Robert Cox | Phaedra C. Pezzullo

Environmental Communication and the *Public Sphere*

4 EDITION

CHAPTER 10

Environmental Justice and Climate Justice Movements

To anyone who continues to deny the reality that is climate change, . . . I dare you to go to . . . the islands of the Caribbean and the islands of the Indian Ocean and see the impacts of rising sea levels. Not to forget the massive hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico and the eastern seaboard of North America. And if that is not enough, you may want to pay a visit to the Philippines right now.

—Philippines delegate Naderev (Yeb) Saño,
speaking to the COP19 Climate Change
Summit in Poland, November 11, 2013

In 2013, Filipino climate commissioner, Naderev (Yeb) Saño, caught global attention with his moving speech. One of the strongest storms ever recorded, Typhoon Haiyan, had killed at least 10,000 people and devastated his country that week. Making connections among climate disaster victims and survivors globally, Saño pled with global governments to take heed: "What my country is going through as a result of this extreme climate event is madness. The climate crisis is madness. We can stop this madness" (Saño, 2013, para. 10).

Within the United States, grassroots voices increasingly have been demanding environmental justice as well. As with climate justice, these communities point out the disproportionate burden of costs specific communities have carried while a smaller number of elites have profited.

Chapter Preview

- In the first section of this chapter, we describe the emergence of the environmental justice movement in response to patterns of *environmental racism*, as well as how that movement has developed a discourse, become institutionalized, and achieved some success.
- The second section identifies barriers faced by people who attempt to speak out against environmental injustices. This section considers two public forums through which environmental justice advocates have attempted to gain recognition in the public sphere:
    - The stigmatization of certain voices as inappropriate in their communication styles when speaking in technical forums
    - The marginalization of frontline communities who use *toxic tours* in response, calling attention to the sights, sounds, and smells of environmental inequalities
- In the third section, we describe the climate justice movement, whose discourse seeks to connect the dots between environmental, social, and economic global struggles and whose actions range from online networks to a rise in civil disobedience.

As discussed in Chapter 2, efforts to redefine the meaning of *environment* by grassroots, multiracial struggles for social, economic, and ecological justice in the United States and globally have changed how many of us understand environmental matters today. Our hope is that when you have finished reading the chapter, you'll understand how the movements for environmental justice and climate justice are also movements for a more democratically inclusive world.

Environmental Justice: Challenging *a Place Apart*

As used by community activists and scholars studying the movement, the term environmental justice refers to (a) calls to recognize and halt the disproportionate burdens imposed on working-class and people of color communities by environmentally harmful conditions, (b) more inclusive opportunities for those who are most affected to be heard in the decisions affecting their communities, and (c) a vision of environmentally healthy, economically sustainable, and culturally thriving communities. This grassroots movement redefined *environment* to encompass where we live, work, play, and learn. Although this movement now includes urban gardens and green spaces, it began out of a broader, emerging focus on toxic pollution.

The Beginnings of a "New" Movement

While credit is due to anti-toxic advocates in the 20th century who raised awareness about public health, a less frequently acknowledged source of critical rhetoric (Chapter 8) about increased toxic pollution production are the polyvocal voices of people of color that also initiated grassroots struggles across North America. The history of Native American genocide and colonization, for example, cannot be delinked from a history of land removal, resource exploitation, and toxic chemical exposure (particularly

through uranium mining and atomic bomb tests). Likewise, struggles of immigrant and migrant farmworkers always have involved critical rhetorics of working conditions in fields, including health concerns about pesticide exposure. Perhaps one of the most famous successful advocacy campaigns of the 20th century was the United Farm Workers' 1965–1970 strike and call to boycott table grapes; Cesar Chavez insisted on organizing Latino/a and Filipino/a workers together to establish the first union contracts for farmworkers, including better pay, benefits, and protections.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, African American civil rights groups, churches, and environmental leaders also tried to call attention to the particular problems of urban communities and the workplace. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. went to Memphis, Tennessee, in 1968 to join with African American sanitation workers who were striking for wages and better work conditions—an event that sociologist and environmental justice scholar/advocate Robert D. Bullard (1993, 1994) called one of the earliest efforts to link civil rights and environmental health concerns. (*Note:* Today, many call Bullard the "father of environmental justice"—http://drrobertbullard.com.) And the 1971 Urban Environment Conference (UEC) was a coalition of labor, environmental, and civil rights groups that tried "to help broaden the way the public defined environmental issues and to focus on the particular environmental problems of urban minorities" (Kazis & Grossman, 1991, p. 247).

Despite these early attempts to bring environmental, labor, and civil rights leaders together to explore common interests, national environmental groups in the 20th century largely failed to support communities of color and working-class communities. In her account of efforts to stop the construction of a 1,600-ton-per-day solid waste incinerator in a south central Los Angeles neighborhood in the mid-1980s, Giovanna Di Chiro (1996) reported,

> These issues were not deemed adequately 'environmental' by local environmental groups such as the Sierra Club or the Environmental Defense Fund. . . . [T]hey were informed that the poisoning of an urban community by an incineration facility was a "community health issue," not an environmental one. (p. 299; see also Alston, 1990)[1]

The racism, economic elitism, and sexism of the broader U.S. culture often marginalized these grassroots efforts (Pezzullo & Sandler, 2007). Finding these individual community efforts had a great deal in common, in the early 1980s a multicultural movement of coalitions across these struggles was born.

Toxic Waste and the Birth of a Movement

When the state government of North Carolina discovered that PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl) chemicals had been illegally dumped along miles of highways, officials decided to bury the toxic-laced soil in a landfill in the predominantly African American and poor Warren County, despite needing to waive two U.S. EPA restrictions to do so. Rather than quietly accept this decision, local residents and supporters from national

civil rights groups tried to halt the state's plan by filing two lawsuits, which failed. In 1982, when trucks carrying the PCB-contaminated soil began driving into Warren County, a multi-racial coalition began placing their bodies in the middle of the roads leading to the landfill and more than 500 arrests for acts of nonviolent civil disobedience occurred. The events of that summer have been narrated countless times as a "symbolic center," a "milestone," and a story of origin for the environmental justice movement (Pezzullo, 2001).

Prompted by protests in Warren County and elsewhere, in the 1980s and 1990s federal agencies and scholars began to confirm patterns of disproportionate exposure to environmental hazards (U.S. GAO, 1983). The United Church of Christ's Commission for Racial Justice (Chavis & Lee, 1987), for example, found the following:

- Race proved to be the most significant among variables tested in association with the location of commercial waste facilities. . . . Although socioeconomic status appeared to play an important role in the location of [these] facilities, race still proved to be more significant (p. xiii).
- Three out of every five Black and Hispanic Americans lived in communities with uncontrolled toxic waste sites (p. iv).
- Approximately half of all Asian/Pacific Islanders and American Indians lived in communities with uncontrolled toxic waste sites (p. xiv).

A follow-up report, *Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty, 1987–2007,* revealed that "racial disparities in the distribution of hazardous wastes are greater than previously reported" in the original 1987 study (Bullard, Mohai, Saha, & Wright, 2007, p. x).

We Speak for Ourselves: Naming Environmental Racism

As communities began to feel the impacts of this disproportionate burden, they began to name their experiences. One powerful phrase seized upon by activists to describe their communities' plights was *environmental racism.* By linking civil rights discourse with environmental discourse, a new vocabulary emerged. Dr. Benjamin Chavis of the United Church of Christ's Commission for Racial Justice defined environmental racism as

> racial discrimination in environmental policy-making and the enforcement of regulations and laws, the deliberate targeting of people of color communities for toxic waste facilities, the official sanctioning of the life-threatening presence of poisons and pollutants in our communities, and the history of excluding people of color from leadership in the environmental movement. (quoted in Grossman, 1994, p. 278)

While Chavis and other civil rights leaders highlighted the "deliberate" targeting of people of color communities, others pointed out that discrimination also resulted from the *disparate impact* of environmental hazards on people of color communities. The 1964 Civil Rights Act used the term **disparate impact** to recognize discrimination in the form of the disproportionate burdens that some groups experience, regardless of the conscious intention of others in their decisions or behaviors. In other words,

racial discrimination results from the accumulated impacts of unfair treatment, which may include more than intentional discrimination or deliberate targeting. Asian American communities also raised attention toward procedural justice concerns, such as translation (Sze, 2011).

In other cases, activists themselves began to call the conditions imposed on low-income communities a form of *economic blackmail*. For example, Bullard (1993) explained, "You can get a job, but only if you are willing to do work that will harm you, your families, and your neighbors" (p. 23). This **economic blackmail** is a false choice presented between financial worth and environmental protection that deflects attention away from the fact that jobs can be provided while meeting basic health and environmental standards.

Naming the problems associated with environmental injustices was important. Rose Marie Augustine (1993), who we will discuss later, attended a workshop for community activists in the Southwest. She said that, for the first time, "I heard words like 'economic blackmail,' 'environmental racism.' Somebody put words, names, on what our community was experiencing."

Courtesy of Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice

Photo 10.1 Founded in Oakland, California, in 1999, Asian Communities for Reproductive Justice (ACRJ) connects environmental justice goals with rights explicitly related to gender and sexuality. Developing an intersectional approach to the precautionary principle, this organization uses the metaphor of "looking both ways" to bridge environmental and reproductive justice concerns (de Onís, 2012).

As protests mounted against such patterns and the failure of the mainstream environmental movement to address the problems, activists began to insist that people in affected communities be able to "speak for ourselves" (Alston, 1990). Social justice activist Dana Alston (1990) argued, in her book *We Speak for Ourselves,* that environmental justice "calls for *a total redefinition of terms and language* [emphasis added] to describe the conditions that people are facing" (quoted in Di Chiro, 1998, p. 105). Indeed, what some found distinctive about the critical rhetoric of the new movement was the way in which it transformed "the possibilities for fundamental social and environmental change through processes of redefinition, reinvention, and construction of innovative political and cultural discourses" (Di Chiro, 1996, p. 303). Environmental attorney Deehon Ferris put it more bluntly when she said, "We're shifting the terms of the debate" (Ferris, 1993).

One important shift in the terms of debate occurred in 1990, when the SouthWest Organizing Project (SWOP) publicly criticized the nation's largest environmental groups, specifically those that belonged to the "Group of Ten."[2] Called "the single most stirring challenge to traditional environmentalism" (Schwab, 1994, p. 388), the letter ultimately was signed by more than one hundred civil rights and community leaders. The letter accused the mainstream groups of racism in their hiring and policies, as well as a lack of accountability toward Third World communities within the United States and abroad. Coverage of the letter in the *New York Times* and other newspapers "initiated a media firestorm" and generated calls for "an emergency summit of environmental, civil rights, and community groups" (Cole & Foster, 2001, p. 31).

Building the Movement for Environmental Justice

Such a gathering came when delegates from local communities and national leaders from social justice, religious, environmental, and civil rights groups met in Washington, DC, for the **First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit**, in October 1991.[3] The summit was a "watershed moment" in the history of the nascent environmental justice movement (Di Chiro, 1998, p. 113). For three days, activists shared stories of grievances and attempted to compose a collective critique of the narrow vision of the environment and the exclusion of people of color from decisions that affected their communities. One participant declared, "I don't care to join the environmental movement, I belong to a movement already" (quoted in Cole & Foster, 2001, p. 31).

By placing concerns about toxic wastes and other environmental dangers into a civil rights frame, they were able to "characterize the distribution of environmental hazards as part of a broader pattern of social injustice, one that contradicts the fundamental beliefs of fairness and equity" (Sandweiss, 1998, p. 51). For example, Janice Dickerson, an African American activist, provided this testimony in a video shown during the summit:

> From the perspective of the African American, it's a civil rights matter; it's interwoven. Civil rights and the environment movement are both interwoven. Because, again, we are the most victimized. . . . There's no difference in a petro-chemical industry locating two, three hundred feet from my house and killing me off than there is when the Klan was on the rampage, just running into black neighborhoods, hanging black people at will. (Greenpeace, 1990)

By drawing on the "morally charged terrain" of the civil rights movement, the summit participants dramatically shifted the terms of public debate about the environment (Harvey, 1996, p. 387). Many of the speakers at the summit also urged participants to demand political representation and to speak forcefully to public officials, corporations, and the traditional environmental movement. At the summit, Chavis explained,

> *This is our opportunity to define and redefine for ourselves. . . .* What is at issue here is our ability, our capacity to speak clearly to ourselves, to our peoples, and forthrightly to all those forces out there that have caused us to be in this situation. (*Proceedings*, 1991, p. 59)

On the last day, participants did so in a dramatic way by adopting 17 Principles of Environmental Justice, an expansive vision for their communities and the right to participate directly in decisions about their environment.

The principles began: "Environmental justice affirms the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological unity and the interdependence of all species, and the right to be free from ecological destruction" (*Proceedings*, 1991, p. viii). The principles developed an enlarged sense of the environment to include places where people lived, worked, and played and enumerated a series of rights, including "the fundamental right to political, economic, cultural, and environmental self-determination of all peoples" (p. viii).

The inclusion of the right of self-determination was especially important to the emerging movement. Many of the summit's participants had criticized the officially sanctioned decision making in their communities for failing to provide meaningful participation "for those most burdened by environmental decisions" (Cole & Foster, 2001, p. 16). In adopting the principles, they insisted that *environmental justice* not only referred to the right of all people to be free of environmental poisons but that at its core is the inclusion of all in the decisions that affect their health and the well-being of their communities.

Afterward, the Southern Organizing Conference for Social and Economic Justice applauded the "new definition of the term 'environment'"; the group invited community activists "to build a new movement" using the Principles of Environmental Justice adopted at the summit (personal communication, June 2, 1992). Deehon Ferris (1993) of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights in Washington, DC, observed that "as a result of on-the-ground struggles and hell-raising, 'environmental justice' [emerged as] a hot issue. . . . Floodgates [opened] in the media." Urban planning scholar Jim Schwab (1994) observed "the new movement had won a place at the table. The Deep South, the nation, would never discuss environmental issues in the same way again" (p. 393). The *National Law Journal* reported that the movement had gained "critical mass" (Lavelle & Coyle, 1992, p. 5). As the movement grew, it achieved more success.

Institutionalization of Environmental Justice

In 1993, the movement persuaded the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set up a **National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (NEJAC)** to ensure a voice in the EPA's policy making for environmental justice groups. The committee

was chartered to provide advice from the environmental justice community and recommendations to the EPA administrator. For example, NEJAC produced advisory reports on the cleanup of brown fields (polluted urban areas), mercury contamination of fish, and new guidelines for ensuring participation of working-class and people of color residents in decisions about permits for industries wanting to locate in their communities.

The movement also achieved an important political goal when U.S. president Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, in 1994. **Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice** instructed each federal agency "to make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing . . . disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States" (Clinton, 1994, p. 7629). Although the Clinton administration began to implement the Executive Order, the succeeding administration of George W. Bush allowed it to lay dormant for eight years (Office of the Inspector General, 2004).

Under the Obama administration, however, the Executive Order on Environmental Justice received new life. The EPA's first administrator under Obama, Lisa Jackson, hosted a White House forum on environmental justice and launched community meetings across the country. "Now, it's time to take it to the next level," Jackson said, adding that the Obama administration would focus on the creation of "green jobs" in disadvantaged communities (quoted in "Obama Revives Panel on Environmental Justice," 2010, p. 2A). On the twentieth anniversary of Executive Order 12898, the EPA launched **Plan EJ 2014** as a set of strategies to recommit to and reinvigorate environmental justice efforts through legal, scientific, information, and resource development and communication. (See http://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/plan-ej/index.html.)

In addition, the mainstream U.S. environmental movement itself underwent changes as a result of the critique of an environmentalism that stood apart from the places where people lived. Pezzullo and Sandler (2007), for example, observed that "much has changed within . . . and happened around" the mainstream and environmental justice movements (p. 12). Dialogue between leaders of the mainstream green groups and the environmental justice community led in some cases to collaborations. Greenpeace, Sierra Club, Earth Island Institute, and Earth Justice have been particularly active in their support of environmental justice concerns.

Since these initial moments, environmental justice has served as a broad umbrella term for a wide range of topics beyond toxic pollution, including urban gardens, city planning decisions, logging debates, and more (Pezzullo & Sandler, 2007). As Bullard (2014) observes, the environmental justice movement has grown significantly over the past two decades: "The number of people of color environmental groups that support the Environmental Justice Movement has grown from 400 groups in 1994 to more than 3,000 groups and a dozen networks in 2013." A subsequent gathering—the **Second National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit**—was held in Washington, DC, from October 23 to 26, 2002. Highlighting women's roles as leaders

in the movement, the second event was even larger, attracting more than 1,400 participants. Out of this Summit, Principles of Collaboration also were written to help guide coalition work between the environmental justice movement and environmental organizations (reprinted in Sandler & Pezzullo, 2007).

Nevertheless, the movement for environmental justice also would confront new obstacles and a need to identify new ways to communicate to pursue their vision.

Challenging Indecorous Voices and Sacrifice Zones

An important theme in the discourse of environmental justice is the right of individuals in at-risk communities to participate in decisions affecting their lives. In this chapter, we want to focus on two barriers North American environmental justice advocates have challenged in the hope of gaining recognition: *indecorous voices* and *sacrifice zones*.

Dismissing the "Indecorous" Voice

When someone is judged as having an **indecorous voice**, she or he is deemed as inappropriate or unqualified for speaking in official forums, which is based in the assumption that ordinary people may be too emotional or ignorant to testify about chemical pollution or other environmental issues in settings that privilege "rational" or logical rhetorical appeals. This perceived need to split environmental science or technical decision making from the experiences and feelings of everyday people can further perpetuate environmental racism and injustices. So, what are the expectations in technical public forums?

Decorum and the Norms of Public Forums

In some ways, the unstated rules that operate in many technical forums addressing environmental problems reflect something similar to the ancient principle of *decorum*. **Decorum** was a virtue of style in the classical Greek and Latin handbooks on rhetoric and is usually translated as *propriety* or *that which is fitting* for the particular audience and occasion. The Roman rhetorician Cicero, for example, wrote that a wise speaker is one who is "able to speak in any way which the case requires" or in ways that are most "appropriate"; he proposed, "let us call [this quality] decorum or 'propriety'" (Cicero, 1962, XX.69).

With exposure to chemical contamination and official denial or resistance, affected residents often become frustrated, disillusioned with authority, and angry. Under such norms of decorum, residents sometimes confront a painful dilemma. On the one hand, to enter discussions about toxicology, epidemiology, or the technical aspects of environmental science in a technical forum is tacitly to accept the discursive boundaries about the type of knowledge valued in that space; many residents do learn a great deal about the science impacting their lives and can provide feedback in

this manner, using everything from surveys to mapping public health conditions in order to provide evidence of costs. Yet, although often reasonable evidence, data are not always persuasive. On the other hand, to share stories about one's personal expertise about one's family's health and to ask questions can transgress powerful boundaries about what is reasonable or acceptable decorum and may leave one more open to being dismissed as unreasonable and not thinking about the big picture. To illustrate this dilemma, the following are two stories typical of environmental justice leaders attempting to be heard these public forums.

Rose Marie Augustine's Story: "Hysterical, Hispanic Housewives"

On the south side of Tucson, Arizona, where Latin Americans and Native Americans are the main residents, chemicals from several industrial plants had seeped into the groundwater table. This contaminated the wells from which some 47,000 residents drew their drinking water. One of the residents, Rose Marie Augustine, described her own and her neighbors' fears: "We didn't know anything about what had happened to us. . . . We were never informed about what happens to people who become contaminated by drinking contaminated water. . . . We were suffering lots of cancers, and we thought, you know, my God, what's happening?" (Augustine, 1991). EPA officials later confirmed the severity of the toxic chemicals that had been leaching from nearby Tucson industrial plants into their well water and listed this site as one the nation's priority Superfund sites for cleanup (Augustine, 1993).

Prior to the area's listing as a Superfund site, residents from the south side had tried to get local officials to listen to their concerns. Augustine (1993) reported that, when residents met with officials, the officials refused to respond to questions about the health effects of drinking their well water. She said that, when residents persisted, one county supervisor told them "the people in the south side were obese, lazy, and had poor eating habits, that it was our lifestyle and not the TC [toxic chemicals] in the water that caused our health problems." Augustine said that one official "called us 'hysterical Hispanic housewives' when we appealed to him for help."

Augustine did not let local officials discourage her. Despite the barriers she faced, she became a national environmental justice leader and eventually helped communities beyond her own. Yet, the biases of technical forums for public participation continue to persist. Our next story shares a similar tale.

Charlotte Keys's Story: "The Evidence Is in My Body!"

When she began to speak up for her community, Charlotte Keys was a young, African American woman in the small town of Columbia in southern Mississippi whom we both know through our advocacy work with the Sierra Club (Robbie as president in the mid-1990s; Phaedra interviewed her for her book, *Toxic Tourism*, 2007). Keys and her neighbors lived next to a chemical plant owned by Reichhold Chemical, which had exploded and burned years earlier. The explosion and fire spewed toxic fumes throughout the neighborhood. Residents also suspected some of

the barrels of chemicals that had been abandoned by the company had leached into the yards of nearby homes and into tributaries of Columbia's drinking water sources.

Many of Keys's neighbors complained of unusual skin rashes, headaches, and illnesses. Officials from EPA and Columbia's mayor initially dismissed the residents' complaints as unsubstantiated; no health assessment was ever conducted. Reichhold spokesperson Alec Van Ryan later acknowledged to local news media, "I think everyone from the EPA on down will admit the initial communications with the community were nonexistent" (quoted in Pender, 1993, p. 1).

Ultimately, Keys organized her neighbors to speak with local officials and at public meetings. One such meeting occurred with officials from the federal Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), who traveled to Columbia to propose a health study of the residents. However, the ATSDR officials proposed only to sample the neighbors' urine and hair and test these for recent, acute exposure to toxins. Keys and other residents objected. They explained their exposure had initially occurred much earlier, when the plant exploded, and had been ongoing since then. Having done their homework, they insisted that the appropriate test was one that sampled blood and fatty tissues for evidence of long-term, chronic exposure. Keys urged the ATSDR officials to adopt this approach because, she said, "The evidence is in my body!" (C. Keys, personal correspondence, September 12, 1995).

The ATSDR officials refused this request, citing budgetary constraints. In turn, the residents felt stymied in their efforts to introduce the important personal evidence of their long-term exposure to chemicals that they believed was evident in their bodies. The meeting degenerated into angry exchanges and ended with an indefinite deferral of the plans to conduct a health study.[5] Like Augustine, Keys did not give up and her persistence helped not only her community but also to build a stronger movement for environmental justice.

Unfortunately, the tension between the ATSDR and the residents of Columbia, Mississippi, is not unusual. Too often, agency officials dismiss the complaints and recommendations of those facing the greatest risk of toxic chemical exposure, believing that such people are emotional, unreliable, and irrational. For example, in an early study of public comments on the EPA's environmental impact studies, political scientist Lynton Caldwell (1988) found that

> public input into the . . . document was not regarded by government officials as particularly useful. . . . The public was generally perceived to be poorly informed on the issues and unsophisticated in considering risks and trade-offs. . . . Public participation was accepted as inevitable, but sometimes with great reluctance. (p. 80)

We also have overheard agency officials complain, after hearing reports of family illness or community members' fears, "This is very emotional, but where's the evidence?" "I've already heard this story," or simply, "This is not helpful."

To be clear, we are not suggesting that the indecorous voice results in a person's rhetorical incompetence or a failure to find the "right words" to articulate a grievance. Instead, we're suggesting that the arrangements and procedures of power may

Courtesy of the Sierra Club

Photo 10.2 The Connect the 9 Community Bikeride took place in April 2014 as a biking tour, organized by the Sierra Club, Global Green USA, the Green Project, Bike Easy, and the Lower Ninth Ward Center for Sustainable Engagement and Development (CSED). Sierra Club Environmental Justice organizer Darryl Malek-Wiley noted "After Katrina, community members decided they wanted to make their neighborhoods sustainable, and that doesn't just mean greener. It also means restoring natural areas like the cypress-tupelo wooded swamp in Bayou Bienvenue, which is within the city limits in the Lower Ninth Ward."

undermine the respect accorded to such individuals by narrowly defining the acceptable rhetorical norms of environmental decision making.

Sacrifice Zones: Out of Sight, Out of Mind?

Environmental justice communities often describe themselves as **sacrifice zones** (Bullard, 1993); that is to say that the neighborhoods that bear the disproportionate burden for unsustainable practices, such as toxic pollution, do not share in meaningful benefits and are part of the "cost" of not changing course. Such neighborhoods often exist outside of dominant viewpoints, making their sacrifices easier to ignore for those who don't live in those communities.

One particularly striking form of communication used more and more by environmental justice groups to connect local communities and wider publics to resist this barrier to recognition is what grassroots activists call **toxic tours.** In *Toxic Tourism: Rhetorics of Pollution, Travel, and Environmental Justice,* Phaedra C. Pezzullo (2007) defines these as "non-commercial expeditions into areas that are polluted by toxins. . . . More and more of these communities have begun to invite outsiders in, providing tours as a means of educating people about and, it is hoped, transforming their situation" (p. 5). (For a vivid example of one such toxic tour in the "Cancer Alley" area of Louisiana, see Pezzullo, 2003.)

Often, these outsiders are journalists, government officials, corporate representatives, environmental allies, religious groups, and other supporters who—in personally experiencing the conditions of a community under environmental stress—are more likely to be persuaded to identify and, therefore, to care and publicize their experiences more widely. On a toxic tour of southern California's Coachella Valley, for example, a director of the state Department of Toxic Substances Control, commented of an arsenic-laced well: "There's the human reaction of imagining myself raising my family in a mobile home where the water looks like it came out of a ditch" (Flaccus, 2011). Unlike EPA or other agency inspections of toxic sites, toxic tours highlight "discourses of . . . contamination, of social justice and the need for cultural change" (Pezzullo, 2007, pp. 5–6). Although environmental advocates have taken reporters and others into natural areas such as Yosemite Valley and the Grand Canyon for the past century to build support for their protection, this use of toxic tours of places of sacrifice is more recent.

Witnessing Environmental Injustices in the Maquiladoras

Some years ago, the two of us and other environmental leaders participated in a toxic tour together outside of Matamoros, Mexico, south of the U.S. border near Brownsville, Texas. This area, which is part of the *maquiladora* zone or manufacturing area, has large numbers of (largely unregulated) industrial plants. These plants relocated to this area from the United States as a result of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Living in nearby *colonias* (crowded, makeshift housing on unoccupied land), the *maquiladora* workers and their families are subject to severely contaminated air and water, abysmal sanitation, and unsafe drinking water; many suffer from a number of illnesses. As Peterson, Peterson, and Peterson argue,

> Both unsustainable development and environmental injustice are chronically acute on borders between comparatively affluent and poor nations (for example, United States/Mexico, Costa Rica/Nicaragua, South Korea/North Korea), where long-time residents and mushrooming immigrant populations are prone to differential treatment, differential access to political systems, and differential conceptions of justice. (2007, pp. 189–190)

The tour through the crowded *colonias* was organized by the Sierra Club and its Mexican allies to introduce leaders from environmental groups to the threats to human health from pollution and unhealthy living conditions for workers and their families. As we walked through the unpaved streets by the workers' homes, we felt overpowered by the sights, smells, and feel of an environment under assault. Strong chemical odors filled the air, small children played in visibly polluted streams by their homes, while others, barely older, scavenged in burning heaps of garbage for scraps of material they could sell for a few pesos.

Being in a community harmed by such hazards opens visitors' senses of sight, sound, and smell and this awareness builds support for the community's struggle: "Odorous fumes cause residents' and their visitors' eyes to water and throats to

tighten . . . a reminder of the physical risk toxics pose." One toxic tour guide observed that toxic tours give visitors "firsthand" evidence of "the environmental insult to residents [of having polluters so close to their homes], as well as the noxious odors that permeate the neighborhood" (Pezzullo, 2004, p. 248).

As toxic tours show, the environmental justice movement continues to confront real-world, on-the-ground challenges to publicize communities' grievances that are often excluded otherwise. Beyond this, environmental justice activists insist the movement embodies "a new vision borne of a community-driven process whose essential core is a transformative public discourse over what are truly healthy, sustainable and vital communities" (National Environmental Justice Advisory Council Subcommittee on Waste and Facility Siting, 1996, p. 17).

The Global Movement for Climate Justice

The environmental justice movement has expanded globally. Here, we want to turn our attention to how the movement for environment justice has been embraced by a vibrant and growing global movement for climate justice, which overlaps and exceeds the previous movement's goals. The largely dispersed, grassroots movement for climate justice views the environmental and human impacts of climate change from the frame of social justice, human rights, and concern for indigenous peoples. In this section, we describe the construction of a new frame of climate justice, as well as the efforts of communities affected by climate change to gain a voice internationally.

Climate Justice: A Frame to Connect the World

Climate scientists and advocates for climate justice generally agree "the greatest brunt of climate change's effects will be felt (and are being felt) by the world's poorest people" (Roberts, 2007, p. 295). Without immediate climate action, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) forecasts that "hundreds of millions of people in developing nations will face natural disasters, water shortages and hunger due to the effects of climate change" (Adam, Walker, & Benjamin, 2007, para. 5). "In 2012, one person every second was displaced by a climate or weather-related natural disaster," according to the Environmental Justice Foundation's 2014 report, *The Gathering Storm: Climate Change, Security and Conflict*. As they note, "with millions of people displaced each year by rapid-onset climate-related hazards and an unknown number fleeing slow-onset environmental degradation, a changing climate presents pressing operational and geopolitical challenges to a number of states" (p. 5).

A Cruel Irony: Impacts of Climate Change

Human rights groups and environmental scholars also charge that the voices of those most affected by climate change are often not part of the conversation about solutions. Dale Jamieson (2007) notes that

> seventy million farmers and their families in Bangladesh will lose their livelihoods when their rice paddies are inundated by seawater. Yet despite the vast number of people around the world who will suffer from climate change, most of them are not included when decisions are made. (p. 92)

He adds, for this reason, "participatory justice is also important at the global level" (p. 92).

There is also a *cruel irony* in this exclusion. As former *New Yorker Times* reporter Andrew Revkin (2007) observed, "In almost every instance, the people most at risk from climate change live in countries that have contributed the least to the buildup of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases linked to the recent warming of the planet" (para. 2). That is, the **cruel irony** of the climate crisis is that those who have contributed the least to the energy policies and demands that cause climate change and have profited the least from these industries have been and will continue to be impacted the most by climate change. Further, as Jacqueline Patterson, executive director of the NAACP's Climate Justice Initiative, notes, our collective response to extreme weather events remains inequitable:

> What's significant about disasters like Hurricane Katrina or even the flooding and tornadoes in Alabama and Mississippi a couple years ago is you start to see the differential impact and the differential response on communities of color. With Hurricane Katrina, it was more a story about the differential response, not as much of a story about climate change. (as quoted in Hsieh, 2014)

As the effects of climate change—particularly in vulnerable areas of Asia and Africa—began to be experienced by local communities and regions, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) from these nations began to build alliances and coordinate with activists in Europe and the United States. One of the most consequential developments of this alliance would be the elaboration of climate justice as a new frame in their construction of messages about global warming and in the mobilizing of others.

Framing Climate Crises as Unethical and as Human Rights Exigencies

The phrase *climate justice* was apparently used first in academic literature by Edith Brown Weiss (1989) in her study *In Fairness to Future Generations: International Law, Common Patrimony, and Intergenerational Equity.* A more movement-oriented demand for climate justice, however, may have been voiced first in the mid-1990s by Tom Goldtooth, the founder of the Indigenous Environmental Network; it was further developed in a 1999 CorpWatch report and was the basis for a resolution at the Second People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in 2002 (Tokar, 2010, pp. 45–46).

In Bali, Indonesia, in August 2002, a coalition of international NGOs, including the National Alliance of People's Movements (India), CorpWatch (United States), Greenpeace International, Third World Network (Malaysia), Indigenous Environmental Network (North America), and groundWork (South Africa) crafted

one of the first declarations redefining climate change from the perspective of environmental justice and human rights. Meeting alongside the UN delegates preparing for the Bali session earlier, the coalition developed the **Bali Principles of Climate Justice.** The principles pledged to "build an international movement of all peoples for Climate Justice" (Bali Principles of Climate Justice, 2002, para. 19). The effort would be based on certain principles, echoing values of the 1991 Principles of Environmental Justice while introducing a new focus on climate change:

1. Affirming the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological unity and the interdependence of all species.
2. Climate Justice insists that communities have the right to be free from climate change, its related impacts and other forms of ecological destruction.
3. Climate Justice affirms the need to reduce with an aim to eliminate the production of greenhouse gases and associated local pollutants.
4. Climate Justice affirms the rights of indigenous peoples and affected communities to represent and speak for themselves. (para. 20)

One consequence of the Bali Principles, as well as other declarations, was to shift "the discursive framework of climate change from a scientific-technical debate to one about ethics focused on human rights and justice" (Agyeman, Doppelt, & Lynn, 2007, p. 121).

Another important moment in this shift came on October 28, 2002, when more than 1,500 individuals—farmers, indigenous peoples, the poor, and youth—from more than 20 countries marched for climate justice in New Delhi, India (Roberts, 2007). The culmination of the summit was the **Delhi Climate Justice Declaration.** The declaration concluded,

> We, representatives of the poor and the marginalized of the world, representing fishworkers, farmers, Indigenous Peoples, Dalits, the poor, and the youth, resolve to actively build a movement . . . that will address the issue of climate change from a human-rights, social justice, and labour perspective. (Delhi Climate Justice Declaration, 2002, para. 12)

The declaration expressed the attendees' resolve to "build alliances across states and borders to oppose climate change inducing patterns and advocate for and practice sustainable development" (para. 12).

Other international gatherings and declarations have followed, including the Durban Declaration on Carbon Trading (2004), a critique of proposed market schemes for trading greenhouse gas emissions; the People's Declaration for Climate Justice (Sumberklampok Declaration) (2007) in Bali, Indonesia, an effort to influence the start of negotiations among the world's nations of a new post-Kyoto treaty; and the large, international mobilizations at the UN climate conferences from Berlin, Germany, in 1995 to annual gatherings, with the 2015 one hosted in Paris, France.

Overall, as opposed to a more general climate change framework primarily focused on scientific-technical information, biocentric reports, and anthropocentric causes, a climate justice frame communicates a value in ethical appeals, human rights, and impacts that evoke exigency to act.

Another Viewpoint: From Fossil Fuels to a "Just Transition"

Black Mesa Water Coalition has mobilized a national network in the United States of environmental justice communities, which are challenging the fossil fuel industry for what they call a "just transition" away from unsustainable industries and toward renewable energy. They emphasize that they are not just calling for a divestment in fossil fuels, but also a reinvestment in more sustainable energy sources and the communities most impacted by these choices. Watch their eight-minute video to listen for how they are making connections between patterns of environmental injustice and building support for climate justice jobs, policies, and ways of living: The Climate Justice Alliance (2014), *Our Power Film/Black Mesa Water Coalition*. Available at http://vimeo.com/84751170.

Mobilizing for Climate Justice

As a result of their exclusion from the official forums, climate justice activists have sought to create alternative structures for communication. In 2014, Anjal Appadurai, a climate activist who helped organize a protest in Vancouver of Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper with signs for "CLIMATE JUSTICE NOW," emphasized the significance of marginalized voices getting heard in global arenas: "Activism takes many forms, but the primary motive is to have the voice heard" ("Climate Change Protestors," 2014). Let's look at some of the ways the climate justice movement is attempting to communicate these ideas and perspectives.

Transnational Organizing

At global summits and elsewhere, climate activists emphasize the need to create lines of communication across borders and within regions to build a movement for climate justice. Given the geographic distance of the many involved, it perhaps is not surprising that the climate justice movement itself is sustained largely online through social networking sites and LISTSERVs that help to mobilize activists for actions at sites such as the Copenhagen conference. For example, the India Climate Justice Forum is hosted by the India Resource Center, a project of Global Resistance, whose goal is "to strengthen the movement against corporate globalization by supporting and linking local, grassroots struggles against globalization around the world" (indiaresource.org).

The climate justice movement also has initiated new social networking sites, blogs, and information sites of its own. For example, the London-based Rising Tide Coalition for Climate Justice (risingtide.org.uk) consists of environmental and social justice groups from around the world, especially in Europe (Roberts, 2007). There is

also a Rising Tide North American network (2008, risingtidenorthamerica.org). Rising Tide grew out of the efforts of groups who came together to organize events alongside a UN climate conference in The Hague in 2000. Other prominent online networks include Environmental Justice Climate Change Initiative (ejcc.org); It's Getting Hot in Here (itsgettinghotinhere.org,), and 350.org.

The number 350 in climate justice discourse refers to 350 parts per million of carbon dioxide as the level in the atmosphere that is safe for the global climate. Like many other online sites, 350.org provides daily updates, video uploads from local activists, and analyses of official proposals. The site also has played a prominent role in the past several years, mobilizing climate justice activists ahead of the UN climate conferences across the globe, and annually since then, in same-day, international displays of concern. Their website claims to involve grassroots activists from 188 countries and "Email is how 350 connects" (350.org). Co-leader Naomi Klein describes how activists from a community in a country like El Salvador have found the link between their history of struggles for social justice to resonate with climate activism, because both are about a desire for "deepening democracy":

> It's a community that was born out of the civil war, a community of refugees . . . and they bring their revolutionary history—and their history of fighting for economic justice—to the climate fight. They're finding ways to respond to climate change that really transform their community in every way, from housing to health care. . . . Climate change is the human-rights struggle of our time. And it's too important to be left to the environmentalists alone. (Stephenson, 2012)

As a result of its online and offline organizing, the climate justice movement brings together coalitions of students, antinuclear and social justice activists, indigenous peoples, academics, opponents of carbon trading, religious groups, and others.

This transnational organizing perhaps was best witnessed so far in the global events on September 21, 2014, when hundreds of thousands of people around the world rallied to "sound the alarm" for the need for climate action. In New York City, the march itself was organized to represent the importance of organizing across communities and concerns, with the following messages represented in six parts of the march (http://peoplesclimate.org/lineup/):

1. Frontlines of Crisis, Forefront of Change (indigenous, environmental justice and other sacrifice zone communities)
2. We Can Build the Future (labor unions, families, students, elders, and more)
3. We Have Solutions (just transition possibilities, including renewable energy and water justice)
4. We Know Who Is Responsible (calling out those holding back progress)
5. The Debate Is Over (scientists and interfaith communities, and more)
6. To Change Everything, We Need Everyone (LGBTQ, people representing states and countries around the world)

Strategic Campaigns

Yet, others have questioned whether the reliance on mass action alone is equal to the scale and complexity of the global economic system that is responsible for climate change: "We really do need a longer term plan," acknowledged Patrick Bond, the director of the Center for Civil Society in South Africa, a plan that "will make the gains we've taken, on the streets and in the communities . . . actually real. How can they be turned into good public policy?" ("Only Political Activism," 2010, p. 186). Radical environmentalist Eirik Eiglad (2010) similarly asked, "How can we see beyond the current . . . focus on the major climate summits [like Copenhagen or Cancun], important as they may be?" (p. 10).

While efforts so far have failed to persuade the U.S. Congress and many other governments that contribute to greenhouse gases to act in significant ways on climate change, some environmental groups are pursuing more strategic campaigns outside of the political process to reduce greenhouse gases directly. Perhaps the most successful of these efforts has been the Sierra Club's Beyond Coal campaign against coal-burning power plants (Chapter 8). As a result of the targeting of state utility commissions, banks, and energy companies themselves, the campaign and its supporters have blocked or cancelled more than 150 proposed plants in the past five years. Yet, even as plants are cancelled in the United States, coal-fired power plants continue to be built as other nations pursue their own economic paths to development. Continuing to study such acts of mobilization, Cox (2010) argues, is essential not just to improve the movement's ability to achieve a particular end, but also to build alliances that can adapt to changing political and climatic situations.

Others, therefore, acknowledge that slowing then reversing climate change will require a basic restructuring of the global economy. What is needed, they argue, are "broad and visionary alliances with people and movements around the world to begin the fundamental transformation of society" (Petermann & Langelle, 2010, p. 187). How to achieve this—and what strategic leverage is required to affect global economies—are challenging questions that are still being debated. (See "Act Locally! How Can You Make a Difference on Global Climate Change?")

Act Locally!

How Can You Make a Difference on Global Climate Change?

"Think globally, act locally" has been a saying in the environmental movement since Earth Day. But how can an individual act locally on a problem like global climate change? We talk about sustainability efforts more in the next chapter, but it is important to remember that you can become more involved in addressing climate change:

1. Investigate what your college or university is doing to reduce its energy consumption or operate in a more sustainable way and find out if you can become involved in these initiatives.

(Continued)

(Continued)

2. Use an app or online carbon footprint tracker to calculate (and reduce) your own output of carbon dioxide. Check out the numerous trackers that are available, like Footprint Tracker at http://carbontracker.com, and iPhone, iPad, and Android all have carbon footprint apps for doing this. Better yet, initiate a crowd sourcing contest to find the top three personal carbon footprint trackers for your campus or group.
3. Call or go online to your local electric utility company for its energy savings guide or request an energy audit, identifying ways to save energy in your apartment or house.
4. Find opportunities to speak at public hearings on renewable energy, such as a bill in your state legislature requiring a percentage of electricity in your state be produced from renewable energy or a town council's public comments on a proposal for a light rail or new bike lanes.

Every year, the exigency of the climate crisis increases. Repeatedly, the IPCC and those who cover it claim that communication is one of the major areas requiring attention. As we discussed in Chapter 6, while global scientists have consensus on the phenomenon that is climate change, its main causes, and its potential consequences, they feel their inability to communicate this information in compelling ways in an age of uncertainty and risk is their main challenge. In particular, "the IPCC has come in for significant criticism for the way in which it has communicated the complex uncertainties inherent in climate science" (Climate Outreach Network, 2014, p. 1). The National Climate Assessment website that allows one to view how climate change may impact any place in the world is one attempt to improve climate communication (National Climate Assessment, 2014).

A Revival of Civil Disobedience

An act of civil disobedience is a peaceful form of protest that violates laws and accepts legal consequences (such as arrest) in order to point out ongoing injustices (Chapter 2). Many global activists who choose civil disobedience as a tactic draw inspiration from Mahatma Gandhi, a leader at the turn of the 20th century in the struggle for Indian civil rights in South Africa and later in the overthrowing of British colonial rule over India. In contrast to more negative perspectives, Gandhi's philosophy optimistically underscores the potential to redeem an institution or opponent through such nonviolent protest.

Although climate justice activists engage the range of public advocacy tactics we have discussed, it is notable that an increasing number of people support climate justice advocates using civil disobedience to participate in the public sphere. According to the Yale Project on Climate Change Communication's and George Mason University Center for Climate Change Communication's 2013 survey report, almost one in four U.S. citizens would "support an organization that engaged in non-violent civil disobedience against corporate or government activities that make

©iStockphoto.com/EdStock

Photo 10.3 A strong advocate for climate action, United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon from Korea is presiding over the UN summits about potential international climate change agreements from 2007–2015, perhaps the most crucial years of climate change negotiations in history.

global warming worse," and one in every eight people say "they would be willing to personally engage in non-violent civil disobedience against corporate or government activities that make global warming worse" (Yale, 2013, p. 4).

In order to dramatize the exigence of climate injustices and the moral obligation to respond, a revival of civil disobedience has begun. In 2008, Nobel Peace Prize winner and former U.S. vice president Al Gore had urged the next generation of climate activists to use civil disobedience:

> If you're a young person looking at the future of this planet and looking at what is being done right now, and not done, I believe we have reached the stage where it is time for civil disobedience to prevent the construction of new coal plants that do not have carbon capture and sequestration. (Vitello, 2008)

That year, as an undergraduate at the University of Utah, Tim DeChristopher heard a scientist of the IPCC on climate change explain the exigence of the climate crisis and decided to join local activists who were protesting the auctioning off of public lands to fossil fuel corporations. He decided to register for the auction and outbid the corporations. Once he had won several bids and was identified as someone incapable of paying for these public lands, he was arrested. DeChristopher spent two

years in jail, was released in 2013, and became a national icon for a new generation of climate justice activists. Upon going to jail, he declared,

> At this point of unimaginable threats on the horizon, this is what hope looks like. In these times of a morally bankrupt government that has sold out its principles, this is what patriotism looks like. With countless lives on the line, this is what love looks like, and it will only grow. (Peaceful Uprising, n.d.).

Since his release from jail, DeChristopher joined Harvard Divinity School and became part of Divest Harvard, a group of students attempting to convince their administration to divest from fossil fuel investments and reinvest in renewable energy. On May 1, 2014, one undergraduate, Brett A. Roche, was arrested in an act of civil disobedience, though all charges were dropped. Frederick E. Small, a Harvard Divinity School graduate and a Unitarian minister based in the area, said, "I don't think Harvard is scared of Brett [Roche] physically. I think Harvard is scared about Brett morally" (Clarida, 2014). The next day, seven Washington University students attempted to enter the quarterly meeting of their Board of Trustees in protest of Peabody Energy CEO Greg Boyce being a member and consequently were arrested. Caroline Burney, a member of the group, Students Against Peabody, clarified that the civil disobedience was connected to broader struggles for climate justice:

> Today's arrests are part of a larger fight against Peabody Coal in St. Louis, across the country, and around the world. We're here for ourselves and for all of the other communities that Greg Boyce and Peabody Coal have destroyed, including Rocky Branch, Illinois and Black Mesa, Arizona. Our fight will continue here in St. Louis at next week's Peabody shareholder's meeting and in Black Mesa at the end of May. (Biggers, 2014)

Many express a growing sense of not just frustration, but urgency, and a moral calling to respond. As Mithika Mwenda, secretary general of the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance, said, "If rich industrialised countries continue to block these talks we . . . will build our forces to hold them to account. We will not accept delay and we will demand our governments withdraw from an unsatisfactory outcome" (Vidal, 2013).

Not just youth are choosing civil disobedience. Forty-eight leaders were arrested on February 13, 2013, in front of the White House as part of their ongoing campaigns to call on U.S. president Barack Obama to reject the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. Among those arrested for blocking the sidewalk were civil rights leader Julian Bond, climate scientist James Hansen, 350.org founder Bill McKibben, and the executive director of the Sierra Club, Michael Brune, whose participation marked the first use of civil disobedience in the organization's 127-year history. (See Brune, 2013, for the Sierra Club's rationale for engaging in CD.) The action came the day before the Forward on Climate Rally (featured in the opening photograph of this chapter).

On September 22, 2014, a day after the largest climate march in history, at least 2,000 global activists from young to old risked arrest organized under the title of "#FloodWallStreet" declaring,

> Wearing blue to represent the sea that surrounds us, we rise to the steps of the NY Stock Exchange at 12:00 pm, flooding the area with our bodies in a massive sit-in—a collective act of nonviolent civil disobedience—to confront the system that both causes and profits from the crisis that is threatening humanity. (http://floodwallstreet.net/)

Communicating the sense of urgency only seems to build.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, we identified some of the communication practices of the grassroots movements for environmental justice and climate justice, as well as their challenges.

- In section one, we described the emergence of a critical rhetoric of environmental justice as people of color and working-class communities challenged mainstream environmental groups' organizational biases and discourse about the environment as a place apart from humans. The environmental justice movement has
  - demanded a halt to the inequitable burdens often imposed on poor and people of color communities,
  - called for more opportunities for those who are most affected by environmental injustices to be heard in the decision making of corporations and public agencies, and
  - articulated a vision of environmentally healthy and economically sustainable communities.
- Section two introduced the barriers and responses to public participation:
  - *Indecorous voices*: communication practices that dismiss the voices of some as "inappropriate" or "emotional," as well as persistent environmental justice leaders who continue to speak up.
  - *Sacrifice zones*: communities that bear the disproportionate burden of unsustainable practices and are hidden from mainstream sight, as well as the use of *toxic tours* to call attention to the sights, sounds, and smells of environmental oppression.
- In section three, we described the global movement for climate justice and the ways in which it has reframed the threat of climate change as a matter of ethics, human rights, and exigence to act. We also compared advocacy choices to mobilize online, imagine new alternatives, and commit acts of civil disobedience.

Although the ecological, cultural, and political challenges we face have no easy answers, the environmental justice and climate justice movements have mobilized grassroots communities globally in ways that enable us to imagine the topic of our next chapter: "sustainability."