Redefining Citizenship: Lessons from Environmental Theory, Practice, and Rhetoric

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Jessica Mary Prody

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Advisor Daniel J. Philippon

June 2011

© Jessica M. Prody 2011

Acknowledgements

During a speech I attended by Terry Tempest Williams she quoted a message that had once been sent to her by a friend, Mardy Murie: “Don’t worry about what you will do next. If you take one step with all the knowledge you have, there is usually just enough light shining to show you the next step.” I have revisited that quotation multiple times throughout my graduate career. Here I want to thank those that provided the foundation of my knowledge, shined lights, and encouraged me to take next steps.

My committee is largely responsible for shaping the best parts of this dissertation. This project would not be what it is without the advice, criticism, and guidance of my advisor, Dr. Daniel Philippon. He helped me recognize the questions I was asking had importance and guided me in becoming my own scholar and finding my own voice. I cannot thank him enough for his time, knowledge, and kindness. Dr. Kirt Wilson also played a central role from the early stages of this project. His breadth and depth of knowledge were essential in helping me to narrow the project’s scope and establish a foundation on which to build its claims. Dr. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell is nothing short of an inspirational figure. Her willingness to make time for and mentor graduate students is beyond admirable. This project is better because of her red pen marks and “Egads!” Every graduate student in our department should express their gratitude to Dr. Edward Schiappa’s for his efforts to help us navigate the professional landscape. I am indebted to him for his advice and open-door policy.

Numerous friends and colleagues have contributed to this project by reading and commenting on sections of the work. Specifically, I would like to thank Brandon Inabinet, Leila Brammer, and Justin Killian for making this dissertation stronger with

their comments, criticisms, and ideas. Many graduate school colleagues—especially Casey Kelly, Amy Pason, Michael Lee, Pamela Hill Nettleton, Meg Kunde, and Kasi Williamson—helped provide the foundation I needed to complete this project and continued to give support as it was being finished. Faculty at the University of Minnesota, particularly Mary Vavrus, also provided necessary friendship and insight.

My closest friends—my second family—gave me support and many needed breaks from research and writing. Britt Peterson and Andrea Lee Tish deserve thanks for their inspiring intelligence, loyalty, and willingness to have chai-n-chats at a moment's notice. The laughter provided by Andrew Erickson, Adam Johnson, Jon Mueller, and Andrew Leaf is beyond compare and provide a balance in my life for which I am extremely grateful. I must also express gratitude to The Bossies for expanding my view of the world through their intellectual challenges and for always giving me a place to belong.

Finally, I could not have completed this project without the support, love, and guidance of my family. My parents, Tom and Patty, instilled in me a love of learning, demonstrating by their own examples that every answer should lead to new questions. Daniel, my much cooler younger brother, has been my reality check, reminding me of what is important in life by telling me when I was taking myself too seriously. These three, along with the pack of goldens (Thor, Gabe, and Dock), have never been short on love and encouragement and have always provided a safe haven in which to find the next step.

Dedication

For my parents, Tom and Patty, and all others who encouraged me to ask questions.

Abstract

Redefining U.S. citizenship for our current global sociopolitical context is necessary. Drawing on environmental theory and practice, I argue for a community-building project that encourages citizenship built on forethought and emphasizes participatory justice, an inclusive notion of security, and sustainable intergenerational justice. The theoretical claims of the project are supported by six case studies that use textual analysis to examine how social movement and governmental discourse has paired environmental concerns and citizenship. These case studies demonstrate and need for and challenges of constructing a citizenship around the above principles. Throughout the project I illustrate the need for global and local consideration of citizenly issues and highlight the tension between urging immediate action on environmental problems and the need for action to be undertaken in a way that addresses philosophical questions of justice, fairness, sustainability, and democratic participation.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements……………………………………………………………………i

Dedication…………………………………………………………………………iii

Abstract……………………………………………………………………………iv

Chapter 1: Redefining Citizenship: Environmentalism and the Power of Language………………………………………………………………...1

Chapter 2: Participatory Justice as a Framework for Citizenship: Lessons From the White Earth Land Recovery Project and George W. Bush Administration………………………………………………………….31

Chapter 3: Redefining Security for a Global Context: *Silent Spring*, Nixon's EPA, and a Move Toward Human Security…………………………………..77

Chapter 4: Community Building: What Bill McKibben and Michelle Obama Teach us About a New Environmentalist Project………………...…...……..116

Chapter 5: Directions for Environmentalists, Civic Engagement, and a Discourse of Possibility……………………………………………………..…….161

Bibliography……………………………………………………………………..177

Chapter 1

Redefining Citizenship: Environmentalism and the Power of Language

During the week in which I was revising the first draft of this chapter PBS ran a Ken Burns documentary series on the national park system, National Parks: America's Best Idea. In one of the segments the narrator told the story of Stephen Mather,a self-made millionaire, who in 1914 wrote a letter to then Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K (Public Broadcasting System, 2009). Lane, about the deplorable conditions of the Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks. Lane responded by telling Mather that if he was unhappy with how they were managed he could come to Washington D.C. and run the parks on his own for a year. Mather accepted and began a mission of creating a single government agency to oversee the maintenance and use of national parks.

One of his earliest actions after taking over the parks was to hire Robert Sterling Yard, editor of *The New York Herald*, to create publicity for the parks. In addition, Mather constantly lobbied politicians and fellow millionaires to partake in his dream of protecting the wilderness. Mather also recognized his position would be strengthened if he could make the case that national parks were an asset to the public, an asset visited and used by many citizens throughout the United States. For this reason, Mather partnered with railroad companies, supporting their "See America First" campaign, which equated visiting existing national parks with demonstrating patriotism. In the World War I era, these appeals garnered public support for the protection of the natural land and a national agency to manage them.

Mather was eventually successful in establishing such an agency and played a significant role in expanding the acreage of the national park system and protected lands.

His material contribution to preservation of the environment cannot be ignored, but I am much more interested in the lesson Mather can teach contemporary environmentalists, those seeking not only to preserve the land but also to repair the damage done, those working not only in very specific areas but also those working to address global environmental concerns, and those trying not only to protect pristine areas of wilderness but also to find ways for humans to live better with the nonhuman environment. The lesson Mather teaches is that rhetoric is powerful—how we talk about issues is important.

This lesson is learned over and over again when it comes to environmental issues. Aldo Leopold's "land ethic" challenged the assumption that nature is there for humanity to conquer. Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* is credited with initiating a new environmentalism. And Al Gore can be said to have made global climate change an unavoidable issue with a film. What these examples demonstrate is that while rhetoric is essential to raising awareness, it is also essential to spurring and maintaining productive action.

Each of these individuals used existing discourses to frame their message of environmentalism; at the same time, their messages had implications beyond environmental concerns. Each of the texts also challenged existing ways of living with the planet and one another, as well as existing modes of political discourse and action. While some of these texts were more powerful or less problematic than others, all of them challenged dominant ways of thinking and made material changes toward addressing environmental concerns. Most importantly, they engaged environmental issues in ways that changed social and political discourse. They altered debates, raising questions and arguing for new foundational values that then shaped action and policy.

We no longer find ourselves in the social context in which Mather, Leopold, or Carson produced their rhetorics. One may even argue that with the current military conflicts, a worldwide economic crisis, and rising political tensions, the global socio-political order is different from that in which Gore released *An Inconvenient Truth* in 2006. These messages spoke directly to the contexts in which they were delivered,[1] but our current context calls for a new environmental message that has the potential to inspire more productive environmental action and policy, at the same time as it can challenge the dominant values currently relied on in political discussions generally. A more communal message of how we might work together, find common ground, and treat one another and the planet with respect might be just the message needed in a world facing global crises and loss of community. Beyond arguments of morality, though, this new message must contain a political component, so that individual action is not the base, but part of a political system, where individual behaviors, collective action, state policy, and global politics all interact to form a new relationship between humans, and between humans and the nonhuman world. Thus, I argue that a redefinition of citizenship should be a primary project of U.S. environmentalism. To redefine citizenship, environmentalists will need to challenge current conceptions of justice, security, and sustainability, broadening each beyond their traditional usage to create a citizenship that is more deliberative, less risky, and more forward thinking than that which is currently practiced.

[1] Mather's message of preservation was actually a message of patriotism. Leopold's concern over interacting with the land can be read as an argument about what community means and the morals by which society should abide. Carson's message against pesticides was a larger critique of scientific discovery and so-called expert knowledge. Gore's text sought to empower individuals in a social context where the individual seemed helpless against larger forces.

The broader project of redefining citizenship may give environmentalists a language through which to reach those who may not have otherwise considered an environmental message. In addition, it may alter debate over political issues beyond the environment by altering priorities, values, and expectations of political actors. The following chapter outlines the current contexts facing environmentalists and uses environmental concerns to argue for the adoption of a particular language of citizenship. It also provides my rationale for the project, gives my plan of study, and offers a preview of the project's structure

Globalism

The global characteristic of the contemporary world is often viewed as the logical consequence of advances in communication technology and transportation that have made the size of the world shrink, allowing for the development of a true global economy and transference of information between individuals in locales separated by great distance. The current structure has been referred to by terms such as "globalization," "globalism," and "globality." These terms acknowledge that we find ourselves in a global structure where distance and traditional political borders no longer have the same influence on social and political affairs as they have in the past. In addition, current world crises are requiring new and more structured global governmental action. For example, Gayil Tashir (2001) writes:

> Deriving from the conceptual framework of democracies—in which the autonomous individual is highly valued—a state is treated as a sovereign country on a given territory, free to constitute its own laws and enforce them within its border. Environmental effects, however, do not recognize such borders. The

> inability of states to deal individually with their environmental problems highlights the limitations of national laws. (p. 42)

Currently, this global system is in crisis. Concerns over a weak global economy and widespread fears of security brought on by numerous violent conflicts and the rise of radical militant groups have created a need for more structured and rigorous global cooperation. In spite of the fact that environmental issues clearly illustrate this need, they often take a back seat to what are framed as more pressing concerns.

Environmental concerns, however, cannot automatically be seen as more or less pressing than any other global concern. They cannot be separated from questions of the global economy, human rights, or even military endeavors. The context of globalization calls for a scholarship that points to the intersections and connections between traditional political concerns that have typically been seen as separate or at least only loosely related. This means looking both at how things like global warming are connected to human rights abuses and how local action has connections to the global political realm. Ursula Heise (2008) argues that the contemporary global context is of primary concern to scholars of the humanities, who must ask “the question of what cultural and political role attachments to different kinds of space might play, from the local and regional level all the way to the national and global” (pp. 4-5). We can no longer afford to believe that political issues can be addressed one-at-a-time in a reactionary mode of politics. Nor can we afford to continue engaging in local and national politics that refuse to consider global ramifications. The global structure in which we find ourselves calls for a mode of deliberation that looks at the very real and complicated interconnections that exist

between pressing political issues and seeks to put forth action and policy that thinks through a variety of potential future consequences, not just economic ones.

Government, even the loose global structures set up to address global issues, typically run on problem-solution models where a specific concern is raised and policy and action is devised to address that concern. This system makes it difficult to recognize the interconnectedness of social and political issues, as well as to address issues that span governmental borders. This, and the absence of global responsibility in some of the world's largest nations (particularly the United States) contribute to a climate in which successfully addressing non-bounded issues is nearly impossible. In spite of the increasing presence of the global, powerful nation-states have continued to work under a hierarchy that places loyalty to nation-states above global structures. Doing away with patriotism is not the aim of this project, but constructing a citizenship that allows individuals to balance their various realms of obligation is. Sometimes, global concerns need to be given higher consideration than national ones, and sometimes local places need more care than either the national or global community. Before individuals can determine what the balance of their loyalties look like, however, a sense of citizenship is needed that reminds them of their connection to others and teaches them how to make decisions about what and where is most important in a given situation. While globalism has challenged our traditional understandings of community and citizenship, another force—hyper-individualism—has pervaded the cultures at the top of the global hierarchy and made broad collective action slow in coming by creating a mindset that values individual rights over obligation to others.

Hyper-Individualism

Hyper-Individualism is understood as the idea that people are driven by personal interest to the degree that concern for community and others becomes practically obsolete. The drive is to achieve individual prosperity and individual rights, without the traditional notion of reciprocity that would attach these rights to communal duties. Nick Stevenson (2003) marks the ever-increasing trend toward individualism as one of the key roadblocks to effective, collective environmental activism. Faced with endless decisions about our actions, "individuals are 'condemned' to become authors of their own lives." Brought on by the "disintegration of the nuclear family and rigid class hierarchies" of industrial society, individuals must face the "uncertainties of a globalized society." This existence is highly indebted to the neoliberal market system that "views the citizen as having the individualized ability to be able to 'maximize his or her lifestyle through acts of choice' (Rose 2000:99)" (p. 30). The market, under this guise of freedom and autonomy, can act as a mechanism regulating norms and instilling certain forms of individualized behavior (p. 33).

Bill McKibben (2007) in *Deep Economy: The Wealth of Communities and the Durable Future* details these norms and behaviors of hyper-individualism and their consequences. McKibben paints the image of the hyper-individualized as those who build homes where members of families need not come into contact with one another, are incapable of making decisions that would benefit the general good, and are facing higher rates of mental disease and disorders than others in any era of human history. What has been lost is a sense of community, any notion that we are, whether we want to be or not, connected to others. Hyper-individualism has led to a situation where individuals seem to

ignore how it is their actions have an impact on others and how we are dependent on others for our existence. Without recognizing these key points, addressing environmental and other global problems will remain impossible.

In this individualized climate, calls for collective action seem to have lost influence (Putnam, 2000). In their place, calls for individualized life changes have emerged. Whether one looks at the slew of books that target individuals with the promise they can save the environment with little effort or change in their lifestyle, articles in the top-ten genre that have appeared in newspapers around the nation, the end credits of Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth*, or organizations built on small lifestyle changes one can make to save the environment, the focus of mainstream environmentalism is not on calls for broad systemic changes requiring massive collective action. Instead, these appeals suggest that individuals can remain individual, not having to interact with others or even the political structure to save the planet. They simply have to "buy green," use reusable shopping bags, drink water from aluminum bottles, and make sure their homes are energy efficient.[2] I am not arguing that an individualized focus has completely destroyed collective action, but it has altered the shape of that action and made calls for systemic change difficult. Even though organizations that focus on broad policy changes still exist, such as the World Wildlife Federation or the Sierra Club, and newer organizations have emerged, such as 350.org, the majority of calls for environmental action have focused on

---

[2] The effectiveness of "green consumerism" and individual modes of environmental action have been heavily debated. For examples see: (Irvine, 1989; Sandilands, 1993).

telling individual members about changes they can make in their own lives rather than on how they can push for more widespread change.[3]

Changes in individual lives will be needed to address the crises facing our world, but individual action alone will not solve crises such as global climate change, and a focus on the individual makes villains of those without the resources to act as ideal environmentalists. To address global environmental issues, strong communities must be built to encourage more systemic change that requires governments and global corporations to act.

Key to this project is that environmental issues, particularly those on a global scope, should not be addressed in a hyper-individual system where connections to others are ignored or avoided. Nor should environmental issues be separated from other global political concerns. In order to address these issues (through the creation of global governance (Hayden, 2005; Stevenson, 2003), a revival of more traditional political/social systems (McKibben, 2007; Sandel, 1996), some combination of the two, or another alternative), we must begin to acknowledge our various loyalties and the wide-ranging effects of our actions. We must begin to acknowledge that connecting with others, through debate, duty, and action are not negative things. Once we realize the power of adopting an identity of citizenship built on recognizing our connection to others,

---

[3] Michael Sandel's (1996) compelling work, *Democracy's Discontent*, details the loss of community interaction. Sandel's focus is not on traditional collective action but on the broader loss of communal places and interaction, such as those that occur in community parks, service organizations, churches, and social organizations. He views these places and organizations as partners with government and training centers for the civic realm. Without such places, individuals enter the political realm without the knowledge or support to navigate political channels.

our right to have a healthy space in which to live and our obligation to provide healthy spaces for others can become central issues of discussion in political debates.

Citizenship and the Environment

One way of addressing the current dilemmas facing environmentalism is to turn to a language of citizenship. Such a turn has the potential to accomplish four things. First, it would tap into a broader theoretical discourse on citizenship that has emerged in the current global climate. Many of these theorists have pointed to environmental issues as a reason for needing a new concept of citizenship, but few (Dobson (2003) being a notable exception) have sought to point to how environmental issues relate to other citizenly concerns, which leads to the second potential accomplishment of a turn to citizenship. Citizenship is not an identity that has a single issue of focus; rather, citizenship is an identity that engages a broad-spectrum of political concerns. A language of citizenship will allow for a discourse that views environmental concerns as connected to other social concerns, rather than an issue separate from politics or any political issues besides the economy. Third, a language of citizenship has the potential to move beyond the individualized language of current mainstream environmental discourse to emphasize systemic change and the obligations of social and political institutions. Finally, it provides a discursive framework with the potential to encompass and surpass the individualized language emphasized in mainstream environmentalism. Citizenship simultaneously suggests a balance of rights and duties that come with being a member of society. This aspect of citizenship justifies calls of social responsibility so essential to addressing the most pressing environmental concerns.

Citizenship must be considered a robust identity, one that is broad enough to allow individuals to engage a variety of social issues as political. Historically, citizenship has been tied to particular nation-states, but depending on how one looks at the concept and its practice, citizenship can be less a relationship between individuals and a governmental structure and more a relationship among individuals bound together through some definable affiliation. This relationship between individuals is the focus of this project. Governmental structures are absent from my conception of citizenship, but the emphasis is not on the rights the state must provide or the duties citizens have to the state. In the context of globalism and hyper-individualism, the focus of citizenship must be on the relationships between individuals, as individual actions have consequences on others, thus creating an obligation to those who are affected by our actions (Dobson, 2003).

Citizenship is also an identity that implies a balance between obligations and rights. As a result, this project focuses on the rights and obligations citizens have to one another in the realms of justice, security, and sustainability. I concentrate on these three elements because they are most useful for a new language of citizenship. These elements are drawn from existing discussions in environmental discourse, but they also speak to a variety of social issues. In addition, they imply that citizens have a right to them at the same time they have an obligation to ensure others receive them.

The notion of justice has been a key concern of those interested in environmental politics, particularly those involved in the environmental justice movement.[4] The

[4] Questions of justice (what it is, who gets it, who gets to enforce it, how should it be enacted) appear in some of the earliest philosophical literature on citizenship to which we have access. It is a concept that appears in the writings of liberal philosophers (Locke,

conception of justice used in here will draw heavily on the work of Dobson, who contends that justice must be the righting of wrongs, that individuals are obligated to address harms caused by their actions. At the same time, if one is wronged, a principle of justice implies that one has the right to expect that wrong to be righted.[5] To have justice as a principle of citizenship requires a consideration of the consequences of action, especially any potential negative effects to other human beings. The implication of such a principle for environmental concerns is clear. For example, justice would require citizens of the United States to act at greater degrees to curb climate change than those whose actions contribute much less to the problem. Justice also speaks to other social issues. For example, how would an emphasis on justice influence our military decisions or our stances on human rights violations in places such as China? It would cause us to raise questions about how our emphasis on economic interests and global power has led to our participation in the harming of individuals across the globe. What constitutes harm that requires just action will be an issue of constant debate and redefinition, which is why my discussion of justice in this project revolves around the concept of participatory justice, creating a deliberative process where all stakeholders can share their concerns, debate issues of justice, and agree upon just action.

The second principle of citizenship discussed in this project is that of security. On a basic level this principle is included for pragmatic reasons. Security is an issue that

---

1689) and foundational texts of republicanism (Cicero, 1999). It is a virtue that emerges at key moments of redefinition of citizenship throughout history (e.g., the American Revolution, the woman's suffrage movement, and the civil rights movement). Justice is a concept that can be discussed as a right, at the same time that it is prescribed as a duty, a duty to ensure justice for community members.

[5] Dobson may disagree with such a reading of his work, as he contends that his conception of citizenship is not contractual, but Tim Hayward (2006) offers a convincing critique that points to the implied contract in Dobson's work.

spans the political spectrum, but it has been most attached to those on the right, those typically less inclined to view themselves as environmentalists. If environmental issues can be framed in terms of lack of security, it is possible that a broader audience may adopt them. The concept of security I advocate is heavily reliant on "human security." This security places humans, rather than the nation-state, at the center of security issues. As a principle of citizenship, generally, it speaks to the reality that everyone has a right to live with a sense of security when it comes to their health, livelihood, and culture and that we have an obligation to ensure others have a secure existence. Incorporating security into a redefinition of citizenship requires reclaiming it as a term that applies too much more than the right of protection from violent attacks on the nation's borders. Security must be expanded to include domestic and foreign security. It must be defined in a way that addresses concerns that range from violent attacks to the ability to breathe healthy air to the right not to be subjected to droughts brought on by environmental crises. Such a principle speaks to environmental issues, but it also speaks to a wide-range of political and social issues, such as civil rights issues, health care, and military endeavors. Like justice, security reminds us that we live among and with others. One cannot be responsible for protecting oneself from all security risks. One of the primary reasons societies establish governments is to ensure protection from outside forces; however, as an element of citizenship security also reminds us that risk can come from internal thought and action. In an era of uncertainty and volatility, a reclaiming of security as a right and obligation may make a new language of citizenship something to which people are prepared to listen.

The third principle, sustainability, inspires the obligation to think through how present actions have an impact on the future and generations beyond us. The citizenship called for in this project is intergenerational. It suggests that we have an obligation to those who live on this planet after us, just as we have a right to live well on this planet throughout our lifetime. Some Native American communities reference the seventh-generation principle, which acknowledges that our actions today have implications for seven generations. (I would be content for political decisions to be made with consideration for a generation or two ahead of now.) Such a principle, once again, asks for discussion of potential consequences and emphasis on foresight currently missing from political discussion. In an alteration of the typical problem-solution model of existing governmental structures, a principle of sustainability asks for existing problems to be addressed after a deliberative process considers what other consequences (particularly negative ones) may be caused in the future by proposed action and legislation. After acknowledging these potential consequences, the question is whether those actions would harm or take away possibilities from future generations to the point that alternate action should be implemented. A second consequence of making sustainability central to citizenship is that communities would begin to deliberate what it is they want to sustain. What, they may ask, do we want to pass on to those who will live here after us? Beyond solving problems, sustainability would ask that those living imagine the world and communities they want to provide for those who come after them.

Combined with justice and security, sustainability reinforces a political process of decision-making and action that is future-oriented, built on recognizing that actions have direct and periphery consequences and rarely are social issues narrow in focus (i.e.,

energy policies have ramifications for foreign relations, environmental impacts, and economic consequences). Justice, security, and sustainability together remind us that citizenship is a communal identity, with individuals receiving these principles as rights so that they may fulfill the obligations of ensuring they are received by others. These three elements also suggest that citizenship need not be tied to a specific governmental structure at every moment; rather, citizenship can be an identity one defines at times as belonging to a specific local community, at others as belonging to a common community of humanity, and at still others belonging to some bounded community in between (i.e., a nation-state or state government). The point is, calling oneself a citizen would require that one practice particular virtues, receive particular rights, and use justice, security, and sustainability to inform individual and communal action and policy.

The global socio-political climate has changed. Uncertain times have historically been moments when notions of citizenship have been challenged and altered. A new language of citizenship is needed if we are to successfully and fairly address the issues that have arisen in this global, individualized context in which we find ourselves.

Why Start with the Environment and Citizenship?

This project concentrates on environmental concerns, because they so clearly illustrate the need for a new version of citizenship. For that reason, I analyze texts that concern both environmental discourse and conceptions of citizenship. But the contribution of the project goes beyond environmental citizenship. Relying on environmentalism to call for a redefinition of citizenship is one way into conceiving of a general citizenship needed in the current global socio-political climate. In other words, while my analyses focus on environmental texts and draw significantly from scholars

writing about the environment, the virtues of citizenship advocated in the analyses, and the process of deliberation and political action called for by the project, are an attempt to redefine a viable citizenship for the contemporary world. This new citizenship has environmental virtue at its core, but the principles of this virtue produce a citizenship that can address more than just environmental problems. Emphasizing the principles of justice, security, and sustainability, the analyses point to a new citizenship on which action and policy can be based that will potentially counter the negative consequences that have emerged from the existing global capitalist system.

I contend that citizenship is a powerful rhetorical mode through which to discuss environmental issues. It seems particularly apt to address the disconnect that exists between action, policy and theoretical explorations of environmental issues. As a concept, citizenship is capable of being used to advocate for virtues that would bring about the widespread change in those attitudes that constrain policy and action. At the same time, citizenship acknowledges the role of political systems in addressing environmental issues. Individual action is not sufficient to solve global environmental crises. Governments and institutions must collectively alter their attitudes and policies in such a way that systematic changes are also made. A discourse of citizenship maintains a significant role for governmental structures and entities, such as corporations, that exist within them.

One of the most significant problems with existing scholarship on environmental citizenship is that it often uses top-down models where theorists design a new form of identity based in "green virtue" and argue it should be adopted by the masses. This project begins with the assumption that we must build from the bottom-up. That is, if a

more productive mode of citizenship is to be brought into existence, it will need to begin with existing ideas and practices of local places.

My objects of study are textual objects of public discourse, ranging from speeches to books to websites that have been used to discuss environmental issues. The goal of using such objects is to determine what rhetoric is already present in public discourse that pairs environmentalism and citizenship. Using the method of textual analysis, I ask the following questions:

1. How have environmental concerns been articulated alongside notions of citizenship in public discourse?
2. What is the relationship between theoretical conceptions of environmental citizenship and virtue and the pairings of environment and citizenship in public discourse?
3. How can a discourse of citizenship be used to discuss environmental concerns in a way that might lead to productive policy and action? What would this discourse of citizenship look like?

What distinguishes these questions from the questions of others who have explored the relationship between citizenship and the environment is that I begin with how citizenship and environmentalism have been paired in existing governmental and social discourses. In addition, these questions allow for the analyses to collectively point to the new conception of citizenship for which the project ultimately calls.

The project relies on rhetorical criticism to build a theory of citizenship. Most discussions of environmental citizenship stick to the theoretical realm. And most rhetorical criticism of environmental texts end with conclusions that either explicate what

is problematic about the rhetoric or explain how the rhetoric frames the environment (typically in relation to humanity). This project seeks to go beyond those conclusions to show that rhetorical analyses, when paired with broader theoretical questions, have the potential to offer prescriptive calls for changes not only in how things are spoken about but also in the underlying frameworks of virtue on which these discussions are based.

Citizenship and Rhetoric

Arguing for a redefinition of citizenship reflects my scholarly background in rhetoric. Throughout history, rhetorical scholars have concerned themselves with the concept of citizenship either by studying it directly or studying discourse produced by citizens. Rhetorical approaches to citizenship make clear that citizenship is not something that emerges after a political system is created. Instead, citizenship comes before a political system. Political systems are created and revised as individuals determine that living together under a system of rights and obligations will help them live better.

Whether looking at the simple act of signing a petition (Zaeske, 2003), the enactment of citizenship in acts of illegal voting (Ray, 2007; Ray & Koenig Richards, 2007), or the consequences of holding individuals up to an ideal form of citizenship (Murphy, 2003), rhetorical scholars have spent considerable time looking at how groups of individuals define themselves as members of the citizenry (Carlacio, 2004; Ray 2004).[6] Inherent in these studies is that citizenship is an ever-evolving, rhetorical identity,

[6] Another approach to citizenship exists in rhetorical studies. This approach analyzes the role of rhetoric (both the practice and study) in a healthy democracy and its importance for citizens (Hart & Sparrow, 2001; McDorman & Timmerman, 2008). These studies address important questions but are not directly related to the focus of this project. I am concerned with theorizing a workable definition of citizenship through the analysis of rhetoric rather than a theoretical exploration of rhetoric's roles in citizenship and democracy.

changing as do social contexts and social discourses (Schudson, 2001). In addition, these studies acknowledge that citizenship is not a single-level identity. Individuals engage in private practices of citizenship, governmental institutions prescribe and define identities of citizenship, and practices of citizenship can be tied to institutions (i.e., debate clubs, fraternal organizations, neighborhood watch groups, etc.) that seem unaffiliated with state institutions. Existing conceptions of environmental citizenship rarely address or use these rhetorical dimensions, and those that do typically focus on a single level (e.g., local, global, or nation-state). Rhetorical studies remind us that citizenship must be discussed as a multi-level, interconnected concept. They also refuse to separate the privileges of the identity from its obligations. Citizenship has never been fully rights-based or fully duty-based. It is most intelligible when one recognizes the balancing act that exists between the two.

One of the most noted calls for such an approach to citizenship comes from Robert Asen (2004), who views citizenship as a process rather than an identity. He states, "In drawing attention to citizenship as a process, a discourse theory recognizes the fluid, multimodal, and quotidian enactments of citizenship in a multiple public sphere" (p. 191). This attention to the multiplicity and fluidness of citizenship is what allows individuals to enact citizenship and challenge the normalized boundaries of the identity. It also highlights the bidirectional, mutually constituting nature of "citizens" and "citizenship" (p. 204). Asen's theoretical work is an important contribution to studies of citizenship because it marks a distinction between the general identity of citizenship and how individual citizens choose to reinforce or challenge that definition.

One concern with drawing heavily on rhetorical studies is the discipline's grounding in traditional definitions of citizenship. Asen does not explicitly fall into the nationalistic category that many rhetorical studies on citizenship do, but he also does not explicitly acknowledge how his theory is complicated by globalism. Possibly because of rhetoric's groundings in the Western democratic tradition, rhetorical studies of citizenship typically focus on the local enactment of citizenship, the challenges of local citizens to national definitions of identity, or national constructions of citizenship. Those who have begun to address the relationship of the global to these concerns have made important steps, but they have only engaged in initial forays upon which scholarship must build (Greene, 2004; Hellman, 2004). I attempt to do this by placing rhetorical studies' focus on local enactment and the importance of the nation-state in conversation with other lines of scholarship that pay more attention to the role of the global. Rhetorical scholars seem to take as a given that the nation-state must play the primary role in theories of citizenship. They have difficulty imagining a citizenship not constantly tied to this geographically bounded structure. Many theories of environmental citizenship challenge this belief, suggesting the nation-state can no longer be given the prime position in citizenship studies. This is not to say the nation-state must be discarded, but it needs to be seen as part of the process and system of citizenship, not the sole object of loyalty.

Environmental Virtue and Citizenship

Considerable literature exists in the fields of philosophy, political science, and environmental studies that theorize how environmentalism and citizenship can and should

be discussed together. Carme Melo-Escrihuela (2008) highlights the difficulties in discussing environmental citizenship:

> There have been several suggestions regarding different ways that citizenship and the environment might be related, for instance “ecological citizenship” (Christoff, 1996a; Dobson, 2005, 2003; Smith, 1998; Curtin, 2002, 1999), “green citizenship” (Dean, 2001; Smith, 2005), “environmental citizenship” (Dobson and Bell 2006; Luque, 2005), “sustainability citizenship” (Barry, 2006), “environmentally reasonable citizenship” (Hailwood, 2005) or “ecological stewardship” (Barry, 2002, 1999). The conceptual diversity, far from being a mere terminological issue, reflects the complexity of the citizenship and environment issue. Indeed, there are specific situations in which a particular notion of ecological citizenship, or one of its features, directly conflicts with another. For instance, for some authors activities such as recycling or sustainable consumption fall into the category of ecological citizens’ duties (Dobson; Barry, 1999), whereas others regard them as private choices, involving the right to live a green life (Bell, 2005). (p. 114)

I do not have the time and space to detail these studies here, and in some cases the distinctions scholars are making seem more academic than practical. Whether recycling is seen as the act of an ecological citizen or a private choice made by an individual, I want people to recycle. The citizenship I offer here could be labeled environmental citizenship, green citizenship, ecological citizenship, sustainable citizenship, or any other such moniker. Or, it could simply be labeled “citizenship,” a pragmatic citizenship that seeks to give individuals guiding values on which to construct communities and systems of

deliberation that provide justice, security, and sustainability to existing and future members. This citizenship will not look the same in every locale; it is a citizenship that asks people to work with those whose lives are intertwined with their own to make decisions about the values, policies, and cultural practices they want to enact in their spaces.

Most individuals examining environmental issues in the humanities and social sciences acknowledge that superficial action and policy will not sufficiently address the problems facing our planet. What is needed is a broad reworking of our current value system built on the assumption that economic growth is the sole marker of progress to a system that recognizes the worth of sustainability and the connections that exist between humans and the non-human world. This is why I am less concerned with what my citizenship is called and more concerned with determining the values that should underlie citizenship and a way of encouraging individuals to advocate those values in their communities.

One way scholars have connected policy and greater social change is through discussions of environmental virtue. The underlying assumption of this literature is that if we can somehow appeal to humans' sense of virtue and/or establish new virtues by which people live, we may face less resistance against environmental policy that calls for sweeping changes to how people live on this planet (Wapner, 2009). Louke Van Wensveen (2005) describes ecological virtue language in terms of "dirty virtues" because "the language expresses a preoccupation with the earth (read: dirt = soil) and also because many ecological virtues would have been considered not particularly praiseworthy, or even vicious, during most of Western history (read: dirty = bad, taboo)" (p. 15).

There are three primary approaches to environmental virtue. The first focuses on specific virtues needed to address environmental issues, such as anthropocentrism and a commitment to science (Cafaro, 2005). The second discusses environmental virtue as part of a larger system of social virtue (Sandler, 2005, 2007). The third advocates general social virtues that must be fostered for a healthier relationship between humans and the nonhuman world (Deane-Drummond, 2006; Frasz, 2005).

Though the language of virtue varies based on discipline, the message is the same—virtue is the key to real change. However, if the main goal of ecological scholars is to shift attitudes and virtues to the point of creating a new society, virtue cannot be the end. Specific virtues can be advocated until pens run dry and printers run out of ink, but if arguments for the adoption of virtue are not presented in the appropriate rhetorical framework, there will never be a widespread social change in attitudes or behaviors that involve the nonhuman environment.

For those who have read Rawls, Aristotle, Locke, Mill, and others, esoteric discussions of ecological/environmental virtue may be convincing and engaging, but for those who are not motivated by a history of ethical thought, a different framework is needed to persuade individuals and communities to alter attitudes, values, and actions. The language of citizenship is a rhetorical framework with which almost every individual is at least familiar. It is a framework that has consistently maintained a distinction between social virtue and vice. It is a language that has been used to position people in their places, identifying them as members of particular environments. At the same time, it is a discourse that remains in a constant state of flux.

A second scholarly approach to environmental citizenship seems to recognize this by focusing less on virtue and more on defining what exactly environmental citizenship might look like in practice. Four common definitions appear in this literature. The first seeks literally to "ground" people, arguing that one can live virtuously with one's environment only if one lives in one's place (Curtin, 2009; McKibben, 2007). The second tries to reconcile traditional liberal political philosophy with environmentalist thought (Barry, 2001; Barry & Wissenburg, 2001; Bell, 2002; Melo-Escrihuela, 2008). Others focus less on a specific place or political system, turning their attention to the need for a more global understanding of citizenship. These scholars draw on cosmopolitanism to advocate for a citizenship that they believe will better address the consequences of globalization and increasing individualism (Hayden, 2005; Stevenson, 2003). The final definition, post-cosmopolitan citizenship, critiques the tie to liberalism in cosmopolitan scholarship and advocates for a non-territorial form of citizenship based on asymmetrical obligation (Dobson, 2003, 2006; Macgregor, 2006).

Those who have begun pairing environmentalism and citizenship have undertaken important and commendable scholarship. They have created the space in which those who are environmentally oriented can imagine a new mode of community that lives better with the planet. At the same time, collectively, the literature holds three areas that need further exploration. First, some approaches ignore the global reach of environmental issues, disregarding the fact that any productive mode of environmental citizenship must account for the global processes that contribute to environmental destruction. In addition, theorists envision a top-down model in which theories of citizenship are developed in philosophical journals and other academic texts and then are somehow implemented in

society. This points to the third concern, which is that those working on environmental citizenship seem to have an unconsidered definition of citizenship that leads them to write more about virtue than the multifaceted identity of citizenship. By beginning with pairings of environmentalism and elements of citizenship in existing social and political discourses, I seek to remedy these weaknesses, while drawing on the strong arguments and ideas of existing scholarship to support the conclusions of the project.

The Chapters

The three central chapters of this dissertation explore the elements of justice, security, and sustainability in existing rhetorical texts. Each includes a comparative analysis of two case studies of environmental discourse that speak to the principle under discussion. The analyses point to how the principle is used in each of the cases to illustrate the discursive space available for incorporating these principles and the caution needed when integrating these principles into conceptions of citizenship. Such a comparison provides insight into why such elements must be included in a redefined citizenship and how such elements speak to issues beyond environmentalism.[7]

Any version of citizenship has some concept of justice, but dominant models of distributive or corrective justice leave something to be desired when constructing a forward-thinking citizenship. In chapter two I argue that a redefinition of citizenship requires a definition of justice that focuses on access to political deliberation, mainly an inclusion of participatory justice into a justice framework. Those who identify as members of the environmental justice movement have most critically discussed the

[7] It is important to note that these comparisons are not pro/con comparisons. Rather, the analyses in each chapter are chosen because they speak to the specific virtue in a way that allows for a discussion on the importance and difficulty of implementing a citizenship based on the virtue.

relationship between justice and environmental issues. These individuals have sought to highlight the relationships between environmental destruction and systems of oppression built on race, gender, class and other characteristics of identity. For this reason, one of the two texts I analyze in this chapter is from a group that claims membership in this movement: The White Earth Land Recovery Project. Founded by Winona LaDuke and led by members of the Mississippi Band of Anishinaabeg, the organization began in 1989, with the goal of buying back native land from the U.S. government. In its twenty years of existence, the organization has expanded its focus to include such issues as sustainable native farming practices and alternative energy. At the core of the organization's work and discourse is a message of justice, both for people and the natural world, which focuses on autonomy, correcting past harm, and collaborating with those who share the organization's values and goals.

My second case study examines the rhetoric of President George W. Bush's administration about the Kyoto Protocol and the withdrawing of the United States from the document. In defending this action, Bush and his administration drew on appeals of justice to defend policy and action, arguing that it would be unjust to harm developed countries' economic interests when the treaty exempts developing nations. Bush's conception of justice is one where harm is shared equally among nations despite unequal contribution to the creation of global problem. Like White Earth's discourse, the Bush Administration's rhetoric emphasized finding just measures through collaboration with like-minded individuals.

When paired, these analyses point to the need for and difficulties of drawing on participatory justice to redefine citizenship. Environmental issues and other global crises

are not either/or issues. Participatory justice, because it allows all stakeholders access to deliberations, highlights the complex nature of many social and political issues. For example, a process that includes a wide array of voices about resource preservation might connect environmental issues, economic concerns, historical systems of oppression, and health issues. Participatory justice also counters the tendency identified in both analyses for dialogue to occur only among those who share values and goals. Participatory justice brings those who disagree to the same debate, asking that individuals listen to and try to understand the viewpoints of others so that common ground might be reached. Participatory justice does not bring harmony to citizenly discourse, but it will allow for decisions to be made justly, by giving all interested parties a voice, potentially leading to decisions that, while they might not make everyone happy, at least can be understood and accepted.

Chapter three argues that a redefinition of citizenship must also reconsider traditional understandings of security. Traditional security approaches that place the protection of nation-state borders as primary fail to address the security concerns that arise from global crises. These crises extend beyond the borders of nations and produce issues that cannot be dealt with using military methods. The texts I analyze in this chapter each offer a definition of security broader than the traditional conception. The first text I analyze is Rachel Carson's Silent Spring, which was built on appeals to security. Through the initial use of military language, Carson makes environmental destruction a security issue. By moving from discussion of a war on the environment to claims about the effects of environmental destruction on the human body and genetic heritage, Carson expands security to include non-military issues and calls for methods beyond strategic

violent action to be used to achieve security. President Richard M. Nixon's "Reorganization Plan no. 3 of 1970," the document that created the EPA, is the second text I analyze. Like Carson, Nixon expands the types of issues that can be viewed as security concerns by framing environmental devastation as a threat to national security.

Collectively these texts demonstrate that securitizing social issues, such as those plaguing the environment, is an important rhetorical move in redefining security. But neither text takes the definition far enough. Carson remains in a tragic mode of discourse that threatens to inhibit action, and Nixon's security maintains a nation focus. Human security, a form of security that places individuals ahead of nation-state borders and accounts for the variety of elements involved in making people feel secure, is a more complex and effective form of security for which we should aim. It offers promising potentials that can be lauded alongside discourses of risk that typically mark security rhetoric. Human security removes the nation-state from a primary position in discussions about security, opens the possibility for a greater variety of methods to be considered for gaining security, and pushes for policy and action that use forethought to prevent future insecurity.

Sustainability is the subject of chapter four. Though sustainability is a term of constant debate, what is certain is that our current mode of living with the planet does not fall under any reasonable conception of protecting the existence of future generations. Thus, I discuss sustainability in tandem with intergenerational justice to argue that the most sustainable and just action in which environmentalists might engage is to focus on constructing communities with the values, skills, and knowledge needed to make decisions about how to live in our changing world.

In this chapter, I analyze Bill McKibben's *Deep Economy: The Wealth of Communities and the Durable Future*. I choose this text as representative of a growing list of books published about the local food movement. This text takes the principles of the local food movement and applies them to broader lifestyle and political changes, arguing for the creation of strong local communities and local economies that aim to increase human happiness. By redefining progress and growth and relying on a secular religious language, McKibben argues for the construction of a different sort of community that will provide a sustainable way of living for future generations. Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign is the second text I analyze. Like McKibben, Obama's discourse calls for a reclaiming of communities and a particular way of life that will help increase the health of our nation. By emphasizing community partnerships and downplaying the role of the government, she calls for the creation of communities similar to those of the past when cultural ways of life produced healthy children and strong attachment to others.

Each approach shows that focusing on community-building accounts for the complexity of social issues; both McKibben and Obama make connections between health, economic, environmental, and psychological concerns. They also suggest that building strong communities capable of making their own choices and debating the important questions of justice and sustainability is a more productive political project than imposing a prescriptive politics on all communities. Together, though, they caution us not to view past ways of living as all encompassing or with nostalgia. When advocating the construction of strong local communities, consideration must be given to historical power structures built on race, class, gender, and other identificatory

characteristics. In addition, these communities cannot be framed as insular; they must position themselves in the broader global framework, making decisions about their local place with consideration for the global consequences of their actions and compassion for local communities unlike their own.

The final chapter of the dissertation discusses how the three elements that frame the project—justice, security, and sustainability—work together to redefine citizenship as an identity that will help produce a more healthy society, not just in terms of environmental issues, but in terms of most issues raised by the globalized, hyper-individual context that seems so detrimental to humanity and the world. The project ends with questions: questions about the relationship between local and global citizenship, questions about the virtue and values needed in a sustainable citizenship, and questions about how to introduce a new conception of citizenship into public discourse. Because this project advocates for a deliberative form of citizenship, offering definitive answers to such questions would be hypocritical. My hope is to spur further discussion and debate about citizenship and the need to refigure how we live with each other and our world.

Chapter 2

Participatory Justice as a Framework for Citizenship: Lessons From the White Earth Land Recovery Project and George W. Bush Administration

Although it may not be a destination for most, a trip to Iowa City, Iowa, in late-January 2010 was one of the highlights of my new year. Two friends and I got in a car, plugged in the itrip and began our way down I35 to support another friend's volunteer work for a women's reproductive health clinic by attending an annual awards dinner. I was prepared to have a nice meal, a couple glasses of wine, and good conversation. I was not expecting to be introduced to Ms. Loretta Ross. The keynote speaker, Ross held the room's attention from the moment she stepped up to the microphone and began giving the history of her social activism.

Ross is the national coordinator and founding member of an organization called SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective, a grassroots network of organizations aimed at addressing reproductive issues faced by women of color communities. Ross said many things that night that I have taken with me, but one statement stood out. As she explained the diversity of individuals and organizations involved in the collective, Ross stressed that there was often disagreement when it came to deciding action or distribution of funds, but the one thing those involved agreed on was "to work together." For example, she explained, anti-choice members of the organization allowed funds to be used to send pro-choice members to a pro-choice rally in Washington D.C., but the collective decided not to put organization funds toward sponsoring the march itself. Compromises like this were made often in the organization, and I would

assume in others like it. What interests me is the implied sense of justice in this type of work.

“We agree to work together.” What if such a statement was the foundation of public deliberation? This approach produces participation that is necessary in a redefined form of citizenship for three reasons: (1) it encourages a period of participatory deliberation prior to making decisions about action, (2) it creates a space for every interested party’s voice to be part of the public debate and (3) ensures that, at least initially, each perspective is heard and valued. This approach to deliberation has great potential for people to base decisions off of common ground and find solutions where everyone can at least understand the decision and feel as though their point of view has been heard, even if they may not be completely happy with the result. Such an approach is in line with the calls for deliberative democracy made by believers in the possibility of a viable and engaged public sphere (Gutman & Thompson, 1996, 2004; Sandel, 1996). It is a dynamic approach that allows members of society to debate disagreements over social policy that are rooted in moral reasoning, different priorities, and divergent worldviews (Gutman & Thompson, 1996, pp. 41-44).

Gutman and Thompson (2004) define deliberative democracy as:

> A form of government in which free and equal citizens (and their representatives), justify decisions in a process in which they give one another reasons that are mutually acceptable and generally accessible, with the aim of reaching conclusions that are binding in the present on all citizens but open to challenge in the future. (p. 7)

The hope is such a process will help those involved in debate minimize their differences and find common acceptable reasoning to address social controversy and the moral debates at the heart of those disagreements. Deliberative democracy is a process that can account for the various moralities individuals in society possess and use to make decisions about social policy. Others have spent considerable space explaining and debating deliberative democracy, doing the concept much more service than I can in the space I have here. What I want to focus on is the process of deliberation. How do we create deliberation that not only enacts justice but also occurs justly? The idea of participatory justice is the focus of this chapter. I look at why participatory justice must be a founding virtue of citizenship and how this form of justice relates to environmental and other issues of public deliberation.

My contention is that participatory justice must be a central concern for environmentalist projects as well as any emerging conceptions of citizenship. Without just access to political processes surrounding environmental issues (or public issues generally), just solutions that account for sociohistorical conditions, human life, and non-human nature cannot be designed. In order to support this position I discuss why justice is my starting point and review how scholars have answered important questions about what justice is, to who is it owed, and who is responsible for providing it. I follow this discussion with analyses of two case studies to show how these questions of justice have been addressed and/or ignored in existing environmental rhetoric. The case studies draw from two divergent ends of U.S. environmental discourse. The first analysis examines the rhetoric of the White Earth Land Recovery Project (WELRP), a group that can be classified as being part of the environmental justice and indigenous peoples movements.

The second analysis examines the rhetoric of the George W. Bush Administration's response to the Kyoto Protocol, a response that represents a more mainstream or institutionalized approach to environmental concerns. Justice is a central concept in both modes of discourse, but the consequences of its implementation could not be more different. I selected these cases because they illustrate alternative views of justice that have been used to approach environmental issues. Contrasting these two views illustrates the difficulties that arise when attempting to agree on just action, but looking at the strengths and weaknesses of each view allows me to posit a just form of participation that would allow each type of justice, in addition to other views, to be heard in discussions over action and policy decisions. Together these analyses demonstrate how important participatory justice is to environmental discourse as well as to a larger project of redefining citizenship, because it is a form of justice that acknowledges the interconnected nature of many social issues and the diverse interests typically at stake in constructing solutions. I conclude the chapter with a discussion of how grounding a redefined citizenship in justice has the potential to create a more productive and thoughtful political sphere.

Why Justice?

Discussion of how justice relates to environmental issues is not new. In fact one might argue that environmentalism is a movement mired in debate over how to correctly enact justice. Most prominently, the environmental justice movement has highlighted how issues of social justice relate to environmental concerns. The conversations of those in this movement will appear readily throughout this chapter, but broader questions of justice have also emerged in theoretical literature on environmentalism. Questions

include but are not limited to: (1) what is justice; (2) what or who is owed justice; (3) who is responsible for enacting justice; (4) should and how can justice be enacted globally, and (5) can justice be enacted across generations. This chapter cannot answer all of these questions, but I use the discussion and analyses it contains to begin commenting on the first three. The remaining two questions will be dealt with in turn in the following chapters.

In a discussion of citizenship and the environment, justice is central. For some justice does not seem like a starting point for discussions of environmentalism or environmental citizenship. In his critique of Andrew Dobson (2003), Tim Hayward (2006) contends that Dobson's ecological citizenship is flawed because it is grounded in justice as its first virtue—a virtue, argues Hayward, that is not strictly ecological. That, however, is exactly why it must be a foundational virtue. Grounding ecological or environmental citizenship in a virtue that is not strictly ecological recognizes that environmental concerns very rarely solely involve the environment. Rather, environmental concerns typically also raise questions of political access, economic equity, health and security issues, and local and global power structures. Being near-sighted is not something that will help environmentalists in achieving their goals of a more livable world or protection for non-human nature. Environmentalists must acknowledge the complex nature of environmental issues and build solutions on virtues that can take the diversity of concerns involved into account. Beginning with justice prevents myopia, because defining or even debating justice requires acknowledging the various factors at play in a single situation.

Others argue that social justice is important because it is a concept that bridges

divergent environmental perspectives, namely those that are "human-based" and those that are "nature-based" (Schlosberg, 2005, p. 98). Dale Jamieson (2007) contends:

> It can be said that justice is both conceptually and historically at the heart of environmentalism. Justice also gives environmentalism a heart in the sense of motivating people to make change and taming the movement's tendency toward misanthropy and pessimism. The heart is not the whole of an organism, however, and justice does not exhaust environmentalism. There are unruly features of the human relationship to nature that express themselves in both environmentally friendly and environmentally destructive ways. Any attempt to provide even a partial map of American environmentalism must also acknowledge these features. (p. 86)

Jamieson expresses the importance of justice to environmentalism. It at once provides a bridge between various environmental approaches and provides the means for making the emotional appeals that are often needed to inspire individuals to act after receiving the rational or intellectual appeals that explain why action is necessary. He also reminds us that justice is not the only factor of environmentalism that exists. It does not raise the only questions that must be answered when addressing environmental concerns, but its ability to bring various environmental positions together and speak in moral terms to an audience wider than the environmentalist community makes it an important foundational virtue for any citizenship influenced by environmental concerns.

What Is Justice?

Defining justice is no easy task. Adding to the difficulty is that any definition offered runs the risk of omitting the concerns of—or, worse, oppressing—those who do

not share the definition (Diefenbacher, 2006, p. 283). The only way to mediate the inevitable omission that occurs from defining a vague concept such as justice is to acknowledge that such a concept will never remain static and must always be debated and refigured as new situations and new information arises. For this reason, I rely on an approach to justice that calls for not only a combination of traditional distributive and corrective approaches to justice but also an inclusion of participatory justice into a justice framework. This framework allows for questions about justice beyond "whom deserves what" and "how do we ensure they get it" and asks what Schlosberg (2005) calls "questions of recognition, difference, and political participation" (p. 97). Schlosberg explains, "The point of including issues of recognition and participation in a larger theory of justice is that distributional equity simply *cannot* come about otherwise" (p. 102). Before going further, defining what is meant by these three modes of justice is important.

Distributive and Corrective Justice

Jamieson (2007), in his discussion of justice and the environment, reminds us of Aristotle's division of justice into distributive and corrective modes. Distributive justice focuses on how benefits and burdens should be distributed throughout a population; whereas corrective justice focuses on punishment and compensation (p. 89). Traditionally, environmental concerns have focused on distributive justice, though corrective justice, in the form of legislative action (such as statutes that impose fines and restitution requirements on those who damage the environment), has become a more common concern in recent decades. These legal measures and calls for them seem to occur much less frequently, however, than debates over who should be subjected to environmental hazards, whose spaces deserve to be preserved, and what rights

individuals have to healthy environmental spaces. And, because both distributive and corrective modes of justice rely on individuals and communities having access to political, economic, and judicial structures, these types of justice often leave disadvantaged populations hindered.

The distributive model of justice has come under considerable fire from the environmental justice movement and those who seek a model of justice that acknowledges social power structures and historically disadvantaged communities (Bullard, 2005, p. 29). Members of the environmental justice movement have demanded that environmental deliberation and action not be based only on traditional modes of justice (Stanley, 2009, p. 1002). They call for procedural or participatory justice to be considered as essential to any framework of justice used to address environmental concerns.

Justice for a Redefined Citizenship

Schlosberg explains that an addition to the traditional distributive paradigm is important "[i]f distributional differences are constituted in part by social, cultural, economic, and political processes." If this is the case, "any examination of justice needs to include discussions of the structures, practices, rules, norms, language, and symbols that mediate social relations" (p. 99). Participatory justice, when combined with distributive and corrective justice concerns, creates a justice framework that can account for unjust access to political debates, legal channels, and power that are so central to determining who faces more than their share of environmental risks (Anand, 2004).

Participatory justice, a concept typically attributed to Iris Marion Young,[8] is nearly indistinguishable from procedural justice. This is a type of justice that focuses on achieving the "meaningful involvement and fair participation of each party to negotiations" (Anand, 2004, p. 128).

Participatory justice is more than this, however; it is a type of justice that allows equal access to debates for all parties who have a stake in the issue, and allows those individuals to voice the opinions, concerns, and values they believe must be considered in the debate. In this project, the definition of justice I advocate is a framework of justice that draws on distributional, corrective, and participatory justice. It is a framework constructed by many in the environmental justice movement.[9] An emphasis on political debate and participation shifts the focus of justice from distributing environmental rights and burdens to trying to prevent environmental harm in whole. Before a situation that may cause harm can occur in a system that emphasizes participatory justice, all potentially affected parties would have a say in the decision-making process.[10] This is not

---

[8] Young, a political scientist concerned about issues of justice, democracy, and feminist theory, discusses participatory democracy and the need for participatory justice in her many works on the unequal political access and power afforded individuals in society.
[9] Robert Bullard (2005) provides the principles of an environmental justice framework: (1) "The framework incorporates the principle that all individuals have a right to be protected from environmental degradation"; (2) "The framework adopts the public health model of prevention as the preferred strategy: it focuses on eliminating a threat before harm occurs"; (3) "The environmental justice framework rests on the Precautionary Principle for protecting workers, communities, and ecosystems"; (4) "The environmental justice framework shifts the burden of proof to polluters and dischargers who do harm, who discriminate, or who do not give equal protection to racial and ethnic minorities"; (5) "The environmental justice framework redresses disproportionate impact by targeting action and resources" (p. 25-30).
[10] Like other theories of the public sphere, it is important to acknowledge what is presented here is an ideal. A system where all affected parties get to voice their concerns, debate options, and agree to action is what should be aimed for and would be possible without pragmatic constraints of time and space. The ideal of such a system would be

a risk management framework, but a framework that relies on the precautionary principle (Bullard, 2005, p. 28) and works on preventing harm in the first place.

Notice such an approach does not suggest there are obviously "right" or "wrong" answers. Rather, the value in the approach comes from the fact that every individual affected has the opportunity to voice her opinion about what is right or wrong, what should be valued and what can be sacrificed, what is considered a harm, and what harms may potentially occur from specific action. Focusing on political access and the inclusion of affected parties in debate also allows for consideration of histories of oppression and social factors that may not immediately come to mind when considering particular issues. But, the question still remains, how do we determine who must provide justice and what are the boundaries of who gets to participate in debates over justice?

Who Owes Justice?

Dobson's ecological citizenship is based on the idea that our communities of obligation are formed by the extent of our ecological footprint. Dobson (2006) argues,

---

consensus, where all individuals speak and come to a common agreement about the correct and just mode of action in a particular incident. In actual practice, this is rarely possible, but the hope is that reaching for such an open process "can help participants recognize the moral merit in their opponents' claims when those claims have merit" and "help deliberators distinguish those disagreements that arise from genuinely incompatible values from those that can be more resolvable than they first appear" (Gutman & Thompson, 2004, p. 11). Through the debate, some involved may be persuaded by the positions of those they had disagreed with prior and some may not. But those deliberating or their representatives must reach a resolution (potentially having to resort to a majority-rule vote if consensus cannot be reached) that participants can at least respect, even if they do not fully agree, because the process was a fair one. Because consensus will rarely be reached and society and its concerns change over time, agreements can be questioned, new arguments made, and old ones can be raised again. The important component of this framework is that we aim to meet an ideal of allowing all stakeholders an avenue to enter the deliberations and have their arguments valued and taken into consideration. Part of that deliberation, as I show in this chapter, will have to be an attempt to answer the question, "what is a just action in this specific situation?"

"we are all ecological citizens," but we are only under the citizenly obligations of justice when we are "occupying too much ecological space," when we are "living, in other words, unsustainably" (p. 449). Dobson's conception of justice states that if you create an ecological footprint that negatively affects or harms another, than you have acted unjustly and to become just, you must correct the harm that was done. This is a form of justice many of us are taught from a very early age; if you wrong another, you must apologize and offer to make it right. This is the principle that is enacted when you are forced to say you are sorry to your younger sibling and return his toy after you stole it from him. Of course, Dobson presents his version of justice in a much more sophisticated manner, one that takes into account asymmetrical global power structures and the fact that some nations and individuals simply have more ability to do harm than others. But the point of the matter is, this type of justice is not a foreign concept; it is one that people are socialized to accept from the time they are toddlers. Yet, this version of justice does not seem to translate easily to a larger political level. This is in large part because so much debate can be had over what actually constitutes harm and who is to blame. What is needed is a conception of justice that allows these questions to be discussed and debated in a fair and equitable manner, giving all involved equal access to the debate and footing proportional to their investment in the outcome. Deciding who owes justice is a central question of debate in the system of justice I am advocating.

To Whom is Justice Owed?

Environmental issues raise three primary challenges to traditional understandings of justice as a virtue doled out in particular communities. Environmental issues are not contained by nation-state borders, span the bounds of time, and affect nonhuman nature.

How do we account for these in debates over just action? How are those who are not yet present, those who exist outside a particular border on a map, and those who cannot communicate in democracy's rational mode of discourse supposed to be represented in democratic deliberation? The first two of these challenges—borders and time—will be dealt with in subsequent chapters. Here, I will focus on how we account for nonhuman nature and how we determine which human individuals must be given voice in deliberation.

The possibility exists to argue, as some do, that the nonhuman world simply has no standing in human political affairs, that its inability to participate through reasoned and rational discourse means that it cannot be considered a party in such debates or in political relationships (Dobson, 2003, p. 113). Those who take this position offer convincing and reasoned arguments for the exclusion of the nonhuman in political relationships, but they ignore that not all relationships (even political ones) are built solely on dominant understandings of reason. What of those communities who see nonhuman nature as their ancestors or even part of their immediate family? For some communities there is no distinction between the human and nonhuman world. Placing such a limit on the realm of political participation threatens to ignore very significant worldviews.

I will not go so far as to argue that animals or plants or air or water should be brought into a courtroom, a legislative hearing, or a community debate, but we do need to determine a way to more deliberately take the nonhuman world into account in political discussions of justice. Building his discussion on Hayward, Schlosberg (2005) explains that such a process can happen if we simply expand our notion of self-interest to

understand that taking care of the nonhuman world means maintaining a livable world for humans and our future generations (p. 105). This acknowledgement can lead to a respect for nonhuman nature that would allow its interests to be represented by a proxy in political deliberation. Schlosberg writes:

> The recognition of the physical integrity of nature can be based on a respect for nature's "bodily integrity," the recognition of the potential in nature to develop, a respect for autopoiesis, and a respect for agency in nature (though not subjectivity or rationality). This is certainly the more ecocentric and bioregional argument, in particular the respect for autopoietic, or self-organizing and self-correcting systems. (p. 104)

With this respect would have to come a procedural framework that accounts not only for nonhuman nature's ability to be consumed but also for its inherent value and mere existence. A process that is open to nonhuman nature as a major consideration—if not a stakeholder—also ensures that multiple worldviews of the human parties affected by issues of debate will also be heard. "The point is that processes that are more amenable to the inclusion of such testimony—participatory mechanisms open to signals from butterflies—can bring recognition of both nature's signals and various human interpretations of them" (Schlosberg, 2005, p. 113).

The justice on which a redefined citizenship must be based is one that ensures those that cause harm have the greatest obligation to act justly by preventing harm from occurring and/or correcting the harm that has been done. Those who have been harmed (human or nonhuman) are those most deserving of justice. What constitutes harm, how to prevent it, and what can be considered righting a wrong must be determined in a just

system of deliberation, where all affected parties (human and non-human) are represented and considered. It is a two-fold system of justice built on what Dobson would call "asymmetrical obligation" and participatory justice. Such a system may be seen as idealistic, something that could never be put into practice.[11] Some may argue human nature to act in one's own best interest would make such a version of justice impossible. Others may contend that continued debates over harm and representation would make enacting justice difficult, because it places more emphasis on the process of discussion than it does on action. Both are credible criticisms that must be taken into account as my discussion of redefining a citizenship founded on this version of justice moves forward. But the diverse ways in which justice is employed in discussions about the environment suggests that only a framework that includes participatory justice would produce a system of deliberation where those who disagree listen to each other and can see final decisions about action as valid. I offer analyses of two environmental discourses that illustrate how the diverse uses of justice in environmental discourse make participatory justice

[11] Marcel Wissenburg (2004) writes: "Citizenship […] has to do with concerned citizens, people who voice concerns and want to see them addressed, and with their support for, or at the very least sufferance of, policies. It can be a way of life—several different ways, in fact—but it is always a mode of representation: a specific model for representing one's case and (it) being represented. The essence of citizenship is universal representation: the equal representation of 'all' in 'all' political affairs" (pp. 82-83). Wissenburg continues in his essay to critique the practicality of this definition and the ability of all to have true representation in the current global structure, offering an alternative of consultative elitism as "the best we can do under unfavorable circumstances" (p. 91). Such a position is dangerous. Even hesitantly arguing for a system not built on the ideal of full representation in concerns of citizenship risks reifying historical power structures that have ensured the unjustified oppressions of multiple groups of human and nonhuman communities. In order to have a productive mode of citizenship, we much strive for an ideal of inclusion, particularly when it comes to questions of justice.

necessary in a redefinition of citizenship. Both use justice as a founding idea, though they draw from widely different concepts of the virtue.

Justice in Practice

The two case studies I offer here examine the website discourse of WELRP and the G.W. Bush Administration's discourse about the Kyoto Protocol. WELRP can clearly be placed in the environmental justice movement category, whereas the Bush Administration's rhetoric focuses on justice from an economic standpoint. In looking at these two divergent examples it is possible to get a broad picture of how justice is currently used in discussions of citizenship, generally, and environmentalism, specifically. Within my analyses I ask the following questions:

(1) What is the realm of citizenship in the discourse? How is community defined?

(2) How is justice defined? What does justice look like? Who is responsible for enacting justice?

After discussing how the texts speak to these questions, I follow the analyses with a discussion of the possibilities and concerns that arise from basing citizenship on a framework of justice that places so much emphasis on asymmetrical obligation and participatory justice.

White Earth Land Recovery Project

The White Earth reservation, located in northern Minnesota, is the home of the Mississippi Band of Anishinaabeg. In 1867, a treaty was signed by the tribe and the U.S. government creating the reservation. This treaty also gave Frederick Weyerhaeuser access to the pine forests in the northern woods (Native Struggles, 1999 December). In an interview with the *Multinational Monitor*, Winona LaDuke explains what happened in

the decades after the treaty was signed. First, a process of allotment was begun, where commonly held land was converted into individually held property, a concept foreign to the Anishinaabeg. LaDuke states, "Over the course of 20 years following the treaty adoption, our land was allotted. Then a good portion of it—250,000 of the 800,000 acres—was taken for taxes by the State of Minnesota" (p. 19). These lands were primarily acquired by the lumber companies or have remained in the hands of the state and federal government.

In 1986, the Federal government "proposed to pay 1910 market value for the land that they were clearing title to" (Native Struggle, 1999 December, p. 20). The tribe fought this proposal, but they failed and received $17 million for the land that had been taken, without consideration for lost income or change in land value since 1910. After losing three federal suits to overturn this settlement and get their land returned, the tribe formed the WELRP in 1989, with grants and a $10,000 Reebok Human Rights Award that had been earned by LaDuke (Winona LaDuke, 2005). The mission statement of the organization reads:

> The mission of the White Earth Land Recovery Project is to facilitate recovery of the original land base of the White Earth Indian Reservation, while preserving and restoring traditional practices of sound land stewardship, language fluency, community development, and strengthening our spiritual and cultural heritage. (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Home Page, 2008)

The organization continues to raise money to buy back reservation land from the United States government and has expanded its concerns to include local food economies and health, alternative energy, genetic modification of traditional foods, the preservation of

indigenous culture, and the strengthening of community. Its expanded focus has contributed to the creation of Native Harvest, a company that sells native produced goods to purchase lands and improve the community.

The history of the organization clearly influences its conception of justice and community. In my analysis I use the WELRP's website to look at how it defines community and how it argues for this specific type of justice.[12] I find that its disadvantaged position in dominant legal and political systems has contributed to a definition of community that is not bound by local, state, or national borders. In addition, the Anishinaabeg culture of those who are members of the organization does not draw distinct lines between human and nonhuman nature; rather both are seen as equally important members of the community. The group calls the community of White Earth its home, but it also exists in a fluid community of supporters, collaborators, and similar

[12] Analyzing websites can be tricky. They are constantly in flux, are not always kept up to date, and may not be completely representative of an individual or organization's discourse. For this reason a defense of this text and a discussion of the method used to analyze the discourse seems necessary. The WELRP's website is the organization's primary mode of reaching non-members of the organization. Though the group has individuals who spread its message through speaking engagements or publishing articles in a variety of periodicals and online sources, www.nativeharvest.com is designed to inform non-members about the work and ideologies of the group. For this reason, I contend it is a viable mode of discourse to use to make claims about the overall worldview of the organization. To determine how the organization defines community and justice I chose a single day, April 22, 2010, and printed each page of the website by systematically going through the links available on the top and left side of the main webpage. I then read through the discourse of these pages, highlighting language choices that provided insight into how the organization viewed community (i.e., who was considered a community member, who was considered an outsider, and what are the minimum requirements of community membership) and how they viewed justice (i.e., what was seen as unjust action, how is responsibility for damage assigned, and what is considered a just act). I particularly looked for repeated words and phrases, noted projects that were highlighted multiple times throughout the site, paid attention to who the website presented as friends and enemies, and focused on how the organization justified its actions and projects. From these readings, relatively clear definitions of community and justice were found.

indigenous organizations. Underlying WELRP's sense of community is a definition of justice. This justice is built on retribution, the righting of wrongs. It is striven for by partnerships and collaboration, and can be fully reached, it seems, by achievement of three things: (1) local autonomy, (2) participation and representation in decisions made about their land, and (3) respect for the community's knowledge and traditions.

Citizenship and Community

The word "community" appears countless times in the website discourse. Whether talking about "community members," "community gardening," or "community meals," clearly one of the main purposes of WELRP is to strengthen its local Anishinaabeg (Ojibwe) community on and around the reservation. Community in this usage emphasizes belonging, togetherness, and autonomy. Central to these things is the land and its inhabitants.

The WELRP community is not solely comprised of people; the idea of community is more encompassing, acknowledging the dependent and collaborative essence of the relationship humans have with nonhuman nature. Whether talking about the historical importance of the West Wind (Ningaabii'anong Noodin) (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Alternative Energy/Wind Power, 2008), using horses to teach young people lessons about trust, friendship, and heritage at the organization's Mishtadim Horse Academy (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Mishtadim Horse Academy, 2008), or the central role wild rice plays in the cultural and historical legacy of the community (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Patents and Biopiracy, 2008), nonhuman nature is considered an essential component to the WELRP's conception of community. This may be best demonstrated in how the organization discusses its project to return sturgeon to

the area. The organization largely contributed to the destruction of the Heilberg Dam and the construction of the riprap that replaced it. Following this, they participated in a collaborative project with the White Earth Biology Department to release sturgeon back into the reservation's waters so that "our relatives the sturgeon could move through their traditional range" (White Earth Land Recovery Project, 2007, p. 14).

The collaborative nature of WELRP contributes to the fluidness of the organization's definition of community. The organization is designed to make a difference in the lives of those who live on or near the reservation, but this primary community is one sphere of an unbounded sense of community that pervades WELRP discourse. The organization realizes that its particular community is connected to all others facing similar threats and must be open to partnering with any individuals or organizations that share their values and/or goals. WELRP states:

> Anishinaabeg Akiing: The Land of the People…..That is where we live. We are the Anishinaabeg of the region, and our neighbors within the borders of the reservation are from all parts of the world. This is land we share, and the question we are interested in asking is how it will be that we can care for this land in the future?" (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Land, 2008)

Because this is the guiding question of the organization, the community WELRP finds itself being a part is one that is constantly shifting to include all those who would like to help them answer that question in a productive manner.

The terms "cooperation," "partners" or "alliance" appear throughout the website discourse. Almost every project undertaken by WELRP is done in collaboration with other organizations, some indigenous, others not, making it one node of multiple

networks working on environmental and cultural projects throughout the world. After describing the complexity of the reservation's ecosystem and the various parties that have stake in the land, WELRP explains, "To protect the land, and plan for the generations ahead, it is important that we work together- no matter where we come from" (*ibid*). One example of the depths of collaboration WELRP engages in is evident in its wind energy initiative. It writes:

> At White Earth, we are developing a local wind initiative, linking both with national models for tribal wind development and developing relationships and capacity with local tribal governments, municipalities, rural electrical cooperatives, utilities and farmers on the reservation and in the region. This integrated program includes a tribal initiative aimed at reducing tribal energy consumption through conservation, renewables and other strategies, development of individual wind and solar projects for the area and development of both regional and tribal wind capacity." (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Alternative Energy/Wind Power, 2008)

In this single project, the people that become part of the community work of WELRP span local, regional, and national geographies. The partnerships involve tribal government, dominant government, people who are not citizens or residents of the reservation, and even electric companies. This demonstrates that the definition of community provided by WELRP is fluid, leaving inclusion in the community open to anyone who might share the organization's goals or even the value of sustainability, which they apply to both culture and environment.

Justice

The definition of community offered by WELRP greatly influences the organization's definition of justice. Justice, in fact, is one of the primary aims of the organization. At the same time that it is a goal in every project undertaken by WELRP, it is also a value on which it basis its action. To understand its conception of justice, it is helpful to first look at what the organization defines as unjust. Said simply, injustice for WELRP is the causing of harm. One example of this is in the organization's discussion of coal power plants. The website explains:

> Most of the energy supplied to the White Earth Reservation comes from coal. In northern Minnesota we see the rail cars carrying thousands of tons of coal through the area daily and each car on those trains represents air pollution, thousands of gallons of polluted water and a deep hole in the earth where the coal was extracted from. Once the coal is burned, its toxins end up in our lakes and rivers with a majority of the lakes in Minnesota and specifically on the White Earth Reservation presently having fish consumption advisories on them for heavy metals and mercury. The two largest sources of these pollutants are coal-fired power plants and incinerators. Coal also causes global warming and climate change. Carbon dioxide is the major cause of global climate change. In the past two-hundred years, the amount of carbon dioxide gases in our atmosphere has grown by almost one-third. That is more than in the past twenty million years. As well, the earth's snow cover has diminished by 10 percent since the late 1960's and since the 1990's the thickness of the Arctic sea ice from late summer to early autumn has diminished by 40 percent. As a result of these ice melts, the sea level

> is on the rise and waterborne and airborne diseases are exploding, as evidenced by the West Nile virus that continues to spread east." (*ibid*)

I quote the above at length to demonstrate that injustice is not something that can only be felt in the home community of WELRP; rather, injustice is something that can be identified by harm done everywhere from a local to global level. Injustice done by current energy usage is a prime target for WELRP, and it is something used to connect the organization and its community to others who are feeling the same injustice all over the world, since in many nations it is the case that indigenous populations are disproportionately subjected to the affects of using nonrenewable energy sources (*ibid*).

This passage also demonstrates that injustice and justice are rhetorically constructed. WELRP excludes the positive attributes of coal (e.g., its accessibility, affordability, easy transformation into usable energy, reliability, and the jobs created by the mining, transporting, and energy production that surround it). Had these benefits been included in the passage above, coal may not seem like such an unjust mode of power. My intention is not to argue for coal-produced energy. I intend only to highlight the rhetorical nature of justice to support my belief that it must be the subject of deliberations between those holding various ideas of the concept. Without deliberation, one-sided accounts such as the one above can lead to one-sided policy that does not even acknowledge divergent viewpoints, let alone take them into account.

One key aspect to WELRP's conception of justice is the idea of interconnectedness. Time and time again in the organization's discourse single issues are tied to a variety of types of harmful consequences. Environmental issues do not just raise concerns over nonhuman nature; they are also connected to health, community traditions,

and economic issues. One example of this is WELRP's Farm to School Program. The program is designed to improve the quality of food served to children in the community school. To do this the organization has partnered with local farmers to provide healthier, more traditional food to students. WELRP is helping to decrease health problems in these children, such as obesity, ADD, and diabetes, which have been traced to eating a non-traditional, preservative rich diet. At the same time, the focus on traditional foods has helped to support the local economy, lessen the community's carbon footprint by having food travel fewer miles, and maintain a cultural history and relationship to the land that nontraditional food threatens to displace (White Earth Land Recovery Project, 2007; White Earth Land Recovery Project, Farm to School, 2008). A just action for WELRP seems to be one that takes interconnected harms into account and rights the wrongs that have been done. This might mean cleaning the air and water contaminated by the use of coal for energy at the same time that one undoes the damage done by digging for the coal, provides treatment for health effects, and determines alternative energy options to prevent the harm from happening again. Or, it might mean protecting wild rice genes from being patented and genetically modified, because WELRP believes it would cause cultural loss, health issues, and a lessening of biodiversity. What WELRP does is acknowledge the interconnectedness of things, realizing that each action causes a chain of consequences. Acting justly for WELRP is determining how to act in a way that causes the least amount of harm and making a point to correct harm that has been caused.

Note this definition is not a definition of justice that asks for a handout or action based on some belief that we must help others because of our shared humanness, something Dobson's work, borrowing from Judith Lichtenberg, calls being a Good

Samaritan. Instead, WELRP is working under a framework Dobson would call being a Good Citizen. Rather than a moral obligation, the obligation of a good citizen is an historical one; obligation occurs when one causes harm.[13] WELRP is asking for retribution for harm it has faced historically and harm it continues to face because of contemporary choices that cause harm to the community.

In a discussion of the hunger faced by many indigenous peoples and the relationship between this hunger and environmental issues, WELRP writes, "In specific, the loss of access to the land, through the theft of the land, and removal of Native people to housing projects caused more food insecurity." The historical and continued theft of land from native peoples causes both immediate and lasting harm for these communities. WELRP is "committed to recovering this set of relations with our relatives with roots" (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Globalized Agriculture and Hunger, 2008), but in order for justice to be done, those who are responsible for the continued harm must participate in helping WELRP correct the harm.

One way much of the harm can be righted is by giving the particular community that houses WELRP local autonomy. This can be done by helping them build a sustainable, local energy economy (including power over the generation and distribution of the energy) (White Earth Land Recovery Project, Alternative Energy/Wind Power, 2008) or by ensuring "food security and food sovereignty" (White Earth Land Recovery

[13] Dobson (2003) distinguishes the moral obligation of shared humanity from the political obligation of citizenship. Moral obligation, for Dobson, arises when we feel we should help others because we are all part of one human community. Political obligation, in contrast, is created when one has done harm to another. One then has an obligation to correct the harm they have caused. Where a moral obligation is good to do, political obligation is done because it would be wrong not to act (pp. 27-29, 48-49, 56).

Project, 2007, p. 10). In a letter opening the 2007 WELRP Annual Report,[14] Winona LaDuke explains the idea of local autonomy well. She writes:

> We are looking for the tools we need to carry on in this millennium. We are looking at the issues of climate change and food security and determining what we need to address these issues in this community: whether it is the questions of which wind turbines we will use, or which plants we will be growing that are resilient to frost and need no irrigation or fossil fuel imports. We are looking at the ways to better serve our people and nurture our youth—in the upcoming years, to ensure they are present as vital parts of our community engaged in that process of self determination whether through our radio and media work, or through our work to create the next energy economy. (p. 3)

This idea of autonomy is not one of isolation. Collaboration, partnerships, and cooperation with those who share similar goals and values are essential to the success of this goal, but the ideas, energy, and effects come from and are felt by the particular community from which WELRP emerges.

One of the primary ways to help WELRP in achieving self-determination is by focusing on providing that community with a voice and representation in discussions about issues that affect it. Historically, the voices of the White Earth community members have been silenced. In early court cases about improper taking of their land, U.S. courts did not listen to their claims or reasoning. This has continued in court cases, such as the 1998 case *Wabizii v. Busch Agricultural Resources*, which charged Busch

[14] This is the most recent annual report available on the website.

Agricultural Resources with false advertising of its wild rice as Minnesota lake rice, to more recent legal battles over the patenting of indigenous food sources.

The organization has had some success, but often the knowledge and claims of environmental destruction and cultural heritage made by the community are dismissed or overshadowed by bigger voices and larger pocketbooks. One way of helping to restore justice is to value the voices of the organization and the members of its community. Incorporating the knowledge of WELRP, its community members, and those in communities like it, adds knowledge to the debate, allowing for the potential of more just and less harmful decisions to be made on a variety of issues on which such communities have been silenced throughout history. Gutman and Thompson (2004) explain the strength of a more just system of participation. They write:

> Deliberation is more likely to succeed to the extent that the deliberators are well informed, have relatively equal resources, and take seriously their opponents' views. But even when the background conditions are unfavorable (as they often are), citizens are more likely to take a broader view of issues in a process in which moral reasons are traded than in a process in which political power is the only currency. (p. 11)

This system does not ensure just results, but the closer actual deliberations come to participatory justice the more "justifiable" the end results will likely be (Gutman & Thompson, 1996, p. 17), because people will have been given the same opportunity as others to share their viewpoint, to persuade and be persuaded, possibly come to support interests of others over their own for moral reasons, and at least come to understand the reasoning behind the final decision. The decision would not be produced by a system that

hampered some individuals' voices from the beginning of the debate. That alone makes the potential results of such a system more just than current political deliberations.

Organizations and communities like WELRP must be heard in decisions that affect the culture and ecosystems of these communities, but what WELRP also reminds us is that these types of issues are usually closely tied to many other issues faced by a community (i.e., health, security, and economy). If we want to act justly, we must realize that all parties with a stake in a debate over any social issues must be allowed to participate and have their voices respected if the most just decision has any chance of being made. This does not mean that organizations like WELRP would always see the results they desire; at times the just decision for those involved might be taking actions that would maintain the status quo or create a larger benefit for some group at the expense of continuing a smaller harm to another. This may not be the full sense of justice for which WELRP is calling, but it is a form of justice that at least gives them an equal seat at the deliberative table, something that is sorely missing currently.

Now, I will turn to a case study much different from WELRP. Beyond the obvious differences of dominant versus indigenous culture and single versus multiple issues, the following case study of the Bush Administration's rhetoric about the Kyoto Protocol draws on different conceptions of community and justice.

George W. Bush and the Kyoto Protocol

Global climate change emerged as an issue in the 2000 presidential debates (Gore & Bush, 2000 October 11). After September 11th both public and presidential attention was turned toward foreign policy, but by 2002, articles and advertisements about the need to address climate change were appearing in major news sources (Poor Marks, 2002

January 28; Berke, 2002 April 14; Herbert, 2002 July 4; Gore, 2003 August 28; Warming Up, 2004 January 25). Members of Congress used EPA nomination hearings to critique the lack of environmental action from the administration (Seelye, 2003 September 24). Members of Bush's own party were seeking legislation to combat global climate change (Lee, 2003 October 2).[15] And, the scientific community had ramped up efforts to warn people of the impending negative consequences suggested by their data if changes were not made soon to counter the greenhouse gases that were gradually warming the planet.

In order to address environmental concerns in line with the conservative Republican principles on which Bush founded his presidency, his administration espoused what it at times termed "New Environmentalism."[16] New Environmentalism was built on the concept of "citizen-conservationists" and the use of the market to control environmental destruction (Devine, 2004, pp. 31-34). The approach addressed the concern that existing regulations, particularly those enacted under the Clinton Administration, harmed the U.S. economy more than they helped the environment. In addition, the Bush Administration argued that previous approaches gave the Federal government too great a role in an issue that should be addressed on individual and local levels.

Bush began implementing New Environmentalism almost immediately upon taking office. His first concern was not to propose legislation; instead, he rolled back and

---

[15] Sen. John McCain (R) from Arizona and Sen. Joe Lieberman (who at the time was a Democrat) from Connecticut sought legislation to restrict the emission of carbon dioxide in a bipartisan effort to bring emission levels down to those of 2000 by 2010.
[16] Devine (2004) provides evidence of the use of this term, citing a speech from Interior Secretary Gale Norton in which this concept is defined and tied to historical environmental figures, such as Teddy Roosevelt and Aldo Leopold (pp. 30-31).

over-rode legislation and policies passed under the Clinton Administration.[17] Notably, Bush withdrew the United States from the Kyoto Protocol on climate change (Vig, 2003, p. 103). This protocol's history can be traced to 1992 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC). The document was a legally nonbinding pledge, signed by the United States and most other nations, for industrialized nations to reduce greenhouse gas emission to 1990 levels by 2000. Shortly after its creation, the scientific evidence made it clear that non-binding regulations would be insufficient to address the human contribution to global warming.

In 1995, at the first meeting of the conference of the parties (COP), those nations that had signed the UNFCC, a decision was made to establish a protocol with legally binding resolutions and that in this first round of discussion the resolutions would target only developed nations. In 1997, in Kyoto, Japan, the COP finalized the resolutions, though three issues remained controversial: (1) the amount of required reductions and the gases included in those reductions, (2) the exclusion of developing nations, and (3) which actions could contribute to the measuring of reductions (i.e., emissions trading) (Fletcher, 2003).

In spite of these continued debates, the treaty was opened for ratification on March 16, 1998, and the United States signed the document on November 12, 1998, under the Clinton Administration, promising to decrease the three major greenhouse gases by 7% from 1990 levels and the three secondary gases by 5% of this level. Susan

[17] Bush's earliest budget proposal, delivered on April 10, 2001, showed a 6.4 percent decrease in funding for the EPA and a 3.5 percent decrease to the budget of the Interior Department (Vig, 2003, p. 118). Also, Bush's energy plan, which called for money and resources to be put toward domestic oil and gas development, was a marked difference from the Clinton Administration's stated focus on alternative energy sources (p. 119).

Fletcher (2003) explains that this 7% reduction would actually be substantially less, because the protocol used carbon sinks and emission trading in its calculations. Even with these inclusions in the document, it was not submitted to the Senate for approval, because in the previous year the senate had passed a resolution, S. Res 98, with a 95-0 vote, stating a disapproval of the document for not including developing nations in the binding agreement. In 2001, President Bush followed the 1997 Senate and declared that the United States was backing out of the treaty, because the reduction levels would be too detrimental to the U.S. economy and unfair when developing nations were excluded from the binding resolutions.

As the most notable global environmental document to date, and a document the United States had participated in creating from its inception, the controversy around the Kyoto Protocol is a significant instance to examine for Bush's ideas about the environment, citizenship, and justice. The withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol is a useful way to illustrate the Bush Administration's conception of justice, but the Senate's vote suggests that the case of the protocol is evidence of a general national approach to environmental concerns in politics, not the actions of those in a particular political party. The Bush Administration's discourse is not unique to presidential and national political rhetoric about the environment, even if some see the discourse as a step back from where the George H.W. Bush and Clinton Administrations had taken us. To varying degrees, the Bush Administration's rhetoric about the Kyoto Protocol is representative of the dominant environmental discourse of the U.S. political system.

Citizenship and Community

In defining the community, like WELRP, the Bush Administration has a clear primary community in mind—the American people. In interviews with foreign press after withdrawing from Kyoto, administration members were often asked to defend or explain their decision. In an interview with the German Press, Bush stated, "And I will consult with our friends. We will work together. But it's going to be what's in the best interest of our country, first and foremost" (Bush & Schroeder, 2001 March 29). Others in the administration reinforced this message (Fleischer, 2001 March 28; Fleischer, 2001 July 27; Bush, 2002 February 14). The administration's acts and discourse demonstrate they were much less concerned with a global community than they were concerned with U.S. economic interests and global power.

The Administration did not ignore that the United States was part of global community or that global climate change was problem that required a global solution (Bush, 2001 June 11), but they determined that this global community was comprised only of those who shared our goals and values. When other nations disagreed with us or were a threat to our value system, they no longer were viewed as part of our community discussions. After pulling out of the treaty, Bush discontinued talks about Kyoto with other foreign leaders. Instead he spoke to them about other global issues and alternatives to addressing global climate change (Persson, Bush, & Prodi, 2001 June 14), often explaining that he was "working with our friends and allies" (Bush, 2001 March 13; Rice, 2001 June 6) to determine solutions that will not harm the U.S. economy. He sidestepped the Kyoto question multiple times by explaining that the decision had been made and that it was time to change the discussion to alternatives. This approach ignored that other

nations continued to support, ratify, and attempt to meet the mandates the treaty set out and that decisions can be changed. Essentially, by removing the United States from the discussion, the Bush Administration removed the United States from the community bound by the treaty to continue talks about how to shape a global solution to climate change.

Just as this project seeks to redefine citizenship, the Bush Administration sought to bring a new definition of citizenship to discussions of environmental policy. The administration constructed the protocol as a document requiring certain nations (those who have contributed the most to the dangerous emissions) to sacrifice by enacting specified standards, while leaving other nations unbound by the treaty. In place of this duty-based citizenship, the administration's rhetoric depicted a clear attempt to bring traditional liberal notions of citizenship[18] to the global environmental debate. Liberal principles of little governmental influence, individual solutions, and capitalist driven solutions pervade Bush's discourse on Kyoto. For Bush and his administration, the Kyoto Protocol not only had issues with who was included in the mandates, but it was a global governing document that allowed for too little freedom for individual nations to find their own solutions. In other words, it represented too much governmental influence, something that breeched the liberal approach to government, where governance is used

---

[18] When using the term liberal I am referring to the liberal political tradition and philosophy one can trace back to philosophers, such as John Locke, not the more common label for those on the left of the political spectrum. This political philosophy has historically been used to argue for individual freedom and limited government involvement in economic and individual matters. Throughout the administration's rhetoric on Kyoto, rhetorical themes of limited government and freedom of choice are consistent. This was in contrast to the values underlying an agreement like Kyoto, which called for some nation's to sacrifice for the good of the global community and involved government oversight of industry and global oversight of particular nation states.

only to address issues of security of person and property, preserving equality and individual freedom (Locke, 1764; Mill, 1999).

The administration's reliance on this mode of citizenship can be seen in two moves. The first was its refusal to implement mandatory regulations on carbon dioxide (Bush, 2001 March 13), arguing instead that business would find its own solutions through free market practices if incentives were offered for reducing emissions. The second was the administration's message that nations must be allowed to find their own solutions to the crisis. In an interview with foreign journalists about Japan's attempt to get the United States to participate in the treaty, Bush (2001 July 17) again defended his decisions to withdraw. Following this defense he stated:[19]

> Each country has to make its own mind up as to how to proceed with this issue. Each country must—the parliaments of these countries must deliberate. The governments must be straightforward, it seems like to me, about the consequences. And we will see how other nations—I know how other nations have accepted my declaration; we'll see how they handle it with their own internal politics regarding this issue.

Lack of mandated global government involvement demonstrated the Bush Administration's attempt to bring liberal philosophy of citizenship to the global debate over environmental policy and also limited those that could be considered part of the community with which the bush Administration would associate. A free-market,

[19] Rhetorical scholars of presidential discourse have readily acknowledged that the words of presidents are the product of the collective work of the president, speechwriters, and members of his administration. Throughout this analysis I quote Bush as well as members of his administration. In each case, I assume the statements work together to create an overall message of the administration.

minimal-governmental-involvement approach was the only method the administration believed could benefit the United States and ensure the country was not caught in an unjust position. If others did not believe in the correctness of this approach, they could not be part of the community in which the Bush Administration saw itself.

Justice

The Bush Administration's view of global climate change cooperation and legislation is summarized in the stated guiding principles used to conceive of a response to the issue. Bush stated:

> As we analyze the possibilities, we will be guided by several basic principles. Our approach must be consistent with the long-term goal of stabilizing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. Our actions should be measured as we learn more from science and build on it. Our approach must be flexible to adjust to new information and take advantage of new technology. We must always act to ensure continued economic growth and prosperity for our citizens and for citizens throughout the world. We should pursue market-based incentives and spur technological innovation. And finally, our approach must be based on global participation, including that of developing countries whose net greenhouse gas emissions now exceed those in the developed countries. (Bush, 2001 June 11)

Though the Bush Administration made continued calls for dialogue with other countries and international leadership, little action was taken to address climate change as a global issue; rather, the focus was on how international agreements would harm the U.S. economy (Bush, 2001 July 17). For the administration a just action was one that could bring about environmental progress without causing such harm to U.S. citizens. This

stance ignored the economic and non-economic harms of global climate change disproportionately faced by world citizens.

The Bush Administration's primary concern with the protocol was that developing nations were not included. This, argued the administration, was unjust. Bush stated:

> We recognize the responsibility to reduce our emissions [….] This is a challenge that requires a 100 percent effort, ours and the rest of the world's. The world's second largest emitter of greenhouse gases is China, yet China was entirely exempted from the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol. India and Germany are among the top emitters, yet India was also exempt from Kyoto. These and other developing countries that are experiencing rapid growth face challenges in reducing their emissions without harming their economies. We want to work cooperatively with these countries in their efforts to reduce greenhouse emissions and maintain economic growth. (Bush, 2001 June 11)

This message of unfairness appeared throughout the administration's rhetoric on Kyoto.[20] The costs of the treaty, argued the administration, were "disproportionate to the benefits"

---

[20] In his letter to the Senate explaining his position on the Kyoto Protocol Bush writes, "The Senate's vote, 95–0, shows that there is a clear consensus that the Kyoto Protocol is an unfair and ineffective means of addressing global climate change concerns" (Bush, 2001 March 13). The Administration is consistent in using the 1997 Senate vote, a vote taken over four years prior to the Bush Administration taking over the White House to defend its stance (McClellan, 2005 February 25; Fleischer, Press Briefing, 2001 March 28; Snow, 2007 January 4). One must ask whether the treaty would have been voted down or at least voted down as unanimously by every Senate that had the floor during the Bush Administration. True, the United States began participation in developing the treaty under the G.H.W. Bush Administration, and it may seem unfair to expect the G.W. Bush Administration to abide by that initial pledge or the signing of the treaty by the Clinton Administration, but the administration does more than say that it disagrees with specific elements of the treaty. It completely removes the United States from any further

(Fleischer, 2001 March 28). This did not mean that the United States would give up all work toward addressing global climate change, just that the work in which the United States engaged would be done in a way that also built the U.S. economy. Bush explained, "Economic growth is key to environmental progress" (Bush, 2002 February 14). This statement is factually correct. Wealthier nations are those that have the luxury to care about and address environmental issues, whether through new technologies or even the enforcement of environmental legislation. At the same time, wealthy nations have achieved their positions because they have participated in environmental destruction at rates less developed nations have yet to take part. Dobson (2003) points to why the international community might find the administration's stance confusing:

> Despite the fact that the United States with just 5 per cent of the world's population produces a quarter of the world's greenhouse gases, 11 times as much per head of population as China, 20 times more than India, and 300 times more than Mozambique—despite all this, the United States claims that the Kyoto protocol is 'unfair,' since it exempts developing countries and is against the United States' best economic interests. (p. 18)

The claims of unfairness from the Bush Administration operate on only one system of measurement (the economy) and fail to take into account the inherent unfairness of greenhouse gas emissions. The focus on damage to the U.S. economy and the belief that other nations (even those who proportionately do far less damage than the United States to the world climate) must sacrifice equally show a disregard for global responsibility.

---

discussion of a treaty previous administrations played a part in originating. The Senate vote was a vote against signing the treaty as it was, not a vote to discontinue any involvement in further developments.

The implication of the Bush Administration's rhetoric was that the current global power structure, which places the United States on the top, must be maintained for the health of the international community. A global economy is a risky place to be for those nations who grew to power in an economy based on fossil fuels and nation-state sovereignty. The fear of losing one's place in the global economic structure gave the Bush Administration tunnel vision on the issues connected to environmental concerns. Global climate change can be connected to famine, military conflicts over lacking resources, possible widespread pandemics, and the increasing number and strength of natural disasters; yet, the primary focus of the Bush Administration was global climate change's relationship to the U.S. economy (Bush, 2001 March 13; Bush & Schroeder, 2001 March 29; Bush, 2002 February 14; Snow, 2007 January 4).

The emphasis on economy also related to how the Bush Administration would like to see the reduction of greenhouse gases measured. Rather than a straight decrease in emissions, Bush wanted reductions to be based on the size of the U.S. economy. This, the administration argued, would be a just approach to climate change. Bush stated:

> My administration is committed to cutting our Nation's greenhouse gas intensity, how much we emit per unit of economic activity, by 18 percent over the next 10 years. This will set America on a path to slow the growth of our greenhouse gas emissions and, as science justifies, to stop and then reverse the growth of emissions. (Bush, 2002 February 14)

"Greenhouse gas intensity" was new terminology in the global climate debate. Introducing it as a potential form of valid measurement allowed the administration to suggest it was developing strict regulations for addressing climate change (Connaughton

& Marburger, 2007 February 7), while not actually cutting the total level of emissions for decades. Under the Bush plan, decreasing the amount of greenhouse gases released would not begin until 2025 (Bush, 2008 April 16)**.** Under this plan, more harm would be done to the planet before attempts were taken to stop increasing greenhouse gas output and right the harms the nation caused by using greenhouse gas producing energy sources. Because this plan allowed for continued growth of the U.S. economy, the Bush Administration saw it as the most just plan. Because injustice is measured by the Administration almost solely by economic harm, not by environmental health, physical health, or the ability of nations most harmed by climate change to maintain a cultural way of life, this was the just action. It allowed U.S. citizens to sacrifice little and maintain a way of life that has consistently caused more damage to the world climate proportionately than any other nation in the world.

At this juncture it is important to ask not only what was the Bush Administration's definition of justice, but also whether the offering of this definition of justice was an honest attempt to seek justice or an attempt to delay action and deny responsibility. While it is impossible to decidedly make claims about the intentions of rhetors without hearing them express those intentions themselves, in this case it is difficult to believe that individuals capable of making it to this level of government were not aware that the framework of justice they were proposing was the only framework that justified the specific policies they proposed for creating (or avoiding) solutions to climate change. This suggests that in debates over justice, one must weigh the arguments on substance, intention, and potential effects of using the definition.

To further its definition of justice, the Administration called for more dialogue and debate, the direction of which it controlled. This stance allowed the United States to maintain its position as a political and economic world leader. Claiming that the targets of Kyoto were "arbitrary and not based on science" (Bush, 2001 June 11), the administration eventually stopped defending its decision to pull the United States out of the treaty and began talking about how we must move forward. In one address Bush stated:

> All of us expressed our views on the Kyoto Protocol, and now we must work together on the way forward. Emerging technologies, such as hydrogen-powered vehicles, electricity from renewable energy sources, clean coal technology, will encourage economic growth that is environmentally responsible. By researching, by developing, by promoting new technologies across the world, all nations, including the developing countries, can advance economically while slowing the growth in global greenhouse gases and avoid pollutants that undermines [sic] public health. All of us can use the power of human ingenuity to improve the environment for generations to come. (Bush, 2005 February 21)

Worth noting is that the calls the Bush Administration made for ongoing discussion and collaboration are not so different from the calls that can be found in the discourse of WELRP. Both stress a need to find commonality and use that to work together, and both discuss the need to account for currently unaccounted knowledge.

In the Bush Administration rhetoric this emerges in the form of questions about science. In his "Remarks on Global Climate Change" Bush (2001 June 11) emphasized the lack of certainty in available science:

> Yet, the Academy's report tells us that we do not know how much effect natural fluctuations in climate may have had on warming. We do not know how much our climate could or will change in the future. We do not know how fast change will occur or even how some of our actions could impact it [….] And finally, no one can say with any certainty what constitutes a dangerous level of warming and, therefore, what level must be avoided.

This call for knowledge went in the face of knowledge accepted by the scientific community. In spite of the fact that the vast majority of the scientific community had argued (1) humans have greatly contributed to the greenhouse gasses that are causing global climate change, (2) global climate change is occurring, and (3) without dramatic steps the world may be facing drastic consequences, the Bush Administration cast doubt by reframing science’s constant drive to refine and build new knowledge as evidence that global warming may not be all that bad (Hogan, 2009; Oreskes & Conway, 2010). For the Bush Administration, significant action could not occur, because more discussion and research was needed. Particularly, more discussion with foreign allies was needed about who had the responsibility to act to alter global climate change and what those actions must be (Rice, 2001 June 6; Bush, 2002 February 14).

The United States deserved the role of leader in these discussions, according to the administration, because of the work it had already done on global warming. Bush explained how the United States had already dedicated itself to the climate change issue. He stated, “The United States has spent $18 billion on climate research since 1990, 3 times as much as any other country and more than Japan and all 15 nations of the EU combined” (Bush, 2001 June 11). Statements like this were made throughout the tenure

of the administration. They were made to defend against criticisms about not participating in the treaty and later they were made to position the United States as the leader in dialogues about what happens after the expiration of the Kyoto Accord in 2012. In a press briefing Tony Snow stated:

> What you have to do is prepare for life after Kyoto. This is—you've got the Kyoto Accord where a number of nations say that they're going to stay under Kyoto until 2012. Well, you're going to have to start thinking toward the future. What the President is saying is, let's not wait until the last minute, let's start working on ways forward. There are other nations that have not met their Kyoto targets and have made it clear that they're never going to meet their Kyoto targets, so what do you do [with] that—how do you put together a policy that, in fact, is something that is going to be politically successful in those countries, economically successful and environmentally successful? (Snow & Connaughton, 2007 February 23)

A call for more dialogue about climate change is promising, but not if it is to be undertaken as the Bush Administration suggested throughout its discourse. Finding ways forward that are just can only be done if all voices come to the table willing to listen to others who do not share their views. Closing down the deliberative community, bounding it by only engaging those who hold the same values and goals, creates a situation in which just action becomes impossible. This is especially the case when one's definition of justice involves only engaging in action that causes no harm to his or her own community at any point. To benefit the whole, sometimes one must be willing to accept

small harms to one's own status or way of life. What those sacrifices must be can only be determined in a broad deliberative process.

Looking at these two analyses together illustrates two significant things. First, determining a working definition of justice for a redefined citizenship must be an on-going process of debate in which all concerned parties participate, and all parties participating must suspend commitment to definitions of justice that include doing no potential harm to one's own community. Sometimes justice involves harm for some and not for others. Second, comparing these two analyses show the risk of defining community as a local entity that can expand to incorporate others based primarily on shared values and goals. Communities include individuals that disagree and have different interests. Justice can only be defined in a working manner if all affected parties are considered part of the participatory community and have their goals, values, and perspectives accounted for in the debate.

In addition, we cannot allow calls for more dialogue to stifle movement forward on actions that are needed quickly. This analysis does illustrate the limits of participatory justice. As an ideal to strive for, this form of justice is limited by real-world constraints of time and space. The United States, under the Bush Administration, chose to exit the global deliberation over the Kyoto Protocol, but that does not mean the aims of the treaty were unjust. The pressing nature of climate change, the effects of which we are already experiencing, suggests that as debate continues, action must begin to be taken, in spite of the fact that consensus has not been reached. Individuals and nations should continue the discussions over what justice means for climate change action, with each conception of justice, even the economic-based justice of the United States, included. But, at this point

the consensus of the scientific community and many of the nations of the developed world, such as most European nations, should begin implementing policies and actions that may eventually persuade the United States to follow their lead.

Conclusion

Prior to offering these two case studies I raised two primary objections to incorporating participatory justice into a framework for addressing environmental issues and redefining citizenship. The first is that it is idealistic, impossible to actually put into practice when human nature is taken into account. Both of these analyses suggest that human nature will be a difficult challenge to overcome. Both define community by those who share their values and goals, potentially limiting their engagement with others who hold very different worldviews. But, the WELRP offers discursive space for viewing participatory justice as a possibility. For this form of justice to be central in a conception of citizenship and public deliberation, the complex and interconnected nature of social issues must be acknowledged. Economic concerns cannot always receive primary consideration. Questions of justice, when applied to real social issues, require that all potential consequences (positive or negative) get taken into account before a final decision is made. This means that economic concerns must be weighed, but we also must look at how an issue affects the health, traditions, and security of various communities. We must also acknowledge that communities rarely exist on an even playing field. Debates about justice must account for sociohistorical conditions and the power structures they have created. Getting powerful communities to take these concerns into account will be a difficult task, but global environmental issues require that we develop a more cognitively complex understanding of the web of social issues and the history that

has helped construct it. Doing so may get these communities to acknowledge that a loss of power or slight harm to their community may actually allow justice to be enacted by providing benefit to others who are in greater need.

Notice this does not only apply to environmental concerns. A more complex understanding of the connections between social issues requires that any debate acknowledge both immediate and more distant connections to other social concerns. This is why a justice framework that includes the traditional distributive and corrective models but emphasizes participatory justice is essential to a redefinition of citizenship. We need a multitude of voices to demonstrate the complexity of the web of social issues, and to offer multiple types of knowledge and worldviews that help to paint a more complete picture of the harms and advantages to specific modes of action.

The second objection I would like to discuss is that an emphasis on discussion and deliberation will lead to little productive action. The Bush Administration seems to prove this as a rule. But, its continued calls for more discussion are not inherently bad. What we need to agree to, however, is to engage in action using the knowledge we do currently have, and that has been verified by knowledgeable communities as the best knowledge of that time, to make educated decisions and construct plans of action that we then implement, revisiting and improving them as new knowledge emerges.[21] Action can

[21] Those in the environmental justice movement who advocate the precautionary principle favor such an agreement. Robert Bullard (2005) defines the precautionary principle: “Before you undertake an action, if you have reasonable suspicion that harm may result from it, and if there is scientific uncertainty about it, then you have a duty to act to prevent harm” (p. 28). As new scientific knowledge emerges, definitions of harm and duties may change, but individuals must work with existing knowledge to determine correct action. This argument reinforces the dynamic nature of participatory justice and deliberative democracy, which is based on the principle that through further deliberation

occur amidst discussion. Those nations who adopted the treaty understand this, as does WELRP, which continues to build partnerships with individuals, organizations, and institutions while also engaging in action.

How can we ensure that justice is a central question in debates over environmental issues and public issues generally? Each time I ask myself this question, I cannot help but believe the answer is in Loretta Ross's words, "we agree to work together." In both of the case studies above is a set of actors that see their communities as being only as broad as those who share their values and goals, but communities cannot bind themselves in that fashion. Communities are made up of individuals who disagree, who have different beliefs about how things should go (Gutman & Thompson, 1996; Gutman & Thompson, 2004; Hayward, 2006). We cannot close off dialogue between those who disagree. We need to agree to work together to, at the very least, acknowledge our differences and try to find common ground. WELRP has valid historical reason for not seeking out divergent values and goals for inclusion in their community. The organization emerged from a community because that community had been silenced in dominant debates for centuries. The Bush Administration, in contrast, seeks to keep dialogue going, but it does so in a way that positions itself as the leader and definer of the debate. It leaves little room to discuss values and concerns that it does not hold.

Here is where Ross's conception of compromise comes in. Groups like WELRP and other disadvantaged communities may need to suspend historical distrust to hear and really listen to the arguments of those it excludes from its community. This can only be expected, however, if more dominant communities agree to listen to the knowledge,

---

new actions and policy will emerge, but deliberation should produce policy by which communities will abide for a certain amount of time (Gutman & Thompson, 2004, p. 6).

experiences, and worldviews of the less powerful. For these discussions to produce just action, we must be able to determine who is going to suffer the most harm and then give their arguments the most weight. We can do this by agreeing to work together. We will not always be completely happy with the decisions, but we should be able to understand that island nations, whose homes may not be there in a few decades from now because of rising sea levels, are facing more harm than U.S. citizens who would have to make some lifestyle changes if we signed a treaty agreeing to reduce greenhouse gases. We can acknowledge that a reservation in Northern Minnesota faces more harm from the mining, transportation, and use of coal for energy near its land than a wealthy suburbanite who might have to pay a little more for their energy if it was made cleaner through the whole production process. In working together, we must agree to give the most voice to those who suffer the most harm. We can only determine who those voices are by listening to each other. And we can only listen to each other if everyone is given access to participate in the discussion.

Chapter 3

Redefining Security for a Global Context: *Silent Spring*, Richard Nixon's EPA, and a Move Toward Human Security

In the weeks I was putting the final touches on this project tornados were the main topic of the news cycle. They tore through much of the Tornado Alley corridor, hitting Mississippi, Alabama, and Oklahoma particularly hard. People lost homes, family members, and their communities. Each person interviewed had a glazed look of shock as she surveyed what was left of the place she called home or he looked around the makeshift emergency shelter in which he now resided. "I don't know what I'm going to do" seemed to be the statement I heard in interviews most often. Watching the news coverage was heartbreaking, but I was able to maintain a certain distance from the images and emotions. This was something—albeit something horrible—that had happened to other people.

On May 22, 2011, a tornado killed two people and severely damaged an area of Minneapolis less than five miles from my own home. The images on television were no longer of places I did not know. I recognized intersections and buildings that were no longer standing. Trees were downed and beaches destroyed in one of the parks I used to go to play volleyball. Friends of mine posted on facebook about people they knew that needed help. The experience was no longer something removed from my own life. It was happening to my community and people I knew. I understood in this moment that what was at stake was not just the loss of housing or employment or even loved ones. Also at stake was a feeling of security.

We all know what it means to be secure, and we all have felt insecure multiple times in our lives; yet, when we talk about what security means in public settings, most head straight for the topics of war, terrorism, or the military. When broader debate occurs, we seem unable to produce consensus about such questions as (1) what are the essential components of security, (2) who is responsible for ensuring security, and (3) how should security be ensured? This chapter enters existing discussions on the definition of security, beginning with two fundamental contentions. First, security is a fundamental element of citizenship in that citizens have a right to security at the same time they have a responsibility to work toward ensuring security for others. Second, current global crises—such as epidemics, economic concerns, and environmental issues—require a broader conception of security than has been prevalent in global politics. I focus on environmental concerns in order to comment on the larger need for a redefined notion of security and a place for that notion in conceptions of citizenship.

I begin the chapter by introducing the existing debate, focusing specifically on the debates over broadening definitions of national security. I then analyze two texts—Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* and Richard Nixon's Reorganization Plan no. 3 of 1970, which created the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Each of these texts relies heavily on appeals to security, yet each pushes the traditional notion of security as it has been used in politics historically. These texts demonstrate that redefining security is *not* impossible as some claim, and they illuminate the caution that must be used in redefining security. I follow these analyses with a discussion of human security, an alternative to traditional ideas of national security. My argument is that in our current socio-political context, where individuals are constantly reminded about their lack of security (whether

from terrorists, the economy, or even the food supply chain), the time is ripe for redefining security in a way that will more comprehensively address the myriad of issues faced by individuals and pave the way for a more deliberative and thoughtful approach to solving security issues. This redefinition of security must draw heavily on the concept of *human security* and be implemented both by talking about issues in new ways and encouraging a more participatory and robust form of political participation. I conclude the chapter with an introductory discussion on the procedural changes needed to implement a broadened understanding of security.

Redefining Security

Including environmental concerns, or any non-military concerns, in a discourse of security requires redefining the traditional understanding of the term as it has been used in U.S. politics. Rhetoricians have noted the rhetorical nature of "security" by examining the discourse surrounding national security issues (such as the use of nuclear weapons (Taylor, 2010; Meyer, 1995)), competing definitions of national security used by political figures (Ivie, 2009), and the reshaping of national security to justify preemptive war (Keller, & Mitchell, 2006). Few rhetorical scholars, however, have specifically examined how security concerns have been or should be discussed in relation to the environment.[22] Dylan Wolfe's (2007) analysis demonstrating George W. Bush's use of security

[22] Environmental scholars, in contrast, have readily acknowledged the connection between environmental concerns and security. They done so by looking at issues of resource scarcity (Cocklin, 2002; Hakes, 2008; Southgate & Douglas, 2007), the relationship between military efforts and environmental destruction (Barnett, 2001a; Brock,1997; Durant, 2007; Finger,1994; Homer-Dixon, 1993; Homer-Dixon & Blitt, 1998; Simmons, 1998), and how climate change has the potential to threaten humanity's various ways of life and even its existence (Biermann & Boas, 2008; Webersik, 2010). But even in these studies where the connection between security and and the environment is made, a comprehensive redefinition of the term is not offered.

discourse to avoid controversy over his environmental policy is a notable exception. But even in this analysis, the focus is on how security discourse allows politicians and governments to avoid addressing environmental concerns. This chapter seeks to offer a usable definition of security that would encourage, if not require, productive action to be taken on environmental issues. Like the discourse Emily Swanson (2007) identifies in the work of Barbara Kingsolver (pp. 138-173), the security rhetoric I advocate brodens the traditional idea of security to include environmental concerns.[23] But the definition of security I offer differs in that it breaks from a patriotic understanding of security. It finds the global human community to be its primary concern and the nation-state a vehicle through which human security might be reached.

Richard Ullman's (1983) "Redefining Security" is one of the earliest texts to call the traditional, militarized definition of national security into question. The article calls for a new definition of national security in a post-Vietnam era. Ullman's definition reads:

> A threat to national security is an action or sequence of events that (1) threatens drastically and over a relatively brief span of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state, or (2) threatens significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state or to private, nongovernmental entities (persons, groups, corporations) within the state. (p. 133)

The second half of this definition challenged traditional military approaches to defining security. Ullman's definition was a step in the right direction, but we must go even further and draw on a concept of security that de-centers the nation state and makes humanity the primary focus.

---

[23] Similar examples of the rhetoric Swanson identifies in Kingsolver's work can be found in contemporary environmentalist writing (Nelson, Lopez, & Williams, 2002).

Why Security Needs Redefining

The term “security” as it is used in social and political realms, needs to be re-envisioned so that it may account for more than traditional “national security” concerns and for the changing role of the nation-state. How we talk about social concepts, such as security, has the potential to shape not only how we view the world but also how we prioritize civic and political action (Schiappa, 2003, p. 32). Simon Dalby (2002) writes:

> Because invoking security is a political act and the discourses that construct dangers and endangered subjects are far from natural or neutral reflections of an independent reality, the larger social and political contexts within which such discourses are invoked should also be given analytical attention. (p. xxi)

The current world context is one in which classical ideas of security simply do not offer a broad enough foundation from which to work (Myers, 1993). R. Schubert, et al. (2008) explain that defining security as the “integrity of territorially organized sovereign nation states within the system of international law as represented by the United Nations” makes the “preservation of nation state integrity in the face of external threats” the priority of security “in an anarchic world of states.” Thus, “the task of guaranteeing security is seen as being ultimately a military one” (p. 19). The current definition of security prioritizes the nation-state over human beings and limits what actions might be taken to provide security to individuals.

Lester Brown (1977) writes, “The purpose of national security deliberations should not be to maximize military strength but to maximize national security,” which means “public resources would be distributed more widely among the many threats to national security—both the traditional military one and the newer, less precisely measured ones”

(p. 38). Brown's argument is that military efforts provide only one sort of security. Citizens, particularly those of the United States, face more insecurity from issues such as health concerns, employment, and maintaining their way of life than they do from invasion or military conflict on U.S. soil. The state is responsible for providing a society that addresses all security concerns. Attending only to military issues is not fulfilling the responsibility the state has for providing security for its citizens, but if we broaden our traditional understanding of security, more attention and funding can be given to the range of issues that also cause insecurity.

One of the most pressing issues, and one that cannot be solved by military tactics, is the social effect of climate change (Barnett, Matthew, & O'Brien, 2010). Effects of climate change are security concerns that "can no longer be confined to traditional ideas of soldiers and tanks, bombs, and missiles" (Myers, 1993, p. 20). Until security threats from sources other than invading armies and terrorist actions are included in an idea of security for citizens, citizens cannot feel fully secure. They will have to face significant changes to their way of life, potential health threats, and fall-out from economic disaster without the assurance that the state will help prepare them for these realities and/or do what is necessary to maintain their security.

A militarized understanding of security has its benefits. It makes primary threats easily identifiable and allocating resources easier. It also provides a clear understanding of success and victory; victory is achieved when there is no longer an outside threat of violence. But if Americans continue to prioritize military security issues over others that have emerged, redefining security will no longer be a deliberate choice. Issues such as climate change will demand to be prioritized as their effects raise security issues that will

be unable to be ignored. Revising how we talk about security has the potential to encourage the attention, funding, and action needed to address these pressing global crises before they happen. The choice that currently exists is to either deliberate and determine a new, broader definition of security now or be forced to adopt one in the future.

In addition to the increasing number of issues that produce insecurity, the changing role of the nation-state contributes to the need for a redefinition of security. A nation-state-based definition of security worked when little knowledge existed about how state and individual actions can have ramifications beyond nation-state borders. Such a notion of security worked when the state's primary responsibilities were to protect borders from being infiltrated and to maintain a rule of law in society. Such a notion of security *does not work* in the current social context in which the driver of an SUV in Minneapolis contributes to the global problem of climate change and the government involves itself more broadly in the general welfare of its citizens through education, health, and economic programs. The importance of nation-state borders has been challenged by both environmental and economic crises and the spread of communication technology, changing the role of the nation-state on a global level. At the same time many nation-states have worked their way deeper into the lives of their citizens, providing much more than protection from border infiltration and a rule of law. We need a definition of security that takes both of these changes into account.

Dalby (1994) writes, "Ecological threats do not consider political boundaries [….] They require solutions that transcend boundaries in many cases, and yet many have locally based origins that are amenable to local interventions. International cooperation

is the order of the day in environmental politics" (p. 39). This position is far more controversial than it may seem at first. Rather than a global context of *realpolitik*, where every state is out to gain as much power as is possible through alliance building and military endeavors, a cooperative approach to security emphasizes global deliberation, compromise, and sacrifice (Mendez, 1999; Myers, 1993). This approach calls us to acknowledge "in the end there is only one basic point, that nobody can feel finally secure as long as others are persistently insecure" (Myers, 1993, p. 16). The importance of nation-state borders is lessened so that individual security and security of the global community can become the foci.

This cooperative approach can be seen as a threat to state sovereignty (Rabkin, 2000). Or, it can be seen as a reconsideration of what sovereignty means in an increasingly global context. A new global political system, one in which states must work together not only on trade, disaster relief, or military endeavors but also on unprecedented global issues, such as economic failures and climate change, does have the potential for altering what state sovereignty means. Sverre Stub (1997) explains:

> If national sovereignty means implementing effective measures to safeguard the security of states and safety of people, it is quite clear that in many cases such sovereignty must be jointly exercised. This means that states must relinquish some of their *formal* sovereignty in order to have *genuine* influence on developments. It is the results that matter. In the long run, no country can achieve national security in the face of global environmental security threats unless the national security of other countries is safeguarded as well. (p. 6)

In the new political system, national sovereignty is not measured, necessarily, by a state's ability to make its border impenetrable; rather national sovereignty is established by having global influence in discussion over addressing global issues. Even then, however, a nation may not be meeting its duties to citizens if it uses that influence to establish policy or initiate action that does not bring about the most secure environment or community for humanity's existence.

To participate in this new global political system in a way that brings security to its citizens, nations will be asked to transform their ideas of sovereignty and security. The United States cannot think of itself as an exception. The United States, writes Paul Harris (2001), "seeks to maintain its sovereignty and to retain its ability to act unilaterally. It resists mandates from international organizations, and it is skeptical of following what it sees as the potential decrees of international bureaucrats" (p. 18). Until this point in history, most U.S. policy has been built on the primary goal of "protect[ing] and promot[ing] the U.S. economy" (*ibid*). This approach is understandable, and it is built on centuries of tradition. But it will not work in the current world context. Too many global issues raise security concerns for citizens, and too many of the global issues are in large part caused by the United States' way of life. A new type of politics built on a new conception of security is needed.

Concerns over Securitization

The securitization of nonmilitary issues has raised many concerns,[24] particularly

---

[24] These arguments are not new, and others have addressed them more thoroughly than I can here (Trombetta, 2008 December). A concise discussion of these debates can be found in Kenneth T. Broda-Bahm's (Spring 1999) article, "Finding Protection in Definitions: The Quest for Environmental Security."

that elevating something to the status of a security issue can often lead to unilateral action by those in power, creating an undemocratic scenario that silences debate and prevents the voices of those affected from being heard (Brock, 1997, p. 21; Barnett, 2001b, p. 25). Another line of critique offered against broadening "security" to include other public issues is that these issues are distinct from issues that have historically been handled in a military fashion; there is no way to "win" these issues, and they cannot always be treated with the urgency or reactive nature that national security issues have been historically (Barnett, 2001b, pp. 9-10; 32; Trombetta, 2008). What these critiques have in common is a belief that security will not or cannot be altered from its historical understanding.

Certainly environmental issues cannot be addressed in the unilateral nature that often underlies military action, and victory in the environmental realm must be seen as an evolving process, as new scientific information is received, requiring an alteration in tactics used to address concerns. Traditional definitions of security would not map well onto these issues. But, if security is broadened beyond a military understanding the critiques offered against securitization can be lessened, because more approaches to addressing security issues become viable.

Broadening the definition of security has at least three important potentials. First, broadening the definition of security does not change the fact that military threats to individuals in a nation-state might occur and need to be dealt with through traditional security tactics; what does change, however, is that military action would not be undertaken primarily to protect the sovereignty of a nation. It would be taken to protect members of humanity at risk. Things like threat levels and warnings would be issued with a real sense of who is at risk and in what ways, not just blanket ratings and color-coding

schemes. And military action would be taken to prevent real threats of violence against citizens.

Second, individuals working under a new definition will still have moments where urgent action, potentially even unilateral action, is required to ensure security, but these issues might include military and non-military concerns. Maybe, for example, society can come to see the impending effects of climate change as urgent as, maybe even more urgent than, terrorist threats. Not every security issue has to be seen as immediate or urgent; a productive definition of security would allow individuals to address urgent concerns while accounting for less pressing matters and preventing insecurity from occurring in the future. How this can happen illustrates a third potential for a broadened understanding of security. More methods for achieving security can be seen as valid. Not everything must be addressed with military tactics. Things like community deliberation, action inspired by new scientific knowledge, and using resources to help people feel secure in their daily lives become possible acts of security.[25] In the next section I present two texts that have relied on non-traditional definitions of security. Together these texts illustrate the possible advantages and challenges that come with redefining security.

Historical Expansions of "Security"

Rarely are Richard Nixon and Rachel Carson viewed as individuals who you might place in friendly conversation with one another, but the pairing of the two's rhetoric is not as odd as it may seem. Carson's (1962) *Silent Spring* critiques the unquestioned use of insecticides and pesticides in the United States. Nixon's Reorganization Plan no. 3 and

[25] Incidents of this type of security work are already emerging in U.S. society. Community food security, for example, has become a focus because of fears of peak oil (Genauer, 2006 July 26), and military officers have called for alternative energy sources to ensure national security (Gjelten, 2008 May 18).

the two letters to Congress attached to it is the rhetorical act that created the EPA. Both are early texts of a form of environmentalism that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, which expanded on historical conservation/preservation approaches to include restoration and prevention of environmental degradation. And Nixon's Reorganization Plan would most likely have not come into existence when it did without *Silent Spring* and other texts that brought environmental issues to the forefront of the America's consciousness. Most importantly for the purposes of this project, both texts redefine security, expanding the idea from traditional ideas of military protectionism. Carson's expansion of security seeks to include both public and private spaces in discussions of security issues. Her text initially relies heavily on war metaphors, constructing environmental issues as security issues by introducing humanity's war on nature, but as she tells the narrative of this war, she deftly moves from external space to the space of home and bodies, demonstrating that the war we are engaged in is actually a war on ourselves, which will inevitably lead to an insecure future. Likewise, in the letters explaining the reorganization plan, Nixon introduces a "war on environmental degradation." He securitizes environmental issues, identifying them as a threat to our ability to shape our way of life. I demonstrate how these definitions of security emerge in each text below and discuss the possibilities and challenges they suggest for redefining security.

Rachel Carson's Silent Spring

Carson's *Silent Spring* is frequently identified as the instigator of New Environmentalism and a chain of environmental activism and progress that continues in contemporary society (Mathiessen, 1999, p. 3; Wadell, 2000, p. 1). President John F. Kennedy read the book and consequently ordered the President's Science Advisory

Committee to investigate its claims, beginning a shift in governmental approaches to the environment from conservation to restoration and rehabilitation. Early governmental action manifested itself in pollution control legislation, such as the Clean Air Acts of 1963 and 1970, the Air Quality Act of 1967, and the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1970. More recently, Al Gore attributed his interest in the environment and subsequent work to combat global warming to his reading of *Silent Spring* as a child (Bocking, 2007; Cart, 2008). At the same time that politicians have been inspired by the text, average citizens have been moved to demand governmental action. The text taught its readers about a new science of ecology and called for them to question the overuse and under-studied application of the synthetic chemicals in pesticides and insecticides.

Carson faced two main rhetorical problems when crafting her text. First, she had to make her message accessible to non-scientists. Second, she was at once critiquing science and its experts and asking her audience to accept the scientific knowledge of ecology that she was advocating. Carson addresses these problems by pairing scientific knowledge with a literary style (Gartner, 2000). The style could hold the audience's attention and was a style new to science; the use of this new style to present the new science suggests ecology was a different sort of science than the sciences people were beginning to distrust. Carson's rhetorical style moralizes science through a narrative of war that raises questions about what it means to be human and encourages the construction of a new relationship between humanity and the environment. The environmental destruction she details becomes more than a question for science; it becomes a question for the moral realm, as humans are given the choice of what to value.

Carson moves from a general ecological space into homes and finally into the body, demonstrating the “war on the environment” raised security issues—particularly health and way-of-life concerns—for individuals that had not been considered previously. The narrative gives readers the option of valuing an ecological balance and achieving a more secure society or pushing society further into chaos by continuing attempts to dominate the environment. I begin by discussing how Carson ties environmental concerns to traditional ideas of security and then look at how she was able to broaden her definition of security.

Silent Spring uses the end of World War II and the emergence of the nuclear age as its setting. It is an era of humanity increasing its power over nature. Carson (1962) explains, “During the past quarter century this power has not only increased to one of disturbing magnitude but it has changed in character” (pp. 5-6). Overall, the plot of the narrative is one of war.[26] Humanity has created a conflict with the environment by engaging in an assault on the natural order through its use of pesticides and chemicals. Disruption in the natural balance can be traced, for Carson, back to a break humanity made from nature. She contends, “The rapidity of change and the speed with which new situations are created follow the impetuous and heedless pace of man rather than the deliberate pace of nature” (p. 7). By assuming that they did not need to follow along with nature’s processes, humans made a break, moving faster and thinking less about the natural consequences of their actions. In doing so, humans tried to disassociate themselves from the natural world.

[26] Cheryll Glotfelty (2000) engages in a detailed discussion of the trope of war in *Silent Spring*, arguing that Carson constructs a new war where environmentalists and the few scientists interested curbing pesticide use were engaged in battle with the chemical industry and governmental scientists in charge of administering the chemicals.

This disassociation led to man's war on nature. The metaphors of war that appear throughout the text help to frame Carson's narrative and ease audiences into the message by drawing on common understandings of militarized security. Phrases used to describe pesticides, such as "chemical death rain" (p. 12) and "agents of death" (p. 13), invoke images of war. The disorder of these images is attached to pesticides and their use. Associating pesticides with military weapons is not the only way in which Carson constructs her war narrative. She also uses the language of enemies and casualties. The targets of these chemicals—insects and weeds—are the enemies in man's war against nature, but, Carson contends, we have misidentified the enemy (pp. 10, 297). The problem with targeting these enemies, suggests Carson, is threefold: (1) these entities are not always our enemies, (2) the enemies fight back, bringing detrimental consequences to humanity, and (3) innocent beings get caught in the crossfire (p. 251). Carson includes numerous accounts of these casualties (for examples see: pp. 122, 198). One of the most chilling invokes images from World War II:

> In the general holocaust that followed the spraying of salt marshes in eastern Florida (pages 146-47), aquatic snails alone survived. The scene as described was a macabre picture—something that might have been created by a surrealist brush. The snails moved among the bodies of the dead fishes and the moribund crabs, devouring the victims of the death rain of poison. (pp. 257-258)

This image of mass death is reminiscent of images of concentration camps and battlefields—bodies spread across the ground, piled upon one another, some of the most inhumane images to ever be produced by human action. Carson's narrative of war is also a story of humanity's degradation, as these images demonstrate the destruction and

insecurity humans have caused by disassociating themselves from their place in the natural balance.

Looking from the perspective of defining security, this narrative can also be read as a cautionary tale against relying solely on militarized conceptions of security. Insects and pests do cause harm to humanity through the spread of disease and destruction of crops. But Carson's narrative demonstrates that not every security threat can be solved through traditional military methods of reclaiming security. Such methods do not take the natural order into account, creating an even more insecure space than that which existed prior to the war on nature. Carson reinforces this message through the narrative's structure.

The structure of the narrative is based on the trajectory of the weapons humans are using in their war. Carson follows the application of insecticides and pesticides on their travels through water, soil, earth, and air as they find their way into plants and animals, causing destruction and death wherever they move. Carson reaches the climax of the narrative by detailing how the chemicals travel back to the very humans who instigate their use. Through food and contact with the world, humans interact with the weapons, which make their way into the human body just as they move through the Earth's ecosystems. Eventually resting in cells, these chemicals become "the menace of our time, 'the last and greatest danger to our civilization'" (p. 208), threatening the health and even existence and genetic heritage of humanity. Carson details how scientific studies have shown that "chemical mutagens" mutate genes and affect chromosomes in animals, increasing the rates of abnormalities and malformation (p. 214). She connects these findings to humans by suggesting no animals' reproductive organs are shielded from the

effects of these chemicals and by elucidating the findings of various studies that detail the detrimental effects of chromosome abnormalities in humans (pp. 213-216).

In addition to threatening humanity's genetic heritage, Carson demonstrates the mass use of these chemicals threatens our health. She ties the alterations these chemicals make in our cells to the rise of cancer in society (pp. 219-243). Here she makes two significant shifts in discussing security. First, health concerns become a security issue, something we fear that causes detriment to society. Cancer must be addressed so that we can live without the fear that our own bodies have been compromised. Carson writes, "For those in whom cancer is already a hidden or a visible presence, efforts to find cures must of course continue. But for those not yet touched by the disease and certainly for the generations as yet unborn, prevention is the imperative need" (p 243). Carson makes a second important definitional shift here. Rather than a reactive method of addressing insecurity caused by the disease—one that focuses solely on finding a cure—Carson calls for a proactive mode of security that seeks to prevent health concerns before they arise.

As a rhetorical narrative, the overarching story of this war is not resolved; rather, it is left to the audience to determine how the story will end (Lucaites & Condit, 1985, p. 100). In place of the war against nature, Carson calls for individuals to enact a more deliberative, thoughtful, and thoroughly ecological approach to the environment. Without such a shift, the narrative will devolve into chaos, destruction, and mass insecurity.

Vivid descriptions of mass sprayings and their aftermaths—dead birds, mammals, farm animals, and even illnesses in humans (pp. 46-49, 92-94, 152)—help Carson raise questions of what it means to be human and what it means to engage in moral action. Rather than a brief maxim that articulates the lesson one is to learn from each story,

Carson uses rhetorical questions to guide her readers through lessons of morality. She uses rhetorical questions to inspire a particular thought process in her audience and to model a broadened form of security for which she hopes they will strive.

In one line of questioning, Carson asks what it means to be human. She states, "The question is whether any civilization can wage relentless war on life without destroying itself, and without losing the right to be called civilized" (p. 99). The chapter concludes with an ontological question: "By acquiescing in an act that can cause such suffering to a living creature, who among us is not diminished as a human being?" (p. 100). Carson provides all the narrative details needed for her readers to answer the question in a way that would cause the current approach of environmental domination, one based on traditional militarized ideas of security, to become questionable. We must include in our definition of security the maintenance of virtues and morals that are central to our culture. In this moment, virtues of compassion and restraint are being violated and threatening the existence of a moral way of life. For Carson, a broader conception of security, one not built on tactics of warfare, will help individuals reclaim the humanity they have lost in the narrow-sighted war they have waged on the environment.

Carson pleas for action and a drastic change to the status quo. She writes, "When will the public become sufficiently aware of the facts to demand such action?" (p. 152). The action she is hoping to bring about here is more funding for research into the chemicals and their use, but at other moments in the text she asks when people will become concerned enough to engage in protest. She writes, "We are rightly appalled by the genetic effects of radiation; how then, can we be indifferent to the same effects in chemicals that we disseminate widely in our environment?" (p. 37). Every fable-like

narrative, every lesson Carson teaches through these stories, is designed to guide her readers in answering this last question correctly. If they learn from the fables that the current ideology of dominance makes them behave inhumanely and makes both their health and moral way of living insecure, they must answer this last question by protesting, speaking up, and working to end the mass, ill-thought use of synthetic chemicals. She explains, "It is the public that is being asked to assume the risks that the insect controllers calculate. The public must decide whether it wishes to continue on the present road, and it can do so only when in full possession of the facts" (p. 13). To regain a secure society, members of the public must engage in citizenly actions. They must transition from passive victims to active agents of change.

Carson's detailed research and compilation of studies, as well as the wide scope of beings shown to be affected by the chemicals, allows Carson's readers to picture the current spaces of chaos and devastation and ask if this space is really where they want to find themselves. These smaller narratives interact with the broader, narrative of the text, suggesting the apocalyptic story can be ruptured and an insecure ending can be avoided. In order to create a more livable ending to Carson's broader narrative, her audience must create a new social space (De Certeau, 1984), one that rejects the current ideology of dominance and adopts an ecological ideology and broader definition of security. To form the new space, Carson's audience must accept a definition of security that is much broader than a militarized concept. They must acknowledge that security includes such things as maintaining their health, continuing a healthy genetic lineage, and fostering morals and virtues that will strengthen the community and the relationship that their community has with its environment.

Carson is unable to detail an exact alternative to the space of devastation. Instead, she suggests that her readers can choose between the insecure space of devastation she constructs in detail and a less defined, but more secure, ecological space. The choice it makes will determine the conclusion to Carson's broader narrative. She guides her readers in challenging the ideology of dominance in three ways. The first two—turning to the human body and using rhetorical questions—have been discussed above. Carson's final appeal for a new, secure social space is derived from a metaphor of an alternative road, which allows her audience to imagine a new social path, built on an ecological ideology.

The last chapter of *Silent Spring*, "The Other Road," is Carson's final plea for the emergence of a different social space. She begins:

> We stand now where two roads diverge. But unlike the roads in Robert Frost's familiar poem, they are not equally fair. The road we have long been traveling is deceptively easy, a smooth superhighway on which we progress with great speed, but at its end lies disaster. The other fork of the road—the one "less traveled by"—offers our last, our only chance to reach a destination that assures the preservation of our earth. (p. 277)

The first path is a path of insecurity, while the second, though less tried, offers the potential for at least securing the existence of humanity on earth. After positing this choice for her readers, Carson continues by offering a variety of methods available that differ from ill-thought out, mass use of pesticides. The methods she advocates have ecological thought as their foundation, relying on natural systems to control problematic insects and plants (p. 279, 285-288, 289, 292) and using chemicals in much more targeted

manners. Beyond the possibility of working with the "fabric of life," Carson gives few details of what her ecological space might look like. Rather, it is a space of possibility, one that we must construct together in a "high-minded orientation," lest we remain in the "primitive" space of devastation (p. 297).

Carson does not explicitly set out to challenge traditional understandings of security in *Silent Spring*, but the possibility of reading the text as a challenge exists. Her use of military language throughout the book invokes the dominant models of security relied on in U.S. culture. These discussions demonstrate the possible risk involved in applying the notion of security to non-military situations and of maintaining a limited understanding of what security means. As she illustrates, militaristic tactics do not work for every social issue or concern, and their improper use can cause more problems than they solve (Zarefsky, 1986).[27] But if we broaden security to include health and way of life concerns, new tactics to further security in society are possible. Carson suggests the possibility of this new security is dependent on including multiple voices in the discussion of what society should value, what it should preserve, and what actions should be taken to ensure people feel secure.

---

[27] David Zarefsky's (1986) examination of President Johnson's War on Poverty offers another example of the limits of defining non-military situations as crises pressing enough to warrant a "war." Zarefsky explains that the metaphor of war initially spurred action and collaboration to address the nation's poverty, but inevitably the defining of the situation as a war contributed to its loss of public support. The early rhetoric of the war on poverty suggested a need for immediate and drastic action, but the proposed policy contained incremental changes that did not match the urgent rhetoric. He points to a tension that exists when using language of war to spur action on issues: urgent language is sometimes necessary to encourage support and action of nonmilitary issues, but the actions needed to address nonmilitary issues are not always the quick modes of attacks military action brings to mind.

The ecological space Carson advocates is one where multiple voices and perspectives would be brought together with proven scientific knowledge to determine how humans can live with the environment not outside of it (p. 278). Her call is explicitly for immediate action and protests to end the use of synthetic chemicals. Implied in her arguments for a different approach to the environment is an acknowledgement that the balance of nature is a fluid process. She calls for an ecological space where this fluidity is recognized and dialogue and the search for new knowledge will allow human behavior toward the environment to evolve as new information and situations emerge. In a sense Carson's overarching narrative will never be finished, as humans will always have to consider their relationship with the environment and will have to constantly participate in discussions about how to live well with the environment of which they are a part.

These discussions are discussions of security; at the center they are conversations about what will allow individuals to feel secure in the spaces in which they have chosen to reside. They are discussions about health. They are discussions about preserving culture and heritage. And they are discussions about preserving a system that allows humans to adapt to social and environmental changes. These are questions of security. Carson's text shows that offering a new definition of security is possible. This new security may begin with traditional militarized ideas, but it can be broadened to include issues beyond the threat of outside violence, methods beyond quick and massive attacks, and success beyond victory over an identified enemy. Security, Carson suggests, is achieved through a process of citizenly participation where individuals come together to determine how they want to live and in what values they want to invest.

Richard Nixon and the Creation of the EPA

Environmental devastation became increasingly visible to U.S. citizens near the time Nixon took office. Images such as the 1969 oil spill off the coast of Santa Barbara, smog covering many U.S. cities, and the chemical-filled Cuyahoga River catching on fire in Ohio made it impossible for citizens to ignore that human activity and pollution was changing the environment in destructive ways. As individuals in the 1960s and 1970s started to engage in collective action and protests aimed at addressing pressing environmental issues, the federal government began to respond. In 1969, Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which included requirements for environmental impact statements (Quarles, 1976, p. 12). The NEPA shifted the government's role from "conservator of wilderness" to "protector of earth, air, land, and water" (The Guardian: Origins of the EPA, 1992). During this time, Nixon watched the polls show environmental issues rise to third in the list of voter concerns and asked his aides to "prepare a program that would put him on the right side of the issue" (Quarles, 1976, p. 12). The EPA opened for business on December 2, 1970. It was a product of the Nixon Administration's plan to "streamline government operations" (Quarles, 1976, p. 14) and Nixon's desire to garner public support (Ruckelshaus, 1993).

The reorganization plan that created the EPA, Reorganization Plan no. 3 of 1970, had two letters attached to it and was submitted on July 9, 1970, with Reorganization Plan no. 4, which created the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The first letter was a single-page that justified Nixon's submission of these reorganization plans to Congress, claiming the preparation and submission was done "in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code." The more detailed

justification was a longer letter intended to explain the EPA and NOAA and persuade Congress that each was necessary to address issues of the current social context. The analysis offered in this section focuses on this longer letter.

Nixon faced two primary rhetorical problems when convincing Congress to support his plan to create the EPA. First, the plan furthered the shift that moved the federal government from environmental conservation to defense and restoration. Second, the extent of reorganization was unlike anything that had been proposed by a president in recent history. Nixon counters both of these potential problems by justifying the EPA using military language. To address the first of these rhetorical problems Nixon spends considerable time constructing environmental destruction as an urgent security problem that requires immediate and drastic action.

To explain an expanded role for government, Nixon relies on the language of national security, a realm in which most allow the government to safely claim ownership. The letter presents the reorganization plan as a coordinated effort to address the current devastation. Nixon calls for total commitment for the sake of national security and the American way of life. The crisis requires the federal government to engage in preparation to launch an attack according to Nixon: “Our National government today is not structured to make a coordinated attack on the pollutants which debase the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land that grows our food.” As it relates to environmental issues, the EPA is created as a Department of Defense. The agency gathers intelligence and engages in warfare against those actions that are attacking our environment.

He opens the letter, “As concern with the condition of our physical environment has intensified, it has become increasingly clear that we need to know more about the

total environment." He explains the government's existing "piecemeal" approach to environmentally related activities are not capable of addressing the problem, claiming, "The time has come to organize them rationally and systematically." The language choices point to a situation of urgency. Words like "intensified" and "increasing" suggest a crescendo of concern over environmental conditions and the growing insecurity these issues are producing for United States citizens. If nothing is done to curb the growing intensity of environmental problems, the future is uncertain; the situation is and will continue to be insecure. Like other moments of crisis, when the government must step in to provide its citizens with national security, the weight of this moment requires governmental action. This crisis language is the foundation on which Nixon securitizes the environment and alters the government's realm of action.

Nixon admits the creation of a new agency goes against his principles of streamlining the government, but the urgency of the situation requires its creation and the cooperation of other governmental agencies and every U.S. citizen. Nixon writes:

> Because environmental protection cuts across so many jurisdictions, and because arresting environmental deterioration is of great importance to the quality of life in our country and the world, I believe that in this case a strong, independent agency is needed. That agency would, of course, work closely with and draw upon the expertise and assistance of other agencies having experience in the environmental area.

Environmental destruction is presented here as a threat to U.S. quality of life. This threat is so severe that it requires a coordinated, militarized effort of various government agencies in order to protect U.S. citizens. The military language used to describe Nixon's

proposal presents environmental destruction as a national security issue, broadening what security can mean in a national discussion. Nixon places environmental concerns on a similar level to military threats; in this presentation, opposition to a call for commitment to the coordinated efforts against environmental destruction become unpatriotic.

Nixon's rhetoric not only broadens what issues can be seen as national security concerns; it also has the potential to redefine security generally. As with Carson, the military threats that are the basis for traditional security endeavors are presented here as only part of the security of which citizens deserve. Nixon's discourse is primarily about the right of citizens to secure their way of life and live in a way that provides them freedom from fear. Nixon enters the environmental realm because of threats he sees to the "quality of life" facing U.S. citizens. The reorganization plan is proposed so that the United States can "effectively ensure the protection, development and enhancement of the total environment itself." The creation of the EPA is a step in maintaining control over our environment. The organization would continue to search out environmental knowledge so that environmental resources can be utilized as society progresses, hopefully moving society into a place where it can feel secure in its ability to predict and control environmental occurrences.

Nixon's securitization of military issues certainly produces urgency and draws support for significant action and government intervention, but this rhetorical approach also produced two problematic roles for the environment. Nixon contends, "We face immediate and compelling needs for better protection of life and property from natural hazards, and for a better understanding of the total environment—an understanding which will enable us more effectively to monitor and predict its actions, and ultimately, perhaps

to exercise some degree of control over them." This domination is part of a shared national goal. Nixon's militarized rhetoric makes a shift here. No longer is the "enemy" of his war only environmental destruction. In this quotation the total environment is in need of subduing. The environment is in need of surveillance so that society might be prepared to act if and when it threatens our way of existence. The pressing environmental concerns are a catalyst for recognizing how powerful and dangerous the environment can be, and humanity must prepare to engage in any conflicts the environment might pose. The environment is an agent in Nixon's rhetoric, one that almost seems to decide to harm humanity when given the option. Nixon's militarized rhetoric ignores the natural balance discussed by Carson or the idea that humanity is a part of nature. In place of this worldview, Nixon offers an ideology that pits humans against the environment and seeks to create an agency that will help humanity tame natural processes.

In addition to presenting the environment as a possible combatant, Nixon at times constructs the environment as a victim in need of rescue. Nixon writes, "The Congress, the Administration and the public all share a profound commitment to the rescue of our natural environment, and the preservation of the Earth as a place both inhabited by and hospitable to man." Here, the environment is placed in a feminine position, in which it is to be rescued and preserved from unspecified attacks. The government, in contrast, is the active hero, able to save the environment from peril and then use the rescued victim for its own purposes. Nixon forgets to acknowledge that governmental action is necessary only because humans have already shown an ability to affect and control the environment. He refuses to admit that humans must address environmental issues because humans have damaged the earth with their way of life, causing both the human and

nonhuman world to face multiple insecurities. Working toward ecological balance is at best a secondary goal to ensuring that the feminized environment can be used and controlled as humanity sees fit.

Nixon's rhetoric expands security to include protection from environmental devastation and the preservation of a particular quality of life but shows us the potential caution needed in such discourse. The value of environmental domination, built on constructing the environment as a particular combatant or a damsel in distress, is not a value we should want to maintain, because it will not, as Carson demonstrates, bring security into existence. When expanding the definition of security, caution must be exercised to ensure that including things like cultural ways of life are done critically, so that the virtues, activities, and environments preserved are those that bring about security rather than those that cause insecurity.

What do These Tell us About Security?

The main commonality between *Silent Spring* and Reorganization Plan no. 3 is that both expand security by securitizing environmentalism. By making environmental degradation a national security issue, connecting it to already understood ideas of militarized national security, both Carson and Nixon defend actions that differ from the status quo at the same time that they make less understood environmental issues comprehensible to their audiences. Those that raise concerns about the securitization of environmental issues may bristle at the rhetoric in each of these texts, but what these texts teach us is that such appeals may be necessary as initial forays into redefining security and incorporating concerns beyond those of the military into discourses of security.

Recall the two major concerns scholars have had with an expanded notion of

security: (1) the threat of turning other social issues into issues on unilateral action, and (2) the fact that most social issues cannot be handled with traditional military tactics. These concerns about broadening security can be answered by looking at how a discourse can use traditional ideas of security to eventually guide an audience to a broadened and more complex conception of what security means and how to achieve it. Both Carson and Nixon wrote at moments of crises, moments where environmental concerns threatened security enough that some unilateral action and coordinated efforts were needed. We may already be at or quickly heading toward a similar situation when it comes to climate change. Sometimes moments of crises are those that open up the opportunity for entrenched discourses to be altered. Framing something as a national security crisis that may not usually fall into such a category allows us, once the most pressing crisis has passed, to consider security in a new light that does not demand unilateral action or military-like efforts.

The danger of not moving beyond securitization as a rhetorical tool is illustrated in the analysis of Nixon's letter. Few would argue that the EPA was any sort of failure, but the language used to securitize environmental issues promotes a reactive rather than proactive approach to addressing environmental issues.[28] Even with its emphasis on the knowledge of ecology, Nixon's military metaphor ensured that the social hierarchy placing humans above the environment remained in place. Preservation was only

---

[28] The Endangered Species Act is an example of this reactive approach. The summary of the act provided by the EPA states, "The Endangered Species Act (ESA) provides a program for the conservation of threatened and endangered plants and animals and the habitats in which they are found." Plants and animals must already be threatened with extinction or major population decline in order to be covered by the act and receive EPA protection. Rather than construct a proactive policy that requires development, industry, and recreation to be done in a way that prevents threatening the livelihood of a species in the first place, the policy waits for a threat before engaging in action.

necessary so that humans could use and exploit the environment as they saw fit. Such an attitude is still present in contemporary environmental discourse. This dominant approach overrides those who ask that we see ourselves as part of the environment, not above it. While Nixon cannot be solely held accountable, this rhetoric may have had lasting consequences for environmental and security discourse, reinforcing the idea that "security" issues must always be dealt with using a coordinated effort and established plan of attack, rather than action built on forethought, deliberation, and cooperation with other humans as well as the nonhuman environment.

Rather than continuing to reinforce the environment as a passive recipient of human care and humanity as the active hero, environmental discourse must recognize humanity as a part of the environment, account for the power humanity has to alter the environment, and simultaneously recognize the environment's ability to respond to human action. One way to begin altering the discourse is by challenging the definition and actions of security. [29]

The primary lesson we can learn from these analyses is that to redefine security, we must move beyond the securitization of social issues to broaden what is included in security concerns. Securitization of social issues is a starting point. It can be used to lead audiences to broader conceptions of security. Nixon's letter does not take this step, which

---

[29] Some environmental groups and organizations have already begun making this discursive shift. The Foundation for Environmental Security & Sustainability was founded in 1999. The Institute for Sustainable Development began advocating environmental solutions to human security issues in 1998. And GRID-Arendal, founded by the Norwegian government in 1989 as a collaborating center with the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), has made environmental security a priority in its research and policy advocacy. The next step is making this discursive shift more prevalent in standard political discourse, so that incidents like the 2010 BP oil spill and climate change are discussed as security issues and given them same (at times more) attention, intensity of action, and resources as the "war on terror."

may be part of the reason we have an EPA that still does little in terms of proactive policy. Securitization of environmental issues spurs action and government policy and constructs a definition of security that includes environmental concerns, but by remaining in a discourse of national security, Nixon draws on military methods to solve non-military, global problems. Security needs to not only be broadened in terms of topics but also in its geographical scope and logic and methods. Without moving beyond militarization of social issues to a broader understanding of security, global environmental concerns will not be addressed and non-military logic and methods will be left unconsidered as tools to bring about security.

Carson's text further demonstrates, by moving from public space to the private realm of body and home, that beginning with securitization provides an opportunity to incorporate a deeper understanding of what it means for humans to be secure. Carson begins with the assault we had launched on the natural world but reminds us that we cannot remove ourselves from that world. Just as we should feel sympathy for the insecure situation in which we have placed birds, mammals, and ecosystems, we must show concern for the insecurity in which we have placed ourselves. Through our own action we have made our way of life, our genetic heritage, and our health insecure. Carson is able to make this point by guiding her reader through a narrative that broadens security from a militarized understanding to one that places humans at the center. Carson stops short, however, of offering an illustration of what could happen if individuals accept her challenge of taking a road that might produce more security. Her narrative is primarily tragic (Nordhaus & Shellenberger, 2007, p. 134), focusing on the devastation that will continue if humanity chooses to do nothing. This type of discourse is motivating

to a point, but it has a risk of becoming overwhelming and making individuals feel hopeless. In constructing a new definition of security, one used to create policy and action to address social crises, the discourse of risk and threat needs to be paired with a discourse of potential, progress, and hope (Nordhaus & Shellenberger, 2007). If a new form of security is going to be adopted, security rhetoric needs to include discussion of what specifically might be gained if new issues are addressed and different security methods are considered. What is needed is a security discourse that avoids the nationalistic tendencies of Nixon's rhetoric and the overreliance on tragedy in Carson's' *Silent Spring* in order to celebrate human ingenuity (Nixon does this well) and place greater importance on humanity over national borders.

Human Security: A Possible Alternative

The two case studies offered in this chapter demonstrate that past social discourses have challenged the traditional understandings of security. While these discourses raised appropriate challenges for the eras in which they emerged, our current context seems to call for a different form of security. Human security, a security that turns attention from the state to the individual, may be an option in an era where global crises have blurred the borders of nations as well as the bounds of political issues.

In the current global context, the state seems incapable of guarding against some of the more pressing security issues facing individual people. Barnett (2001b) explains:

> What is notable about this late-modern era is the relative impotence of the state to control the terms of security. The state is increasingly unable to act as regulator between global dynamics (such as speculative capital moving instantly through dense communication networks, to the illegal movement of drugs, weapons and

> people through the proliferation of cheap and rapid transport), and local places. In this respect initiatives to uniformly (de) regulate trade and investment, such as the WTO, can be read as proof that sovereignty no longer provides comprehensive security. Further, even the traditional concern for national security from external aggression is harder to control given the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the sophisticated nature of terrorism. (p. 123)

As stated earlier, human beings, in their daily experience, understand security to be more than protecting nation-state borders. People reach for their security blankets when they are sick, when their way of life is threatened, when they feel a level of uncertainty about their welfare or the welfare of their loved ones. While this fact has remained consistent throughout history, what has changed is the scope of the issues causing insecurity and the role the state has taken in the lives of its citizens. Maintaining borders, protecting property, and establishing a rule of law is only a small part of the concerns governments have assumed when it comes to their citizens. The merits of expanding governmental involvement in general welfare, economic concerns, health issues, and even sexuality, has and will certainly continue to be heavily debated, but it is clear that we have come far enough that government will not be going back to a more limited way of governance any time soon.

Thus, we need a working definition of security that leads us to “worry less about focusing on protecting the ‘state’ and more on protecting ‘individual’ citizens” (Liotta & Shearer, 2007, p. 39). Barnett (2001b) explains, “[a] human-centered environmental security concept places the welfare of people first and prioritises the welfare of the most disadvantaged above all else” (p. 127). He continues, “In contrast to thinking about

violent conflict, a human-centered conceptualisation of environmental security asserts the need for cooperation and inclusion to manage the environment for the equal benefit of all people and future generations" (p. 128).

The concept of human security was canonized in a 1994 United Nations *Human Development Report.* Dalby (2002) summarizes the four major characteristics of this concept as laid out by report. He writes:

> First, it is a universal concern relevant to people everywhere. Second, the components of security are interdependent. Third, human security is easier to ensure through early prevention. Fourth, and perhaps the crucial innovation of the formulation, is the shift of the referent object of security from states to people. (p. 8)

Meyers (1993) details what would be included in a security built on these four principles:

> Security applies most at the level of the individual citizen. It amounts to human wellbeing: not only protection from harm and injury but access to water, food, shelter, health, employment, and other basic requisites that are the due of every person on Earth. It is the collectivity of these citizens needs—overall safety and quality of life—that should figure prominently in the nation's view of security. (p. 31)

Without a redefined idea of security, one that is not subsumed under ideas of national security, humans will continue to feel insecure in this new global socio-political context where new issues, new threats, and new global relationships place individuals in insecure situations and solutions call for non-military methods. Thus, a new concept of security, one that challenges the "the hidden goal of security—that of maintaining power within

the state" must emerge. It must include "social, political, and environmental" issues (Barnett, 2001b, p. 48). Without removing protection of the state as the primary goal of security, such an inclusive definition of security will only lead to the application of military logic to all issues included under a security rubric (*ibid*). By transforming the focus from nation-state borders to human beings, this concern can be addressed. More methods for achieving security become possible when this question is, "what actions will make these particular people more secure" instead of "how should we protect our nation-state borders."

There is an argument to be made that sometimes insecurity leads to growth. Some of the changes to the global political context mean that we will need to grow as nations and individuals, learning to work with others very unlike ourselves and needing to expose ourselves to beliefs, values, and practices very unlike our own. These are positive moments where insecurity can lead to progress, growth, and introspection (Appiah, 2006), but with them will come other issues and moments where the negative consequences of insecurity emerge, such as health concerns, environmental destruction, and loss of jobs to outsourcing. By addressing these threats to individual security, we, as a society, may be able to make citizens not only capable but welcoming of the positive forms of change that stem from feelings of insecurity.

Conclusion

Carson and Nixon demonstrate that rhetoric has the potential to refigure security to incorporate issues and methods that have not been held in traditional definitions of security. Our current world context requires that a new definition of security must emerge if our most pressing global crises are going to be addressed. Adopting human security as

the mode of security used to influence policy and funding decisions offers promising potentialities that can be emphasized even in discourse detailing the threats people face.

First, security debates would focus on achieving security for members of humanity rather than protecting of nation-state borders, which means more debates over security would have to take place with global consideration, opening the door for cooperation that cannot seem to take place in a global political structure where each participant values its nation-state over humanity. Imagine global discussions about pollution or climate change that held human security as the basis of the discussion. What global solutions might arise when human security is placed above things such as national economic growth? Whose needs might be heard or accounted for that are usually ignored because they are speaking for a nation not viewed as powerful?

Human security has the potential to help create a stronger system of global cooperation and organizations with the power to make consequential standards that include the voices of all affected and give the loudest voice to those who suffer the most insecurity (Barnett, 2001b, p. 148). Dalby (2002) reminds us, “The largest questions of humanity’s future cannot avoid the matter of who decides on what is most valuable” (p. 183). In order to ensure that individuals of wealthier and more powerful nations are not ignoring the needs or values of those in less wealthy and powerful nations, a global system must be set up that allows concerns to be voiced on global issues by any affected parties involved in the matter. This does not mean that every person in the world must be able to come to a specific place at a specific time and have his or her specific voice heard. It does mean, however, that whether through existing global institutions (such as the United Nations or global NGOs) or through a newly established global system of

deliberation and governance, we must ensure that everyone has the possibility of having their concerns and values represented to a body that can pull rank over the rulings of nation-states. We can no longer have nation-state borders, nation-state economies, and nation-state standards of living as the central concerns (and often the biggest roadblocks) in deliberations over global issues. We need to change our mindset to place humanity and its general security at the forefront; doing so may help bring about a more secure world built on global cooperation and human relationships.

Second, basing security discussions on human security alters the focus of dialogue. One question of debate would become what is causing the greatest insecurity to human health, ways of life, and heritage. In this debate military threats are not ignored, but they are measured against other threats to human security. Policy-makers and citizens would weigh risks; possibly seeing that money spent on a “preventative war” in Iraq might do more to prevent risk if directed toward funding research projects to make alternative energy options more productive. Funding and policy decisions would prioritize those concerns deemed to be causing the greatest amounts of insecurity. This would mean that a more comprehensive understanding of what makes people feel secure would be considered. Economic stability, health, and the maintenance of cultural traditions and values might all be identified as elements that help people feel secure in their spaces. Human security would suggest that these could be brought up in debates and given resources and attention if claims about these concerns were deemed valid security issues.

A third promising possibility of human security is that it may help alter political action from a reactive to a proactive mode of policy. To begin, achieving a society that relies on a definition of human security is a proactive, long-term project. It will only

emerge as dominant social definition if sustained educational efforts about the benefits of the approach reach individual citizens (Ullman, 1983, p. 152). If social institutions and organizations can be reclaimed as places where the values and virtues of citizenship are lauded and citizenship training takes place (Sandel, 1996), individuals could be instilled with values that support a definition of human security over militarized security.

Redefining security as human security suggests a redefinition of citizenship generally. Human security requires that decisions are made and actions are taken in ways that produce the least insecurity in the future. P.H. Liotta and Allan Shearer (2007) explain, "'Right decisions' must focus on the long view and not just the *next* crisis; to do this wisely requires strategic attention, strategic planning, and strategic investment" (p. 156). Government is set up as a reactive institution. Not built on foresight, it is designed primarily to respond to problems that arise, as with the string of natural disasters I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter.

When events occur that cannot be predicted a government must be reactive, but those reactions can be made more effective if a proactive approach is taken in preparation for the occurrence of such events. For example, the main source of information for those affected by the tornado in Minneapolis was a facebook group created by a past-Minneapolis resident out of his Harlem apartment (McKinney, 2011 May 28) not a central communication hub created by the governmental organizations in charge of providing citizens with services. And residents were still waiting for necessary services a week after the tornado, because those services could not be delivered until the area was declared a federal disaster area (Shenoy, 2011 May 30). In each case the weakness of a reactive form of government is demonstrated—the first shows a lack of a prepared

communication plan for such incidents and the second a lack of preparation for helping individuals regain personal security in a timely manner. In each case community members and organizations have tried to pick up the slack, but without resources (both monetary and human capital) the help is doled out in a piecemeal manner to those who have the ability to search it out. If human security was the foundation of security concerns situations such as this may be avoided or at least tempered, as governmental approaches to natural disasters would be based on quickly and effectively helping individuals regain the security they had lost.

As citizens are educated about the virtues of human security, they may begin to work together to demand that the political system address concerns more proactively. A people-centered drive to achieve a new form of security has the potential to transform politics (Barnett, 2001b, p. 114), as more and more coalitions are built on broad concepts, such as garnering security and thinking about the consequences of specific political legislation and action. As citizens demand such governmental action, the hope is that government would respond by transforming itself into a system that provides security for its citizens ahead of its borders.

Chapter 4

Community Building: What Bill McKibben and Michelle Obama Teach us About an Environmentalist Project

When I was a junior in college, I spent a month living with my grandpa in his rural Minnesota town during winter term while I interned at a local arts center. Since that time, he has referred to me as “roommate,” and I make a point to visit him as often as I can. My grandfather, a ninety-one-year-old Marine who lauds the presidencies of Nixon and Reagan, is an old-school Republican who believes in fiscal responsibility and a social safety net. We rarely approach politics in the same way, but he is one of the many figures in my life that has shown me that political disagreement does not equate to an inability to discuss issues in a civil manner or even come to agreement every once in a while.

While working on this dissertation, I was having dinner at Grandpa’s house with my uncle (a capitalist libertarian) and cousin (who is whatever everyone else at the table is not). One of them asked, “So, what is your dissertation about?” I began explaining the overarching question and general concepts, laughing at the “hippie” and “bleeding heart liberal” comments being given in response to my explanation. That is, until I came to discuss this chapter. The table perked up when I explained that I intended to look at the production and consumption of local food. My uncle began to discuss how important buying local food was for local economies, listing off facts about how much more money goes to the farmers and the communities in which the food is grown than when one buys food shipped in from California or even further away. My cousin, who was just finishing culinary school, started talking about the freshness of the food, the perks of knowing the people who produce the food, and the challenge of cooking seasonal dishes. And my

grandpa talked about how my grandmother was ordering produce and meat from local farmers more than a decade before it was a trendy thing for liberal city-folk to do. For them, buying local food was not a political choice; it was a normal way of life.

Local food changed the tone of the discussion; something about it made each of us feel like we had a contribution to the discourse. I think there are two reasons for this. First, food is part of everyone's daily life, so we each have significant opinions and experiences with food that we want to share. Second, food is tied to community. Most of us choose to eat with those we care about; some communities build identities based on food produced in the area (my grandfather's community, for example, has Corn on the Cob Days); and community celebrations often have food as a central component. There is something about food that reminds us we are related to others.

The following chapter is about sustainability and intergenerational justice. These terms are the object of much philosophical debate, with people asking whether or not sustainability is a requirement for intergenerational justice, whether they are obligations of current citizens, and what it means to enact either. It is easy to get mired in these debates, but the debates do not seem to be getting us any closer to action that brings about either sustainability or intergenerational justice. What the conversation around the dinner table showed me was that these questions might not be the ones we should currently be asking. Rather, we should be asking questions about community. How do we create a community that inspires people to act in consideration of following generations? How do we create community with members willing to engage important social questions civilly? How do we create communities where people see each other as people and not as political stances to attack? Something about reminding people they are part of a

community allows them to have a rational discussion that emphasizes commonality and respects difference, where people actually listen to each other, exchange information, and acknowledge that different points of view do not equate to an inability to work together.

The primary project of environmentalists must be the creation of communities that are founded on members' humanity and teaches them how to interact with each other and non-human nature as ethical citizens; this is what we should be aiming to sustain. This project not only provides a common cause for environmentalists, but it also has something to offer individuals across the political spectrum. I begin the chapter by looking at Bryan Norton's convergence hypothesis and the general need for a focus on community building in environmental thought to argue for a more pragmatic approach to discussions of environmental issues and policy. Next, I use two case studies, analyses of Bill McKibben's *Deep Economy* and Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign, to examine how individuals are currently tying together questions of community, intergenerational justice, and environmental issues. Following these analyses, I will examine the existing debates over sustainability and intergenerational justice in order to show how without a strong, civically oriented community the debates are not resolvable. I conclude by arguing why a shift toward building stronger communities would be beneficial to those concerned with environmental causes.

Community Building as an Environmental Goal

In *Toward Unity Among Environmentalists* Bryan Norton (1991) identifies two crises in the environmental movement. The first is the constant need for environmentalists to defend their successes and to urge new reforms to those outside the movement. He finds the second crisis—the internal crises—more pressing. He argues,

"There has emerged within the movement no single, coherent consensus regarding positive values, no widely shared vision of a future and better world in which human populations live in harmony with the natural world they inhabit" (p. 6). In identifying these crises and offering the convergence hypothesis as a solution, Norton set off a twenty-year debate about the role of pragmatism in environmental thought.

Norton argues that in spite of the lack of a shared worldview, environmentalists can rally around objective goals, "such as change in policy or the designation of a particular area as a wilderness preserve" (p. 12) and that the values that inspire these goals are relatively insignificant. Environmentalist philosophers invested in a nonanthropocentric worldview take issue with this argument. They insist that the values underlying policy or action were essential and should be the focus of environmental discourse to avoid the risk of cooptation or the loss of environmentalist aims. They refuse to agree to Norton's claim that human interests and nature's interests often intersect. Without acknowledging these intersections partnerships cannot form between those holding anthropocentric and nonanthropocentric worldviews.[30]

I side with Norton in this debate. At the same time, I sympathize with those who wish all people might hold nonanthropocentric environmental values. The truth of a diverse world is that a time will not exist in the foreseeable future where all people are persuaded to view the world outside of a hierarchy that places humans above the

---

[30] A succinct summary of the debate around Norton's hypothesis can be found in Ben Minteer's (2009) introduction to *Nature in Common*. In addition, Brian Steverson's (2009) and Baird Callicott's (2009) essay in this collection provide examples of some of the most common criticisms Norton's convergence hypothesis has faced.

nonhuman world. A pragmatic approach,[31] one that strives to find common goals for individuals who hold differing values, is needed. My contention is that environmentalists can rally around even bigger projects than single policy objectives, such as the creation of strong, civically minded communities that can sustain values across generations. Uniting around a particular objective gives the movement strength, according to Norton. It allows the movement to be inclusive of values and appeal to a broad spectrum of the public. In addition, it allows those in the movement to apply values on a case-by-case basis, creating cooperation with others who may approach those same instances from different, but overlapping value systems. A vision that focuses on creating communities will not only increase unity among environmentalists, but it also provides vision around which non-environmentalists can also rally.

What ties environmentalists together, according to Norton (1991), is a belief in scientific principles. The consensus is:

> A shared belief in scientific naturalism and its associated belief that all things in nature are related in complex, hierarchically organized systems—the commitment to scientific naturalism, its associated natural aesthetic, and to a belief that

[31] I draw on Richard Bernstein's definition of pragmatism offered by Norton (2009) in response to his critics (p. 243-246). The elements of Bernstein included in Norton's discussion are: antifoundationalism, fallibilism, the social character of the self, and recognition of radical contingency. Norton adds "an empahsis on the role of language and symbolic expression as conventional tools of understanding and communication; a rejection of representationalism in epistemology and its companion, the correspondence of truth; pragmatists emphasize action rather than pure thought" (p. 243). The pragmatism Norton outlines, "Marks the end of certainty and a rejection of a priori knowledge. One manifestation of this complex of ideas is a tendency, in discussion in the public policy arena, to favor a problem-oriented approach that expects theory to emerge from action, in specific problem contexts rather than to develop and refine theory to determine right action in specific situation" (*ibid*).

> humans evolve their personalities and cultures within environing systems that are, ultimately, shaped and limited by hierarchical constraints. (p. 239)

This consensus allows specific communities to determine how to address specific ecological problems as they emerge and alter their actions and policy as new scientific knowledge emerges (Norton, 2009, p. 240). This is essential, because “ecosystem health can be understood only in a cultural context—the land ethic is a locally determined sense of the good life, constructed with a careful and loving eye on the natural constraints imposed by the ecological and climatological context of that life” (Norton, 1991, p. 239). This scientifically based worldview prioritizes the language of ecology and ethics rather than the language of economics (p. 195), but it also allows for local communities to tailor their treatment of the environment as long as their ethical debates and actions are undertaken using ecological reasoning (pp. 194, 203).

One of the key components of Norton’s convergence hypothesis is that “it can be pluralistic, even while seeking to develop a shared worldview—it may turn out that environmentalists have considerable freedom of intellectual choice regarding the philosophical aspects of a worldview” (p. 92). Managing that freedom of intellectual choice requires training to weigh the various elements involved in making a just decision. Norton explains:

> All environmentalists, regardless of their allegiance to diverging traditions, must seek to manage the entire mosaic that is the American landscape. If we are to maintain the productivity of American agriculture *and* protect biological diversity, if we are to maintain adequate water supplies for homes and industry *and* preserve some wild scenic rivers, if we are to provide sufficient opportunities for outdoor

> activities *and* preserve the pristine nature of wilderness areas, we must make large-scale land use decisions with an eye to their larger context. A landscape that can accommodate all of the varied aspirations of Americans will have to be a patchy landscape, in which urban elements, productive elements, and pristine are arranged intelligently. (pp. 188-189)

In addition to Norton's five axioms of scientific knowledge that prescribe ecosystem health (p. 193), individuals will need the training to weigh the various decisions, claims, and interests in order to choose the correct mode of action in a given situation.[32] Establishing strong communities that hold this scientific knowledge as equally important to the civic knowledge needed to engage in debates over environmental action is essential to furthering our ability to live well with the non-human world and with each other.

Norton explains that because of their reactive approach, environmentalists lack a "positive vision for the future" (p. 206). This is a criticism environmentalists seem to have taken to heart. Since the original publication of *Towards Unity Among Environmentalists*, it seems some have decided to offer a positive vision. Texts like *Cradle to Cradle* offers hope that technological and industrial innovation can produce a healthier environment and sustainable world (McDonough & Braungart, 2002).

---

[32] In the twenty years since proposing the convergence hypothesis, Norton (2009) has come to hope that such training might lead to a deliberative process in which the hypothesis would no longer be useful and that a deliberative process that allows for the exchange of various values may erase the dualistic thinking that makes it necessary. He writes of his efforts in *Sustainability*, "I tried to reform our language for discussing environmental values and policy and proposed that, once my linguistic scrubbing of old, vestigal, dualistic categories is complete, the [convergence hypothesis] will no longer be essential. I tried, that is, to propose a pluralistic vocabulary rich enough to include all people and all values in a deliberative process, and set out to replace the illusory separation of humans from nature that originated in dualistic metaphysics and still infects our language today with a pluralistic but procedural approach to hearing and integrating multiple values through deliberative process and social learning" (pp. 258-259).

Environmentalist authors, such as Barbara Kingsolver (2007) in *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle*, have written celebratory pieces about living life more conscious of your choices and their impact on the environment. And many environmental philosophers have avoided apocalyptic rhetoric in favor of imagined futures better than our current reality. These futures address asymmetrical global power structures (Dobson, 2003). They are futures where an unorganized network of activism is making the world a better place (Hawken, 2007). And they are futures where strong communities provide security and justice for their members and the global community (Curtin, 1999; Heise, 2008; McKibben, 2007)

The creation of these strong communities can be that positive vision Norton pleads with environmentalists to develop. Rather than being reactive, environmentalists can take a proactive position, becoming the driving force behind the creation of civically minded communities.[33] This approach will help environmentalists evolve to address what Norton refers to as "third-generation problems," those that are global and require "paying close attention to larger and larger, and more and more inclusive systems" (p. 214). Without an attention to building such communities, sustainability and intergenerational justice are impossible goals, because people will not have the tools necessary to advocate for these values in deliberation, let alone act or create policy with such principles in

---

[33] Though some would argue environmentalists have already taken up this call, it seems to me that the call has been taken up primarily by environmental philosophers and not as the foundational environmentalist project. The debates over environmental citizenship, ecological citizenship, sustainability citizenship, etc. certainly highlight important theoretical questions involved in citizenship and the environment, but they are not moving us closer to creating communities equipped to foster a citizenship that can address the most pressing of environmental issues. These debates must now take a back seat to the discussions about what communities that would be capable of productive environmental action should look like and what we need to do to create such places.

mind. Norton writes, "If we pay no heed to the context in which future generations form and question their values, they will indeed live in a different world than we do; we will have contributed nothing to their culture; we will be strangers across only two generations" (p. 219).

Others besides Norton have pointed to the importance of having a strong positive vision (Nordhaus & Shellenberger, 2007), and still others have pointed to the need for strong community and strong political systems in which various philosophies and ethics can be navigated to address environmental issues. I will go into more detail about this later in the chapter, but here it seems important to discuss why new communities and political systems are necessary. Rolf Lidskog and Elander Ingemar (2007) contend three challenges to democracy and traditional ideas of justice currently exist: the need for global justice, international justice, and biospheric egalitarianism. They explain:

> The situation is therefore such that environmental problems are transnational and non-local in character, while current democratic political structures are territorial and nationally anchored. Not only are the problems unbounded, many of the activities and actors causing environmental problems are also non-local in the sense that they are not subordinated to territorially organised politics. (p. 77)

They continue, explaining that it is not just space that challenges traditional understandings of democracy and justice, but also time (p. 79), the fact that many of the effects of environmental problems will not reach their peak until years and decades after they are caused. They write:

> There is a need for a system with global accountability, where even actors with few resources have the opportunity to influence questions that affect them. In

> such a system, the question of responsibility and respect for future generations and non-human species will be discussed and taken into account when making decisions. (p. 91)

Due to the fact that environmental issues, as well as other political issues, such as health, economic, and civil rights concerns, have effects beyond the scope of specific localities and times, we must begin to consider endeavoring on a project that will create a lasting foundation on which to discuss and address the most pressing issues facing society.

One of the problems with existing calls for community building is that they focus on "what an ideal society is, not on how to achieve it" (Prugh, Constanza, & Daly, 2000, p. 44). In the next section of the chapter, I analyze two case studies that begin to get at the question of how we bring such communities into existence. In part, these communities can emerge around activities and policies designed to address specific concerns, such as food politics and obesity, but overall, the aim must be to create strong communities by constructing networks of interested parties aiming toward similar goals and/or united by shared values.

Local Food Movements and Community Building

The building of strong local communities will help to produce citizens capable of engaging the hard questions posed by environmental issues; strong local participation has the potential to train individuals in the means of citizenship necessary to tackle both local and global environmental problems (Hiskes, 2009, p. 119). The local food movement is one project that environmentalists and social justice activists have undertaken, and it is a project that has community at the center. As Orrin Williams (2005) writes, "Food and

farming offer a unifying point for a movement that is multicultural, anti-racist, and anti-sexist and that embraces all aspects of the environmental justice movement" (p. 127).

Michael Pollan (2010) provides a brief history of the emergence of the "food movement. "Or perhaps I should say 'movements,'" he writes, "since it is unified as yet by little more than the recognition that industrial food production is in need of reform because its social/environmental/public health/animal welfare/gastronomic costs are too high." Despite the various reasons for becoming a food activist, Pollan contends that the movement "coalesces around the recognition that today's food and farming economy is 'unsustainable'—that it can't go in its current form much longer without courting a breakdown of some kind, whether environmental, economic, or both."

I examine two different approaches to the food movement. McKibben's *Deep Economy* begins with the desire to address economic and environmental concerns, whereas Obama's Let's Move campaign begins from a desire to address public health issues. What we see in the comparison of these two discourses is that regardless of the reason for entering the food movement, at the heart it is "about community, identity, pleasure, and most notably carving out a new social and economic space removed from the influence of big corporations on the one side and government on the other" (Pollan, 2010). In short, they show that community is the ideal around which a diverse movement can converge. The convergence must happen in a way that avoids sentimentalism and nostalgia of a past imperfect era. If the movement creates a vision of a new type of community that borrows from the strengths of the past, prepares its members to exist in the new global world, and faces pressing social issues, it can become the political project environmentalists need.

Bill McKibben's Deep Economy

McKibben has been addressing environmental concerns since the 1980s, writing *The End of Nature* in 1989, the first book for a popular audience on global warming. Since then he has been a leading U.S. environmentalist, engaging in activism and writing aimed at finding solutions to global environmental crises. *Deep Economy* (2007) approaches this project by arguing for a different society, one built on local economies and strong community ties. The book combats the negative effects of an ever-expanding economy and loss of community. McKibben identifies three challenges to our fixation on growth that we must recognize: growth creates inequality rather than prosperity, we are running out of energy to keep the growth going, and growth no longer makes us happy (p. 11). As he develops his argument, he returns again and again to the theme of happiness. He delves into the specific logistics of the economy and communities he seeks to establish, but his primary goal is happiness. He wants to create a system that works for people in contrast to the existing system for which people work. Creating a system that will bring happiness to community members will require redefining resources, growth, and progress. I look at these redefinitions in detail. I begin with a look at the complexity of McKibben's argument and some concerns about his proposal.

The strength of McKibben's argument is his ability to address the variety of issues at play in his concern with our current approach to community and the economy. He seamlessly moves from issues of social interaction (pp. 83-84) to strengthening local economies (p. 91), health (p. 85), maintaining cultural traditions (pp. 83-86), farm subsidies (pp. 86-87), and food quality (p. 90). McKibben begins his discussion of local economies by discussing food production, but as he moves further into his argument, he

introduces other industries he believes might be localized, such as communication (radio), energy (p. 151), architecture (pp. 158-162), and currency (pp. 162-164). Here we see that local food is even more intricate than originally thought. In addition to bringing together environmental, health, economic, and cultural concerns, it has the potential to be a catalyst and model for other types of local economies.

Because of the complexity of the issues at play, McKibben argues, local agriculture is the project for which environmentalists and those concerned with food issues have been searching. Unlike organic food:

> "Local" will be harder to co-opt, because Del Monte and its ilk simply can't grow different food in every market; if they tried, their economies of scale would disappear. "Local" steps far enough outside current conventional economics to represent a real challenge. (p. 89)

McKibben calls for an exodus from the global economic structure. One might question who has the power to make such an exodus and what effect it might have on the global community. McKibben's proposal primarily has relevance for developed nations, particularly the United States. Developing nations, on the other hand, cannot afford to remove themselves from the global structure, because this structure provides food to citizens and furthers types of needed economic development. McKibben acknowledges that the local communities for which he calls are needed in U.S. society because it has reached the threshold where more money will not make its citizens happier.[34] In

[34] This generalized claim does ignore that there are communities in U.S. society who continue to live economically disadvantaged lives. In many ways, McKibben's proposal is one that only the already advantaged have the luxury of adopting in the immediate or near future. That said, one might contend that if local communities and economies became the prevalent mode of U.S. communities, that the costs of living such a lifestyle

developing and poverty-ridden nations a larger per capita income could exponentially increase the quality of individuals' lives. But, what will make people happier in wealthy societies are more and stronger relationships with others in their communities.

Does McKibben's proposal have the ability to benefit communities globally? Yes, the communities he imagines may have smaller ecological footprints and may provide happiness to their community members, but will they really make a dent in global environmental or food crises? Or will these communities even continue to view themselves as part of a larger global community? In other words, how does such a local focus make an impact in a global world? I will address these questions throughout this analysis, concluding that while McKibben's proposal offers a beginning for framing a community-building project, caution must also be used so that local communities are not constructed in isolation from their global position.

McKibben's text argues for radical social change, one that ensures sustainability and provides a community that sustains just values between generations. He is able to make this radical claim and present his approach as one of moderation by redefining resources, growth, and progress. For McKibben, intergenerational justice involves passing down a set of values and community systems that place human happiness at the forefront and challenge the importance of an ever-growing economy.

Resources, in *Deep Economy*, are any elements of a community that can increase human happiness rather than elements that are used to create consistent economic growth and profit. One way McKibben redefines resources is by looking at what we gain from

---

may become affordable to all segments of society helping to combat the economic inequality that seems ever-growing in our current system.

moving to a local food system. He frames the potential drawbacks of eating locally as strengths:

> Eating this way has come at a cost. Not in health or in money (if anything, I've spent less than usual, since I haven't bought a speck of processed food) but in time. I've had to think about every meal, instead of wandering through the world on autopilot, ingesting random calories. I've had to pay attention. But the payoff for that cost has been immense, a web of connections I'd never known about. I've gotten to eat with my brain as well as my tongue; every meal comes with a story. The geography of the valley now means something much more real to me. I've met dozens of people I wouldn't otherwise have known. (p. 94)

The above passage is a conversion narrative. After opening himself to the experience, mindfully engaging in the local food economy, just as one might mindfully throw himself into a spiritual experience, McKibben found a community in which he belonged. Eating locally, being part of the community, and consciously making the decision to think about the food one ingests do take time, just as doing one's religious duty. McKibben is offering a secular religious experience and the sense of belonging and security that comes with associating with a religious community. Rather than framing things that increase efficiency and speed as the greatest resource, McKibben channels religious rhetoric to elevate community, personal connection, and experience in the resource hierarchy.

Another rhetorical move McKibben uses is categorizing people as resources by comparing them to the non-renewable and scarce resources currently driving our economy. He explains that while one farmer can farm thousands of acres with enough chemicals and oil, most places do not have endless supplies necessary for such farming.

Rather they have “no shortage of farmers” (p. 198). In these redefinitions of resources, McKibben begins putting humans at the center of concern. Viewing resources this way moves us toward an economy that works for humans and as a side effect has the potential to address democratic, environmental, health, and financial issues. The first of these issues can be embarked upon simply by living locally, celebrating the resources one gains in a local food economy, and creating the strong communities needed to support local economies. Environmental and health progress are byproducts of this system. Food that travels shorter distances is fresher, healthier, and typically uses fewer chemicals and fuel to produce and transport. Addressing financial issues is another byproduct of this type of local economy, but it can be seen more clearly when looking at how McKibben redefines the ideas of growth and progress.

In order to accept McKibben’s redefinitions of growth and progress, one must first accept his view that the environment and economy are not inherent enemies. Instead, we need to create an economy where the two can further each other. He explains, “You can’t get richer, at least for long, by impoverishing the world around you. This insight is so clear that, sooner rather than later, all economists will almost certainly embrace it in their work” (p. 29). McKibben asks, “What does richer mean? Even if I am getting richer, am I getting happier?” (p. 30). These questions lead McKibben to redefine growth and progress, taking them out of traditional economic approaches that emphasize profit and continued expansion and putting them in a framework that includes measures of happiness and health. Again, McKibben draws on religious discourse, particularly messages from the Judeo-Christian tradition that preach about the perversion of wealth. The religious concepts of tithing and charity are both concepts driven by the idea of

sacrificing unneeded wealth for the strengthening of community, with the underlying assumption that engaging in such acts will get the actor closer to some type of spiritual or eternal happiness. Because McKibben's proposal is secular, the concept of a happy afterlife is absent from his discussion of focusing less on wealth and more on community. The sense that one might achieve happiness in her own community by, for example, choosing to support local farmers by spending a bit more for groceries at the local cooperative, is a similar promise.

Rather than economic growth, McKibben argues, we need to focus on the growth of communities that foster both strong economies (not built on constant growth) and sustainable environments. Progress is defined as our ability to move forward with a society that fosters human connection, strives to increase happiness, and upholds values that address social problems that are currently decreasing happiness. To make the argument for a new type of growth, McKibben must show the negative effects of our current approach to the economy including poor treatment of workers and national security risks (pp. 52-67). His largest concern, in the vein of the questions Rachel Carson posed, seems to be with what the existing economy has done to us as human beings. He writes, "Perhaps the very act of acquiring so much stuff has turned us ever more into individuals and ever less into members of a community, isolating us in a way that runs contrary to our most basic instincts" (p. 37).

To reclaim our humanity and grow a just society we need strong local economies, based in strong democratic communities, because then what grows is human happiness. McKibben explains, "We need to once again depend on those around us for something real. If we do, then the bonds that make for human satisfaction, as opposed to endless

growth, will begin to reemerge" (p. 128). McKibben turns to talk of "growing" democracy, by commenting on the importance of town hall meetings, what he calls, "a school for educating students about student affairs: for making them citizens" (p. 169). McKibben does not posit a universal definitions of community, happiness, or growth that every community should adopt. He writes

> The point is not 'Old ways good, new ways bad.' Rather, each locality, instead of relying solely on Adam Smith as filtered through the World Trade Organization and the World Bank, needs to figure out what its mix of tradition and resources and hopes allows" (p. 217).

This democratic education he call for will allow each citizen to participate in defining what happiness and growth mean for his or her locality through deliberation and a consideration of options.

In addition to increasing our happiness, these smaller democratic strongholds are necessary for a practical reason: they will allow us to solve some of the world's most pressing problems. McKibben contends:

> It's not the U.S. federal government, for instance, that's done anything about global warming. Instead, cities and states have been active: San Francisco adopting a commitment to solar power, California cutting auto emissions, seven eastern states banding together to control power plant emissions. States have taken the lead on everything from stem cell research to medical marijuana to the right to die. Figuring out the right level on which to work often means figuring out the economics.

We must, he explains, find "economies of scale" that "will support a standard of living most of us can be happy with, yet not overwhelm the earth's physical systems" (p. 172).

The reliance on "us" and "we" throughout McKibben's rhetoric, paired with the focus on local activism and policy, deemphasizes the institutional nature of the global economic and political structures. McKibben's proposal is people-centered. While calling for the strengthening of communities, McKibben is retaining individuality. Rather than the lone individual of a liberal political philosophy, however, this is an individual situated in a community. This individual is one with a place to voice her opinions and a sense of security that others will support her if the need arises. The system McKibben imagines is a collection, a web of interconnected nodes, one that mirrors the technology representative of our current era—the Internet. He writes, "The small nodes hook together into something much larger, but not so monolithic it can't easily hive off into new sites and communities and forums." If the local economies McKibben imagines can be connected like the Internet, we can grow a global system of communities that are not parochial or closed off from the world. This, for McKibben, is progress.

Does everyone have the ability to enter into this network? McKibben does not account for those communities that do not have the resources to sustain healthy local economies. Both domestically and globally communities exist without the money or resources to grow their own food or provide their own power. What obligation do communities with these abilities have to provide assistance to those who lack them? McKibben's communities are not insular, but they also are not presented as having significant obligation to others. Connecting with others, as one does on the Internet, suggests these communities might also disconnect at any moment of their choosing. One

is bound to other members of one's community through daily interaction and a desire to sustain a happy and healthy life, but loose connections with other communities do not encourage the same accountability.

The current model of global interaction, illustrated by methods such as the Green Revolution, an effort to provide food to poverty-ridden nations while indebting the people of these nation to global agribusiness (p. 206), clearly is not just or fully addressing global inequities, but McKibben's model does not offer an alternative to address global food crises and these methods have helped to feed those who need food. I agree with McKibben's contention that:

> The poor nations of the world need to develop. But if they develop according to our model, the planet will break under the strain. We in the rich nations need to change, not just for environmental reasons but because our way has stopped producing as much human happiness as it should. That middle ground is hard to define, and we will take generations to reach it, because we start so far apart. But it is more local than the world we know now, and less individualistic. (p. 226)

But we need to more critically think through how to construct local communities that have obligations to other localities, recognizing that, often by chance (Nussbaum, 1994), they have been given the privilege of living somewhere where the creation of local economies is possible.

Defining growth and progress as creating communities that are able to produce more health and happiness is radical, but McKibben presents it in a way that allows it to seem moderate. Through his use of evidence, acknowledgement of time, presentation of his approach as apolitical, and attacking hyper-individualism, he proposes a type of

society in *Deep Economy* that can be seen as the moderate solution to our radical, unbalanced contemporary society. McKibben's message has the potential to reach a variety of individuals, including non-environmentalists, because of how he balances the evidence of his argument. In one passage about the benefit of small farms over large corporate farms McKibben includes first hand testimony of a small farmer alongside scientific conclusions from the USDA Census of Agriculture (p. 67). His own experience living locally in Vermont is partnered with accounts of local living he has witnessed around the world. McKibben uses economic, psychological, and scientific evidence. Like Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, *Deep Economy* is a collection of data that makes arguing against its position difficult.[35]

The sense of moderation continues to emerge in the framing of his argument. He does not demand that everyone eat locally at all times or that people should be figuring out how to survive using the resources of only their small corner of the earth. He only argues that we must know what is available to use in our spaces and place value on that by emphasizing it, acknowledging it, and working to create a community that supports the use of our local resources. He states, "We don't need to become Amish, but we do need to start building an economy that works for our current needs, rather than constantly readjusting our lives to serve the growth of the economy" (p. 112). The readjustment he seeks is not going to be immediate. He explains:

---

[35] This is not to say that McKibben has not had his critics. Even in praising the focus and research that went into the text, Jeffrey Tannenbaum (2007) states the book is "given to one-sidedness and oversimplification." Lance Morrow (2007) also refuses to dismiss McKibben's work outright but raises caution about its "Vermontlichkeit." The most common criticism is that the book is utopian or "overly optimistic" (Deep Economy, 2001 January 1).

> I am not suggesting an abrupt break with the present, but a patient rebalancing of the scales. The project will not be fast, cheap, or easy. Fast, cheap, and easy is what we have at the moment; they are the cardinal virtues upon which our economy rests (and if they also happen to be the very adjectives you don't want attached to your child, well, that should give you a little pause). (p. 120)

Getting to our current position has taken time; it will take time to get us to the balanced society for which McKibben calls, a society where "happiness" not "efficiency" is the god term.

In addition to the evidence used to make his argument and admitting that creating a society that produces happiness will take time, McKibben emphasizes the moderate nature of his position by presenting it as apolitical. He writes:

> These changes I'm discussing are not, as far as I'm concerned, ideological. They aren't liberal or conservative, Democratic or Republican; social conservatives and environmentalist progressives could find common ground in them. At the risk of betraying my background as a Sunday school teacher, let me say that these changes seem to me, at least in some measure, to be compatible with strong faith. (*ibid*)

Local food, small economies, and furthering strong communities have elements that appeal to individuals throughout the political spectrum. As discussed above, they can even be framed in a religious fashion. Though individuals may come to agree with the argument and project for various reasons and/or values, they can be united by a shared goal of creating strong communities, furthering happiness, and finding common civic ethics.

Finally, moderation is emphasized most strongly when McKibben identifies the main target of his concern—hyper-individualism. McKibben acknowledges that individualization in the last 500 years has made great gains for liberty and social equality but that we have taken individualization too far, coming into an era in which community is no longer necessary and individuals have become isolated from each other (p. 98). A belief in pure rationality and self-interest as motivation ignores that individuals are motivated by other values, such as love and obligation. McKibben offers his vision of local economies as a way to move away from hyper-individualism; this vision is, he argues, a "more hopeful version of the future" (p. 105). He writes:

> A tomato from the small farmer at the end of your suburban road takes less fuel to transport, and a tomato from the farmer at the end of your suburban road tastes better. But it's more than that—it's better because it comes from a…farmer down at the end of your suburban road. Getting that tomato—from his farmstand, from a farmers' market, from your CSA share, even from a bin at an enlightened supermarket—requires you to live with a stronger sense of community in mind. Requires that you shed a certain amount of your hyper-individualism and replace it with a certain amount of neighborliness. It *doesn't* require that you join a commune or become a socialist. If we let go of a little bit of our individualism (at the moment, we have plenty to spare), we may recover something we've been missing. (p. 105)

McKibben presents his approach as reclaiming a social balance that has been lost. The ability of his proposal to address a number of interconnected social concerns and radically alter the lives of people, redefining resources, growth, and progress in order to

bring them happiness is certainly laudable. It is a project around which environmentalists can rally in order to put forward a hopeful future, rather than continuing a reactive policy of social activism. That said, we must be cautious about constructing "community" as a God-term and waxing nostalgic about the value of small communities that have historically been supportive of their members while also at times being insular and oppressive. McKibben's talk of moderation and balance touches on this, but environmentalists, if they adopt creating strong communities as a project, will have to put the questions raised by such concerns at the forefront. The second analysis addresses this nostalgia somewhat more explicitly, while also pointing to the complexity of the issues involved in food politics and presenting the strengthening of local communities as a moderate approach to pressing social concerns.

Michelle Obama's Let's Move! Campaign

Launched on February 9, 2010, Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign was designed to "solve the challenge of childhood obesity within a generation" (U.S. Government, Learn the Facts, 2010 February 10). At first glance it may seem strange to classify the campaign as an element of the local food movement, but its aims to erase food deserts, provide healthier school lunches, and increase the amount of farmer's markets are all shared by members of the local food movement. The desire to create healthier lives for children affected by obesity makes the campaign inherently intergenerational and the goal of the campaign is to sustain a healthy society; thus, the ideas of Let's Move can be looked at for how they speak to intergenerational justice and sustainability. The campaign actually has its roots in a vegetable garden dug and planted by Obama and local school children from Bancroft Elementary almost a year prior to the

campaign's official launch. It consists of organic vegetables. The students helped work the garden, returned to harvest vegetables, and learned to cook with them. The planting of this garden began Obama's discourse on the importance of community gardens and sustainable gardening practices (Burros, 2009; Shapely, 2009).

Though these community gardens have become a secondary element of Let's Move, Obama has constructed a campaign that calls for networks of strong local communities to address a complex set of issues ranging from children's health to national security. In this section, I analyze the discourse of Michelle Obama's speech that launched the campaign, the press release from the White House announcing the campaign, the campaign's website, and the partnership Let's Move has formed with WalMart. Obama's rhetoric focuses on community and highlights the complexity of the issues involved in addressing obesity. This analysis highlights the caution that must be used in constructing locally based movements so that they recognize the tendency of such appeals to foster nostalgia and avoid cooptation that weakens their potential to create more just and sustainable communities.

Let's Move has four elements: (1) offering parents the tools and information they need to help combat obesity in their children, (2) strengthening the Child Nutrition Act to improve nutrition at kids' schools, (3) eliminating food deserts in America within seven years, and (4) finding new ways for children to be physically active. The campaign is a national effort, but it is based on local communities and families creating the environments needed to bring about healthy change. It is "comprehensive, collaborative, and community-oriented" (The White House, 2010 February 9). The campaign is designed as a network of invested individuals and organizations; the elements of the

network are mobilized by the Partnership for a Healthier America, a foundation "encouraging, tracking, and communicating commitments to healthier lifestyles from partner organizations" (U.S. Government, The Partnership, 2010 February 9). The campaign's website targets seven specific groups in its "Take Action" section: parents, schools, community leaders, chefs, elected officials, kids, and health care providers (U.S. Government, Take Action, 2010 February 9), providing each group with an action plan to help tackle the epidemic. The connected web of involvement is a common theme of the campaign. Obama (2010 February 9) states:

> Let's move to help families and communities make healthier decisions for their kids. Let's move to bring together governors and mayors, doctors and nurses, businesses, community groups, educators, athletes, Moms and Dads to tackle this challenge once and for all. And that's why we're here today—to launch "Let's Move"—a campaign that will rally our nation to achieve a single, ambitious goal: solving the problem of childhood obesity in a generation, so that children born today will reach adulthood at a healthy weight.

In contrast to McKibben's discussion of local movements, this campaign provides a central institution guiding localized activities. But like McKibben's campaign, the global questions of food are not addressed. Obama's focus is children in the United States. The campaign is national in scope, tackling an epidemic that can only exist in wealthy nations where food is in abundance and manual labor (i.e., carrying water for miles, working a family garden, or walking miles to the nearest town) is rarely needed to maintain one's life. How Obama's model might translate to target a global food crisis—mainly malnutrition or starvation—is unclear. The question remains, can a locally based food

system account for global food politics? It may be that a local system in wealthy nations would leave resources available to help address food crises globally, but these current locally based attempts have not dealt with the global question in a sophisticated manner. As an environmentalist community building project is undertaken, these concerns would need to move to the forefront more than they are currently.

Let's Move places the blame for obesity on various areas of society, including schools, homes, business, and communities; thus, individuals from each of these sectors must play a role in combating the epidemic. Obama recognizes obesity as a symptom of a broader social problem, the loss of a society that emphasizes community and family. Our fast-paced culture that values efficiency, the quick and easy, over human relationships and health is the cause of the epidemic. Obama states:

> Like many of you, when I was young, we walked to school every day, rain or shine—and in Chicago, we did it in wind, sleet, hail and snow, too. Remember how, at school, we had recess twice a day and gym class twice a week, and we spent hours running around outside when school got out. You didn't go inside until dinner was ready—and when it was, we would gather around the table for dinner as a family. And there was one simple rule: you ate what Mom fixed—good, bad, or ugly. Kids had absolutely no say in what they felt like eating. If you didn't like it, you were welcome to go to bed hungry. Back then fast food was a treat, and dessert was mainly a Sunday affair.

Let's Move seeks to bring some of this past approach back into existence.

Such an approach could be seen as sentimentalizing an era that was problematic when it comes to issues of social justice. The era of which Obama speaks is one where

communities were often insular, sometimes comprised of members fearful of those unlike themselves. For better or worse, community members policed social norms, and often individual freedom was sacrificed for stability within communities. In addition, the experience Obama details above never existed as the universal American experience. It was a middle class experience, one that could not be achieved my families whose parents worked multiple jobs to keep a roof over their families' heads or where children spent their leisure time working to contribute to the family income. The nostalgia with which Obama speaks of this era must be approached with care. Certainly, the scene Obama describes has its virtues, but advocating for the strengthening of local communities must be done in a way that draws on these virtues, while leaving behind the downfalls of the era and constructing communities and ways of life attainable by all citizens.

Obama acknowledges the longer work hours and higher prices of produce facing American families today that make the scene above difficult to achieve for any family. She even admits to being caught up in the fast-paced, fast food lifestyle until her pediatrician told her to take more control over what her children ate. She explains, "That was a moment of truth for me. It was a wake-up call that I was the one in charge" (*ibid*). Here Obama, as she has done so expertly throughout her husband's presidential campaign and presidency, presents herself as an average American. In spite of her Harvard law degree, high socioeconomic status, and current White House address, like her love of talking about her moderately priced clothing, the quote above suggests she not only understands the "American experience;" she has lived it. Her role as First Lady has given her the opportunity to begin this campaign, but she is undertaking it as a citizen just like those who might choose to join her.

Obama recognizes we cannot go back to that place where families let their children run around the neighborhood every afternoon and sat around the table together every night, but she says we can use those values to shape a community-wide approach that adapts the values of that time to fit contemporary society and alters society in small ways to support those values. Her approach, like McKibben's, is a plan of moderation. She states:

> This isn't about trying to turn the clock back to when we were kids, or preparing five course meals from scratch every night. No one has time for that. And it's not about being 100 percent perfect 100 percent of the time. Lord knows I'm not. There's a place for cookies and ice cream, burgers and fries—that's part of childhood [….] It's just about balance. (*ibid*)

Her message is also about political moderation. She explains:

> This isn't about politics. There's nothing Democratic or Republican, liberal or conservative, about doing what's best for our kids. And I've spoken with many experts about this issue, and not a single one has said that the solution is to have government tell people what to do. Instead, I'm talking about what we can do. I'm talking about commonsense steps we can take in our families and communities to help our kids lead active, healthy lives. (*ibid*)

The solution Obama offers is not overarching; it is "no one-size-fits-all solution," which is what opens the campaign to support from a wide swath of the population. The words "families" and "communities" are used multiple times throughout the launch speech. The solutions to the epidemic will be found in these local places. She lauds the efforts of those already working in their localities to build more sidewalks, parks, playgrounds, and

community gardens. She praises Will Allen, a community leader who has brought farmer's markets to underserved areas. And, she acknowledges food industry leaders for signing on to be part of the solution to the epidemic. The press release announcing the campaign states, "[Let's Move] will take into account how life is really lived in communities across the country—encouraging, supporting, and pursuing solutions that are tailored to children and families facing a wide range of challenges and life circumstances" (The White House, 2010). Those in the campaign are doing more than finding solutions to a health epidemic; they are redesigning communities and their values.

Local activism is most emphasized in part three of the campaign. Erasing food deserts requires examining the options available in local places and devising plans that use existing access to stores and the introduction of new food options to food desert areas. Obama (2010 February 9) states:

> Today, for the very first time, we're making a commitment to eliminate food deserts in America—and we plan to do so within seven years. Now, we know this is ambitious. And it will take a serious commitment from both government and the private sector. That's why we plan to invest $400 million a year in a Healthy Food Financing initiative that will bring grocery stores to underserved areas and help places like convenience stores carry healthier food options. And this initiative won't just help families eat better, it will help create jobs and revitalize neighborhoods across America.

This part of the campaign addresses some social justice concerns involved in food politics. It also is the place in the campaign where environmental concerns are implicitly connected to the obesity epidemic. This connection is never explicitly acknowledged by

the campaign, but increasing the ability to eat local food has multiple environmental consequences, such as decreasing the "food miles" involved in transporting food from distant places, which may also decrease the amount of CO_2 emitted into the atmosphere.

The complexity of the obesity epidemic can begin to be examined by looking at the effects felt by obese children. Obama states, "This isn't just about inches and pounds or how our kids look. It's about how our kids feel, and how they feel about themselves. It's about the impact we're seeing on every aspect of their lives" (*ibid*). Obesity is primarily a physical health concern, but it has emotional and psychological effects that must also be recognized.

The complicated effects of the obesity epidemic extend beyond the realm of children's overall health. Obama justifies the campaign by showing how the epidemic has external effects on the general state of society. The epidemic raises concerns about education and health care when Obama states, "If kids aren't getting adequate nutrition, even the best textbooks and teachers in the world won't help them learn. It they don't have safe places to run and play, and they wind up with obesity-related conditions, then those health care costs will just keep rising" (*ibid*). Children are the central concern of the campaign, making it inherently intergenerational in scope, and these discussions of economic impacts reinforce this. She repeats this latter idea later in the speech: "Economic experts tell us that we're spending outrageous amounts of money treating obesity-related conditions like diabetes, heart disease and cancer. And public health experts tell us the current generation could actually be on track to have a shorter lifespan than their parents." This campaign seeks to do justice to those who are affected by the mistakes of the generations that have come before them. Those who participated in the

development of a society that left strong communities behind must now step up and reclaim a healthier way of life so as not to continue doing injustice to those who come after them.

The string of issues involved in the obesity epidemic culminates in the traditional governmental appeal of national security. Obama explains, "Military leaders report that obesity is now one of the most common disqualifiers for military service" (*ibid*). If the values on which Obama builds the campaign are not enough to reach across the political spectrum to gain support for the campaign, the wide-range of issues tied to the epidemic of obesity should be. Whether one is concerned with social justice and poverty issues, the economic problems caused by health care, or national security, a reason exists for any individual to contribute to the campaign by working to rebuild strong communities that promote healthy living.

The initial organic garden tended by Obama and local community children is a far cry from where the movement stands currently. One of the campaign's most notable partners is WalMart, often held up as a prime example by those who contend corporations are destroying the fabric of community (McKibben, 2007; Sandel, 1996, p. 334). Working with Let's Move, the company developed a Nutrition Charter, a three-part project designed to challenge childhood obesity. The three elements are: improving nutrition in its packaged foods by 2015, making healthy foods affordable, and using a "healthy seal" to "empower consumers" to make better choices (Mulligan, 2011).

Obama announced the partnering on January 20, 2011, in a speech touting the pairing as proof that "yes, we can" solve the epidemic. She states:

> Efforts like this show us that yes, we can improve how we make and sell food in this country. We can do that. And we can feed our kids better. Yes, we can give parents better information so that they can make better decisions for their families. We can do this.

The phrase that marked her husbands' presidential campaign is repeated in her speech, allowing her to tie into the feelings of hope that the phrase had inspired and present the partnership as a victory in the challenge she has waged against the obesity epidemic.

But is such a partnership really a victory? Can partnerships with global corporations with a history of destroying local economies and treating workers poorly help construct the strong communities Obama suggested as essential when she launched the campaign. Even Obama seems conscious that such a partnership has the potential to weaken the initial aims of her campaign. After identifying WalMart's CEO Bill Simon as a great asset to the campaign, she reminds us individuals such as Simon care about the effects of obesity on "our nation's children" not as corporate executives but "as parents and grandparents" (Obama, 2011 January 20). Downplaying the corporate nature of WalMart, Obama seeks to humanize those with which she is working. The majority of her announcement speech, in fact, presents the many strides that have been taken in communities across the country to fight obesity. WalMart becomes secondary to the parents, doctors, educators, and politicians across the country trying to teach about and provide healthier lifestyle choices for children.

The campaign began with a project of making healthy food available to all Americans. Though this healthy food was not always designated as local and organic, initial discussion of the epidemic and healthier food did include placing greater emphasis

on local, organic food. One of the strength of a local community structure McKibben pointed to above was the inability of institutions such as WalMart to co-opt the movement. If they attempted, for example to sell local produce, it would require a major shift in business practices and contribute to the strengthening of local economies rather than the global economies within which WalMart currently exists. Local produce, however, does not appear in the discourse about the relationship. One report states, "WalMart also wants to revise its supply chain to lower costs on healthy foods and ultimately make them more affordable" (Hagan, 2011), but the details of the revisions are unclear. One might assume the revisions could be a shift toward using more local produce, which would align with WalMart's announcement in fall of 2010 that it would "double the percentage of locally grown produce it sells to 9 percent" (Clifford, 2010).

A shift to local food as part of the Let's Move/WalMart association would have the potential to significantly alter the economic structures of food production and consumption. WalMart's size makes it one of the few social institutions whose purchasing practices can actually alter social and economic structures, potentially providing a place for corporate cooperation in a project to build stronger communities. However, it has yet to be seen how the partnership will play out in this instance. Nine percent is a good starting point for WalMart's local food efforts, but that percentage will not alter the food, social, or economic landscapes enough to create the strong, locally based communities that should be central to an environmentalist project. The absence of local and organic food in the discourse introducing the partnership is a bit disparaging. It suggests that rather than strengthening local communities, WalMart may be using the

movement to strengthen its bottom line. This could cause the movement to lose the more radical claims conceived at its inception.

Comparing McKibben's *Deep Economy* and Obama's Let's Move campaign points to the strength of appeals built on establishing strong communities. The focus on strong community values and networks of action allows radical change to be presented as a moderate proposal. In addition, these community-based projects have the potential to address a wide variety of interrelated issues from health to economic, environmental to national security. The two campaigns analyzed here are really not that different. At the heart of each is a drive to reclaim a lost sense of community that holds people responsible to one another, reminds us of our interdependency, and passes down healthy values through generations. These proposals are both about intergenerational justice and sustainability. They have the ability to redefine what we see as resources and what we value as growth and progress.

The strength of these community initiatives to appeal to a wide variety of people should not be gained, however, from idealizing a past that may have had stronger community ties but less social freedom and less social justice. We must be assured that the community initiatives supported by an environmentalist vision for the future also address existing issues of social justice and inequality. Of the two projects analyzed here, Obama's campaign identifies this most explicitly, highlighting the need to solve the problem of food deserts and increase access to farmer's markets. But we must go further. The values we choose to sustain and pass down to future generations through strong communities must consistently draw on a desire to further issues of equality, democracy, and justice. At times, the emphasis on these values may threaten the wide appeal of

community-based movements, but even as environmentalists seek to envision a practical and hopeful vision for the future, they must remember to maintain a certain level of idealism and set boundaries on what they will and will not compromise. At this point, I turn to existing discussions of sustainability and intergenerational justice to demonstrate that the questions being asked cannot be answered without strong, civically minded communities. I will conclude by discussing what these communities should look like and how we might reach them.

Debates Over Sustainability and Intergenerational Justice

Questions of intergenerational justice have come to the forefront of environmental discourse as science has shown us humans' abilities to affect the earth in generations beyond their lifespan. In particular, global climate change and its future effects have made such discussions a pressing matter, as contemporary contributions to climate change have been recognized as unjust actions whose consequences will be felt and dealt with by those who come after us (Caney, 2009; Dudai, 2009; Page, 2007b). Others have argued that intergenerational justice is really about the capabilities we leave future generations (Page, 2007a). The debate becomes even more complicated when sustainability is thrown into the mix. So many concerns have arisen that entering the debate is daunting.

I attempt to capture the generalities of the debate here for two reasons. First, I find it important to show the variety of approaches individuals are taking to the questions of sustainability and intergenerational justice so that we can understand the complicated conversations that will have to occur in the communities environmentalists should seek to construct. Second, though the discussion is complicated, that does not mean it lacks

value. The questions being debated are important, and we must become equipped as a society to answer them.

To begin answering these questions we must first examine how individuals have talked about sustainability and intergenerational justice. Some ask what the relationship is between justice and sustainability (Holland, 46-68). Some contend that you cannot have one without the other (Agyeman, 2008; Dower, 2004). Others ask whether sustainability is even a useful concept when it comes to discussions of environmental issues (Barry, 2004). Another set of questions asks how we get people to choose to enact intergenerational justice (Birnbacher, 2009). Others argue we need contemporary social justice before we can address issues of sustainability (Fitzpatrick, 2001). Another line of inquiry is concerned with determining what social practices might bring us toward a more just and sustainable society (Seyfang, 2005). Still others examine what emphasizing intergenerational justice means for existing political structures and hypothesize about the structures needed for just sustainability (Norton, 2004; Barry, 2006). Finally, some are concerned with determining what must be included in a sustainable intergenerational justice (Norton, 2004; Jacobs, 2004). Must we ensure natural resources are available or simply the capacity to address pressing crises? Should we be focused on environmental welfare or the passing down of specific virtues and civic/moral practices through which communities can make decisions about their own welfare (Prugh, Constanza, & Daly, 2000)? Michael Jacobs (2004) argues that this line of inquiry contains the most important questions about sustainability and intergenerational justice. He explains: “The disagreements over the ‘meaning of sustainable development’ are not semantic disputations but *are* the substantive political arguments with which the term is

concerned" (p. 26). The problem we have currently is that communities are not equipped to debate this line of questioning. Presently, as a whole, we do not have the values or civic engagement necessary to come to community conclusions about what we want to sustain.

Ernest Partridge (2003) provides an excellent overview of the existing discussions of intergenerational justice and the relationship of the concept to sustainability. Partridge argues that though we may not know exactly what intergenerational justice looks like, we can move forward by acknowledging four fundamental factors we can know about future generations:

1. Because they are human, they will have certain biological requirements to sustain their health.
2. They will be self-conscious beings with the "capacity to choose among alternative futures, and with the capacity to reason abstractly and thus to act on principle." This means, "future persons will be bound by familiar moral categories of rights, responsibilities, and the demands of justice."
3. If these future people are going to live they must have a "functioning ecosystem."
4. They will need "stable social institutions and a body of knowledge and skills that will allow them to meet and overcome cultural and natural crises." (p. 434)

Partridge develops guidelines for our actions, but those guidelines are not the focus of this discussion. Communities need to develop their own guidelines for sustainable intergenerational justice, but it is useful to highlight that Partridge's approach shares

similarities to Norton's convergence hypothesis. Both emphasize the importance of scientific knowledge as a basis for decision-making. Both seek to encourage policies that benefit current and future generations, and both seek to further environmental and moral education among community members. These all will need to be part of the sustainable communities envisioned by environmentalists.

The most important reason community building must become a political project of environmentalists is that without community the pressing questions of sustainability and intergenerational justice cannot be resolved. Prugh, Constanza, and Daly (2000) explain that the questions concerning shared public values "must be found in the political arena, and that is why the most important dimension of sustainability is political" (p. 6). They argue, "We need a politics of engagement, not a politics of consignment. A more engaging politics will be necessary to achieve a sustainable world of our choice, as opposed to one imposed by nature's unpredictable responses to abuse" (p. 10). This type of political engagement can only occur if we have strong communities that foster democratic engagement and citizenly obligation.

Richard Hiskes (2006) discusses the importance of community in establishing the moral commonality necessary for intergenerational justice to be enacted. He contends that our obligations to future generations must be built on justice, because justice is the only virtue that "can claim that *all* must do so not out of a shared sense of humanity but because of shared moral and legal principles governing ownership and distribution of resources" (p. 85). This justice is enacted in strong communities because of a shared understanding of a communal identity, an identity that manifests "through daily interpersonal interaction, cultural interaction, and what de-Shalit calls 'moral similarity'"

(*ibid*). Others attempting to outline a working model of intergenerational justice echo this central role of justice in strong communities (McCormick, 2009; Dobson, 2003). Hiskes (2009) contends that aiming for future justice actually strengthens existing communities through "'reflexive reciprocity— an action that rebounds on itself in furthering the interests of both present performer and future recipient." He expands, "In short, protecting and furthering the environmental rights of future generations enhances and adds strength to the same rights of the present generation. Thus, respecting the rights of the future redounds to our benefit in a kind of virtual reciprocity—reflexively strengthening our rights today" (p. 49).

Communities emphasize humanness, our connection to others as people with whom we live. Because of this, strong communities are required to enact compassionate and moral justice, including environmental justice. Hiskes explains:

> Human rights are the products then of human identity, but that identity itself is forged in relationships with others, with institutions and institutionalized power, and with nature—relationships that are themselves always changing. It would be illogical to assume then that amidst all this flux and growth, human rights would remain static. (p. 146)

Only through strong communities do we develop the capacity to address changing needs of humanity and non-human nature. And only through strong communities can we determine what sustainability and justice is needed in each locality. Communities that emphasize our interdependence on one another and foster civic skills in its members are essential for debating questions about environmental concerns, as well as other social issues. Strong communities can address issues on an individual basis, deciding, for

example, in particular moments whether to emphasize sustainability or justice (Margoluis, 2005).

Environmentalists who have focused on community currently fall into two camps—the local or the global. Many, like McKibben, have argued that the strong communities environmentalist should envision are small cities or towns where people depend on their neighbors and construct a way of life that allows the community to exist somewhat autonomously from others (Curtin, 1999). The other camp has taken a more cosmopolitan approach (i.e., Dobson, 2003; Hayward, 2006), discussing how to create a global community of citizens who act to address environmental problems. I am not comfortable in existing fully in either of these camps, though at the present moment I would suggest focusing on creating strong local communities that are capable of deliberating questions of intergenerational justice and sustainability is necessary.

The local places where we reside are training grounds (Sandel, 1996). In these places we learn how to interact with others and carry our lessons of democracy, justice, and deliberation to our other realms of citizenship. We learn in these spaces to determine the moral requirements of our place. Before being capable of making determinations on a global or even national level, where the needs, interests, values, and backgrounds of those involved vary exponentially, we must first learn how to make them with those we see as having something in common with us because of our shared space and general way of life. Drawing on Mary Midgley, Baird Callicott (1989) speaks of the nested communities to which each of us belongs. These communities provide us with different moral obligations. He explains, “I have different obligations to my fellow citizens which I do not have to human beings in general.” He continues, “These subtly shaded social-moral

relationships are complex and overlapping" (p. 56).[36] We need practice determining what our obligations are close to home so that we may navigate our various obligations to communities beyond where we live. These local communities will certainly not be homogenous. Even next-door neighbors can have very different life experiences and worldviews, but the differences in needs and values will certainly be less than when engaging in a discussion with someone half a world away. We certainly need to have global debates over sustainability and intergenerational justice, but if we cannot yet have those debates with those that live next door, doing so globally seems impossible.

The initial communities environmentalists envision should be material places. Neighborhoods, towns, or cities would be good places to begin creating strong communities that pass down values of democracy, justice, and sustainability to its members. In these places, people with various values and interests will have to learn how to debate questions of sustainability and intergenerational justice. They should ask themselves what sustainability means for their locale, what do they want to pass down to those who will inhabit the place after them, and how does their community relate to others. This last question will help guide these small communities away from isolating themselves inside the small circle of their nested community and toward considering how their citizenship in this place relates to their citizenships in communities beyond.[37]

---

[36] Callicott (2002) advocates this approach again in his essay "My Reply."

[37] Focusing on the local may seem like a questionable move when the most pressing environmental concerns are global, but our global approach has made little headway. Global attempts to address climate change, for example, have done little to curb greenhouse gasses. This is in part because we have not yet instilled the values needed to make intergenerational justice and sustainability guiding virtues of citizenship. They will not immediately become virtues of global citizenship, especially if people do not practice them in their daily lives. Norton's call was for a positive vision for the future. What I provide here is a pragmatic, future-oriented project that acknowledges a global

What Does the Community Look like?

This past spring and summer I had a share of a community supported agriculture (CSA). Every Tuesday I walked to the garden center a half-mile from my house and picked up a box of produce. I am not a practiced cook, but over the summer I learned how to use collard greens and found recipes for carrot soup. I made a variety of slaws to bring to barbeques, and I delighted in fresh organic tomatoes that were grown less than 100 miles from my home. Every Tuesday, I said hello to the cashiers at the garden center, sharing stories with them about the summers I had spent during my teenage years working in a farmer's market and green house. These were experiences I would not have had without the CSA.

The farmers that grew my food were a young couple in their thirties. They donated part of the price of the CSA, as well as left over food, to an organization that provided food for those who could not afford to buy their own. Not only did I get excited to peek into my box every week to see what was different from the last, but I felt more connected to what I was eating. I learned how the seasons worked, how some things are only available once a season, while others wax and wane based on planting times. I also felt connected to others. The cashiers at the garden center, my roommates who showed me how to use the unknown produce we received, my friends that came over to eat what we made, and others I found who also had CSAs all were part of my local network. A feeling of belonging, of acknowledging the existence of others and having my own acknowledged, may have been one of the best parts of the CSA.

---

community capable of acting sustainably and justly. This will not come into existence overnight. Rather, it is a community environmentalists that can present a positive vision for the future that will be the product of hard work beginning at a very small, local scale.

I did not sit and talk with the people I met about their philosophies on sustainability or intergenerational justice, but regardless, we shared in common that we were part of a community whose actions contributed to bringing these concepts into existence. The community was certainly limited. Those of us who joined the CSA had fairly similar value sets that inspired us to buy our produce in this way and at least a certain level of income that allowed us to afford it. But imagine if those members got together and invited the neighborhood to a picnic where CSA members used their produce to supply the community with a meal. Those not part of the CSA could bring their own food, entertainment, or supplies to the table. And maybe that community picnic would spark conversations about the needs of the neighborhood and the direction the citizens wanted the community to go, or maybe the picnic would build relationships between people where there had not been relationships previously, so that when a problem arose in the neighborhood new people could collaborate to find a solution. The community-building project I propose for environmentalists can begin this easily. More steps will certainly follow, but creating connections and asking questions are the first steps. This may sound nostalgic, cheesy even, but why would we not aim to build communities where we know our neighbors and could talk to them civilly about the issues facing the place we call home? Doing so might prepare us to talk to others in places beyond our neighborhood that we call our homes as well.

Throughout this chapter my argument has been that environmentalists, especially those concerned with questions of sustainability and intergenerational justice, should make community building a primary goal. Without strong communities that value scientific knowledge, active democracy, and civic values, intergenerational justice and

sustainability will remain pipe dreams. The spaces created cannot be insular. They must value their locality while recognizing their place in the global world. These are the communities environmentalists should be aiming to create, because they are the communities necessary for answering the tough philosophical questions and undertaking the actions needed to solve the world's pressing environmental concerns. They are the communities we need to live happier, simpler, more connected lives.

They are not, in the words of McKibben, cheap and easy; they are complex, interconnected, dependent, exciting, and brimming with possibility. McKibben and Obama both present examples of community based initiatives that address the multiple complicated elements at play when it comes to issues of food, environments, and health. They present their approaches as moderate alternatives to the lack of balance in contemporary society. In doing so, they redefine resources, growth, and progress, and ask for individuals to begin focusing on building societies in which it is worth living. The take home message is that there is not a one-size fits all solution. My uncle, cousin, and grandpa's community will look different and make different decisions than the one in which I reside. No two communities will be alike, but we can strive to create communities in our places, and places beyond where we reside, that value the actions and politics needed to begin defining what sustainability and intergenerational justice mean for that place. This is a project environmentalists can and should get behind.

Chapter 5

Directions for Environmentalists, Civic Engagement, and a Discourse of Possibility

The neighborhood I called home throughout much of the process of writing this dissertation is called Linden Hills. Located in South Minneapolis, it is nestled between two of the city's lakes and has a downtown to rival that of any small town. The local hardware store is next door to the bakery, which is across the street from the deli, ice cream shop, and boutique gift shop. I can walk to all of these places, in addition to a number of restaurants, coffee shops, and the local co-op, in no more than ten minutes. As a renter, I never really felt all that part of the community. I enjoyed the shops and restaurants and loved living near the lakes, but I always felt like I was visiting, like the place was temporary. There was no need to make connections with others who shared my space. This changed when I got a puppy, a happy-go-lucky golden retriever named Thor.

People talk to you when you have a puppy. One day during a break from writing I took Thor for a walk around one of the lakes. Along the way we met a couple in their eighties. Dressed in matching navy-blue rain jackets, they asked to pet Thor and told me about all the dogs they had raised together. My heart broke when the man looked up at me and said, "I just wish I could still have a dog." We continued talking about how much they wished their assisted living place would let them have pets and how they walked around the lake in part to see the dogs. Every time I see these two now, I stop, say hello, ask how they are doing, and they pet Thor.

The same day we first met this couple, we were walking past the deli. The owner, a woman dressed in jeans and a t-shirt, came out. After wiping her hands on her apron, she knelt down to pet Thor and told me to bring him into the shop any time. I needed to

pick up some meat for a grill-out my roommates and I were having that night, so I followed her back into the store. On the floor was a bowl of dog treats (Thor discovered them before I did and had a lovely afternoon snack). In the case was meat raised locally on sustainable farms. The deli's employees could tell me about the farm that brought in their meats and cheeses and gave me specific instructions on how to grill the various items I had purchased. Before we left, one of the women working there walked around the counter and gave Thor a piece of ground beef.

My conversations with the couple at the lake and the workers at the deli were brief reminders that I share this community with other people, even though I rarely acknowledged this. Instead, when people asked me about where I lived, I would talk about the neighborhood's amenities: its organized compost pick-up service, its large food co-op, and its many restaurants serving local, organic, and fair trade food items. And that, I believe, is a problem. As Colin Beavan (2009) writes in *No Impact Man*:

> I sometimes wonder if our lack of social connection and community is at the root of our environmental problems. I wonder, at least in my case, if that lack has meant that I don't feel responsible or accountable to anything beyond myself. Without real community, where is the visceral sense of connection to something larger, to something to which I owe my care? Maybe one reason I felt like I couldn't make a difference when the project started was because I wasn't firmly connected to anything to which I could make a difference. (p. 130)

Until people feel connected to those in their own place, the majority will never feel a sense of obligation to those beyond their localities. Without that human connection, they will never have the motivation to act to address global problems.

I began this project with the story of Stephen Mather and the National Parks System. Mather's own sense of obligation to preserve the wilderness left a legacy of wilderness preservation that people still have the chance to enjoy today. His mastery of language allowed him to sell the creation of the parks system as a worthy and viable option. He tied the parks to patriotism and presented them as something of which U.S. citizens should be proud. This type of inspiring rhetoric is a lesson for modern-day environmentalists. In the context of globalization and hyper-individualism, however, this nationalistic discourse is not the rhetorical direction that should be taken. Instead, a discourse of citizenship—one built on participatory justice, a broad definition of security, and sustainability—has the potential to spur policy and action that can address the pressing environmental issues of our era. It has the potential to help regain the importance of relationships to others, particularly those with whom we share our spaces, inspiring us to work together to make those spaces worthy of passing on to others.

In this conclusion I raise more questions than answers. I hesitate to focus so strongly on building local communities when our most pressing problems are global in scope; I wonder how a discourse of citizenship might be implemented to eventually spur productive action; and I worry my approach has class implications that are nearly impossible to avoid. That said, a discourse that redefines citizenship in the ways I have put forth has significant potential that makes it worthwhile. It asks for potential sacrifice and change from individuals to address pressing concerns as it simultaneously offers something in return for that sacrifice—a sense of community and connection to others and the justice, security, and sustainable legacy that come with them.

Creating Local Citizenship to Address Global Problems

One of the primary tensions I have struggled with throughout these chapters is between local action and global issues. This tension seems to spring from the two primary components of the global context I identify in the introduction—globalization and hyper-individualism. The first puts attention on global economic systems, politics, and crises while the other demands a system where people are reminded of their relations to one another. How can both these needs be addressed in a single construction of citizenship? The chapters on participatory justice and community-building focus primarily on addressing the loss of relationships and community interaction, while the chapter on security points to our need for a political approach that looks beyond our nation's borders.

Reconciling these two seemingly contradictory directions requires further discussion. How can strong local communities be created in a way that positions them in a global framework and makes addressing global crises a priority? How are local concerns weighted against global crises? These questions remain unanswered by this project, but they also suggest the need for an emphasis on citizenship and community building in our current era. The realm of citizenship is where individuals address issues that arise from living with others and act to improve their shared communities. It requires skills of deliberation, critical thinking, and social awareness. And it is essential in a world context where globalization and hyper-individualism have challenged traditional understandings of political structures and relationships among individuals in the political realm. Training in citizenship gives people the skills and knowledge needed to navigate the questions that remain. The elements of citizenship I discuss place varying emphasis

on the local and the global, but together they provide a framework that might help individuals build strong local communities while still contributing to global political action.

Participatory justice can happen most easily on a small scale. When local communities address local issues, obstacles such as distance and numbers of stakeholders are limited, making it easier to create a deliberative system where all affected individuals can be given a chance to engage in debate and deliberation. What such a system might look like on a national or global scale is unclear. Democratic governments use representation to achieve such a system on a national level, but these systems have shown they are open to corruption as wealthy individuals and corporations are able to garner more access than the average individual citizen (e.g., the Supreme Court's ruling on *Citizen's United vs. the Federal Election Commission*) and significant groups of individuals are left underrepresented.[38] If participatory justice is going to be realized beyond local town-hall meetings and city council forums, retraining needs to take place. Here is where the creation of strong sustainable communities becomes essential. Few existing local communities (neighborhoods, cities, and towns) have thriving political debate or engagement (Putnam, 2000).

Communities are, in fact, often created in ways that encourage individuals to avoid interaction, sometimes through the use of gates and sometimes by making what was once a community activity private (e.g., attending church versus broadcasting church

---

[38] For example, in the 112th US Congress women make up 17% of the members in spite of women being slightly over fifty percent of the general population. People of color are represented by just over 15% of the membership in contrast to the over thirty-six percent of people of color in the general population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 November 4; Congress.org, 2011).

into members' homes) (McKibben, 2007; Sandel, 1996). Community members may choose to get involved if they are upset with a decision made by political leadership or if there is a specific issue affecting their way of life, but individuals do not often get involved to help shape the future direction of their place.[39] Cicero (1999) reminds us, "There is, then, no possibility of bringing aid to the state, however great the dangers that oppress it, at a moments notice or when you want to, unless you are in a position that permits such action" (p. 6). We cannot only engage in politics "when the necessity of crisis compels" us (*ibid*). Instead, we must live lives as engaged citizens in order to influence the directions of our communities and advocate for our own interests in beliefs. Making community building the object of sustainability efforts may alter reactive types of participation and help individuals to feel invested enough in their spaces to become engaged with those who share them.

Greta Gaard (2007) writes of "learning to speak a new language of home." Calling a place home, she contends, "implies a kind of intimacy, a kind of knowledge of place, a set of relationships and commitments" that one earns through a process of exploring the land, joining with other people, listening, and studying (p. 7). If people can come to feel part of a place and recognize their relationships to others and the environment, they may be inspired to pass those recognitions and the values they arouse

---

[39] Recent activities, such as those of the Tea Party or pro-gay marriage activists, suggest political activism is not dead. But cases such as these often are still reactive action. Tea Party members rally against existing political policies and legislation, but offer little in designing future politics. Pro-gay marriage activists argue for future policy, but their most active engagement is not in spurring new legislation. Most often, these individuals are engaged in action to counter anti-gay marriage legislation. Involvements in both movements are spurred by perceived threats to one's personhood. This differs from the citizenship asked for in this project that asks individuals to involve themselves for the sake of building a better community generally, rather than defending specific personal interests.

to generations that come after them. Creating a community people can call home requires acknowledging the specific needs and problems of that place. It also means emphasizing the interdependency we have with those who share our home. Valuing this interdependency and using it to inform decisions made on a local level has implications for a global form of citizenship as well.

Martha Nussbaum (1994) argues for the creation of a global political community that recognizes what we share "as both rational and mutually dependent human beings." Judith Butler (2003) echoes this sentiment in her call for "reimagining the possibility of community on the basis of vulnerability and loss" (p. 10). In each case, our dependence on and connection to others is placed at the forefront of political community. Building communities on this foundational reality of the human experience changes political possibilities. It does not erase disagreement, but debate happens with the understanding that every action undertaken by a community has effects on the people in that community currently and on future community members. Acknowledging the interdependence of community members also points to the interconnected nature of communities, since each exists in the global community of humanity. Thus, a community that values the relational nature of its own place has the potential to carry that value to its global role. These communities have potential to make decisions that benefit the local community and contribute to addressing global concerns.

Human security is a definition of security that draws on this idea of interdependency. Its global nature and emphasis on individual security produces a global scope that downplays the importance of the nation-state border, but the individual focus has the potential to reinforce the hyper-individualism that exists in the current socio-

political context, leading individuals to be concerned with their own security over that of others. But if human security is introduced as a concept in local communities, individuals can be taught to have discussions about what they need to feel secure individually and about the insecurity others around them are facing. Drawing on a relational concept of citizenship can globalize human security and its concern with the individual.

In a relational concept of citizenship we recognize (1) that insecurity in one locale has the potential to breed insecurity elsewhere, and (2) secure places often have resources to contribute to helping insecure places become secure. Thus, two conversations about human security are essential. The first involves how to protect local communities in the global community who are most at risk of insecurity, because they lack resources and political power. The second is concerned with how to maintain a fair level of security for those who already have access to resources, social stability, and a secure way of life.

The introduction of human security on a local level will allow communities to get used to discussions that involve some individuals being asked to give up excess in order to provide security for those who do not have enough. Globally, these discussions need to happen, but if these types of sacrifices are not even willing to be made on a local level for the assurance of security for those who live next door or down the street, how can we expect them to be made for people whose faces we never see?

Creating a cosmopolitan, global citizenship is certainly a goal we may one day reach. Individuals cannot continue to ignore that their local actions have global consequences and that global power structures exist that put some people at an advantage in a global system at the expense of causing insecurity for others. But, we do not yet have strong enough local communities to encourage people to act as citizens on a global level.

Until individuals are capable of having hard but civil discussions with their neighbors (and are willing to sacrifice to help the less well-off person down the street live a more secure life) people will never make the connections and sacrifices needed to address our most pressing global crises.

Implementation

Implementing a new conception of citizenship will not be easy. The citizenship I call for in this project is itself a rhetorical construction, and introducing it into actual political systems faces rhetorical challenges. First, one cannot simply tell people to adopt this way of participation and the values that underlie it. Just because I think every community on every level of governance should use the principles of participatory justice, human security, and sustainability justice does not mean others will be easily persuaded to alter their worldviews and values to adopt my suggestions. Second, citizenship and political engagement seem to have lost emphasis in a world where many people feel disillusioned by the governmental process and candidates seem frightened to take stances unpopular to their corporate campaign donors.

If, however, Robert Asen (2004) is correct and citizenship is a process rather than and identity, hope for implementing the process I develop here exists. Each of the analytic chapters of this dissertation argues for the use of certain principles when engaged in citizenly matters, but no chapter argues for a universal way in which those values should be implemented or a correct mode of action that should stem from them. Instead, these principles are designed to be used by people in their places, determining in each instance who is a stakeholder in the debate, what security concerns individuals are facing in a particular moment, and what values and types of community will be passed down to

the next generation if particular decisions are made. In short, they are guiding principles for those who choose to adopt the identity of citizen. While in the process of citizenship, these principles should help form the questions citizens ask themselves as they consider particular actions and policies. These principles, with grounding values on which the process of citizenship can be built, provide the questions of the debates not the answers.

The first rhetorical challenge, then, is to introduce the values of the principles outlined in this text. Reclaiming our educational system as a training ground for citizenship is a first step in this process. Michael Sandel's (1996) contention that community organizations and institutions, such as schools and fraternal organizations, must once again become educational centers of citizenship recognizes the importance of individuals learning to see themselves as citizens capable of participating in the process of citizenship. Sandel suggests that questions of economics and morality should be the primary topics of public discussion to ensure that society is not destroyed by the loss of a strong middle-class or civic virtue. The values that underlie participatory justice, security, and sustainability are at their core moral virtues, in that they imply ethics of how to live with and among others. If such values were central to a curriculum of citizenship, it may be possible these values would come to have greater prominence in politics from a local to a global level.

Nussbaum (1994) also argues for educational institutions to reclaim a responsibility for training citizens, but her focus is less on training individuals for local acts of citizenship and more on creating cosmopolitan citizens (see also: Dobson, 2003, pp.174-207). As local spaces are reclaimed as places to teach citizenship, concepts of a cosmopolitan education outlined by Nussbaum can begin to be incorporated so that local

communities of strong citizens avoid becoming insular. As Nussbaum explains, this does not mean that one loses a sense of home:

This means, in educational terms, that the student in the United States, for example,

> may continue to regard herself as in part defined by her loves—her family, her religious, ethnic, or racial communities, or even her country. But she must also, and centrally, learn to recognize humanity whenever she encounters it, undeterred by traits that are strange to her, and to be eager to understand humanity in its "strange" guises. She must learn about the different to recognize common aims, aspirations, and values, and enough about these common ends to see how variously they are instantiated in the many cultures and histories. (Nussbaum, 1994)

The educational discourse used in the training of citizens would begin by drawing on the values, aims, and aspirations of one's local place. Nussbaum suggests that getting to understand these elements of one's home allows one to make connections on a global level. The discourse used to train citizens should begin by making connections between those that share a common local place and use these recognitions of commonality to illustrate our interconnectedness and shared humanness. Then it may be possible to create a global citizenship that allows people to maintain a home but to see how their home fits amongst the homes of others in the world. This process of citizenship cannot be imposed on a population. Rather, the existing values and goals of a locale must be used to introduce the principles of participatory justice, security, and sustainability, allowing each community to make decisions about what those principles look like in its place.

Asen’s view of citizenship as a process acted out by those who adopt the identity of citizen gives hope that, if individuals in a community decide to, how citizenship is enacted can be altered. Doing so may address the second rhetorical concern that individuals feel powerless and disillusioned when it comes to citizenship. It might be possible to persuade more people to participate in the world as citizens if they can be convinced that what it means to be a citizen can be altered. Citizen becomes a desirable identity if the process of citizenship’s potential to reshape community in a way that improves the lives of people is recognized. A political process founded on the principles outlined in this project may allow such recognition to occur.

Concerns of Access and Existing Social Power Structures

The process of citizenship and types of communities called for in this project are certainly ideals, but they are ideals for which I think society must strive if issues such as climate change, global poverty, and gross economic inequality are to ever be addressed. Those who already have social, economic, and political resources are those who can most easily participate in such a citizenship and create such communities. Adopting the identity of citizen and engaging in a process of citizenship—particularly one like that outlined here, which calls for extended dialogue and participation in order to achieve participatory justice—requires time. It also requires political access and knowledge that often comes from having political connections and/or receiving a particular level and type of education. The citizenship I call for is difficult to adopt for individuals who work two jobs to support a family and have little leisure time.

I could brush this concern off by saying that with participatory justice and strong community building as principles of this process of citizenship, communities would find

a way to hear the voices of such individuals, but such a statement seems naïve. Beyond issues of socio-economic class, one also has to acknowledge existing power structures built on race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and religion that have historically silenced entire groups of voices in community discussions and political debates. While I cannot address these concerns here, I want to offer two comments about why I think my concept of citizenship opens the possibility for such concerns to be dealt with in the future.

First, this project rests on viewing citizenship as a process, so the principles outlined within the project are best viewed as coming into practice through a slow evolution of citizenship. That means those localities that currently have the resources to engage in building strong communities that draw on participatory justice models and view human security as tantamount should begin the process. As these communities are built, individuals will be forced to acknowledge the inequalities within their own community. They will begin to understand others as people on which they depend and who depend on them rather than as representatives of a particular social grouping that can be dismissed or ignored. This process of citizenship asks individuals to take the knowledge of what it means to live in their own localized space and bring it to the larger spaces of which they are also a part to avoid recreating what were at times insular communities of the past.

As communities become aware of inequities that prevent some in their communities from being able to engage in the process of citizenship, they may begin to consider inequalities that exist outside their communities. Such awareness may encourage broad social and political changes that would make it possible for more communities of individuals to adopt the identity of citizen and principles on which the process of

citizenship should rest. As discussions of citizenship and community building move forward, the acknowledgement of historical oppression and barriers to citizenship must be at the forefront of the debate. Individuals must come to recognize their continued existence and their participation in the processes that contribute to maintaining them. To be good citizens, as Andrew Dobson (2003) reminds us, we must be willing to right the harms that we have participated in causing. Individuals often feel morally obligated to do this in their personal lives. Such an ethic must now be carried to our local process of citizenship and beyond.

The second comment I would like to make is that even though the adoption of a new definition of citizenship is a slow evolutionary process, it is also a radical project. Redefining citizenship is done not only to meet the needs of an era marked by globalization and hyper-individualism but also to alter society in a positive way, to make society something in which it is worth living. To redefine citizenship means to reconsider historical barriers that have prevented or hindered the participation of specific social groups. It also means reconstructing ways of life. What if, as Bill McKibben suggests, a shift to local economies and building strong communities meant harnessing the efficiencies that technology and social progress have given us—not to drastically increase the GDP but to drastically increase our leisure time? What if we created local economies in which people made a living wage working one thirty-five or forty hour job a week, because for that community human security meant being able to afford a roof over your head and having time to voice your concerns over the direction of your home? These communities will not emerge overnight, but the ideas outlined in this project make such

communities possible and accessible, even to communities that have not always been afforded political access.

A Discourse of Possibility

Recognizing the importance of relationships has the potential to make a positive environmental impact, but it also has implications for other pressing social and political issues. Just like people, political issues are interconnected. Environmental, health, economic, and civil rights concerns cannot be separated, so constructing a citizenship that works to address one will have positive consequences for the others. For example, if a community is built where individuals buy food locally, a strong and more secure economy might emerge in that place, and people may build relationships that encourage them to venture out from their homes. Because people in the community know each other, they may even feel an obligation to ensure that when people's health is threatened there is an option to help them get healthier. Because they know each other they may be less inclined to accept social inequality and injustice, whether it comes from one's economic position, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or sexuality. A new definition of citizenship that recognizes the interconnected nature of our social issues is needed. I have tried to offer such a definition here.

As a rhetorical tool, a discourse of citizenship does not erase the fact that people need to be made aware of the risks they are facing by not acting on pressing global concerns. Fear can be a motivating factor, but it can also be paralyzing. A discourse of citizenship argues that a new way of interacting with each other and the world is needed because we are currently at risk, but it also offers a world of possibility to replace the one that currently can inspire fear (Nordhaus & Shellenberger, 2007). This world is built on

strong human relationships. It asks people to become invested in their homes and acknowledge their connections to the humans and environment that share it. It is a world that asks people to become knowledgeable of their locality while striving to understand how that place fits in a global framework and shares values and goals with both its neighbors and communities half a world away. People in this world have a stake in determining how their places will choose to enact principles and values. They have the opportunity to provide a valuable place to call home to those who come after them.

Discourse has the potential to shape how we see the world and act in it. Rather than focusing on the factors preventing individual action from making a significant impact on society's most pressing issues, the discourse I offer here asks us to focus on how conversations with neighbors while on a walk or shopping at the deli provide a foundation on which our home might be changed. It asks that we make creating the communities in which we would like to live a priority, not because they are close to a Target but because we feel connected to the people with whom we share it.

The arguments in this project are not solely academic. They are arguments about how we live with one another, how we speak to one another, and how we both affect and are affected by those around us. My hope is that they reach beyond the world of academia to help transform the world we share.

Bibliography

Asen, R. (2004). A discourse theory of citizenship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 90*, 189-211.

Agyeman, J. (2008). Toward a 'just' sustainability. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 22*(6), 751-756.

Anand, R. (2004). *International environmental justice: A north-south dimension.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Appiah, K. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of srangers.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Asen, R. (2004). A discourse theory of citizenship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 90*, 189-211.

Barnett, J. (2001a). Environmental security and U.S. foreign policy: A critical examination. In P. Harris (Ed.), *The Environmental International Relations, and U.S. Foreign Policy* (pp. 68-91). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Barnett, J. (2001b). *The meaning of environmental security: Ecological politics and policy in the new security era.* New York, NY: Zed Books.

Barnett, J., Matthew, R.A., & O'Brien, K.L. (2010). Global environmental change and human security: An introduction. In R.A. Matthew, J. Barnett, B. McDonald, & K.L. O'Brien (Eds.), *Global Environmental Change and Human Security* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Barry, B. (2004). Sustainability and intergenerational justice. In A. Dobson, *Fairness and Futurity: Essays on Environmental Sustainability and Justice* (pp. 93-117). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barry, J. (2001). Greening liberal democracy: Practice, theory, and political economy. In J. Barry, & M. Wissenburg (Eds.), *Sustaining Liberal Democracy* (pp. 59-80). New York, NY: Palgrave.

Barry, J. (2006). Resistance is fertile: From environmental to sustainability citizenship. In A. Dobson, & D. Bell, *Environmental Citizenship* (pp. 21-48). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Barry, J. & Wissenburg, M. (2001). Introduction. In *Sustaining Liberal Democracy* (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: Palgrave.

Beavan, C. (2009). *No impact man: The adventures of a guilty liberal who attempts to save the planet and the discoveries he makes about himself and our way of life in the process.* New York: Picador.

Bell, D. (2002). How can political liberals be environmentalists? *Political Studies, 50*, 703-724.

Berke, R. (2002, April 14). In a forceful speech, Gore criticizes administration. *The New York Times*, p. 22.

Biermann, F. & Boas, I. (2008, November/December). Protecting climate refugees: The case for global protocol. *Environment, 50*(60), pp. 8-17.

Birnbacher, D. (2009). What motivates us to care for the (distant) future? In A. Gosseries, & L. Meyer, *Intergenerational Justice* (pp. 273-301). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bocking, S. (2007). The silent spring of Al Gore. *Alternative Journal , 33*(1), 34-35.

Brock, L. (1997). The environment and security: Conceptual and theoretical. In N.P. Gleditsch (Ed.), *Conflict and the Environment* (pp. 21-24). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Broda-Bahm, K. T. (1999). Finding protection in definitions: The quest for environmental security. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 35*, 159-170.

Brown, L. R. (1977 October). Redefining national security. *Worldwatch Paper*, *14* .

Bullard, R. D. (2005). Environmental justice in the twenty-first century. In R.D. Bullard (Ed.), *The Quest for Environmental Justice: Human Rights and the Politics of Pollution* (pp. 19-42). San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Book.

Burros, M. (2009, March 19). Obamas to plant vegetable garden at White House. Retrieved 2011, January 25 from The New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/20/dining/20garden.html.

Bush, G. W. (2001, July 17). *Interview with foreign journalists.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=73623.

Bush, G. W. (2001, March 13). *Letter to members of the Senate on the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 28 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=45811.

Bush, G. W. (2002, February 14). *Remarks announcing the clear skies and global climate change initiatives in Silver Spring, Maryland.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=73200.

Bush, G. W. (2005, February 21). *Remarks in Brussels*, Belgium. (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=73719.

Bush, G. W. (2008, April 16). *Remarks on energy and climate change.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=76957.

Bush, G. W. (2001, June 11). *Remarks on global climate change.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws?pid=45987.

Bush, G. W. (2003, October 29). *Statement of adminsitration policy: S-139 - Climate Stewardship Act of 2003.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=24730.

Bush, G. W. (2005, February 23). *The President's news conference with Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder of Germany in Mainz.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=73719.

Bush, G. W., & Schroeder, G. (2001, March 29). *Remarks prior to discussions with Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder of Germany and an exchange with reporters.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=45658.

Butler, J. (2003). Violence, mourning, and politics. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality, 4*(1), 9-37.

Cafaro, P. (2005). Thoreau, Leopold, and Carson: Toward an environmental virue ethics. In R. Sandler, & P. Cafaro (Eds.), *Environmental Virtue Ethics* (pp. 31-44). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Callicott, J. B. (1989). *In defense of the land ethic: Essays in environmental philosophy.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Callicott, J. B. (2002). My reply. In W. Ouderkirk, & J. Hill (Eds.), *Land, Value, Community: Callicott and Environmental Philosophy* (pp. 291-326). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Callicott, J. B. (2009). The convergence hypothesis falsified: Implicit intrinsic value, operational rights, and de facto standing in the Endangered Species Act. In B. Minteer (Ed.), *Nature in common? Environmental Ethics and the Contested Foundations of Environmental Policy* (pp. 118-141). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). *Presidents creating the presidency: Deeds done in words.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Caney, S. (2009). Climate change and the future: Discounting for time, wealth, and risk. *Journal of Social Philosophy , 40*(2), 163-186.

Carlacio, J. (2004). Alternative articulations of citizenship: The written discourse of a nineteenth-century African American woman. In G. Hauser, & A. Grimm (Eds.), *Rhetorical democracy: Discursive practices of civic engagement* (pp. 115-121). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring* (First Mariner Books edition 2002 ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Cart, M. (2008, February 15). Another inconvenient truth. *Booklist*, p. 77.

Cicero. (1999). *On the commonwealth and on the laws.* (J. Zetzel, Ed.) New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clifford, S. (2010, October 14). Wal-Mart to buy more local produce: The local-and-sustainable movement has spread to the nation's largest retailer. *The New York Times*. Retrieved 2011, March 31 from Business Day: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/15/business/15walmart.html.

Cocklin, C. (2002). Water and "cultural security". In E. A. Redclift (Ed.), *Human Security and the Environment: International Comparisons* (pp. 154-176). Northampton, MA: Edgar Elgar Publishing.

Congress.org. (2011). *Congressional directory.* Retrieved May 6, 2011, from Congress.org: http://ezpetition.org/congressorg/directory/demographics.tt?catid=all.

Connaughton, J. L., & Marburger, J. H. (2007, February 7). *Open letter on the president's positions on climate change.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/?pid=83693.

Connor, S. (2007, April 12). The independent-12 April 2007: Native languages hold the key to saving species. Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/297.

Curtin, D. (1999). *Chinnagounder's challenge: The question of ecological citizenship.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Dalby, S. (2002). *Environmental security.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Dalby, S. (1994). The politics of environmental security. In J. Käkönen (Ed.), *Green Security or Militarized Environment* (pp. 25-53). Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth Publishing Company.

De Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everday life.* (S. Randall, Trans.) Berkeley , CA: University of California Press.

Deane-Drummond, C. (2006). Environmental justice and the economy: A Christian theologian's view. *Ecotheology, 11*, 294-310.

Deep economy: The wealth of communities and the durable future. (2001, January 1). *Publishers Weekly, 254(1)* , 41-42.

Devine, R. S. (2004). *Bush versus the environment.* New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Diefenbacher, H. (2006). Environmental justice: Some starting points for discussion from a perspective of ecological economics. *Ecotheology, 11*(3), 282-293.

Dobson, A. (2003). *Citizenship and the environment.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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

Dower, N. (2004). Global economy, justice, and sustainability. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, 7*, 399-415.

Dudai, R. (2009). Climate change and human rights practice: Observations on and around the report of the office of the high commissioner for human rights on the relationship between climate change and human rights. *Journal of Human Rights Practice, 1*(2), 294-307.

Durant, R. F. (2007). *The greening of the U.S. military: Environmental policy, national security, and organizational change.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

EPA. (2011, March 2). *Summary of the Endangered Species Act.* Retrieved April 29, 2011, from EPA: United States environmental protection agency: http://www.epa.gov/lawsregs/laws/esa.html.

Finger, M. (1994). Global environmental degradation and the military. In J. Käkönen (Ed.), *Green Security or Militarized Environment* (pp. 169-191). Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth Publishing Company.

Fitzpatrick, T. (2001). Making welfare for future generations. *Social policy & Administration, 35*(5), 506-520.

Fleischer, A. (2001, March 28). *Press briefing by Ari Fleischer.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=47500.

Fleischer, A. (2002, February 14). *Press briefing by Ari Fleischer.* (J.T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb/edu/ws/?pid=61632.

Fleischer, A. (2001, July 27). *Press briefing with Ari Fleischer.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency. ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=63664.

Fletcher, S. R. (2003). *Global climate change: The Kyoto Protocol.* Congressional Research Service. Congressional Information Service, Inc.

Fransz, G. (2005). Benevolence as an environmental virtue. In R. Sandler, & P. Cafaro (Eds.), *Environmental Virtue Ethics* (pp. 121-134). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Gaard, G. (2007). *The nature of home: Taking root in a place.* Tuscon, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.

Gartner, C. (2000). When science writing becomes literary art: The success of Silent Spring. In C. Wadell (Ed.), *And No Birds Sing: Rhetorical Analyses of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring* (pp. 103-125). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Genauer, E. (2006, July 26). *Peak oil and community food security.* Retrieved April 28, 2011, from Energy Bulletin: http://www.energybulletin.net/node/18521

Gjelten, T. (2008, May 18). *Military officers tie energy to national security.* Retrieved April 28, 2011, from NPR: http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=104267992

Glotfelty, C. (2000). Cold War, Silent Spring: The trope of war in modern environmentalism. In C. Wadell (Ed.), *And No Birds Sing: Rhetorical Analyses of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring* (pp. 157-173). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gore, A. (2003, August 28). Something basic has gone wrong. *The New York Times*, p. A25.

Gore, A., & Bush, G. W. (2001, October 11). *The second Gore-Bush presidential debate.* Retrieved 2008, December 28 from The Commission on the Presidential Debates: http://www.debates.org/pages/trans2000b.html

Greene, R. W. (2004). The concept of global citizenship in Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's Empire: A challenge to three idea in rhetorical mediation. In G. Hauser & A. Grimm (Eds.), *Rhetorical Democracy: Discursive Practices of Civic Engagement* (pp. 165-171). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guggenheim, D (Director). (2006). *An inconvenient truth: A global warning* [Motion Picture].

Gutman, A., & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and disagreement.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Gutman, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hagan, C. (2011, January 20). *Walmart pledges to make food healthier, more affordable*. (CNN) Retrieved 2011, March 31 from The Chart: http://thechart.blogs.cnn.com/2011/01/20/walmart-pledges-to-make-food-healthier-more-affordable/.

Hakes, J. A. (2008). *A declaration of energy independence: How freedom from foreign oil can improve national security, our economy, and the environment.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Harris, P. (2001). International environmental affairs and U.S. foreign policy. In P. Harris (Ed.), *The environment, international relations, and U.S. foreign policy* (pp. 3-42). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Hart, R. P., & Sparrow, B. H. (Eds.). (2001). *Politics, discourse, and American society: New agendas.* New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hawken, P. (2007). *Blessed unrest: How the largest social movement in history is restoring grace, justice, and beauty to the world.* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Hayden, P. (2005). *Cosmopolitan global politics.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

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

Heise, U. K. (2008). *Sense of place and sense of planet: The environmental imagination of the global.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hellman, S. (2004). Rhetoric of globalization: A social movement defines its collective identity in America. In G. Hauser (Ed.), *Rhetorical Democracy: Discursive Practices of Civic Engagement* (pp. 173-178). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Herbert, B. (2002, July 4). Fouling our own nest. *The New York Times*, p. A13.

Hiskes, R. (2006, April-June). Environmental human rights and intergenerational justice. *Human Rights Review*, 81-95.

Hiskes, R. (2009). *The human right to a green future: Environmental rights and intergenerational justice.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hogan, J. (2009). *Climate cover-up: The crusade to deny global warming.* Berkeley, CA: Greystone Books.

Holland, A. (1999). Sustainability: Should we start from here? In A. Dobson, *Fairness and futurity: Essays on environmental sustainability and justice* (pp. 46-68). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Homer-Dixon, T. (1993 Fall). Environmental security and global security. *Headline series*.

Homer-Dixon, T., & Blitt, J. (1998). *Ecoviolence: Links among environment, population, and security.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Irvine, S. (1989). Consuming fashions? The limits of green consumerism. *Ecologist, 19*, 88.

Ivie, R.L. (2009). More good, less evil: Contesting the mythos of national insecurity in the 2008 presidential primaries. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 12*(2), 279-301.

Jacobs, M. (1999). Sustainable development as a contested concept. In A. Dobson, *Fairness and Futurity: Essays on Environmental Sustainability and Justice* (pp. 21-45). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jamieson, D. (2007). Justice: The heart of environmentalism. In R. Sandler, & P. Pezzullo (Ed.), *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement* (pp. 85-101). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Keller, W. W., & Mitchell, G. R. (2006). *Hitting first: Preventive force in U.S. security strategy.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Kort, W. (1985). *Modern fiction and human time: A Study in narrative and belief.* Tampa, Florida: University of South Florida Press.

Layzer, J. A. (2006). *The Environmental Case: Translating values into policy* (2nd ed.). Washington D.C.: CQ Press.

Lee, J. (2003, October 2). Sponsors ease bill on gases that warm the climate. *The New York Times*, p. A20.

Leopold, A. (1968). *Sand county almanac and sketches here and there* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lidskog, R., & Elander, I. (2007). Representation, participation or deliberation? Democratic responses to the environmental challenge. *Space and Polity, 11*(1), 75-94.

Liotta, P., & Shearer, A. (2007). *Gaia's revenge: Climate change and humanity's loss.* Westprot, CT: Praeger.

Locke, J. (1764). *The treatise of civil government [1689].* (T. Hollis, Ed.) Retrieved August 20, 2009, from The Online Library of Liberty: http://oll.libertyfund.org/index.php?option=com_statcxt?staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=222&Itemid=99999999.

Lucaites, J. L., & Condit, C. M. (1985). Re-constructing narrative theory: A functional perspective. *Journal of Communication, 35*, 90-108.

MacGregor, S. (2006). *Beyond mothering earth: Ecological citizenship and the politics of care.* Vancouver, British Columbia: UBS Press.

Margoluis, C. (2005). Between economic justice and sustainability. In D. Naguib, & R. J. Brulle, *Power, justice, and the environment: A critical appraisal of the environmental justice movement* (pp. 277-292). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Mathiessen, P. (1999). Rachel Carson. *Time , 153* (12), pp. 187-189.

McClellan, S. (2005, February 25). *Press briefing by Scott McClellan.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=66131.

McCormick, H. (2009). Interenerational justice and the non-reciprocity problem. *Political Studies, 57*, 451-458.

McDonough, W., & Braungart, M. (2002). *Cradle to cradle: Remaking the way we make things.* New York, NY: North Point Press.

McDorman, T. F., & Timmerman, D. M. (Eds.). (2008). *Rhetoric & democracy: Pedagogical and political practices.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

McKibben, B. (2007). *Deep economy: The wealth of communities and the durable future.* New York: Holt Paperbacks.

McKinney, M. (2011 May 28). From New York City, with love. *Star Tribune*. Retrieved 2011 May 28 from: http://www.startribune.com/local/minneapolis/122777379.html.

Melo-Escrihuela, C. (2008). Promoting ecological citizenship: Rights, duties and political agency. *ACME: An International E-journal for Critical Geographies, 7*, 113-134.

Mendez, R. P. (1999). Peace as a public good. In I. Kaul, I. Grunberg, & M. A. Stern (Eds.), *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century* (pp. 382-416). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, D. S. (1995). Framing national security: Elite public discourse on nuclear weapons during the cold war. *Political Communication, 12*(2), 173-192.

Myers, N. (1993). *Ultimate Security: The Environmental Basis of Political Stability.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Mill, J. S. (1999). *On Liberty [1869].* Retrieved 2008, August 15 from Bartlby.com: http://www.bartleby.com/130/.

Minteer, B. A. (2009). Unity among environmentalists? Debating the values-policy link in environmental ethics. In B. A. Minter (Ed.), *Nature in Common? Environmental Ethics and the Contested Foundations of Environmental Policy* (pp. 3-17). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Morrow, L. (2007, April 2). Be my neighbor. Retrieved 2011, March 31 from The New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/22/books/review/Morrow.t.html

Murphy, T. (2003). Romantic democracy and the rhetoric of heroic citizenship. *Commuication Quarterly, 51*, 192-208.

Mulligan, J. (2011, January 25). First lady Michelle Obama announces collaboration with Walmart in support of Let's Move! campaign. Retrieved 2011, March 31 from Let's Move Blog: http://www.letsmove.gov/blog/2011/01/25/first-lady-michelle-obama-announces-collaboration-with-walmart-in-support-of-lets-move-campaign/.

Myers, N. (1993). *Ultimate Security: The Environmental Basis of Political Stability.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Native Struggles for Land and Life: An interview with Winona LaDuke. (1999 December). *Multinational Monitor*, pp. 19-23.

Nelson, R., Lopez, B., & Williams, T. T. (2002). *Patriotism and the American land.* Barrington, MA: The Orion Society.

Nixon, R. (1970, July 9). *Reorganization Plan no. 3 of 1970.* Retrieved 2008, September 20 from U.S. Code: http://www.access.gpo.gov/uscode/title5a/5a_4_93_1_.html.

Nixon, R. (1970, July 9). *Reorganization Plan no. 3 of 1970: Message of the president.* Retrieved 2008, September 20 from U.S. Code: http://www.access.gpo.gov/uscode/title5a/5a_4_93_3_.html.

Nordhaus, T., & Shellenberger, M. (2007). *Break through: From the death of environmentalism to the politics of possibility.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Norton, B. (1999). Ecology and opportunity: Intergenerational equity and sustainable options. In A. Dobson, *Fairness and Futurity: Essays on Environmental Sustainability and Justice* (pp. 118-150). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Norton, B. G. (2009). Convergence and divergence: The convergence hypothesis twenty years later. In B. Minteer (Ed.) *Nature in common? Environmental Ethics and the Contested Foundations of Environmental Policy* (pp. 235-259). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Norton, B. G. (1991). *Toward unity among environmentalists.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1994, October/November). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. Retrieved 2007, January 24 from *Boston Review*: http://bostonreview.net/BR19.5/nussbaum.php.

Obama, M. (2010, February 9). Michelle Obama's remarks at "Let's Move" launch. (L. Sweet, Editor) Retrieved 2011, January 30 from *Chicago Sun Times*: http://blogs. suntimes.com/sweet/2010/02/michelle_obamas_remarks_at_let.html.

Obama, M. (2011, January 20). *Remarks by the first lady during let's move! Walmart announcement*. Retrieved 2011, March 31 from The White House: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/01/20/remarks-first-lady-during-let-s-move-walmart-announcement.

Oreskes, N., & Conway, E. M. (2010). *Merchants of doubt: How a handful of scientists obscured the truth on issues from tobacco smoke to global warming.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.

Page, E. (2007a). Intergenerational justice of what: Welfare, resources or capabilities? *Environmental politics, 16*(3), 453-469.

Page, E. (2007b). Fairness on the day after tomorrow: Justice, reciprocity and global climate change. *Political Studies, 55*, 225-242.

Partridge, E. (2003). Future generations. In V. DeVeer, & C. Pierce (Eds.), *The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book: Philosophy, Ecology, Economics* (3rd ed., pp. 428-436). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Penz, P. (1998). Environmental victims and state sovereignty. In C. Williams (Ed.), *Environmental Victims* (pp. 27-47). London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

Persson, G., Bush, G. W., & Prodi, R. (2001, June 14). *The president's news conference with European Union leaders in Goteborg, Sweden.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 28 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=45966.

Pollan, M. (2010, June 10). The food movement rising. Retrieved 2010, December 20 from *The New York Review of Books*: http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2010/jun/10/food-movement-rising/.

Poor Marks on the Environment. (2002, January 28). *The New York Times* , p. A14.

Prugh, T., Constanza, R., & Daly, H. (2000). *The local politics of global sustainability.* Washington D.C.: Island Press.

Public Broadcasting System. (2009). *National parks: America's best idea*. (The National Parks Film Project) Retrieved 2009, September 29 from Public broadcasting system: http://www.pbs.org/nationalparks/.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of the American community.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Quarles, J. (1976). *Cleaning up America: An insiders view of the environmental protection agency.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Rabkin, J. (2000). The Value of Sovereignty and the Costs of Global Environmentalism. In T. L. Anderson, & H. I. Miller (Eds.), *The Greening of U.S. Foreign Policy* (pp. 1-30). Stanford, CA: Hoover Institutions Press.

Ray, A. G. (2004). The permeable public: Rituals of citizenship in Antebellum men's debating clubs. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 41*, 1-16.

Ray, A. G. (2007). The rhetorical ritual of citizenship: Women's voting as public performance. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 93*, 1-26.

Ray, A. G., & Koenig Richards, C. (2007). Inventing citizens, imagining gender justice: The suffrage rhetoric of Virginia and Francis Minor. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *93*, 375-402.

Rice, C. (2001, June 6). *Press briefing by national security advisor Condoleeza Rice on President's travel to Europe.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=78897.

Ruckelshaus, W. (1993 January). William D. Ruckelshaus: Oral history interview. (T. E. Agency, Producer) Retrieved 2008, September 23 from EPA: http://www.epa.gov/history/publications/ruck/index.htm.

Sandel, M. (1996). *Democracy's discontent: America in search of a public philosophy.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknapp Press.

Sandilands, C. (1993). On 'green' consumerism: Environmental privatization and 'family values'. *Canadian Woman Studies/Les Cahiers de la Femme, 13*, 45-47.

Sandler, R. (2007). *Character and environment: A virtue-oriented approach to environmental ethics.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Sandler, R. (2005). Introduction. In R. Sandler, & P. Cafaro (Eds.), *Environmental Virtue Ethics* (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Schiappa, E. (2003). *Defining reality: Definitions and the politics of meaning.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Schlosberg, D. (2005). Environmental and ecological Justice: Theory and practice in the United States. In J. B. Eckersley (Ed.), *The State and the Global Ecological Crisis* (pp. 97-116). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Schubert, R., Schelinhuber, H., Buchmann, N., Epiney, A., Griebhammer, R., Kulessa, M., et al. (2008). *Climate change as a security risk.* Sterling, VA: Earthscan.

Schudson, M. (2001). Politics as cultural practice. *Political Communication, 18*, 421-431.

Seelye, K. (2003, September 24). Hearing on E.P.A. nominee takes and ideological turn. *The New York Times*, p. A22.

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

Shapely, D. (2009, September 8). Michelle Obama' White House garden. Retrieved 2011, January 25 from *The Daily Green*: http://www.thedailygreen.com/environmental-news/latest/michelle-obama-gardens-47022002.

Shenoy, R. (2011 May 30). One week later, services trickle in for tornado victims. *MPR News*. Retrieved 2011 May 30 from: http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2011/05/29/tornado-week-later-minneapolis/.

Shiva, V. (2005). *Earth domocracy: justice, sustainability, and peace.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Simmons, G. (1998). *The scourging of Iraq: Sanctions, law, and natural justice* (2nd ed). NewYork, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, K., & Yamamori, T. (Eds.). (1992). *Growing our future: Food security and the environment.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc.

Snow, T. (2007, January 4). *Press briefing by Tony Snow.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=60324.

Snow, T., & Connaughton, J. (2007, February 23). *Press briefing by Tony Snow and Jim Connaughton, chairman of the council on environmental quality.* (J. T. Woolley, & G. Peters, Eds.) Retrieved 2008, September 22 from The American Presidency Project: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=75128.

Southgate, D., & Douglas, G. H. (2007). *The world food economy.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Stanley, A. (2009). Just space or spatial justice? Difference, discourse, and environmental justice. *Local Environment, 14*(10), 999-1014.

Stevenson, N. (2003). *Cultural citizenship: cosmopolitan questions.* Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Steverson, B. K. (2009). Contextualism and Norton's convergence hypothesis. In B. A. Minteer (Ed.), *Nature in Common? Environmental Ethics and the Contested Foundtions of Environmental Policy* (pp. 21-35). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Stub, S. (1997). Our future--common or none at All. In N.P. Gleditsch (Ed.), *Conflict and the Environment* (pp. 3-14). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Swanson, E. A. (2007). Natural arguments: Popular discourse and environmental legislation--1945-2007. [PhD dissertation] Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Talshir, G. (2001). Ecological sustainability: A private case of social justice? In J. Barry, & M. Wissenburg (Eds.), *Sustaining Liberal Democracy* (pp. 37-56). New York, NY: Palgrave.

Tannenbaum, J. (2007, April 2). *Why growth is bad, gardens good and Cuba key to oil-free future*. (M. Hoelterhoff, Editor) Retrieved 2001, March 31 from *Bloomberg*: http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aTiNjJ_HtgK8&refer=muse

Taylor, B. C. (2010). "A hedge against the future": The post-Cold War rhetoric of nuclear weapons modernization. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 96*(1), 1-24.

The Guardian: Origins of the EPA. (1992). (R. Farrah, Producer, & The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Retrieved 2010, September 8 from EPA: http://www.epa.gov/history/publications/print/origins.htm.

The White House. (2010, February 9). *First lady Michelle Obama launches let's move: America's move to raise a healthier generation*. Retrieved 2011, January 25 from The White House: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/first-lady-michelle-obama-launches-lets-move-americas-move-raise-a-healthier-genera.

Trombetta, M. J. (2008). Environmental security and climate change: Analysing the discourse. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 21*(4), 585-602.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010, November 4). *USA quick facts from the U.S. Census Bureau.* Retrieved 2011, May 6, from U.S. Census Bureau: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html.

U.S. Government. (2010, February 9). *Learn the facts: Raising healthier kids*. Retrieved 2011, January 31 from Let's Move!: http://www.letsmove.gov/learnthefacts.php.

U.S. Government. (2010, February 9). *Take action*. Retrieved 2011, January 25 from Let's Move!: http://www.letsmove.gov/action.php.

U.S. Government. (2010, February 9). *The partnership for a healthier America*. Retrieved 2011, January 25 from Let's Move!: http://www.letsmove.gov/partnership_join.php.

Ullman, R. (1983). Redefining Security. *International Security, 8*(1), 129-153.

Van Wensveen, L. (2005). The emergence of ecological virtue language. In R. Sandler, & P. Cafaro (Eds.), *Environmental Virtue Ethics* (pp. 15-30). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Vig, N. (2003). Presidential leadership and the environment. In N. Vig, & M. E. Kraft (Eds.) *Environmental Policy: New Directions for the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 103-125). Washington D.C.: CQ Press.

Wadell, C. (2000). The reception of Silent Spring: An introduction. In C. Wadell (Ed.), *And no birds sing: Rhetorical analyses of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring* (pp. 1-16). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illionois University Press.

Wapner, P. (2009). Paul Wapner on an empathetic climate policy. *Tikkum, 24*, 86-87.

Warming Up. (2004, January 25). *The New York Times*, p. WK14.

Webersik, C. (2010). *Climate change and security: A gathering storm of global challenges.* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Alternative Energy/Wind Power (Gaa-Noodin-oke)*. Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/1.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Education*. (White Earth Land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/7.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Farm to school program*. (White Earth Land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/25.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Globalized agriulture and Hunger*. (White Earth Land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/250.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Home page*. (White Earth Land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2011, June 1 from White Earth Land Recovery Project and Other Related Issues: www.welrp.org

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Land*. (White Earth Land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/10.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Mishtadim horse academy*. (White Earth Land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth land Recovery Project: nativeharvest.com/node/9.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Native harvest*. Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Online Catalog: nativeharvest.com/native_harvest.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Patents and biopiracy*. (White Earth land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/249.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2008). *Seed sovereignty*. (White Earth Land Recovery Project) Retrieved 2010, April 22 from White Earth Land Recovery Project & Native Harvest Catalog: nativeharvest.com/node/251.

White Earth Land Recovery Project. (2007). *White earth land recovery project 2007 annual report.* White Earth Land Recovery Project. Callaway, MN: White Earth Land Recovery Project.

Williams, O. (2005). Food and justice: The critical link to healthy communities. In D. Naguib, & R. J. Brulle, *Power, Justice, and the Environment: A Critical Appraisal of the Environmental Justice Movement* (pp. 117-130). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Winona LaDuke: WELRP Founder. (2005). (W. E. Project, Producer) Retrieved 2005, March 1 from http://www.welrp.org/winona.html

Wissenburg, M. (2004). Fragmented citizenship in a global environment. In B. B. John Barry (Ed.), *Europe, Globalization and Sustainable Development.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Wolfe, D. P. (2007). Sidestepping environmental controversy through a rhetoric of security: George W. Bush in Summerhaven Arizona. *Western Journal of Communication, 71*(1), 28-48.

Zaeske, S. (2003). *Signatures of citizenship: Petitioning, antislavery, and women's political identity.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1986). *President Johnson's war on poverty: Rhetoric and history.* University, AL: The University of Alabama Press.