondly, Palmer's formulation positions environmental education as a mere instrument of environmentalisms—a 'technology', as it were, for achieving particular measures of sustainability and conservation. If environmental education is to enjoy high priority status in 'formal education programmes' its *educational* merits need to be explicitly demonstrated and valued, but these are the very qualities that receive only scant attention in *Environmental Education in the 21st Century.* ◙

Noel Gough

Deakin University, Melbourne

Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, vol. 4, 1999

Education for sustainability is an increasingly important concept in environmental education, both nationally and internationally. The latest issue of the *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education* (vol. 4, 1999) draws together competing arguments in the debate over the nature and purpose of education for sustainability and its role in contemporary environmental education. The articles in this volume are drawn largely from the on-line colloquium hosted by the journal in 1998. The *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education,* now in its fourth year, continues to make an enormous contribution to the field. The current volume presents 15 papers in either English or French (with abstracts in both languages). English language articles, however, predominate. The journal also includes a book review section (6 books

reviewed in this volume) and concludes with a 'News and Notes' section that details forthcoming conferences, new journals, web sites, and so on.

The first three papers in this volume (by Lucie Sauvé and John Huckle and a rejoinder by Lucie Sauvé) show that education for sustainability is contested both as a concept and as a focus for environmental education. While the discussion between Sauvé and Huckle could be seen as one over the relative merits of competing principles, other papers in this volume address some concerns about the implementation of education for sustainability. For example, Berryman argues that we need to be wary of and indeed move away from what he sees as totalising concepts such as education for sustainability. They may, he feels, do more harm than good. Four papers in this volume, by Smyth; Courtenay-Hall and Lott; Hart, Jickling and Kool; and Selby, also look at the barriers to and possibilities for implementing education for sustainability at the national and international level. The links between education for sustainability and biodiversity, consumption and tourism are also explored in papers in this volume. The final three papers, while not dealing specifically with the topic of sustainability, do, through their discussion of the notion of voice, address the issue of sustainable research practices. For example, Rixecker explores the role of academic voice in a cross-cultural context; Malone the voice of the community and Payne & Riddell the voice of teachers in professional development. I would like to focus here, however, on the debate between Sauvé and Huckle.

The most recent United Nations conference on environmental education was held at Thessaloniki in Greece in December 1997. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) conferences on environmental education have in the past been very influential in setting directions for the field (see, for example, Belgrade 1975, Tbilisi 1977, UNCED 1992). It is, therefore, not unreasonable to argue that the Thessaloniki conference will most likely have a similar impact on the field. At Thessaloniki the focus on education for sustainability or education for sustainable development, initially raised by the Brundtland Commission in 1987 and clearly outlined in Chapter 36 of Agenda 21 at UNCED in 1992, was reconfirmed. Indeed, Sauvé argues that UNESCO has, through its support, legitimised the concept of sustainable development. 'Without further analysis, and at great expense', she argues, 'UNESCO is now placing sustainable development at the heart of the project of planetary education, considering it to be the ultimate 'goal' of human development' (1999, p. 10).

Sauvé's paper argues that sustainability and/or sustainable development is not an appropriate goal for environmental education because of the problematic nature of the notion of sustainable development. For Sauvé, a principal problem with the notion of education for sustainability is the ease with which a variety of competing positions have managed to use and co-opt the term. It is not only used by environmental educators but by governments, industry/business and economists. She

argues that these 'others' interpret the term differently from many environmental educators and have managed to co-opt the term for their own (impure) purposes. For Huckle, a major error of Sauvé's paper is this equation of 'all education for sustainability with the promotion of the dominant discourse' (1999, p. 39). Rather than supporting the status quo, education for sustainability, Huckle claims, always 'seeks to expose contradiction, ideology and politics' (1999, p. 40).

Sauvé proposes the notion of education for the development of responsible societies instead of education for sustainability. This is a preferable goal for environmental education because it 'involves nothing less than the reconstruction of the system of relationships among persons, society and the environment' (Sauvé 1999, p. 11). This kind of environmental education, she argues, is a way forward because it promotes an ethic of responsibility and will transform us into responsible beings (1999, p. 28). However, the term responsibility is no less complex than sustainability. Sauvé, therefore, problematises the notion of responsibility by distinguishing between 'deep' and 'shallow' responsibility. With 'shallow' responsibility individuals feel obligated to follow laws, however, with 'deep' responsibility there is a sense of responsibility which sees 'a union of subject and object, of humans and nature ... between being and doing' (1999, p. 29). Deep responsibility is what can be promoted through environmental education, she believes. For Huckle, however, Sauvé's call for education for the development of responsible societies is nothing more than education for citizenship. He suggests that such an approach could be seen to be as contentious and problematic as sustainability as a focus for education. He states: 'We all know what the political right means by education for responsibility and indeed human rights education is partly a response to schooling as a means of social control' (1999, p. 42). Rather, education for citizenship is about both rights and responsibilities. While Huckle acknowledges that the notion of education for sustainability is complex and is used differently in various contexts, he argues that Sauvé is mistaken in thinking that the term needs to be divorced from its 'economic' readings.

It is impossible, he argues, to separate environmental and social issues from economic issues (1999, p. 36). For Huckle, Sauvé misses the point entirely by grounding her discussion in debates over modernity and post-modernity and ignoring the central role that capitalism has and does play in the global environmental crisis. Furthermore, he argues that the critical theory that underpins education for sustainability encourages 'discursive democracy' which in turn acts as a control on the economic and political spheres. For him, education for sustainability is 'underpinned by critical theory and pedagogy and linked to community and citizenship education' (1999, p. 38).

In his defence of education for sustainability, he argues that it is more holistic and inclusive than environmental education. It is more than nature studies and incorporates both the natural and social sciences. It is driven by and promotes, he argues,

'values that should lie at the heart of education as a process of enlightenment' (1999, p. 38). While Huckle believes that critical theory and pedagogy are at the heart of education for sustainability, Sauvé sees sustainability as a reductive concept that should not act as a basis for educational theory. She, therefore, argues against sustainability as the 'ultimate value and finality of education' (1999, p. 48).

These papers by Sauvé and Huckle, along with the others in this volume, provide a lively introduction to the debate over the nature, purpose and place of education for sustainability in contemporary environmental education. ☺

Bibliography

Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, vol. 4., 1999.

UNCED 1992, *Earth Summit '92*, The Regency Press Corporation, London.

UNESCO-UNEP 1976, 'The Belgrade Charter', *Connect*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 69-77.

UNESCO-UNEP 1978, 'The Tbilisi Declaration', *Connect*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-8.

Jo-Anne Ferreira
Griffith University

Sheridan Bartlett, David Satterthwaite, Roger Hart, Ximena De La Barra, Alfredo Missair 1999, *Cities for Children, Children's Rights, Poverty and Urban Management*, Earthscan, ISBN: 1 85383 470 X Paperback, 305pp, £18.95 UK

This publication was commissioned by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and draws a range of authors together to provide a comprehensive and cohesive document. The complexity of the subject matter is dealt with in three clearly framed parts, Part 1 provides a backdrop addressing the convention of rights of the child, child development and families, Part 2 explores in practical detail what these rights mean in day to day life and guidelines for upholding those rights and Part 3 focuses on governance for children's rights.

Bartlett sets the scene by stating that almost half the world's population live in cities, some twelve million children per year die of preventable causes and even in the worlds largest economy, the USA, a quarter of the children live in poverty. She makes a case that economic development has taken precedence over recent decades and social development including the welfare of children has been overlooked. We have a moral obligation to meet the basic rights of children and in the long term, this makes economic sense also.

The current Convention on the Rights of the Child was adopted in 1989 and, in contrast to earlier conventions, it was designed