ROOTS OF CHANGE: AN ENGAGEMENT OF DELEUZIAN THEORY AND THE ADVOCACY OF THE GREEN BELT MOVEMENT

by

LISA D. SLAWTER

(Under the Direction of Kevin M. DeLuca)

ABSTRACT

This project examines the advocacy of the Kenyan-based Green Belt Movement (GBM) and select theoretical concepts from French philosopher Gilles Deleuze in an exploration of the rhetorical possibilities for social change. Since 1977 the GBM has planted more than 30 million trees and worked to advance issues concerning the environment, women, human rights, democratic governance, and poverty. Deleuze's postmodern philosophy offers an array of concepts that work to flesh out the significance of the GBM's advocacy for the rhetoric of social change. Utilizing and challenging Deleuzian theory, this project focuses on tree planting and shifting personae as creative forms of communication that facilitate openness and deterritorialize the realm of environmental advocacy. In addition to analyzing rhetoric that originates from within the GBM, this project also considers how U.S. media coverage reterritorializes environmentalism. Ultimately, this project highlights the rhetorical possibilities for social change created through openness and openness reterritorialized.

INDEX WORDS: Green Belt Movement, Deleuze, social change, environmentalism, tree planting, personae, audience, openness

ROOTS OF CHANGE: AN ENGAGEMENT OF DELEUZIAN THEORY AND THE ADVOCACY OF THE GREEN BELT MOVEMENT

by

LISA D. SLAWTER

B.A., Augustana College, 2003

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2006

ROOTS OF CHANGE: AN ENGAGEMENT OF DELEUZIAN THEORY AND THE ADVOCACY OF THE GREEN BELT MOVEMENT

by

LISA D. SLAWTER

Major Professor:	Kevin M. DeLuca
Committee:	Celeste M. Condit Christine L. Harold

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2006

DEDICATION

For Jeremy, who kept me on the edge throughout the process of "becoming Deleuze."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank my advisor, Kevin DeLuca, for his support and creative encouragement for this project and my larger academic journey. His passion and intelligence have provided invaluable inspiration. I also want to thank the Speech Communication faculty at the University of Georgia, especially my committee members, Celeste Condit and Christine Harold, for giving me the opportunity to experiment and the support and resources necessary to do so. Their challenging questions, insightful guidance, and encouraging presence facilitated the development of this project and my scholarship.

I also want to thank my fellow graduate students for helping me to engage and grapple with new material, for encouraging me to voice and develop my ideas, and for providing an outlet for both frustration and fun. I am especially grateful to Dylan Wolfe for continually sharing his passion for and knowledge of environmental rhetoric with me through scholarly conversations, collaborative work, and constant friendship. I also extend my heartfelt thanks to Jamie Landau for sharing this experience with me and offering support, feedback, and much-needed perspective on our long runs and in-depth conversations.

Finally, I want to thank my family for always encouraging me to do my best and always supporting me as I try.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

HOW DOES IT WORK?: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE GREEN BELT MOVEMENT, DELEUZIAN THEORY, AND THE RHETORIC OF SOCIAL CHANGE

In 1977, Kenyan Wangari Maathai initiated a local tree planting campaign called the Green Belt Movement (GBM), which has since planted more than 30 million trees. In addition to environmental conservation through tree planting, the GBM advances civic and environmental education, facilitates participation in advocacy and networking campaigns, and works for capacity building for women. In 2004, Maathai received the Nobel Peace Prize for her work with the GBM. As an internationally recognized advocacy group, the GBM offers an interesting case study for environmental and social change. It embodies both the local and global dynamic of environmentalism and thrives on connections between environmentalism and other progressive agendas. In this project I use rhetorical criticism and theory to explore a number of questions with respect to the GBM. How did the simple act of local tree planting become part of a larger global movement for social change? What is the significance of the connections the GBM draws between environmental and "human" causes? These questions lead to a larger consideration of how environmental and social change occur. How do advocates change the way people think and/or act toward the environment? What are the possibilities for social change in today's postmodern, globalized world? As I explore these questions

about the GBM, environmentalism, and social change, I also engage the work of French philosopher Gilles Deleuze. This allows me to delve into and question how Deleuzian theory[1] can work for and/or challenge environmentalism, social change, and rhetorical scholarship. By reading the GBM's advocacy through the lens of Deleuzian theory and reading Deleuzian theory through the GBM's advocacy, I use and push back against both as I explore the possibilities for social change.

Although the GBM does more than advocate for the environment, I examine it within the context of environmentalism precisely because it exceeds and pushes the boundaries of environmental movements. While not solely an environmental movement, the GBM clearly organizes people to do important work for the environment. Recent debates in the U.S. environmental movement highlight the importance of connections between environmental and other progressive concerns (Shellenberger & Nordhaus, 2004; Werbach, 2004). As this project unfolds I analyze how the GBM's openness to multiple forms of advocacy, including environmentalism AND women's empowerment AND economic development AND political reform AND human rights AND… encourages connections not only within the environmental movement but also across different social movements. In addition to these connections, the GBM also brings together the local and global dynamic of social movements. Environmental movements, in particular, champion the connection between the local and the global. The emphasis on the local—from local grassroots activism to local biodiversity and, most recently, local food sources—exists alongside the global dimension of environmentalism, which is fueled both by the global reach of environmental concerns such as climate change and by

[1] I include works that Deleuze co-authored with psychoanalyst Félix Guattari in this category of "Deleuzian theory."

globalization and the spread of technologies that increasingly diminish the "localness" of places and actions (LocalHarvest, 2005). Although catchy, the phrase "think globally, act locally" does little to show how movements for social change can actually make the connection between the local and global. The increasingly global nature of environmental problems suggests the need for social change on a larger scale, for local action to become global. By exploring how the GBM works at both the local and global levels, this project may illustrate the possibilities for a globalized social protest.

My examination of the GBM and Deleuzian theory draws from and expands upon previous critical and theoretical work. In this chapter I place myself within scholarly conversations about environmental and social movement rhetoric and introduce the Deleuzian sensibility that provides the framework for my critical perspective. After providing this background, I give an organizational overview of the remainder of this project.

Literature Review

By drawing connections between environmental protection, social justice, human rights, women's empowerment, and good government in the international arena, the GBM both complements and expands the current possibilities for social and political change. My study of the GBM is grounded in a rhetorical approach to understanding social movements, particularly those concerned with environmental change. Although environmentalism and other social movements have been studied extensively, the international dimensions and global implications of social movements tend to elude close analysis. When international dimensions are considered, they are most often filtered

through Western actions or perspectives (for example, see Peterson, 1997). In this project, I use an examination of the globally-recognized Kenyan-based GBM to enter into scholarly conversations about environmental and social change. Specifically, I work from and expand upon the literatures of environmental justice, cultural influences on environmentalism, and rhetorical approaches to social movements. Through this project, I hope to call attention to how international considerations influence what meanings are possible and what actions are productive for movements advocating for social change.

The intersection of environmental concerns with those of race, class, and sexuality and the associated political possibilities afforded by these connections is increasingly being studied with respect to the environmental justice movement (Gottlieb, 1993; Szasz, 1994; DeLuca, 1999a; Cole & Foster, 2001; Pezzullo, 2001, 2003; Burch & Harry, 2004; Heinz, 2005). Although these studies focus solely on the integration of progressive agendas within American environmentalism, their attention to the connections between the environmental movement and other social concerns is useful for examining similar connections in the GBM. In his examination of the transformation of the American environmental movement, Gottlieb (1993) suggests that considering toxics, environmental justice, and other alternative groups as changing branches of environmentalism "involves a redefinition that leads toward an environmentalism of equity and social justice, an environmentalism of linked natural and human environments" (p. 320). His discussion of alternative groups of environmentalism addresses questions of gender, ethnicity, and class. In Szasz's (1994) examination of what he calls "radical environmental populism"—the toxics movement that is a part/precursor of the environmental justice movement—he recognizes that:

> The movement brought a whole new mass base of working people and people of color to environmentalism. It forged practical and conceptual links between environmentalism and the struggles against racism and sexism. Most recently, it has articulated the position that environmentalism is not just one more issue that exists alongside, but unconnected to, other great social causes of the day. (Szasz, 1994, p. 6)

Szasz discusses these links forged by radical environmental populism as the new tactical and conceptual direction of environmentalism in which addressing environmental concerns also necessitates "dealing with issues of class, racism, and sexism" (p. 151).

In DeLuca's (1999a) analysis of the image events staged by American environmental justice groups, he discusses how "[e]nvironmental justice groups have been working to establish contingent alliances directed toward political interventions in larger-than-local discourses. Their redefinition of environment has enabled them to forge links with groups concerned with race, class, and rural issues" (p. 82). DeLuca points to these connections as indicators of new political possibilities to act against various kinds of oppression. While not an analysis of the communication practices of the environmental movement, Cole and Foster (2001) examine how the environmental justice movement in the U.S. "transforms the possibilities for fundamental social and environmental change through redefinition, reinvention, and construction of innovative political and cultural discourses and practices" (p. 14). Pezzullo (2001, 2003) focuses on rhetorical appeals associated with the environmental justice movement; specifically, she examines the inventional resources used in citizen discourse in Warren County, North Carolina and the politicized memory negotiated through cultural performances on the

toxic tours in Louisiana's "Cancer Alley." Burch & Harry (2004) and Heinz (2005) examine the potential for politically problematic presentations of environmental justice issues in newspaper coverage. Despite the narrow focus on American environmentalism, these studies of environmental justice offer a way to begin examining the social and political implications of the GBM's integration of environmentalism with other progressive agendas.

The American bias in studies of environmental justice reflects the larger tendency for scholars of environmental rhetoric to focus on environmental advocacy and environmental movements in the U.S. and a few other select locations. This limited focus is problematic due to the increasingly global nature of environmental problems and the significance of cultural differences. Although scholars have studied environmental discourse as filtered through popular culture, they have paid less attention to the importance of international cultures for environmentalism (Meister & Japp, 2002). Just as the nature/culture divide is problematic because it essentializes what nature "is," the failure to attend to the variances and specificities of different cultures also creates a problematic essentialized culture (Evernden, 1992). A few environmental communication scholars do attend to some of the international dimensions of environmentalism. Carbaugh's (1996) comparison of U.S. and foreign depictions of natural settings is noteworthy because he attends to the important influence that cultural differences have on environmental thought and advocacy. In his conclusion, Carbaugh emphasizes that future studies need to grapple "with highly particular, socially situated, symbolically constructed images of place. Specific case studies that trace the patterned use and interpretation of nature in communication and community are essential" (p. 54).

In this and other studies, Carbaugh seriously considers the interaction between cultural views and treatments of the environment as he discusses the cultural practice of place-naming by the Western Apache of south central Arizona, examines listening as a cultural form of communication by the Blackfeet of northern Montana, and compares Finnish and American relationships with nature (Carbaugh, 1996, 1999). Peterson's (1997) consideration of the implications of the sustainable development discussions at the Rio Earth Summit for global environmental governance is similarly oriented to account for international perspectives, but her analysis focuses primarily on North American views.

In addition to occasional studies of international or cultural influences on environmentalism, the theoretical "wilderness debate" provides an in-depth consideration of the international dimensions of the environmental movement (Callicott & Nelson, 1998). Although this analysis is not rhetorical and is limited primarily to the branch of environmentalism concerned with wilderness, it still offers insight into the possibilities for the study of a global environmentalism. The voices of international scholars in the wilderness debate encourage awareness that global environmentalism is not necessarily American environmentalism (Guha, 1989, 1998; Bayet, 1994; Plumwood, 1998). In Guha's (1989) critique of radical American environmentalism and wilderness preservation, he calls attention to the grave social consequences of putting American deep ecology into practice worldwide. Guha faults the preservation and restoration of pristine wilderness for displacing local peoples and imposing high costs upon the poor, and he suggests that "[t]he wholesale transfer of a movement culturally rooted in American conservation history can only result in the social uprooting of human populations in other parts of the globe" (Guha, 1989, p. 236). He calls attention to non-

Western forms of environmentalism in which environmental protection "is a question of sheer survival, not of enhancing the quality of life" and ecological concerns are integrated with those of equity and social justice (Guha, 1989, p. 241). Nearly a decade later, Guha (1998) revisits these ideas and reaffirms his plea "to put wilderness protection (and its radical edge, deep ecology) in its place, to recognize it as a distinctively North Atlantic brand of environmentalism, whose export and expansion must be done with caution, care, and above all, with humility" (p. 277). Although other scholars have critiqued Guha's humanistic perspective (Johns, 1990; Foreman, 1998), his emphasis on the importance of historical, contextual, and cultural forces in determining the appropriate form of environmentalism, from wilderness preservation to pollution control, ecological urban planning, energy conservation, and sustainable agriculture, suggests the need to study forms of environmentalism from all parts of the globe.

Like Guha, Bayet (1994) also considers the high costs of a wilderness preservation form of environmentalism in an area where the land is not free of human presence, the Australian landscape. Rather than advocating for a universal form of environmentalism (such as wilderness preservation), Bayet stresses the existence of "many shades of green" (p. 323). In pointing to scholars who emphasize the limitations of a universalized American or European approach to environmentalism and in focusing my study on the work of the GBM, I do not mean to privilege non-Euroamerican approaches. Unlike Callicott (1991), who seems to advocate exporting the "Third World" human-nature symbiosis approach to conservation, exemplified by Amazonian Indians and rubber tappers, to the "First World," I agree with Foreman's (1998) questioning "of whether any single land-management approach is suitable throughout a culturally diverse world" (p.

400). I also work from the assumption that even studies of "global" environmentalism have neglected the diversity of international environmental practices and that by attending to them we may better understand the possibilities for change on the global scale.

Although what constitutes an internationally-appropriate environmentalism is widely disputed, many scholars recognize the necessity for a global environmentalism due to the global nature of environmental problems. In Johns' (1990) response to Guha, he remains committed to the potential of deep ecology but also acknowledges the importance of a global environmentalism:

> If the movements for environmental protection anywhere in the world are to be relevant, they must address issues within the global framework. This can only be done in conjunction with and by engaging other movements around the globe. (p. 246)

Naess (1995), who believes "there is a sound basis for *global* cooperation between supporters of the Deep Ecology movement and ecologically concerned people in the Third World," emphasizes the need for action on the global scale (p. 284). He asserts that:

> Today the global nature of all the major ecological problems is widely recognized, along with the stubborn resistance of most local, regional, and national groups to give global concerns priority over the less-than-global…To the slogan "Think globally, act locally" should be added a new one: "Think globally, act globally." Actions are global in whatever locality you act.

> Many fierce local or regional conflicts have a global character, crossing every border and level of standard of living. (Naess, 1995, p. 288)

Most recently, Diamond (2005) concludes his book *Collapse* by stressing the importance of the interconnectedness of societies today. He writes that "[t]he problems of all these environmentally devastated, overpopulated, distant countries become our own problems because of globalization" (Diamond, 2005, p. 517).

The international importance of environmental issues in today's globalized world suggests the need to attend more closely to environmentalism as a social movement in the global arena. In Carcasson's (2004) examination of the rhetorical response of U.S. presidents to the global environmental crisis, he recognizes that "[a]t some point in time, international environmental issues will become *the* defining issue of global politics" (p. 282). While environmentalism may not yet be the most important issue in global politics, it is becoming an increasingly important area of social and political change. My examination of the GBM pushes the study of social movements into the international, not just the American, realm.

In addition to literatures on environmental justice and cultural influences on environmentalism, rhetorical studies of social movements also serve as a foundation for my study. In Short's (1991) examination of the function of Earth First!'s agitation and confrontational rhetoric for the larger environmental movement, he works from the assumption that "[t]he rhetoric of any social movement must create, order, and define a view of reality that enables the movement to sustain itself in times of confrontation, crises, or complacency" (p. 107). He concludes that agitation and confrontational rhetoric have both instrumental and consummatory dimensions, impact the larger

framework of the social movement, and speak to audiences both within and outside the social movement. Olson & Goodnight (1994) analyze the social controversy over the use of fur as "an extended rhetorical engagement that critiques, resituates, and develops communication practices bridging the public and personal spheres" (p. 249). They discuss the significance of both discursive and nondiscursive oppositional arguments in social controversy over animal rights. Killingsworth & Palmer (1995) examine the "hysterical" style of the protest rhetoric of the environmental movement and discuss the history and implications of "hysteria." They examine how the rhetorical form of environmental arguments functions for the movement itself. These essays emphasize the rhetorical nature of social movements by showing the importance of rhetorical form and arguments.

DeLuca (1999a) contributes to the rhetorical study of environmentalism by "rethink[ing] the rhetoric of social movements in light of image events" (p. xii). In working from the assumption that "[t]hrough rhetorical practices, people construct, perpetuate, and transform identities, discourses, communities, cultures and worldviews," DeLuca rejects the study of social movements as leader-centered objects or collectivities, and instead uses Laclau and Mouffe's articulation theory and McGee's conceptualization of ideographs to talk about a "discursive theory of politics and social change" (p. xii). In examining staged image events as the primary rhetorical tactics of American (and Canadian) environmental groups, DeLuca supplements the literature with an analysis that takes media seriously and challenges the notion of rhetoric as "reasoned discourse" (p. 14).

In addition to studies of environmental movements, rhetorical approaches to a diverse array of other social movements also focus primarily on the Westernized world (Morris & Browne, 2001). However, these studies still provide general guidance for understanding how rhetoric shapes efforts at social protest and transformation (Morris & Browne, 2001). Rhetorical approaches to the style (Campbell 1973; Browne 1994), form (Andrews, 1969; Zarefsky, 1977), argument (Burgchardt, 1980; Railsback, 1984), context (Conrad, 1981; Darsey, 1991; Murphy, 1992), rhetor (Tonn, 1996; Stewart, 1980), or audience (Burgess 1968; Lake, 1983) of various social movements show the rich potential for rhetorical analyses of social movements (Morris & Browne, 2001).

Although existing analyses of the environmental movement, as well as other social movements, examine the rhetorical possibilities for social change, the failure to consider international dimensions and implications of environmentalism limits our understanding of the possibilities for social change. By examining the advocacy of the GBM, a Kenyan organization of international significance, I work from these existing analyses, but I also move beyond them into an exploration of different cultural and international possibilities for social change.

Critical Perspective

In this project I expand previous rhetorical studies of environmentalism not only by considering the interconnected and international dynamic of the environmental movement, but also by analyzing the GBM from a Deleuzian perspective. Rhetorical scholars are increasingly utilizing concepts from Deleuze and Guattari in their work (Doyle, 1994, 1998; Nealon, 1998; Vivian, 2000, 2004; Harold, 2004; Halsey, 2004). In

Vivian's (2000) examination of the self as a rhetorical form "that exists only in its continual aesthetic creation, in its indefinite *becoming*," he is heavily influenced by Deleuze and Guattari's critique of established conceptions of the subject (p. 304). Deleuzian concepts such as becoming, AND, multiplicity, the fold, experimentation, assemblages, and movement permeate Vivian's analysis. Vivian concludes that "[t]he rhetorical self, therefore, is composed of difference, multiplicity, and contingency—of its passage through the space of the 'AND,' where it is 'neither one thing nor the other,' to use Deleuze's phrase" (p. 315). Harold (2004) uses Deleuze's (and Foucault's) conceptualization of the shift from disciplinary to control societies as "a productive model through which to conceptualize the political practices of culture jamming" (p. 193). She suggests that pranks enact Deleuze's conceptualization of creating, rather than communicating, to elude control. In Halsey's (2004) examination of the role of vision in the construction of Nature, he uses Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the rhizome, as well as their more broad theorization on the problems of vision, language, and representation. He calls attention to the way "in which modern ways of seeing/judging/knowing Nature have tended to conjure an unproblematic alignment of bodies" and suggests the need to "move beyond binary envisionings of the socio-ecological terrain" (p. 59).

My interest in the GBM and Deleuzian theory lies in their potential to offer one possible answer to the question of how social change occurs in today's postmodern, globalized world. Using Deleuzian theory to approach the GBM provides a theoretical grounding for beginning to answer this question. I do not mean to suggest that *the*

answer or *one* political position follows necessarily from Deleuze's theoretical work. Rather, as Hardt (1993) recognizes:

> There is not one, but many corridors one can follow for the passage to action. It will not be fruitful, then to attempt a general definition of the politics of poststructuralism, or even the politics of Deleuze's philosophy. It is more appropriate and more productive to ask ourselves, What can Deleuze's thought afford us? What can we make of Deleuze? In other words, what are the useful tools we find in his philosophy for furthering our own political endeavors. (p. 119)

As I analyze the GBM's advocacy, I utilize a Deleuzian perspective to guide my rhetorical analysis. While my purpose is not to define or explain Deleuze, which would go against the nature of his project, my utilization of Deleuze in some places involves explanations of Deleuzian theory and more explicit descriptions of how I use and/or challenge that theory. Throughout my project I try to maintain an engagement, or conversation, with Deleuzian theory. Following Massumi's (1992) recommendation to read Deleuze and Guattari as "a challenge…to pry open the vacant spaces…build…a plateau of intensity…creating a fabric of heightened states," I engage and explore elements of Deleuzian theory that function most provocatively for my project (p. 8). Like Deleuze, who "selects the specific aspects of a philosopher's thought that make a positive contribution to his own project," I focus only on select concepts and aspects of Deleuzian theory (Hardt, 1993, p. xix).

Throughout this project I utilize Deleuzian theory in three primary ways. I engage Deleuze on communication, work from and challenge the Deleuzian conceptualization of

ideology, and use Deleuzian concepts to examine the GBM and "how it works." The first two of these elements, communication and ideology, come from Deleuze's larger project. Deleuzian theory offers an orientation, a new way of viewing the world, and a new ontology, not an inflexible methodology or tool for incremental change. For my purposes, the first significant aspect of this ontology is that the Deleuzian project critiques representation and communication and instead encourages creation. Deleuze and Guattari present a nonrepresentational ontology; they assert that "flows of content and expression don't depend on signifiers" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 21). Instead of representation and communication, they advocate collective creation and the construction of "vacuoles of noncommunication, circuit breakers, so we can elude control" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 175). As I discuss more in Chapter 2, their critique of representation is one of affirmation and productiveness (Deleuze, 1983). In contrast to communication, the act of creating concepts is productive and political because the creation of concepts transforms life and complicates ideas (Colebrook, 2002). By engaging Deleuze to analyze the GBM's communication, I go beyond a strictly Deleuzian read of the GBM to challenge Deleuzian theory itself. I argue for the possibility of creative communication, a Deleuzian communication that challenges and creates, and I use the GBM to explore this possibility. At the same time, the Deleuzian perspective on communication also enables me to critique the GBM's forms of communication.

In addition to engaging and challenging Deleuzian theory on communication, my analysis of the GBM's advocacy also takes up the issue of ideology. Social movements frequently organize around a particular ideology. For example, the environmental movement unites around the belief that protecting and preserving the environment is

Good. Deleuzian theory challenges this organizing principle by dismissing ideologies and instead stressing the importance of relations, singularities, and specific events (Deleuze, 1995). Deleuzian theory disrupts the idea that globalization may provide the possibility for social change to become united by universal methods and ideas. Our interest, Deleuze (1995) asserts, should be "in the circumstances in which things happen: in what situations, where and when does a particular thing happen, how does it happen, and so on" (p. 25). Instead of universal, abstract, and transcendental judgments or ideologies, Deleuze and Guattari (1994) advocate the possibility of only relative and perspectival good and bad assessments. They suggest that "[a]ll concepts are connected to problems without which they would have no meaning and which can themselves only be isolated or understood as their solution emerges" (p. 16). Deleuzian theory would then "prescribe" that the GBM and other movements for social change should attend to particular relations of the situation and act according to those relations rather than an ideology. In contrast, my analysis pushes back on Deleuzian theory to examine how the GBM may work as a model for an ideology of relations. I explain and develop this concept in Chapter 3.

The final way in which I engage Deleuze functions as a more straightforward utilization of Deleuzian concepts, which I use to guide my rhetorical analysis and illuminate "how the GBM works." According to Deleuzian theory, "[t]he only question is how anything works, with its intensities, flows, processes, partial object—none of which *mean* anything" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 22). Analyzing the GBM with a Deleuzian sensibility, then, encourages examining how the GBM works. Understanding what the GBM's advocacy means is less important than mapping the processes and flows that

make it work. As I describe below, the remaining chapters explore this question of how the GBM works by examining its discursive and nondiscursive advocacy, as well as media representations of the GBM. In these chapters, I highlight a number of Deleuzian concepts that become important for my analysis of how the GBM works, including affirmation, the fold, AND, the rhizome, multiplicity, and (de)(re)territorialization. Although the GBM's advocacy does not always map perfectly onto these Deleuzian concepts, the concepts do help flesh out how the GBM may work in both the local and global arenas.

In addition to utilizing and challenging Deleuzian theory to approach the GBM, I also expand the Deleuzian sensibility to incorporate my own theoretical insights and developments. I draw from Deleuzian theory and the GBM's advocacy to discuss "openness" as a key concept that highlights how the GBM, and other movements for social change, may work. Although Deleuze's philosophy provides a critical anchor for my examination of the GBM, this is a rhetorical, not a philosophical, project. In addition to rhetorical analyses of social movements and environmentalism, I also engage other scholarship on rhetorical criticism and theory. I build upon rhetorical theory about personae to propose "shifting personae" as the symbolic pattern that Maathai utilizes to address the many audiences of the GBM (Black, 1970; Booth, 1983; Wander, 1984; Morris, 2002). I continue the work of rhetorical scholars who analyze nondiscursive forms of rhetoric, such as tree planting, photographs, and video segments (Short, 1991; Olson & Goodnight, 1994; DeLuca, 1999a, 1999b; Simonson, 2001; Hariman & Lucaites, 2003; Finnegan, 2003). Through my analysis of the GBM's advocacy and Deleuzian theory I push forward not only a reading of the GBM, an engagement of

Deleuze, and the development of rhetorical theory, but also an expansion of the possibilities for social change. This project challenges what the environmental movement is and how it works. Read together, Deleuze and the GBM push back and inform the possibilities for social change, specifically within the environmental movement.

Outline of Subsequent Chapters

The three body chapters of this project examine how the GBM works. In Chapter 2, I discuss how the GBM uses tree planting as both the mode and substance of their argument. The GBM's tree planting is a nondiscursive, open, and affirmative form that argues for a particular human/nature relationship, challenges dominant forms of power, and draws connections between many different causes. In this chapter I also consider tree planting in light of numerous contextual forces and introduce the concept of "openness." My analysis of tree planting in Chapter 2 provides a starting point for engaging and challenging the Deleuzian critique of communication, and I additionally discuss the GBM's tree planting in terms of Deleuzian affirmation.

While my analysis of tree planting highlights one way the GBM works, in Chapter 3 I turn to the GBM's discourse—specifically Wangari Maathai's 2004 Nobel lecture—to examine another way the GBM works. Maathai, founder and spokesperson for the GBM, often serves as the international voice of the GBM. In this chapter I analyze the Nobel lecture as one way the GBM presents itself to an international audience. In the lecture, Maathai facilitates openness and balances a multiplicity of different audiences as she speaks to the local and global arenas in which the GBM works. I ground my analysis of

Maathai's lecture in rhetorical theory on personae, but I expand the personae theory by describing how Maathai uses shifting personae. I engage Deleuzian concepts such as the rhizome, AND, alliance, multiplicity, and assemblage to flesh out how Maathai's shifting personae and "in-between" position help the GBM's advocacy to work. I also continue my critique of Deleuzian theory on communication and introduce a consideration of how the GBM may challenge the Deleuzian perspective on ideology.

In Chapter 4, I move outside of the GBM's rhetoric to examine U.S. news coverage of the GBM. Examining how the U.S. media presents the GBM allows me to consider one way that external audiences represent the GBM. I utilize the Deleuzian concepts of (de)(re)territorialization to examine how media representations of the GBM identify the GBM's advocacy as environmentalism and, in doing so, challenge what environmentalism means. I examine how media representations reterritorialize the environmentalism deterritorialized by the GBM. In reterritorializing the GBM's environmentalism, media coverage affirms an environmentalism that works not only for strictly "environmental" issues, but also confronts issues of race, class, and sex. I use the concept of reterritorialization to highlight the potential for the openness promoted by the GBM's advocacy to be incorporated into more programmatic forms of social change.

By considering the GBM's tree planting, Maathai's Nobel lecture, and U.S. media representations of the GBM in Chapters 2 through 4, I attend to different ways in which the GBM works. In Chapter 5, I summarize my analyses in relation to earlier criticism and theory and offer concluding thoughts about the possibilities for social change suggested by my engagement of the GBM, Deleuze, and rhetorical theory.

CHAPTER 2

PLANTING TREES, ARGUING FOR CHANGE: THE ADVOCACY OF THE GREEN BELT MOVEMENT

When GBM founder Wangari Maathai planted seven trees on World Environment Day in 1977, she did more than landscape a park on the outskirts of Nairobi, Kenya (Maathai, 2004a). She began an argument with rhetorical force that would resonate throughout the world. The GBM's tree planting works as a nondiscursive, affirmative, and open form of advocacy. By planting trees the GBM promotes a particular relationship between humans and the environment, challenges dominant forms of power, and draws connections between environmental protection, community development, social justice, women's empowerment, and poverty reduction. To date the GBM has planted more than 30 million trees, launched initiatives in at least six African countries, and received international recognition through numerous awards, including the 2004 Nobel Peace Prize (Green Belt Movement, 2005; 2006). In this chapter I situate the GBM's tree planting contextually to show how it is both the mode and substance of the GBM's advocacy. I examine the ways in which tree planting allows the GBM's advocacy to work in both the local and international arenas. Throughout the chapter I utilize Deleuzian theory to guide my analysis of the GBM's tree planting, and I also let my reading of the GBM push back upon Deleuzian theory.

Although the GBM encompasses a variety of programs, including projects for civic and environmental education, capacity building, advocacy, household food security, and green belt safaris, tree planting is "the focal activity" and "the signature of GBM's work" (Green Belt Movement, 2006; 2003). Grassroots tree planting is the GBM's "core activity," and trees are a "symbol of hope" (Maathai, 2004a, pp. 6, xv). The GBM self-identifies tree planting as the "entry point" for their mission "to mobilize community consciousness for self-determination, equity, improved livelihoods and securities, and environmental conservation" (Green Belt Movement, 2006). As a simple, visible action, tree planting may be what the GBM is most recognized for. I argue this is because tree planting embodies the GBM's argument for social change.

In choosing to focus my attention on tree planting, I am not ignoring the GBM's other programs, because tree planting is inherently connected to its other initiatives. Through tree planting, the GBM works to:

> generate income for women…educate populations on the inter-relationship of environment and other issues, such as food production and health…curb rural migration to urban centres for better prospects… promote environmental education… avert desertification… [p]romote environmental conservation and sustainable development… [p]romote indigenous trees and shrubs… [p]romote a positive image of women by projecting their leading role in national development…[e]ncourage indigenous initiatives to restore self-confidence in a people overwhelmed by foreign "experts"… alleviate poverty. (Maathai, 1984, as cited in Michaelson, 1994, p. 547)

The connection between tree planting and the GBM's diverse advocacy goals suggest that tree planting does more than restore the environment. Although tree planting is widely accepted as an "environmental" activity by individuals and groups across the environmental spectrum (from the timber industry to governmental agencies to non-profit programs), the GBM infuses this activity with additional rhetorical force (Cohen, 1999). As the mode of the GBM's argument, tree planting works through nondiscursive affirmation and openness. As the substance of the GBM's argument, tree planting establishes a close relationship between restoring the environment and empowering people, challenges accepted structures of power, and connects environmental conservation to more humanist concerns. In the next section of this chapter I attend closely to the context in which the GBM works in order to set the stage for understanding tree planting as the mode and substance of the GBM's argument.

Contextual Forces

"In Kenya, planting trees and protecting trees are not neutral acts"

(Lappé & Lappé, 2003, p. 184).

Although the "depiction of the multi-purpose benevolent tree… strikes a chord in many cultures," the politics of tree planting depends upon the specific context (Cohen, 1999, p. 428). For example, providing resources for planting trees from the "outside" establishes a different dynamic than finding resources and initiative for tree planting from within a community.[2] Similarly, using tree planting to beautify an urban environment

[2] Like the GBM, the Kansas-based "Trees for Life" organization has helped people in developing countries to plant more than 30 million fruit trees. Trees for Life uses tree planting for education, health, and environmental initiatives by providing training and support to villages in "developing" countries (Trees for Life, 2006).

and create a memorial constructs human/nature relationships differently than planting trees for harvesting food or timber.[3] Additionally, planting trees unsuited to their environment creates environmental problems rather than solutions.[4] Following Deleuze's eschewal of abstractions and universals, I disagree with those who would suggest that tree planting, or any form of global environmentalism, necessarily diminishes the significance of contextual differences such as culture or economies (for example, see Peritore, 1999). Tree planting, while perhaps a universally-recognizable action, does not have a universal "meaning." As a process, tree planting is connected to specific circumstances and contextual forces that influence how it works.

Critical attention to context is not new to the field of rhetoric. Wichelns (1925) distinguishes rhetorical criticism from literary criticism by asserting that rhetorical texts, and therefore criticism, are temporally situated and performed. Contextual forces become particularly significant when analyzing the rhetoric of social change. In Oravec's (1981) analysis of Muir's persuasive appeals for the preservation of Yosemite, she highlights the significance of context. Oravec asserts that Muir "succeeded in wedding a primarily aesthetic convention to a motivation for action not only appropriate to his subject, but appropriate to his place and time" (p. 256). The success of Muir's appeals was thus related to their appropriateness for the context—the subject, place, and time in which Muir wrote. Lake (1983) calls attention to the significance of intended audience as a contextual force. In his examination of the consummatory force of Red

---

[3] The "Trees for Courage" program, sponsored by the "Keep Albany-Dougherty Beautiful" chapter of "Keep America Beautiful," planted trees to create a "community tribute to military personnel who have lost their lives in the Iraq conflict." This tree planting event was "intending to honor values and to develop a special local place of beauty" (Keep America Beautiful, 2006).

[4] In an interview, Maathai speaks about planting the "right kind of trees." She gives the example of the damage done by planting exotic species such as eucalyptus trees. She recounts that the eucalyptus "should be used for drying up swamps…. we do not have swamps to dry up in Kenya—in fact, we need water, so these are obviously the wrong kinds of tress for us" (Maathai, as cited in Topouzis, 1990, p. 31).

Power protest rhetoric, Lake asserts that the intended audience matters because of the "misleading results which can be produced when a majority culture critical perspective is imposed on minority culture discourse" (Lake, 1983, p. 141).

In addition to subject matter, audience, place, and time, cultural factors are also an important part of context. Lake's (1991) examination of Red Power protest rhetoric highlights the difference in cultural constructions of time by comparing the temporal perspectives of Native Americans to Euramericans. In examining the rhetorical power and limitations of different cultural constructions of temporal metaphors, Lake acknowledges the importance of cultural contexts. Chaudhary and Starosta (1992) also rely heavily on cultural considerations as they show why the Satyagraha rhetoric of Mohandas Gandhi is not synonymous with Western rhetoric of civil disobedience. By reading Gandhi's strategies from a historically and culturally contextualized perspective, they reexamine and challenge the conclusions of previous rhetorical analyses. Xiao (1995) asserts that rhetorical critics should pay attention to cultural context because cultural translations may alter the meaning of a text. He concludes that "influential discourse is meaningful and persuasive within a particular cultural context and in relation to a specific cultural audience" (Xiao, 1995, p. 83). Examining culture as a contextual force therefore contributes to understanding the meaning, significance, and success of protest rhetoric.

Situating the GBM's advocacy within Kenyan history, politics, and culture provides a way to begin understanding how contextual considerations contribute to the rhetorical force of the GBM's argument. Through tree planting the GBM works to counteract the disappearance of Kenyan forests and challenge the larger forces behind environmental

degradation. The short-sighted practices that contribute to the decline of Kenyan forests—such as clearing land to grow cash crops—may be traced to Kenya's political past (Breton, 1998). Kenya was colonized and ruled by the British from 1887 until it became an independent country in 1963 (Schmied, 1991). British colonizers told the Kenyan people that their traditional crops were backwards and instead encouraged the widespread reliance on cash crops (such as coffee, tea, and oil) and rapid exportation of resources (Lappé & Lappé, 2003). The effects of the colonial system linger today not only in environmental practices but in the general attitudes of the Kenyan people (Salih, 1999). Under British rule, traditional Kenyan heroes and role models were condemned, Kenyan religion was deemed immoral, and indigenous values were often abandoned (Wallace & Gancher, 1993; Lappé & Lappé, 2003; Maathai, 2004a). Colonization generally undermined Kenyan authority and promoted a reliance on outside assistance to solve problems. The colonial legacy left Kenya with externally-driven environmental policies that were reactive instead of proactive and participatory (Salih, 1999).

The domination and oppression of Kenyan initiative continued in post-colonial Kenya due to corrupt leadership by the Kenyan African National Union (KANU) political party from 1963 until 2002.[5] In this context women's capacities were particularly suppressed because the rule of the authoritarian government intensified cultural expectations for women to be docile and subordinate to men (Breton, 1998; Maathai, 2004a). In addition to the obstacles constructed by the post-colonial mindset, corrupt government, and cultural expectations, the imposition of foreign priorities, practices, and

[5] Although the path to multiple party politics began in 1986, opposition parties did not emerge until 1991, and even then, the 1992 and 1997 elections were impacted by fraud and violence, and the KANU remained in power ("Kenya," 2005; Maathai, 2004a; Thobhani, 2000; Worthington, 2003). The 2002 elections marked the end of the KANU reign, but today Kenya's democratic government is still battling corruption.

ideas that are continually introduced through the process of globalization further contextualize the GBM's tree planting. As Kenyans look outside themselves for solutions, rely on new technology to solve problems, and depend on global rather than local fixes in an attempt to follow the path to "economic growth and development," they often find the interests of their communities subjugated to the expansion of industries such as tourism (Naess, 1995; Salih, 1999). These consequences of globalization are problematic in part because the influx of industrialized ideals into Kenya has not been accompanied by a similar flow of resources and education. Although education and access to technology have increased rapidly from 1977 to the present, many Kenyans are not fully literate and lack access to technology even as basic as the telephone, let alone the internet (Lappé and Lappé, 2003; Maathai, 2004a; World Bank, 2005). [6]

In addition to the forces of post-colonialism, political oppression, cultural restrictions, and foreign influence, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)—particularly "women's organizations"—have a rich history in Kenya. British colonizers originally created Kikuyu women's organizations to produce "good citizens," but some of these women's organizations later played an important role in the fight for Kenyan independence against British colonizers (Kanogo, 1988; Udvardy, 1998). In 1963, Kenya's first president, Jomo Kenyatta, saw women's organizations as capable of providing a framework to facilitate a participatory path for developing rural Kenya, and he advocated the formation of such voluntary groups under the concept of "harambee"—

[6] From 1977 to 2002, the literacy rate in females over age 15 more than doubled, from 37 to 79 percent. During the same period, the literacy rate for males over age 15 increased from 66 to 90 percent. From 1977 to 2001, the number of radios per 1,000 people increased from 30 to 221 per 1,000 people. From 1977 to 2002, the number of television sets per 1,000 people increased from less than 4 to approximately 30 per 1,000 people. From 1977 to 2003, the number of phone lines per 1,000 people more than doubled, from approximately 4 to 10 per 1,000 people. Additionally, from 1999 to 2003, the number of mobile phones per 1,000 people increased 50-fold from less than 1 to approximately 50 per 1,000 people. As of 2002, less than 1.3 percent of the Kenyan population uses the internet (World Bank, 2005).

Kiswahili for "let's pull together" (Hyma & Nyamwange, 1993; Udvardy, 1998). The originally Kikuyu form of organization expanded as voluntary grassroots women's organizations flourished in more than forty different ethnic groups in Kenya (Udvardy, 1998). In addition to the influence of colonial and post-colonial politics, these women's organizations have been shaped by funding priorities of foreign development agencies (Silliman, 1999). Women's organizations are often utilized as a forum to disseminate expertise, information, and technology:

> They have been identified by donor groups, both governmental, and nongovernmental, as the most effective local fora through which to channel development assistance and fit well into the donor strategies that promote local nongovernmental and/or private voluntary organizations as alternatives to state bureaucracies. (Udvardy, 1998, p. 1751)

The origins of the GBM can be traced to the National Council of Women of Kenya (NCWK), an umbrella organization established in 1964 to unite rural and urban women's organizations by creating a common forum (Maathai, 2004a). After a failed attempt as a private company, Envirocare, Maathai launched the tree planting movement as part of an NCWK campaign called "Save the Land Harambee" (Maathai, 2004a).

This brief consideration of the contextual forces at work in Kenya suggests that the GBM's tree planting takes place in a degraded environment where the initiative and abilities of the broader Kenyan population have been undermined by outside influences, corrupt government, a lack of resources, and Kenyan cultural expectations (for women). In a place where people "are both poor and concerned about basic needs like food, water, clothing and education… the Green Belt Movement uses tree planting as an entry-point

into communities since the trees meet many felt needs of rural communities" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 80). In a culture where "there are still some who think that conservation is solely the duty of the government and not their own," the GBM's tree planting argues for the power of individuals to take action (Maathai, 2004a, p. 77). In a time of political turbulence, the GBM's activism makes it a leader among "new civil society actors such as human rights groups, new political parties, and societies for the promotion of democracy" (Wölte, 2002, p. 174). In the face of an audience (of prospective participants) of illiterate and semi-literate community members, the GBM's tree planting "deliver[s] the conservation message in a manner that the audience will understand and appreciate" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 82). In a country where women's organizations have a long and varied history, the GBM utilizes pre-established forms of organization and recognized paths for development assistance to ground the tree planting movement.

Although this overview of the Kenyan context provides the basis for my reading of how tree planting works as the GBM's argument, these contextual forces are not alone in influencing how the GBM's tree planting may be read. Just as the act of tree planting itself does not have a universal meaning, the GBM's tree planting does not have a universal meaning. In highlighting the importance of contextual forces, I do not mean to suggest that one "universal" context may be constructed for reading the GBM's tree planting. Following Derrida, DeLuca (1999a) describes meaning as "a temporary fixing of the negotiations among the text, subjects, and social discourses" (p. 128). The infinity of possible contexts and "irreducible polysemia" defies attempts to ascribe a single meaning (DeLuca, 1999a). Recognizing the possibility for infinite constructions of

context, and the infinite associated meanings, is particularly important in the case of the GBM.

I argue that the GBM's tree planting works through its ability to be read through any number of contexts, such that taking it "out of context" may enhance the rhetorical force of tree planting by enabling it to travel through communication channels that would stop it if they realized its subversive potential. As a movement recognized worldwide, the GBM is not always read through the lens of the Kenyan context. On a global level, the GBM works outside of the Kenyan context just described, so there are many possible readings based on different constructions of context because individuals bring different experiences and knowledge to bear as they interpret the GBM. There is no universal or "true" context in which to read the GBM's tree planting.

Context, then, is not merely a task of simple historical construction, but also of political criticism. DeLuca (1999a) identifies context construction as the task of the critical rhetorician. As I present the Kenyan context in which the GBM works, I am not advocating that this is *the* context through which the GBM must be read, but rather I am presenting *a* context that offers a reading of the GBM that opens possibilities for thinking about social and environmental change. Even as I construct the Kenyan context of the GBM, I also recognize the larger play of context. I discuss significance of the play and variation of contextual forces further in my consideration of "openness" at the end of the next section.

Tree Planting as the Mode of the GBM's Argument

In this section, I assert that tree planting is a nondiscursive, affirmative, and open mode of argument. As I explain and provide evidence for each of these aspects of the form of tree planting, I also draw upon rhetorical and Deleuzian theory. Although I consider tree planting as mode in this section and as substance in the next, the mode and substance of tree planting realistically work together to create an argument with rhetorical force.

Nondiscursive Advocacy

While many rhetorical analyses focus primarily or solely on discursive forms of argument, a number of scholars have examined nondiscursive arguments. In DeLuca's (1999b) examination of the unorthodox political tactics of Earth First!, ACT UP, and Queer Nation, he stresses the need to "take account of public arguments that exceed the bonds of reason and words" (p. 20). Although the GBM does use words and other "reason-based" appeals, tree planting is the central component of their advocacy campaign. As a nondiscursive direct action, tree planting becomes an important resource for advocacy and social change in the Kenyan context. In attending to tree planting as a performative argument, an act of rhetorical invention, I align myself with those who credit the nondiscursive with doing more than merely gaining attention for linguistic explanations (for examples, see DeLuca, 1999b; Short, 1991).

Communication scholars have examined a number of nondiscursive forms that environmental advocacy may take, including visual, cultural, and bodily forms. DeLuca and Demo (2000) examine Carlton Watkins' landscape photography of Yosemite Valley

as a form of visual rhetoric that had political and cultural effects. They discuss the role of images in environmentalism and suggest that "landscape photography and paintings are founding texts in the construction of a wilderness vision that has shaped the contours and trajectory of environmental politics" (DeLuca & Demo, 2000, p. 242). Just as Watkins' images "resonate with, but also comment on, larger cultural narratives regarding national identity, scientific and industrial progress, and even race and class privilege," the GBM's tree planting makes a larger argument in the Kenyan context (DeLuca & Demo, 2000, p. 251). In Simonson's (2001) examination of controversy as social noise, he attends closely to different cultural forms of media, asserting that "[c]ultures of music, entertainment, and celebrity contain different communicative opportunities than does news-based controversy" (p. 401). He concludes that "[m]usic and entertainment media do not simply provide new exposure… They also tap into powerful kinds of cultural rhythms that are qualitatively different than the news" (Simonson, 2001, p. 416). By showing that the form of argument significantly impacts the content and reception, Simonson's work helps to justify my attention to tree planting as a form of argument. Finally, DeLuca (1999b) focuses on modes of public argument that "highlight bodies as resources for argumentation and advocacy" (p. 9). He asserts that "in using their bodies to perform their arguments, Earth First!ers are enacting a mode of argument that supports the substance of their argument" (DeLuca, 1999b, p. 15). Members of the GBM do not use bodies in the same way, but tree planting does enact a mode of argument that supports the substance of their argument. Like bodies, which "become not merely flags to attract attention for the argument but the site and substance of the argument itself," tree planting becomes the site and substance of the GBM's advocacy (DeLuca, 1999b, p. 10).

In conjunction with discursive forms, tree planting performs the argument of the GBM. Olson and Goodnight (1994) privilege discursive elements in their reading of the social controversy over fur, but their recognition of the power of nondiscursive arguments to disrupt accepted practices highlights the potential for tree planting to become rhetorically important. Olson and Goodnight assert that:

> In social controversy, nondiscursive arguments usher into the public realm aspects of life that are hidden away, habitually ignored, or routinely disconnected from public appearance. By rendering these aspects noticeable and comment-worthy, performed arguments expose specific social conventions as unreflective habits and so revalue human activities… the nondiscursive side works to reconstitute grounds by the display of radically recontextualized appearances that provoke reexamination of the norms of personal conduct and challenge the range of publicly acceptable means of communication. (p. 252)

By analyzing nondiscursive arguments entwined with discursive arguments, Olson and Goodnight attempt to show how these two "sides" of argument work in collaboration. As I examine the GBM's tree planting as argument, I also consider how discursive elements work in connection with tree planting as a nondiscursive argument. In Chapter 3, I attend more closely to discursive elements of the GBM's advocacy through an examination of Maathai's Nobel lecture.

When taken in context and in conjunction with discursive arguments, tree planting becomes significant as the mode of the GBM's argument. For example, the widespread lack of technology, literacy, and education in Kenya mean that the GBM's argument is

encountered by many Kenyans through direct observation of and oral communication about tree planting (Michaelson, 1994; Lappé & Lappé, 2003). The visibility and simplicity of tree planting is therefore important to the mode of the argument. The following comments from one GBM participant demonstrate how the form of argument contributes to the rhetorical force:

> My house is so beautiful, surrounded by trees. Others passing see my trees and ask, "How did you get so much green?" Then I tell them about the Movement and help them get trees for themselves. (as quoted in Lappé & Lappé, 2003, p. 172)

DeLuca (1999b) asserts that "the significance of direct actions is in their function as image events in the larger arena of public discourse" (p. 12). I argue that the GBM's tree planting is significant as a sustained image event that embodies the GBM's argument through the continued planting, caring for, and utilization of trees. This extends the rhetorical force of the argument as the form continually influences and overlaps with the substance.

The GBM's tree planting, as a nondiscursive form of argument, works as creative communication to provoke movement, to link flows of content and expression, and, in Deleuzian terms, to invent "vibrations, rotations, whirlings, gravitations, dances or leaps which directly touch the mind" (Deleuze, 1994, p. 8). By focusing on the creative and resistive potential of tree planting as a form of argument, a form of communication, I challenge the Deleuzian devaluation of communication that I introduced in Chapter 1. In contrast to Deleuze and Guattari (1994), who advocate moving beyond the bounds of representation and communication in order to create, resist, and conceive of "difference

in itself," I assert that the GBM's tree planting functions as precisely the sort of creative resistance that Deleuze and Guattari seek in their critique of communication (Hardt, 1993, p. 63). Deleuzian theory suggests that "[w]e do not lack communication... We lack creation. We lack resistance to the present" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 108). However, I argue for the possibility of a creative communication that creates, resists, and works outside the bounds of representation. My examination of the GBM's tree planting as the mode and substance of their argument helps to show how tree planting may function as creative communication.

In addition to challenging the Deleuzian critique of communication by emphasizing the creative potential of tree planting as a nondiscursive form of communication, my analysis of the GBM also pushes against the Deleuzian conception of what communication is and what it can do. Unlike Deleuze, who considers talk to be "idle," lacking knowledge about "what a body can do," I argue that both discursive and nondiscursive communication do things (Deleuze, 1988, p. 18). Rhetoric is more than "mere talk"; communication is action. This understanding of communication also challenges some of the GBM's own descriptions of their work. For example, Maathai describes the significance of the GBM's tree planting as "taking action" as opposed to "just talking" (as cited in Cuomo, 2000, p. 41). Although I call attention to the importance of tree planting as nondiscursive advocacy, I do not subscribe to this talk/action dichotomy. The GBM's tree planting is significant not because it is action as opposed to talk, but because the nondiscursive form allows it to work with various contextual forces and constraints. Tree planting is an empowering and positive form of communication that works in conjunction with discursive communication to overcome

obstacles such as limited access to communication technology, low levels of literacy, and the numerous barriers associated with a country that has more than forty different languages and dialects (Wallace & Gancher, 1993). In the next section I continue examining tree planting as the form of the GBM's argument as I engage the Deleuzian concept of affirmation.

Affirmation

I argue that the GBM's tree planting functions as an affirmative mode of argument in the Deleuzian sense. Deleuzian affirmation is not uncritical acceptance, but rather total critique (Hardt, 1993). According to Deleuze (1983), "[t]o affirm is still to evaluate…To affirm is… to release, to set free what lives. To affirm is to unburden… to create new values which are those of life, which make life light and active" (p. 18l). As an affirmative mode of argument, the GBM's tree planting does not accept the status quo, but rather challenges it by affirming it and creating productive alternatives. A critique of affirmation affirms the status quo, only to fold (or appropriate) it into an affirmation of an alternative. Deleuze (1983) describes how "a new force can only appear and appropriate an object by first of all putting on the mask of the forces which are already in possession of the object" (p. 5). This suggests that a social movement must mimic the structures it resists. A critique of affirmation does not deny or oppose what is, but rather affirms it by "borrowing" or "folding back" the features of the "forces with which it struggles" (Deleuze, 1983, p. 5). In an engagement of Deleuze, Harold (2004) examines pranking as a playful appropriation, rather than a negative and opposing resistance. She asserts that the prankster "resists less through negating and opposing dominant rhetorics than by

playfully and provocatively folding existing cultural forms in on themselves" (Harold, 2004, p. 191). Like pranking, the GBM's tree planting affirms existing cultural forms, such as structures of aid, forms of development, and women's traditional roles, but it also critiques these systems through positive appropriation and folding.

The GBM's utilization of foreign and governmental aid provides a primary example of how tree planting functions as a critique of affirmation. The GBM first affirms what is by attracting and utilizing outside assistance to plant trees. As I discussed earlier, the GBM plants trees through an existing network of traditional women's organizations, and these organizations promote a form of development often encouraged by the government and backed by international aid organizations (Michaelson, 1994). By adopting an organizational structure known to attract "financial support, publicity and other resources" from the international humanitarian community, the GBM affirms and even intensifies the structures of domestic and foreign aid (Michaelson, 1994, p. 541). Rather than saying "no" to the dominant systems of power that the GBM ultimately critiques, planting trees funded by these systems of power functions as a "yes." This affirmation, however, does not work as a simple acceptance of the status quo. Wearing the mask of a "nonpolitical project" and operating through approved channels provides the GBM with the opportunity to intensify, appropriate, and fold the system in on itself (Maathai, as cited in Topouzis, 1990, p. 31). The GBM accepts outside sources of aid, but it uses that aid to affirm an alternative to the status quo, to empower poor Kenyans to take initiative and work for change through tree planting. This ultimately undermines the power and authority of the dominant forms of power that provide the aid. Rather than

opposing or saying "no" to the systems of power it critiques, the GBM's tree planting intensifies and even exploits those systems in a Deleuzian affirmation.

One example of this critique of affirmation occurs shortly after the GBM's founding in 1977. Instead of opposing or saying "no" to the Department of Forestry for its failure to protect Kenya's forests, the GBM initially affirms the Department's authority and power by asking for assistance planting trees. After laughing at the GBM's goal of planting 15 million trees, the head of the Kenyan Department of Forestry originally "promised to provide all the seedlings that [the GBM] would require at no charge" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 25). However, the Department took back this promise after less than one year because the GBM "had distributed more seedlings than [the Department of Forestry] could afford to give away for free" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 25). By utilizing Department assistance and seedlings, the GBM affirms and intensifies, rather than opposes or rejects the Department of Forestry's role as government agent and environmental authority. Through this intensification the GBM appropriates and folds the system back on itself by planting more trees than the Department could possibly provide. This ultimately disrupts the Department's authority as the GBM affirms a creative alternative to government-sponsored environmental protection. As poor African women begin to develop alternative methods of planting and caring for trees, the GBM's tree planting further critiques dominant forms of power. Maathai (2004a) highlights the playful and positive nature of this appropriation and creative alternative as she notes, "[i]t was then our turn to laugh" when the GBM surpassed the Department's expectations (p. 25). By intensifying the Department of Forestry's role to the breaking point and then

empowering women to supply the large number of seedlings that the Department failed to provide, the GBM's tree planting performs a critique of affirmation.

In addition to intensifying rather than opposing action from the Kenyan Department of Forestry, the GBM also exploits private sources of aid through affirmation. Instead of condemning large corporations for their poor environmental standards, the GBM utilizes their available resources. For example, Mobil Oil of Kenya provided financial support during the early stages of the GBM's tree planting (Maathai, 2004a). Maathai (1984) suggests that the GBM "would probably have taken a very different turn—perhaps no turn at all—had Mobil Oil not supported it in its initial stages when it was more an idea than a movement and needed seed money very urgently" (as cited in Michaelson, 1994, p. 545). By planting trees paid for by the large institutions that often cause the development that leads to environmental degradation and poverty, the GBM folds the system back on itself in critique. Utilizing money from Mobil Oil to plant trees is not an uncritical acceptance of everything that Mobil Oil stands for because the GBM reappropriates those resources to affirm an alternative: tree planting to combat environmental degradation. Although Mobil Oil may be contributing to the GBM for the purpose of greenwashing its image, this does not diminish the potential for the GBM's tree planting to perform a critique of affirmation. The GBM uses money earned through unsustainable environmental practices to fold the system back on itself and affirm work toward an environmentally sustainable alternative. By taking money from Mobil Oil, trees from the government, and donations from foreign bodies, the GBM intensifies assistance and aid, rather than discrediting it. By affirming the system, rather than

rejecting it outright, the GBM's tree planting opens the possibility for turning the system against itself.

In addition to affirming and critiquing structures of aid, the GBM's tree planting also challenges current paths of development and traditional women's roles. Tree planting affirms and intensifies economic development because, in addition to material benefits such as firewood, fodder, and food, participants receive a small stipend for each seedling that survives. The short-term economic and material gains associated with tree planting attract support for the GBM's advocacy because they improve participants' daily existence (Wallace & Gancher, 1993). At the same time, tree planting also works to critique the current forms of development by empowering poor women with few resources and little education to take a positive step with a simple, understandable, and easily replicated process: tree planting (Topouzis, 1990; Michaelson, 1994). Because tree planting is "labor intensive, not resource intensive," it utilizes the available capacities of participants (Michaelson, 1994, p. 550). The GBM's tree planting promotes and affirms the need for development, but also critiques current paths to development by mobilizing poor participants to work for sustainable development. Through tree planting the GBM critiques current forms of development without opposing or condemning all development. Because most GBM participants are poor Kenyan women, tree planting also critiques traditional women's roles by affirming women's identities as caretakers and community organizers and intensifying these roles to grant women the authority to challenge dominant forms of power. I expand upon how the GBM's tree planting affirms and critiques women's roles later in my analysis of how tree planting challenges dominant forms of power.

In this section I have examined how the GBM's tree planting works as a positive and active form of resistance that affirms, intensifies, critiques, and offers an alternative to the status quo. By folding and appropriating existing forms of aid, development, and women's roles to create new and different possibilities, tree planting intensifies and exploits, rather than opposes and says "no" to, the status quo. Engaging Foucault, Deleuze (1995) describes this folding as "'doubling' the play of forces… to resist, to elude power" (p. 98). By affirming an alternative, tree planting highlights how "resistance can also enable and direct energy flows rather than merely thwart them" (Harold, 2004, p. 197). Like Harold (2004), I see the potential for Deleuzian folding and affirmation to offer "new dimensions for rhetorical invention," and I argue that tree planting functions as an example of such a new dimension (p. 200). In the next section I continue my analysis of tree planting as a mode of argument through a discussion of openness.

Openness

The final aspect I examine of tree planting as the GBM's mode of argument is what I refer to as its "openness." As a mode of argument, tree planting has not one but many meanings. The pluralism encouraged by the openness of tree planting as a form of argument creates more sites for circulating the GBM's advocacy. In my earlier section on contextual forces, I introduced the idea of play into the context of the GBM. As the GBM's mode of argument, the openness of tree planting functions according to this idea of contextual play. Although the meaning of tree planting may vary greatly depending on the specific context, for the most part people across cultures are able to ascribe some sort

of meaning to it. I assert that it is precisely this openness—the capacity that tree planting has for embodying different meanings—that makes it readily accessible as a rhetorical resource for people from a variety of backgrounds to pick up and use. In contrast to having a universal "meaning," tree planting is open to working differently in different contexts. This openness, however, does not make tree planting abstract. Unlike abstractions, tree planting is still dependent on specific relations and circumstances.

The openness of the GBM's tree planting enables it to resonate in many different ways in many different locations. The global and international significance of the GBM's tree planting is tied to openness. Although the construction of the Kenyan context I identified earlier may contribute to its rhetorical force on the local level, the openness of tree planting also creates the possibility for outsiders to ascribe whatever meaning they want to it. Viewed from outside by construction of the Kenyan context, the GBM's tree planting may be: a massive landscaping campaign; planting and restoring an Edenic vision; enabling limitless consumption; challenging dominant powers; reinforcing the status quo; an individual solution to a systemic problem; a nice hobby; a smart business move; checkbook environmentalism; unnatural; natural; nature restoration; humans attempting to control nature; an encouraging grassroots campaign; third world tokenism; an example of human-nature symbiosis; a sustainable society; a simple thing to do to save the earth—like recycling; an environmental movement; a women's movement; a movement for peace; a publicity stunt; a way to preserve local biological diversity; an idealist move in a country that is doomed; and many other things as well. Reading the GBM's tree planting "out of context" does not necessarily do violence to the group's advocacy, because increasing circulation can contribute to its rhetorical force. The

openness of the GBM's tree planting allows its message to be circulated by those who might disagree with a different reading of it, advancing its creative movement.

While Deleuze does not specifically refer to the concept of "openness," his discussion of the "AND" gets at the plurality of meanings and difference I am referring to. Like AND, which Deleuze (1995) asserts "is neither one thing nor the other, it's always in-between," tree planting is neither one thing nor the other, it's always in-between (p. 45). This "in-betweenness," this openness, gives it power. Tree planting can be this AND this AND this AND.... I discuss the significance of the concept of AND more in Chapter 3 as I examine how Maathai simultaneously addresses a multiplicity of different audiences.

To demonstrate the openness of tree planting, I briefly examine a reading of the GBM's tree planting as a "consensus movement." Michaelson (1994) reads the GBM's tree planting as a "self-help" activity or an action that is part of a "consensus movement." He identifies tree planting as a conflict-free activity. As such, he suggests that activities such as tree planting "seem to be relatively benign attempts to cope with exploitative and disempowering circumstances" (Michaelson, 1994, p. 549). Although he acknowledges the transformative potential of tree planting, Michaelson observes that the "GBM has not entered the traditional political arena, for example, to lobby for tougher regulations on cutting down trees. Rather, it seeks to plant trees and educate about the causes and effects of ecological destruction" (p. 546). He concludes "Since one would be hard pressed to find an advocate of deforestation or desertification, the movement acquires a consensual character" (Michaelson, 1994, p. 546). By reading tree planting as apolitical, non-adversarial, and unthreatening, Michaelson demonstrates how the GBM's tree

planting may be accepted even by those whose power it challenges (p. 549). He asserts that "[t]his consensual orientation allowed GBM to flourish in the face of a severely repressive political regime" (Michaelson, 1994, p. 557).

The openness of tree planting as a form of argument creates alternative paths and interpretations that the GBM's advocacy may travel as it works in Kenya and across the globe. As I suggest in my earlier section on context, my reading of the GBM's tree planting in light of Kenyan contextual forces is one of many possible constructions and does not diminish the openness of tree planting as a mode of argument. My discussion of (de)(re)territorialization in Chapter 4 further highlights the significance of tree planting's openness and show how openness may productively create social change in the global arena. In addition to working as a nondiscursive, affirmative, and open mode, tree planting functions as the substance of the GBM's argument.

Tree Planting as the Substance of the GBM's Argument

Much of the substance of the GBM's argument is communicated through tree planting. In this section, I examine more specifically how the GBM's tree planting argues by establishing an interconnected human/nature relationship, challenging dominant forms of power, and drawing connections between various social issues. As I analyze tree planting as the substance of the GBM's argument, I draw from various environmental literatures to support and develop my examination.

Establishing an Interconnected Human/Nature Relationship

Different constructions of the human/nature relationship demand different kinds of social responses to nature. Evernden (1992) recognizes the significance of the constructed human/nature relationship when he asserts that "[t]he so-called environmental crisis demands not the inventing of solutions, but the re-creation of *the things* [which occupy the domain of nature] *themselves*" (p. 123). By positioning the social construction of nature as the cause and solution to environmental problems, Evernden ascribes a certain power to the human/nature relationship. Plumwood (1998) also grants power to constructions of human/nature relationships. She asserts that conceptualizing wilderness as opposite and separate from culture:

> erases indigenous influence, locates it as the site of masculinist transcendence, the site of elite strategies which deny the honorable title of nature to everyday land, and the locus of ecological concepts which are unable to recognize interweavings of nature and culture. (Plumwood, 1998, p. 669)

She identifies the "need to reclaim the ground of continuity, to recognize both the culture which has been denied in the sphere conceived as pure nature, and to recognize the nature which has been denied in the sphere conceived as pure culture" (Plumwood, 1998, p. 670).

The GBM's tree planting may advocate for just such a continuity. Through tree planting, the GBM argues for a human/nature relationship in which nature is not separate from humans, but rather closely connected. This relationship is constructed through the location in which trees are planted, the justification for planting trees, and the human

agency involved in the planting. From 1977 to 1997, the GBM supported a massive tree planting campaign on private farms. Since then, the tree planting campaign has shifted to public lands, but the focus is still on environmental conservation *within* communities (Green Belt Movement, 2003, p. 11). By encouraging tree planting in the places where people live, the GBM advocates an environmentalism that is not just about saving pristine nature and protecting wilderness, but is also about promoting a particular interaction between nature and people.

The GBM further promotes an interconnected relationship by highlighting the value of tree planting for humans. The well-being of humans is closely tied to that of nature because humans depend on natural resources to survive. In the environmental education associated with tree planting, the GBM emphasizes the benefits of trees for providing food, firewood, shade, soil stability, and aesthetic beauty (Green Belt Movement, 2003, p. 12). Although this is a decidedly utilitarian approach that advocates planting trees not for nature's sake, but for the sake of humans, it does promote an important connection between humans and nature.

The GBM takes the human/nature connection a step further by relating them in oppression. The oppression and abuse of nature negatively impacts humans, but the oppression of humans also negatively impacts nature. As I discuss more in the next section, the GBM's tree planting challenges dominant forms of power that oppress both humans and nature. The first half of the pledge that GBM participants recite at tree planting ceremonies highlights the GBM's argument about the interconnected nature of human and environmental problems:

> Being aware that Kenya is threatened by the expansion of desert-like conditions; that desertification comes as a result of misuse of land and consequent soil-erosion by the elements; and that these actions result in drought, malnutrition, famine and death; we resolve to save our land by averting this same desertification through the planting of trees wherever possible. (Maathai, 2004a, p. 21)[7]

This statement connects the desertification of the environment to human abuse of the land, and in turn, human suffering to the "suffering" of the land. The pledge finishes:

> In pronouncing these words, we each make a personal commitment to save our country from actions and elements which would deprive present and future generations from reaping the bounty [of resources] which is the birthright and property of all. (Maathai, 2004a, p. 21)

In asserting human agency to intervene and protect nature, so that nature may continue to provide necessary resources, the pledge further advances the utilitarian view of nature. However, the pledge and action of tree planting also assert a connection between humans and nature. Although nature is vulnerable to human ability to destroy or restore it, humans are also vulnerable to the forces of nature. In the pledge, drought in nature implicitly leads to human malnutrition, famine, and death. Because of this interconnected relationship, the GBM does not grant humans complete control over nature, but it does assert the ability for humans to act in nature. As the GBM's tree planting connects humans to their environment, it also advocates that humans are capable not just of restoring their environment, but also themselves.

---

[7] Other versions of the pledge include the phrase "by indiscriminate cutting down of trees, brush-clearing" after "misuse of land" (See for example, National Council of Women of Kenya 1982, as cited in Jungck, 1985, p. 76; Breton, 1998, p. 13).

Challenging Dominant Forms of Power

In addition to establishing an interconnected human/nature relationship, the GBM's tree planting disrupts governmental, scientific, and foreign forms of authority by empowering ordinary Kenyan people, particularly women and the poor. Maathai suggests that "implicit in the action of planting trees is a civic education, a strategy to empower people and to give them a sense of taking their destiny into their own hands, removing their fear, so that they can stand up for themselves and for their environmental rights" (as cited in Cuomo, 2000, p. 40). Through tree planting the GBM argues that all Kenyans, not only those currently in power, can create change. The tree planting campaign is about "not only taking action to save the environment, but also about the responsibility we have to have as citizens, to change the government and to demand better governance" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 128-129). By encouraging and empowering individuals outside the government, outside traditional sources of power, the GBM challenges entrenched beliefs about the dominant power of the government.

Although the GBM originally invited government foresters to teach participants how to plant trees, they soon moved away from this governmental and scientific authority, which presented solutions that were often too technical for the semi-literate women to implement. This resulted in hostility from the forestry department and the government, particularly because the GBM was able to succeed in planting trees without the support of these forms of power (Maathai, 2004a). The KANU government later blocked GBM initiatives, and "[e]fforts to access denuded forests were often met with violence" because the GBM challenged the authority of the government (Green Belt Movement, 2003, p. 12).

Instead of a professional approach to forestry, the GBM encourages participants to use "traditional skills and wisdom," "common sense," and even "women sense" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 27). Maathai (2004a) recalls how after rejecting the practices of government foresters:

> The women quickly became very innovative and used techniques that would have been completely unacceptable to professional foresters. Indeed at one point, the foresters complained that the women were adulterating their profession! Women substituted broken pots for seedbeds, used granaries or any raised ground to keep seeds and seedlings away from domestic animals… Many women have indeed become foresters without diplomas! (p. 28)

The GBM's local and non-technical tree planting campaign thus challenges established forms of authority by demystifying forestry science and recognizing a different kind of expertise. Like the grassroots activism of the American environmental justice movement, the GBM's tree planting challenges the tendency within mainstream environmentalism to dismiss and devalue "[n]onscientific expertise, and expertise grounded in daily experience" (Seager, 1996, p. 281).

By valuing women's skills and non-scientific expertise, the GBM's tree planting not only questions whether science is the most legitimate form of knowledge, it also challenges the authority of foreign power that is often associated with science and progress. By arguing for local solutions that are appropriate to the Kenyan context, the GBM disrupts the learned helplessness, dependence on outside power, and foreign practices left over from colonialism and continually reinforced by globalization. The GBM "is not a branch of a foreign NGO but an indigenous initiative, registered and

headquartered in Nairobi. It is wholly managed by Kenyans and deliberately prefers to rely on local capacity, knowledge, wisdom and expertise where appropriate" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 6). By grounding itself in the Kenyan context, the GBM challenges the assumption that foreign ways of progressing and developing are universally appropriate. This interrogates and critiques the residual beliefs of colonialism and mobilizes ordinary Kenyans to act. The GBM's tree planting is a "development project *by* the people rather than *for* the people. It was structured to avoid the urge to work *for* rather than *with* them. This approach is empowering the local people" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 72). Tree planting "harnesses local expertise and resources and encourages communities to stand on their own feet" (Maathai, as cited in Breton, 1998, p. 13). Locally organized tree planting creates "confidence in local people who are often overwhelmed by experts and come to think that they are incapable and backward" (Maathai, as cited in Breton, 1998, p. 13). It shows participants that "they can cause positive change to their environment and that they can do it on their own" (Maathai, as cited in Topouzis, 1990, p. 31)

Because the GBM works primarily with women's groups, the challenge to dominant forms of authority is all the more significant due to cultural expectations for women (Motavalli, 2002; Maathai, 2004a; Green Belt Movement, 2003). The GBM's tree planting challenges power structures by showing "the willingness, ability and capacity of women to play leading roles in communal, regional and national development" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 39). Tree planting empowers women by providing them with independent sources of income and allowing them to take control of the condition of their immediate environment; this challenges patterns of exclusion, subordination, and patriarchy (Obi, 2005). Through tree planting the GBM interrogates

cultural expectations for and discrimination of women and ordinary Kenyans. By connecting humans to their environment and challenging dominant forms of power, the GBM's tree planting inherently draws connections between environmentalism and other social issues.

Drawing Connections

The GBM's tree planting most obviously embodies an argument for environmental protection because trees "prevent soil erosion and generally protect, rehabilitate, and conserve the environment" (Green Belt Movement, 2003, p. 6). Tree planting is often identified as an environmental activity, so it is relatively easy to see how the GBM uses tree planting to argue for environmental protection. In the Kenyan context, however, the GBM's tree planting simultaneously does work for environmental protection AND women's empowerment AND poverty reduction AND political reform AND community development AND household food security. Tree planting connects the GBM's advocacy for human and environmental rights.

As I discussed earlier, the GBM's tree planting campaign is carried out primarily by women's groups. By giving women the authority and opportunity to work for change through tree planting, the GBM advocates for the empowerment of women. The education and advocacy training that accompanies tree planting also empowers GBM participants by helping them to "understand the linkages between the environment and their daily challenges" (Green Belt Movement, 2003, p. 11). In addition to connecting environmental protection and women's empowerment, the GBM's tree planting also creates linkages to economic empowerment. The GBM provides a small financial token

of appreciation to women's groups for each tree seedling that survives (Green Belt Movement, 2003). Additionally, the GBM emphasizes the economic benefits provided by trees, including firewood, building and fencing materials, fodder, and fruit. Because environmental protection is interwoven with economic growth, participants of the GBM gain economic empowerment, which not only increases their standard of living, but also leads to political emancipation (Rodda, 1991; Thiessen-Reily, 2000; Waggoner, 2000).

The GBM further connects environmental protection, women's empowerment, and poverty reduction to political reform by challenging dominant forms of authority through its tree planting. Additionally, the GBM advocates for community development and food security by teaching participants to internalize the connection between their basic needs and tree planting. For example, because some of the indigenous trees the GBM encourages participants to plant yield food, the GBM is able to simultaneously address "issues such as environmental conservation, restoration of local biodiversity, malnutrition, and alleviation of hunger at the family level" (Green Belt Movement, 2003, p. 17)

By blurring the boundaries between humans and nature, the GBM challenges the perception that environmentalism is only about the environment. Like the German and Indian environmental traditions, which "allow for a greater integration of ecological concerns with livelihood and work… [and] place a greater emphasis on equity and social justice (both within individual countries and on a global scale)," the GBM is concerned with more than the preservation of wilderness for wilderness's sake (Guha, 1989, p. 241-242). The interconnected human/nature relationship enables the GBM's tree planting to work for both environmental protection and human justice as it argues against the abuse

of nature and humans. "A truly radical ecology," Guha (1989) asserts "ought to work toward a synthesis of the appropriate technology, alternative life style, and peace movements" (p. 242). Similarly, White (1995) stresses the importance of connections as he writes, "environmentalism must be a basic element in any coherent attempt to address the social, economic, and political problems that confront Americans at the end of the century" (White, 1995, p. 173-174). Although Guha and White focus their critiques on the American context, their visions correspond to much of what the GBM works for in Kenya.

Like the American environmental justice movement which has "has reshaped the agenda of activists and policy-makers, expanding the range of what are considered to be environmental issues to include urban, public health, and community quality of life issues, and focusing attention on the 'social frame' of the state of the environment," the GBM's tree planting connects environmental protection to human issues, including household food security and good government (Seager, 1996, p. 273; Breton, 1998, Cuomo, 2000). Maathai asserts that in Kenya, the struggles for justice, women's rights, and the environment "interact so closely that you can't have one without the other…Governments that oppress people are the same ones that are not sensitive to people's livelihoods or to the environment" (as cited in Motavalli, 2002). Through tree planting in the Kenyan context, the GBM argues for connections between community empowerment, justice, poverty reduction, and environmental conservation.

Deleuzian theory has much to offer with respect to the connections drawn by the GBM's advocacy. In the next chapter I highlight and examine the significance of the GBM's connections by utilizing Deleuzian theory to analyze how Maathai's Nobel

lecture connects and works in between many different audiences. Before moving on to a deeper examination of the connections drawn by the GBM, I conclude with a few thoughts about the implications of this chapter for Deleuzian theory and the rhetorical possibilities for social change.

Conclusion

As a nondiscursive, open, and affirmative mode that establishes an interconnected human/nature relationship, challenges dominant forms of power, and draws connections between various social issues, tree planting functions as the mode and substance of the GBM's argument in the Kenyan context and beyond. Throughout this chapter I utilized Deleuzian theory to flesh out how the GBM's tree planting works. This enabled me to highlight the significance of tree planting as an affirmative form of argument that acknowledges and intensifies current systems in order to fold them back in critique. Drawing from Deleuzian theory as a whole helped me to focus on the play and openness of the context and form of the GBM's advocacy. In addition to using Deleuzian theory to examine how the GBM's tree planting works and using the GBM's tree planting as an example of how Deleuzian theory works, my analysis also offers challenges to Deleuzian theory on communication.

My reading of the GBM's tree planting as creative communication challenges Deleuze's commitment to moving beyond communication. I argue that the GBM's tree planting shows the possibility for creative communication that can escape the problems of communication and representation that Deleuze critiques. As creative communication, tree planting creates Deleuzian resonances, positive connections, and new productive

lines of flight. In challenging Deleuzian theory on communication, I also reject dichotomies that separate talk and action. Although I move beyond a strictly Deleuzian reading of the GBM by discussing and valuing tree planting as communication, examining this nondiscursive communication through a Deleuzian lens helps highlight the productive elements of tree planting. In Chapter 3, I continue exploring the possibilities for creative communication as I analyze Maathai's discourse in the Nobel lecture.

In addition to working from and pushing Deleuzian theory, my analysis of the GBM's advocacy also engages rhetorical theory and scholarship to suggest rhetorical possibilities for social change. Although I challenge Deleuzian theory on communication, my engagement of Deleuze also brings to the foreground the importance of communication that is creative, particularly for advocates of social change. As the mode of the GBM's argument, tree planting works as creative communication. The nondiscursive mode of argument allows the GBM's advocacy to work with and against a variety of existing structures and forms of power in numerous different contexts in Kenya and internationally. The GBM's affirmative mode of argument provides a model for how social movements may advocate for change by affirming and offering an alternative to the status quo. The openness of tree planting becomes especially significant with the increasingly global nature of environmentalism and other social movements because it enables the advocacy to navigate both the local and global contexts. In addition to the significance of tree planting as a mode of argument, as the substance of the GBM's argument, tree planting offers important insight for the rhetoric of social change. By repatterning the human/nature relationship and dynamics of power, tree planting affirms

alternatives to the status quo. Additionally, by drawing connections and blurring the lines between different social causes, the GBM's tree planting encourages a form of advocacy that remains open to many different causes.

Taken together, these qualities of tree planting as the mode and substance of the GBM's advocacy offer an important symbolic register for advocates of social change. The nondiscursive and affirmative openness that reshapes relationships and power dynamics and draws connections presents a unique path to social change. I discuss the significance of the GBM's openness for advocates of social change more in terms of (de)(re)territorialization in Chapter 4. Although I emphasize the creative potential of the GBM's tree planting, as Harold (2004) suggests of culture jamming, the strategies embodied in tree planting "should not be seen as a replacement for more traditional modes of civic engagement" (p. 192). Instead, I assert that creative communication functions as a supplement to more traditional forms of social movement rhetoric. In the next chapter I continue exploring how the GBM's advocacy offers important possibilities for rhetorical invention by analyzing Maathai's discursive patterns as another form of creative communication that encourages openness. Just as the GBM's tree planting blurs the boundaries between environmentalism and other types of advocacy with tangible projects for sustainable development, economic empowerment, and democracy, I argue that Maathai's shifting personae position her on the border between a multiplicity of audiences so that her appeals for the GBM remain open to different readings in different contexts.

CHAPTER 3

WANGARI MAATHAI'S SHIFTING PERSONAE: BALANCING A MULTIPLICITY OF AUDIENCES

When Wangari Maathai learned she had been selected to receive the 2004 Nobel Peace Prize, she planted a tree (Polier, 2004). As I showed in Chapter 2, tree planting, as the mode and substance of the GBM's argument, works as creative communication. When Maathai formally accepted the Nobel Peace Prize at the Nobel Ceremony in Oslo, Norway on December 10, 2004, she did not plant a tree, but I assert that she did engage in creative communication as she balanced a multiplicity of audiences. The immediate audience for Maathai's Nobel lecture included Norwegian royalty, government leaders, intellectual and cultural elites, various diplomats, the Kenyan Environmental Minister, and the Assistant Minister for Education, as well as Maathai's friends and family (Abrams, 2001; Munene, 2004). Additionally, media coverage of the Nobel ceremony ensured that Maathai's words would travel well beyond the approximately 1,000 people present in Oslo City Hall and continue to resonate through television broadcasts, newspaper stories, and internet sites that summarized or provided access to the complete lecture. Facing diverse immediate and extended audiences, Maathai framed her message about the GBM's advocacy in a way that enabled it to work for people from different cultures and in different contexts.

In this chapter I examine Maathai's 2004 Nobel lecture as an example of how the GBM simultaneously works in the local and global arenas and balances a multiplicity of different audiences through the use of creative communication. I argue that Maathai's discourse embodies openness and embraces difference in such a way that allows her to constitute multiple and diverse audiences. Engaging and extending rhetorical theory on personae, I discuss this creative communication as "shifting personae." Rather than limiting the work of the GBM to one audience of fixed identity, Maathai uses shifting personae to construct the GBM and its audience as an ever-changing assemblage of different identities. Using Deleuze to interpret and critique this symbolic pattern, I highlight the significance of how Maathai's shifting personae work through the Deleuzian AND, in between, along borders, in the middle, and through rhizomatic connections to create an assemblage of multiple audiences. As I continue exploring the concept of creative communication and introduce the concept of an ideology of relations, I engage and push back against both Deleuzian theory and the GBM's advocacy. In the following sections I examine Maathai's discursive patterns as shifting personae, map Deleuzian theory onto my analysis of shifting personae, and discuss challenges to Deleuze and the GBM, before concluding with reflections on the implications of Maathai's symbolic patterns for the rhetoric of social change.

Maathai's Shifting Personae

Wangari Maathai is a Kenyan-woman-African-environmentalist-human-rights-activist-Nobel-Peace-laureate. This assemblage of different "identities" contributes to Maathai's ability to constitute a number of audiences, but I primarily credit Maathai's

rhetorical choices for facilitating her diverse appeals. Through the use of continuously changing pronouns and open content, which I discuss in terms of shifting personae, Maathai challenges traditional boundaries and discrete identities. She alters her speaker position and simultaneously addresses multiple different audiences.

Maathai's work with the GBM both operates from within and pushes against traditional Kenyan cultures. As a sub-Saharan woman, Maathai's personal background offers resources for occupying this border between cultures. Born to a farmer in Nyeri, Kenya in the 1940s, Maathai spent her childhood in a Kikuyu community (Maathai, 2004a; Ahmad, 2005). Educated in Kenya, the United States, and Germany, Maathai experienced cultures outside of her Kikuyu and Kenyan background (Maathai, 2004a). Socialized through work and advocacy in the emerging modern Kenyan state and abroad, Maathai formed connections and alliances across cultural traditions.[8] Although these different experiences diversify Maathai's own cultural identity, the discursive persona she constructs in the Nobel lecture does not necessarily correspond to who she is as a "real" person. Like Ware and Linkugel (1982), who "draw a sharp distinction… between the rhetor's personal ethos and the ethos represented by the rhetorical *persona* the speaker assumes," I distinguish Maathai's discursive persona from her "real" identity (p. 51; emphasis original). However, I also recognize that Maathai's personal background may provide her with rhetorical resources to bridge and assemble many identities, including those that she does not inhabit, such as a non-African woman.

In rhetorical theory, "persona" refers to that which is called into being by a discourse; it is the "human presence that saturates a text" (Jasinski, 2001, p. 429).

[8] Through advocacy networks, Maathai attended conferences, such as the United Nations conference on Human Settlements in 1976 in Vancouver, Canada where she met others working for "improved societal living conditions" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 15).

Maathai's persona—the "first persona"—is the implied author, or the manifest tokens of the speaker present in the discourse (Booth, 1983; Black, 1970). Unlike a "real" person, a persona is implied by discourse and may in fact be quite different from the speaker as a "real" person; "personae are not persons; they remain in the realm of words" (Charland, 1987, p. 138). While it is true that Maathai, the person, is an individual, a member of a collectivist culture, a Nobel Peace Laureate, an African, a Kenyan, a woman, an eyewitness to environmental degradation, an educated individual, a leader, the founder of the GBM, and more, I assert that Maathai's discourse in the Nobel lecture positions her persona as shifting from one, to some, to all, and even to none of these identities. By presenting and shifting between multiple first personae through the use of changing pronouns, inconsistent speaker positions, and open content, Maathai navigates a position in between different cultures, including collectivist, individualist, African, non-African, woman, non-woman, Kenyan, and non-Kenyan cultures.

Members of collectivist cultures often signal the importance of community, interdependence, and ingroupness in their communication (Delgado, 1999). The saying, "I am because We are" characterizes the outlook of collectivist cultures (Moemeka, 1997, p. 174). Maathai conforms to some of the discursive patterns of collectivist cultures through her use of the collective "we," "us," and "our." In contrast, Maathai also follows discursive patterns of individualist cultures, which place the interests of the individual over the social group, through her use of the individual "I," "me," and "my." She integrates collectivist and individualist discourse and straddles the two cultures as she says:

> Although this prize comes to me, it acknowledges the work of countless individuals and groups across the globe… To all who feel represented by this prize I say use it to advance your mission and meet the high expectations the world will place on us. (Maathai, 2004b, p. 1)

Even as she stands up as an individual Nobel Laureate, Maathai undercuts her position as an individual by sharing the acknowledgement and referring to the collective *us*. This intermittent use of individualist and collectivist language enables Maathai to constitute her first personae in a way that relates to both types of audience members. While a listener from an individualist culture might hear "me," "individuals," and "I," Maathai's acknowledgement of "groups," "all," and "us" may be what engages a listener from a more collectivist culture. In addition to shifting pronouns, Maathai closes her lecture with a series of calls to action that may be read differently by members of different cultures. An individualist listener might hear Maathai address a series of individuals, while collectivist listeners might hear the successive calls to action as representative of everyone doing their part in a collectivist society in which "services are demanded from all, everybody according to their strength and situation" (Moemeka, 1997, p. 175).

The audience called into being by Maathai's discourse, or the "implied auditor," is the second persona (Black, 1970, p. 192). Maathai's simultaneous management of collectivist and individualist first personae allow her to blur together and unify a potentially diverse set of second personae. Shifting between collectivist and individualist first personae invites audience members from both collectivist and individualist cultures to identify with the GBM's message. Although Africa, Asia, and Latin America are often associated with having collectivist cultures, the tension between collectivism and

individualism also exists within these countries in the form of an emerging conflict between traditional collectivism and a more modern individualism (Delgado, 1999). Individualist language is more common in Kenya today, whereas in the 1960s, "[t]he personal pronoun 'I' was used very rarely in public assemblies. The spirit of collectivism was much ingrained in the mind of the people" (Kenyatta, 1965, as cited in Miller, 2002, p. 170). Straddling collectivist and individualist cultures through her discursive choices enables Maathai to speak to both African collectivist cultures and non-African individualist cultures, as well as bridge old and new visions of African culture.

In addition to shifting between individualist and collectivist personae, Maathai also positions herself between the African woman and non-African woman personae. She begins the lecture by simultaneously acknowledging and abandoning her African woman persona:

> As the first African woman to receive this prize, I accept it on behalf of the people of Kenya and Africa, and indeed the world. I am especially mindful of women and the girl child. I hope it will encourage *them* to raise *their* voices and take more space for leadership. (Maathai, 2004b, p. 1; emphasis mine)

Immediately after self-identifying as an African woman, a shift in pronouns locates Maathai outside the community of African women by referring to *them* and *their* rather than *us* and *our*. Maathai simultaneously occupies and abandons the African woman persona by shifting pronouns. This sort of shift occurs throughout the speech. For example, when describing the women involved in the GBM, Maathai says, "together, *we* have planted over 30 million trees that provide fuel, food, shelter, and income to support *their* children's education and household needs" (Maathai, 2004b, p. 2; emphasis mine).

With the use of *we*, Maathai begins this sentence by speaking as an insider, but by shifting from *we* to *their*, she finishes this thought from the position of an outside onlooker. Although Maathai is an African woman and mother, the pronoun *their* aligns her with an audience that is outside of the African woman persona.

In straddling the (non)African woman personae, Maathai both embraces and eschews the traditional African mother identity. The work of the GBM reaffirms accepted roles for African women as mothers, wives, housekeepers, income earners, and community organizers, but as I discussed in Chapter 2, it also folds back these roles to challenge dominant forms of power (Rodda, 1991). In the Nobel lecture, Maathai asserts that because "women are the primary caretakers, holding significant responsibility for tilling the land and feeding *their* families… *they* are often the first to become aware of environmental damage as resources become scarce and incapable of sustaining families" (Maathai, 2004b, p. 2; emphasis mine). Even as Maathai ascribes agency to the "caretaker" role by recognizing the capacity for awareness that this position brings, her use of *their* and *they* rather than *our* and *we* distances her from the African woman and mother personae. The distance in this excerpt disappears in other sections of the lecture as Maathai embraces the African mother persona. Early in the lecture, Maathai acknowledges, "[a]s a mother," the inspiration provided to the youth by the Nobel Prize. She also ends the lecture with an appeal to "give back to our children a world of beauty and wonder" (Maathai, 2004b, p. 4). In doing so, Maathai constructs her persona and that of her audience as mothers/caretakers.

By identifying with and distancing herself from the African woman and mother personae, Maathai is able to construct second personae both within and outside the

African woman and mother identities. Alternating between her African woman and mother personae and her non-African woman and mother persona encourages audience members who identify with either "identity" to take ownership of the GBM. The shifting African woman and mother personae also creates space for diversity within African and non-African, female and male audiences. Not all women have children, and even those who do may not necessarily be the primary caretaker. By distancing herself from the African woman and mother personae, Maathai leaves space for her audience to do the same—whether they do so because they are not African or female, or because they do not want to identify with the traditional roles, poverty, and lack of education often associated with many African women. The overlap created by Maathai's shifting personae allows the GBM to constitute diverse audiences, or second personae of (non)African women, men, mothers, fathers, caretakers, and the childless alike.

In addition to adding play to the African woman and mother personae, Maathai also presents an unstable first persona in her discourse about Africans and Kenyans in general. As she did with the African woman persona, Maathai initially occupies an African persona when she refers to the pride that the Nobel Prize gives to "our men" (Maathai, 2004b, p. 1). However, only a few lines later, Maathai starts to distance herself from the African and Kenyan persona when she says, "I am also grateful to the people of Kenya—who remained stubbornly hopeful that democracy could be realized and *their* environment managed sustainably" (Maathai, 2004b, p. 1; emphasis mine). By using *their* rather than *our*, Maathai moves away from the African persona, only to re-enter it again a moment later with a reference to "my fellow African Peace laureates" (Maathai,

2004b, p. 1). In addition to shifting personae in separate sentences, Maathai even switches from an African to a non-African persona within the same sentence:

> My fellow Africans, as *we* embrace this recognition, let *us* use it to intensify *our* commitment to *our* people, to reduce conflicts and poverty and thereby improve *their* quality of life. Let *us* embrace democratic governance, protect human rights and protect *our* environment. (Maathai, 2004b, p. 1; emphasis mine)

Attention to the use of inclusive and exclusive pronouns again reveals Maathai's multiple personae. By referring to Africans and Kenyans as both *us* and *them*, Maathai occupies multiple, shifting first personae.

In addition to shifting pronouns, the content of Maathai's lecture also maintains an openness that enables it to speak to multiple audiences. Although Maathai delivers her Nobel lecture in English (the official language of education and government in Kenya), she also utilizes resources from the language and culture of her Kikuyu ethnic group (Schmied, 1991; Kembo & Webb, 2000; "Biography," 2005; "Kenya," 2005;). Maathai's closing remarks include a reflection on her childhood that seems indebted to Kikuyu culture:

> I would visit a stream next to our home to fetch water for my mother… Playing among the arrowroot leaves I tried in vain to pick up the strands of frogs' eggs, believing they were beads. But every time I put my little fingers under them they would break. Later, I saw thousands of tadpoles: black, energetic and wriggling through the clear water against the background of the brown earth. (Maathai, 2004b, p. 4)

For many listeners, this narrative might be an accessible and accurate description of a universal childhood experience, but for Kikuyu listeners the narrative may call upon more specific cultural associations. The wriggling tadpoles may stir memories of a particular Kikuyu tongue twister, the stream location may resonate with the centrality of the river to Kikuyu culture, or Maathai's reference to frog eggs as beads may echo a Kikuyu folktale in which a girl dips her hand into a river and it comes out "full of beautiful beads" (Liyong, 1972, p. 111). Although specific, this narrative remains open for different readings by different audiences.

As I suggest above with respect to Maathai's use of collectivist, individualist, and (non)African woman and mother first personae, shifting between African, non-African, Kenyan, and non-Kenyan first personae allows Maathai to constitute multiple audiences, or second personae. The audience implied by Maathai's Nobel lecture encompasses a range of individuals already constituted by other conflicting discourses, but Maathai's avoidance of a fixed first persona allows her to simultaneously constitute these multiple second personae that might otherwise have been mutually exclusive. In addition to constituting Kenyan and African audiences, Maathai also speaks in a way that resonates with audiences outside the Kenyan and African personae. As with the African woman and mother personae, shifting between personae legitimates the inclusion into the GBM of those who feel separate from the Kenyan and African personae, regardless of their "identity." This allows Maathai to speak to not only Kenyans, non-Kenyans, Africans, and non-Africans, but also to a diversity of Kenyans and Africans who may not identify with traditional roles. Shifting personae opens space for audiences to read Maathai and the GBM in a number of ways.

Through the use of non-fixed personae, Maathai is able to make use of a more ambiguous "we," "us," and "our" throughout her speech to project her message through all of her first personae. In introducing her calls to action at the end of the lecture, Maathai says:

> Today *we* are faced with a challenge that calls for a shift in *our* thinking… *We* are called to assist the Earth to heal her wounds and in the process heal *our* own… This will happen if *we* see the need to revive *our* sense of belonging to a larger family of life, with which *we* have shared *our* evolutionary process. (Maathai, 2004b, p. 3; emphasis mine)

In this excerpt, the *we* includes all of Maathai's first personae, as well as the multiple second personae she calls into being. The openness of this *we* is further emphasized as Maathai continues, "there comes a time when *humanity* is called to shift to a new level of consciousness… A time when *we* have to shed *our* fear and give hope to each other" (Maathai, 2004b, p. 3). By using *humanity* interchangeably with *we*, Maathai shows the openness facilitated by her use of shifting personae. Shifting first personae diversify and expand the type of audience Maathai is able to constitute. The openness encouraged by multiple personae enables audience members to mold Maathai's message to their own identities and uses.

Shifting the Personae Literature

Maathai's use of shifting personae in the Nobel lecture presents a challenge to existing personae literature that characterizes personae as fixed and stable. Existing literature on personae recognizes different "levels" (first, second, third, fourth) of

personae, but it limits discussion of these levels to fixed personae (Black, 1970; Booth; 1983; Wander, 1984; Morris, 2002). Critics recognize different types of first personae, such as the "warrior" persona, the "nurturing persona," the "militant mother" persona, and the "charismatic" persona, but do not discuss these personae as shifting from one to another (Lake, 1990; Dow & Tonn, 1993; Tonn, 1996; Hogan & Williams, 2000). Black (1970) discusses the second persona in singular terms, as "*the* implied auditor" or "the image of *a* man" (pp. 193-194, emphasis mine). Wander (1984) and Morris (2002) both expand Black's second personae by recognizing the possibility for texts to constitute more than one auditor or audience, but these auditors emerge from exclusion and silencing by fixed first and second personae, rather than from shifting first personae. In Wander's (1984) augmentation of the personae literature, he conceptualizes the third persona as those audiences rejected by the speaker, or "the 'it' that is not present" in the discourse (p. 209). In addition to the second persona called into being, Wander's third persona "refers to being negated… a being whose presence, though relevant to what is said, is negated through silence" (Wander, 1984, p. 210). Morris (2002) further extends the types of audiences called into being by a discourse with his introduction of the fourth persona as:

> a collusive audience constituted by the textual wink… an implied auditor of a particular ideological bent, presumably one who is sexually marginalized, understands the dangers of homophobia, acknowledges the rationale for the closet, and possesses an intuition that renders a pass transparent. (p. 230)

Morris's (2002) expansion of personae recognizes the possibility for two types of audiences, "dupes" and those that can read the "textual wink" (p. 230). Although the

third and fourth personae introduce the possibility for multiple audiences into the personae literature, they differ from shifting personae, which do not silence, negate, or marginalize audiences, but rather imply an ideological position that embraces difference and simultaneously constitutes a multiplicity of different audiences.

Critics have used personae analyses to "identify recurrent personae, trace the emergence and evolution of these personae, describe the essential discursive characteristics…of the personae, describe how specific individuals might manage multiple personae (polyphony), and assess the impact of particular personae in particular situations," but have not yet engaged the personae literature to examine the possibility or significance of shifting personae (Jasinski, 2001, p. 430). In addition to personae, scholars also use different terminology to discuss a number of concepts similar to personae, such as authorial voice, speaking or subject position, author-in-the-text, and role (Jasinski, 1997; Foucault, 1972; Fiske, 1986; Hart, 1997). However, scholarly engagements of these terms still do not attend to the significance of unstable or shifting personae as I have highlighted here. For example, Jasinski (1997) engages Bakhtin's concept of polyphony to examine the dynamic "eventfulness" and interaction of different authorial voices inscribed within *The Federalist Papers*. He describes "Publius" as a polyphonic character who, through "the process of voice appropriation… speaks as both 'founder-father' and popular politician" (p. 35). Unlike Maathai's multiple personae that coexist through shifting pronouns and open content, Publius's polyphonic voices are in tension as they represent competing positions in a dialogue. Additionally, although Jasinski (1997) recognizes the capacity for authors to layer a diversity or variety of voices in the text, he fails to discuss the significance of shifting between different voices and

the implications for constituted audience and rhetorical invention. By discussing Maathai's open and shifting presence in terms of personae, rather than polyphonic voices, I call upon associations of ideology and constituted audience inherent to the personae literature. In addition to allowing Maathai to constitute a multiplicity of different audiences, shifting personae encourage an ideology of relations. I return to discuss the significance of shifting personae for ideology in a later section. Like Charland's (1987) theory of constitutive rhetoric, my theorization of shifting personae challenges the concept of "an audience composed of unified and transcendent subjects" (p. 147).

I assert that Maathai's use of non-fixed personae in her Nobel lecture troubles current personae literature, but the symbolic pattern legitimated in Maathai's lecture is not so much completely new as much as it is missing from current rhetorical theory. The multiple, shifting, and self-contradictory personae Maathai utilizes in her lecture parallel the way some African women writers depict identity (Nfah-Abbenyi, 1997). For example, Nfah-Abbenyi suggests that African women writers are able to infuse their characters with "various and varying positional perspectives… characters do not present an essential, unified identity, but rather multiple and contradictory identities and subjectivities that are constantly changing, within specific social situations (pp. 150-151). By bringing this symbolic pattern into the realm of personae literature, I highlight its significance for rhetorical theory and the rhetoric of social change.

As a rhetorical pattern, shifting personae represent and reinforce the openness of the GBM's work and forms of communication. Just as tree planting remains open as a mode of argument and draws connections between environmentalism and other progressive causes, Maathai's shifting personae open the message of the GBM for a

multiplicity of audiences and draw connections between seemingly contradictory audiences. In addition to personae theory, Deleuzian theory also offers insight into the rhetorical patterns in Maathai's Nobel lecture. In the next section I explore Maathai's use of shifting personae from a Deleuzian perspective.

Deleuzian Shifting Personae

Shifting personae enable Maathai and the GBM to work in the Deleuzian middle, draw connections, and construct an assemblage of different audiences. Reading shifting personae through a Deleuzian sensibility helps to explain how the GBM works to balance a diversity of audiences in the global arena. As I discussed in the previous section, shifting personae allow Maathai to constitute a variety of different audiences. In Deleuzian terms, we can read this openness as the GBM working in between, along borders, and in the middle of its multiple audiences. Instead of speaking solely to a Kikuyu audience or a Norwegian audience or to any one specific audience, Maathai constructs her persona on the border between audiences, where Deleuze (1995) suggests "things come to pass" (p. 45). In the previous section I used textual analysis to examine how Maathai constituted multiple personae, and I labeled Maathai's rhetorical strategy shifting personae. I maintain that this label describes how Maathai speaks to multiple audiences by constantly shifting from one persona to another. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), however, the border between things is "a transversal movement that sweeps one *and* the other away," not "a localizable relation going from one thing to the other and back again" (p. 25; emphasis original). Although my analysis breaks Maathai's rhetoric apart into this sort of "localizable relation," I argue that the overall effect of shifting

personae as a symbolic pattern is this movement in between that is simultaneously both and multiple, constantly intersecting and crossing all audiences. As I discuss above, Maathai often shifts personae multiple times in one sentence. This enables her to speak to many audiences, rather than just one or the other.

Maathai's movement on the border and between audiences locates her in the middle, where Deleuze and Guattari (1987; 1995) suggest that things and thoughts pick up speed, become, work, advance, grow, and unfold. Maathai sets the GBM up to work in the middle by simultaneously constituting audiences of multiple backgrounds. Work in the middle, which Deleuze and Guattari (1987) describe as fast motion and movement, does not originate in one point and end in another. Rather than beginning with one audience and then moving to another, or privileging one audience over another, shifting personae allows Maathai to work from the middle of all audiences so that the GBM's message travels between audiences and through the middle. A Deleuzian perspective, then, would not describe the GBM by the audiences and advocacy campaigns it connects, but by the way it moves in the middle and between audiences and advocacy campaigns. My analysis and description of how the GBM works—through tree planting and shifting personae—attempts to map this movement.

As Maathai and the GBM work in between, along the border, and in the middle they forge connections and relations between different audiences and advocacy campaigns, which can be illuminated through the Deleuzian concepts of the rhizome, AND, alliance, multiplicity, and assemblage. Deleuze's (1995) assertion that "a concept's power comes from the way it's repeated, as one area links up with another" suggests that the connections and linkages created by the GBM provide it with power and

rhetorical force for its advocacy. (p. 147). Connections are not only just combinations; they are continuous and open crossings between things. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) offer the rhizome as a way to conceptualize how these connections work. Rhizomes are horizontal stems that send out roots and shoots from nodes, so there are branches and lateral offshoots, but no single center. Because rhizomatic connections are nonhierarchical, no one part is higher or more central than another. Maathai's use of shifting personae connects a multiplicity of audiences to the GBM in a rhizomatic manner, in that it does not privilege one audience over another. Shifting personae allows the GBM's advocacy to function rhizomatically so that it is "always in the middle, between things, interbeing, *intermezzo*" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 25). Working between nonhierarchical audiences enables the GBM to work on both the local and global scales.

Rhizomatic connections become manifest through the Deleuzian AND. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) assert that "the fabric of the rhizome is the conjunction, 'and… and… and'" (p. 25). Maathai's lecture works through this rhizomatic AND by speaking to collectivist AND individualist AND women AND non-women AND African AND non-African AND Kenyan AND non-Kenyan audiences. According to Deleuze (1995), "AND is neither one thing nor the other, it's always in-between, between two things; it's the borderline" (p. 45). The Deleuzian AND suggests that the GBM's audience is neither collectivist or individualist or any other one identity; it is always in between and on the border. The connections drawn by the GBM's tree planting—which I discussed in Chapter 2—between sustainable development AND economic empowerment AND political reform AND human rights AND women's rights AND … similarly embody the

Deleuzian AND. Tree planting does not work for sustainable development or political reform, but instead lodges itself in between. Deleuzian theory highlights the revolutionary potential of the GBM's advocacy—both in the form of shifting personae and tree planting—by calling attention to the force of the AND. According to Deleuze (1995), the AND is a "line of flight" where "becomings evolve" and "revolutions take shape" (p. 45).

The connections created through the AND do not unify difference, but rather construct alliances between difference. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) characterize the rhizome as alliance, so Maathai's shifting personae do not unify diverse audiences, but offer a site for alliance. The GBM's tree planting does not unite all advocacy campaigns, but creates an alliance between multiplicities of different campaigns. Multiplicities, or collections of parts, are defined not by centers of unification, but by numbers of dimensions (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Colebrook, 2002). Multiplicities connect and become rhizomatic assemblages. Shifting personae allow Maathai to speak to a multiplicity of different audiences, to find connections between them, and to create alliances.

Another Deleuzian term that highlights the importance of the GBM's connections is assemblage. Deleuze and Parnet (1987) describe assemblage as "a multiplicity which is made up of many heterogeneous terms and which establishes liaisons, relations between them, across ages, sexes and reigns—different natures… the assemblage's only unity is that of co-functioning: it is a symbiosis" (p. 69). As with alliance, the assemblage constructed by Maathai's shifting personae and the GBM's tree planting do not unify, but rather create connections and relations. Deleuze uses the term assemblage to emphasize

the process of connection and challenge the possibility of a unified whole that pre-exists these connections (Colebrook, 2002). The GBM is an assemblage of participants that works for an assemblage of causes directed at an assemblage of audiences. Reading the GBM as an assemblage emphasizes the process of connection so that the GBM's advocacy does not threaten the integrity of the multiplicity of differences by trying to mold them into a unified whole. Deleuze (1995) asserts that "[i]t's not a matter of bringing all sorts of things together under one concept but rather of relating each concept to variables that explain its mutations" (p. 31). This suggests that the GBM should not work by uniting all audiences and advocacy campaigns under one concept—tree planting—but by relating tree planting to different variables and audiences. Shifting personae provide the GBM with the means to maintain an assemblage of different participants, audiences, and advocacy campaigns. Deleuze provides a way to conceptualize how the GBM can work not through unification, but through assemblage. This acts to challenge any notion of a global social movement as a "unified whole."

Although Maathai's use of shifting personae can be read as working in the Deleuzian middle through rhizomatic connections, alliances, and assemblages of audiences, some aspects of Deleuzian theory also present challenges to my reading of Maathai's shifting personae. In the next section I discuss how Deleuzian theory and the GBM push back against and inform one another.

Critiquing Deleuze and the GBM

Deleuzian theory offers a way to read and critique the GBM, but the advocacy of the GBM also provides a site for critiquing Deleuze. The GBM's advocacy embodies

openness and difference, but it also remains grounded in ideology, which is problematic for Deleuze. Using the GBM as a model, I propose an ideology of relations that responds to situations, remains open to difference, and assembles rather than unifies. I also continue my critique of Deleuze's dismissal of communication and representation. Just as tree planting works as creative communication, I argue that the GBM's shifting personae demonstrate how communication can be used to create resonances, connections, and new productive rhizomatic lines of flight. I challenge Deleuze's rejection of communication because the GBM uses communication to create and construct an ideology of relations.

As I introduced in Chapter 1, Deleuzian theory rejects concepts like ideology, which are universal, abstract, and transcendental (Deleuze, 1995). Rather than transcendent or universal abstractions and ideologies, Deleuze asserts that "there are only processes, sometimes unifying, subjectifying, rationalizing, but just processes all the same. These processes are at work in concrete 'multiplicities,' multiplicity is the real element in which things happen" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 145-146). We may try to conceptualize how the GBM works outside of ideology by reading its advocacy as a process that engages a multiplicity of social causes and audiences. However, as a movement advocating for social change, the GBM is fundamentally grounded in ideology. Even as Maathai's discourse creates openness and embraces different audiences through shifting personae, it does so through the assumption of a shared ideology. Black (1970) argues that the second persona reveals the ideology advocated by the speaker: "the network of interconnected convictions that functions in a man epistemically and that shapes his identity by determining how he views the world" (p.

193). Although Maathai's shifting personae enable her to constitute multiple second personae, these personae are assembled through an ideology that affirms human ability to improve the state of the world. Non-fixed personae help Maathai to present this ideology to different audiences, but ideology remains at the core of her message.

Drawing from both the GBM and Deleuze, I advocate for the possibility of an ideology of relations. Like Charland (1987), who focuses on ideological effects in his analysis of constitutive rhetoric, I believe that "ideology forms the ground for any rhetorical situation," often operating as the driving force behind social movements (p. 148). Although I challenge Deleuzian theory by maintaining the significance of ideology, I argue for the need for a transformed ideology, an ideology of relations. Charland suggests that "[a] transformed ideology would require a transformed subject," and I assert that Maathai's shifting personae lay the groundwork for a transformed ideology by altering conceptions of the subject and audience (p. 148). Shifting personae construct audiences that are not unified or transcendent, but rather maintain their difference as they are connected and assembled through the GBM's advocacy. By discursively shifting personae, I argue that Maathai constructs the possibility for an ideology that is open to Deleuzian relations.

Deleuze and Guattari (1994) suggest that "[a]ll concepts are connected to problems without which they would have no meaning and which can themselves only be isolated or understood as their solution emerges" (p. 16). According to Deleuzian theory, concepts "only have value in their variables, and in the maximum of variables which they allow" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 144). I inject this Deleuzian attention to relations into my reading of the GBM's ideology. The Deleuzian emphasis on relations and connections

suggests that Maathai and the GBM could not know the ethics of a situation until the moment of that situation. In many ways, the GBM's advocacy easily fits this concept of an ideology of relations. Instead of viewing the protection and restoration of the environment as universally *Good*, the GBM advocates environmental protection that also works to "address community-felt needs," so that trees are planted not only for the environment, but also for people to use for food, fodder, and firewood (Maathai, 2004a, p. 80). Additionally, the GBM does not advocate *one* method as *the* way to proceed with its advocacy, but maintains that "there exists no blueprint for GBM; rather, it achieves its objectives by formulating and revising its strategies" (Maathai, 2004a, p. 93). The affirmative mode of tree planting I discussed in Chapter 2 suggests another way the GBM responds to the relations of the situation. In order to affirm an alternative, the GBM first affirms and responds to current systems of aid, development, and women's roles. As I discussed in the previous paragraph, Maathai's shifting personae also position the GBM's advocacy to work from an ideology of relations as she responds to and assembles a multiplicity of different audiences. Rather than unifying diverse audiences, Maathai assembles them in an ideology of relations.

Although many aspects of the GBM's advocacy respond to relations and specific situations, the GBM's ideology may also be read as unifying. Maathai's shifting personae constitute an assemblage of different audiences, but her discourse may also be interpreted as unifying those audiences through an ideology that affirms human ability to improve the condition of the world. An ideology of relations troubles this reading of Maathai's ideology as an indiscriminate affirmation of human agency and would instead read Maathai's Nobel lecture as the affirmation of human agency only in relation to the

specific situation in which it occurs. In the next chapter, I examine this sort of reading, which closes down the GBM's openness, as a reterritorialization of the GBM's advocacy. My conceptualization of an ideology of relations functions in the middle, between a conception of a unifying ideology and Deleuzian relations. The middle, after all, is where Deleuze (1995) suggests "[t]hings and thoughts advance or grow… where everything unfolds" (p. 161). By using Deleuze and the GBM to push back against each other, Maathai's shifting personae can be read as the groundwork for an ideology of relations, such that ideology can work through relations and relations can work through ideology.

In addition to engaging and challenging Deleuzian theory on ideology, Maathai's use of shifting personae also challenges Deleuzian theory on communication. Like tree planting, Maathai's use of shifting personae challenges the Deleuzian critique of communication by functioning as a creative form of communication that avoids the problems Deleuze associates with representation. As I discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, Deleuzian theory advocates moving beyond representation and communication. One of the reasons Deleuze criticizes representation is for its inability to present "difference in itself" (Hardt, 1993, p. 63). Deleuze views representations and identities as limiting difference because they close down infinite and open difference by reducing it to relative terms, so that difference can only be conceived in reference to something else—as "different from" (Colebrook, 2002). I argue that the both/and position afforded by the GBM's advocacy embraces and conceptualizes a Deleuzian sort of difference. Maathai's rhetorical choices and the nature of the GBM's work challenge the traditional boundaries drawn by representations, discrete labels, and identities. Through shifting personae—a

creative form of communication—Maathai destabilizes fixed identities and recognizes difference as flow. By moving on the border and between audiences, Maathai challenges difference that is constructed in crude opposition, such as woman versus man. Although my analysis utilizes some of these crude oppositions, such as Kenyan and non-Kenyan, to talk about Maathai's personae, the play and movement Maathai introduces by shifting personae challenges these oppositions of identity and categories. Rather than constructing an audience of manageable identities, Maathai's shifting personae opens the possibility for recognizing difference itself in the form of open and shifting personae. This Deleuzian difference connects and interacts in a way that privileges no one difference over another. I discuss this Deleuzian difference in terms of deterritorialization in the next chapter as I continue my exploration of how the GBM works through the openness facilitated by creative communication and an ideology of relations.

Conclusion

The Nobel Ceremony historically provides the occasion for Nobel laureates to "appraise what has been done, ponder future courses of action and reflect on ways of mobilizing humanity as a whole in the supreme cause of peace-building," but in this chapter I have demonstrated how Maathai's Nobel lecture also contains rhetorical patterns that have broader significance for advocates of social change (Mayor, 1995, p. 5). The Nobel lecture gives Maathai the opportunity to address an international audience and functions as an important site of negotiation for the different identities and audiences of the GBM. The widespread prestige and visibility of the Nobel Peace Prize draws

worldwide attention to the GBM by essentially handing Maathai a microphone and placing her and the GBM in the spotlight.[9] In addition to media coverage of the immediate ceremony, the rhetorical patterns in the Nobel lecture resonate throughout much of Maathai's public discourse, including the deluge of radio, television, newspaper, and magazine interviews associated with her receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize (for example, see Inskeep & Montagne, 2004; MacDonald, 2005; Utne, 2005). In the next chapter I examine more specifically how mainstream U.S. media coverage represents the GBM and Maathai by reterritorializing the openness facilitated by their advocacy, but before moving on I briefly summarize the implications of Maathai's discursive patterns for rhetorical theory, Deleuzian theory, and advocates for social change.

In her Nobel lecture, Maathai navigates a position in between different cultures through the use of changing pronouns, inconsistent speaker positions, and open content—a rhetorical pattern I label shifting personae. By engaging and extending rhetorical theory on personae, I highlight the significance of Maathai's discursive choices, which continue to facilitate the openness embodied by tree planting as the GBM's argument. Maathai's use of shifting personae enables her to balance and assemble a multiplicity of audiences in the local and global arenas. As Maathai advocates a new recognition of the linkages between environmentalism and other social issues, she also facilitates a new kind of relationship between the identity of the speaker and the audience through her discursive patterns. By shifting personae Maathai constitutes a multiplicity of different

[9] Geir Lundestad (1994), Director of the Norwegian Nobel Institute and Secretary of the Norwegian Nobel Committee compares the impact of the Nobel Peace Prize to a microphone and a spotlight "It serves as a microphone in the hand of the laureate. Persons whose voices were barely heard before are suddenly listened to with great interest, quoted in the leading newspapers, and received by leading politicians… [it] is a spotlight in the sense that more attention is focused on the situation in the laureates' countries than would have been the case without the Prize" (p. 9).

audiences and lays the foundation for an ideology of relations. In addition to utilizing rhetorical theory to analyze Maathai's discursive patterns, I also engage a number of Deleuzian concepts to further examine how the GBM's advocacy works.

Although my rhetorical analysis of Maathai's shifting personae breaks down some of the larger movements, connections, and openness created by her discursive patterns, mapping a Deleuzian sensibility onto Maathai's Nobel lecture highlights the significance of these relations and connections. Examining Maathai's discursive patterns in terms of the Deleuzian in between, along borders, in the middle, rhizome, AND, alliance, multiplicity, and assemblage suggests how the GBM works on local and global scales and draws attention to the features that provide the GBM's advocacy with rhetorical force. A Deleuzian perspective emphasizes the significance of discourse that simultaneously constitutes a multiplicity of audiences and tree planting that simultaneously works for a diversity of causes. Read through Deleuzian theory, the GBM's advocacy works as an assemblage of advocacy issues and assemblage of participants and audiences that are in no way uniform. Taken together with my rhetorical analysis of Maathai's shifting personae, Deleuzian terminology shows how the GBM's advocacy works to encourage openness, draw connections, and assemble, rather than unify, diverse audiences. In Chapter 4, I examine how the openness and difference facilitated by the connections, relations, and movements in the GBM's advocacy—a deterritorialization of environmentalism—gets reterritorialized by the U.S. media.

In addition to using Deleuzian theory to flesh out how the GBM works, in this chapter I also challenge Deleuzian theory on ideology and communication. I suggest that shifting personae legitimate a dynamic relationship between Maathai and an assemblage

of audiences, and this creative communication lays the groundwork for a Deleuzian ideology of relations. I use the GBM as a model to begin conceptualizing an ideology of relations that works from and challenges Deleuzian theory. Although the GBM relies on an ideology, I identify the possibility for its advocacy to assemble, rather than unify, audiences by remaining open, responding, and relating to different contexts and cultures. I also extend my critique of Deleuzian theory on communication by discussing Maathai's discursive patterns as creative communication. By shifting personae, Maathai creates resonances between different audiences and facilitates openness and creative lines of flight.

My utilization of rhetorical and Deleuzian theory to analyze Maathai's discursive patterns also suggests rhetorical possibilities for social change offered by the GBM's advocacy. The GBM offers the global environmental movement a model of how assemblages of diverse local groups may come together to act at an international level. This provides hope that although global environmental problems demand a global response, they do not demand a universal solution (which we can neither find nor agree to). By assembling diverse audiences and advocacy issues, the GBM challenges the tendency of social movements to organize around one issue. Although we often think of social movements in terms of their identity, Maathai and the GBM refuse a single identity. Rather than unifying around one ideology, an ideology of relations may allow advocates to assemble different causes and audiences. The GBM offers a model of both an ideology of relations and the creative communication needed to manage this reformulated ideology. Maathai's shifting personae offer advocates of social change a new symbolic resource for addressing diverse audiences and situations. As a rhetorical

resource, shifting personae may allow advocates to maintain enough openness to work in the local and global arenas.

Although the work of Maathai and the GBM can be read through the Deleuzian AND, in the middle of audiences and advocacy campaigns, our society often looks to classify things in discrete categories. The GBM does work for environmentalism AND economic empowerment AND human rights AND political reform AND …, but, as I will discuss more in Chapter 4, media coverage about the GBM often identifies it as a primarily environmental organization. This reduction suggests that although the GBM's work in the middle and in between offers space for multiple audiences and readings, any one audience may be likely to reduce it to one classifiable term. This does not necessarily challenge the power, force, and movement that Deleuze assigns to the middle, the AND, and the rhizomatic, but instead it creates an opportunity for clarifying how things work in that in between space. I assert that the openness created by shifting personae—by working rhizomatically in the middle to assemble multiplicities—provides the GBM with rhetorical force by expanding the potential audiences for the GBM.

CHAPTER 4

MEDIA REPRESENTATIONS OF THE GBM: RETERRITORIALIZING ENVIRONMENTALISM

In the 27 years prior to Wangari Maathai's receipt of the 2004 Nobel Peace Prize, the GBM appeared in U.S. news infrequently, with no television broadcasts and only about ten articles containing more than a sentence or two about the GBM or Maathai. Since the announcement of the 2004 Nobel Peace Prize, there have been more than 20 extensive articles about the GBM and Maathai, as well as five television news broadcasts. ABC anchor Peter Jennings' qualifying comments about preparing the October 8, 2004 "Person of the Week" report on Maathai "in a very big hurry" and on "short notice" highlights the abrupt increase in attention to Maathai and the GBM after the announcement of the 2004 Nobel Peace Laureate. In addition to covering their receipt of awards and prizes, news coverage often appears when Maathai and/or the GBM are active in protests that turn violent, involved in conferences on women or the environment, or cited as experts or examples of environmental success (Sciolino, 1985; "Saviors of the planet," 1991; Toufexis & Bloch, 1992; Wax, 2004). Although it may be interesting to comment on when and why the GBM makes U.S. news, for the purpose of this chapter I am more interested in how the GBM is portrayed within the news and the significance of the representations offered by the verbal and visual coverage.

Having already analyzed the GBM's tree planting as an open form of argument and Maathai's use of shifting personae to appeal to multiple and diverse audiences, I turn now to examine how media representations of the GBM present this openness. Specifically, I examine U.S. news coverage from major newspapers, magazines, and television broadcasts.[10] In addition to providing a manageable body of media representations, U.S. new coverage offers an externally constructed view of the GBM. This external perspective gives some indication of how the GBM's advocacy moves in the international arena. U.S. news coverage predominantly presents Maathai and the GBM as environmental advocates. However, the descriptions and images of the GBM within the news coverage challenge narrow conceptions of environmentalism. News coverage describes how the GBM's environmentalism upsets government structure and authority, works for women's empowerment, and advocates for human rights. Visual representations show poor African women working to restore the environment where they live. In this chapter, I argue that U.S. news coverage reterritorializes environmentalism by labeling the GBM "environmental." After mapping the Deleuzian language of territorialities onto environmentalism, I turn to an examination of the news coverage texts. Finally, I conclude with a discussion of the implications of the reterritorialization for the GBM, environmentalism, and social change in general.

[10] I collected this news coverage by searching for "Green Belt Movement," "Green Belt" and "Kenya," "Wangari" and "Maathai," and "Maathai," in the full text of articles and the summary of television broadcasts from 1977 to the present in *The Los Angeles Times*, *Newsweek*, *The New York Times*, *Time*, *The Washington Post*, *USA Today*, *U.S. News and World Report*, and television news broadcasts from *ABC*, *CBS*, *NBC*, *CNN*, and *PBS* by using LexisNexis Academic, the Television News Archive at Vanderbilt University, and the respective search engines on individual media outlet websites.

Deleuzian (De)(Re)Territorialization

Any attempt to classify, categorize, or assemble the characteristics of environmentalism may be read as a territorialization that reduces the "infinite proliferation of differences" that precedes territorialization (Colebrook, 2002, p. 37). Labeling activism "environmental" organizes the flow of different actions, ideas, and motivations into a similar group, reducing inherent differences. Connecting a multitude of differences into one body through the label, "environmentalism," territorializes the activism. In contrast, the openness and connections promoted by the GBM's advocacy, which I discuss in Chapters 2 and 3, work to challenge, or deterritorialize, conventional categorizations, or territorializations, of environmentalism. This deterritorialization opens the territory of environmentalism to the flow of difference by removing the strict organization and order of environmentalism. Instead of reining in infinite differences, deterritorialization facilitates branching out. Through the rhizomatic connections, the GBM ruptures the boundaries of environmentalism and creates deterritorialized flows along lines of flight that extend its advocacy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). The GBM deterritorializes, or "leaves the territory" of environmentalism, as it opposes, unravels, and offers escapes from the organization of "environmentalism," tearing the GBM away from the area of environmentalism (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 508; Deleuze & Parnet, 1987). Although the GBM deterritorializes environmentalism, deterritorialization is never separate from territorialization or reterritorialization.

Reterritorialization stops the unraveling, seals lines of flight, and re-establishes the coding of territoriality (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Deleuze & Parnet, 1987; Massumi, 1992). Media coverage that labels the GBM as an "environmental movement"

reterritorializes its advocacy, reorganizing that which had branched out and re-imposing the boundaries of environmentalism onto the group. However, this reterritorialization is not a return to the former territory of environmentalism. Massumi (1992) describes reterritorialization as "the imposition of new patterns of connection with itself and its surroundings" (p. 51). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) assert that "[r]eterritorialization must not be confused with a return to primitive or older territoriality: it necessarily implies a set of artifices by which one element, itself deterritorialized, serves as a new territoriality for another, which has lost its territoriality as well" (p. 174). The reterritorialization of environmentalism does not return it to an older territory, such as the domain of rich, white males working to preserve pristine wilderness. Rather, it constructs a new territoriality from the deterritorialized environmentalism. The media's representation of the GBM as environmentalism reterritorializes environmentalism by re-establishing boundaries, but also by pushing beyond the former "environmentalism territory." In the following sections I examine the reterritorialized environmentalism constructed by U.S. news representations. After examining how media representations identify the GBM's work as environmental, I consider how discursive and visual expansions of the "environmental territory" function to reterritorialize the GBM's environmentalism.

(Re)Territorialization of the GBM's Environmentalism

Media representations shut down some of the openness created by the GBM's deterritorialization of environmentalism by re-categorizing the GBM as environmental. References to environmentalism permeate news coverage of the GBM. The environmental descriptors range from calling the GBM an "environmental movement,"

an "environmental group," and "environmental work" to referring to Maathai as a "green militant," "environmental campaigner," "environmentalist of global stature," and "environmental activist" (Tyler, 2004; Perlez, 1989c; Brokaw, 2004; Wax, 2004; Robinson, 2005; French, 1992; Dixon, 2004). Short articles and media coverage that only briefly mention Maathai and the GBM particularly tend to utilize explicit "environmentalist" labels to quickly characterize the type of advocacy (for examples, see Anderson, 1991; "Government critics arrested in Kenya," 1992; Cothran, 1995; Weeks, 2000; Stein, 2004). Emphasis on the "environmentalist" identity of the GBM also emerges in coverage of the controversy over awarding the Nobel Peace Prize to "a Kenyan environmentalist whose tree planting campaigns are only tangentially related to war and peace" (Gibbs, 2005). As reporters describe, for example, how "some critics questioned how environmentalism is relevant to peace," they further classify the GBM and Maathai as environmentalists (Duke, 2004).

In addition to explicit labels, the media also covers Maathai and the GBM in "environmental" sections or segments and describes their advocacy in terms of the impact on the environment. For example, *Time* carries articles about Maathai and the GBM in special "Environment" and "Earth Day" sections that focus on "Heroes for Mother Nature," or "Saviors of the Planet" ("More heroes for mother nature," 1990; "Saviors of the planet," 1991; Toufexis & Bloch, 1992; Mutiso, 1998; Golden, 2000; Robinson, 2005). Other coverage that does not explicitly identify the GBM as "environmentalist" or appear in "environmental" sections also presents the GBM's work as primarily environmental by focusing on the movement's physical impacts on the environment. In describing the GBM as a "tree planting program" or recounting how planting trees

"help[s] farming by reducing erosion and rolling back the desert… helps combat global warming, which is speeded by the rapid deforestation of the Earth," media coverage emphasizes the environmental components and benefits of the GBM (Sciolino, 1985; "Debate: Aid from USA can rescue the hungry," 1989). Characterizing the GBM solely as "a grass-roots effort to plant millions of trees in Kenya to slow erosion" presents a primarily environmental orientation (Anderson, 1991).

Media coverage further amplifies the environmental character of the GBM by separating Maathai's other types of advocacy from her environmental work with the GBM. By describing Maathai as "a Kenyan woman who started an environmental movement that has planted 30 million trees in Africa *and* who has campaigned for women's rights and greater democracy," Tyler (2004) does not recognize that through planting trees, the GBM also works for women's rights and democracy (emphasis mine). Listing Maathai's advocacy for women's rights and democracy separately from her work with the "environmental movement" implies that the GBM's work is only a narrow form of environmentalism. Another article similarly separates Maathai's "tree-planting campaign and pro-democracy work," isolating the GBM from non-environmental advocacy (Lacey, 2005).

By classifying the GBM's work as environmentalism, the media injects a territoriality into the GBM's advocacy that restratifies the openness and experimental lines of flight. In the next two sections, I analyze news descriptions and images to show how this environmental territory is actually a reterritorialization.

Discursive Reterritorialization

Although most news coverage describes the GBM as environmental, much of it also challenges conventional understandings of this label. In this way it reterritorializes, rather than territorializes, environmentalism. Instead of completely shutting down the openness of the GBM's advocacy by categorizing it as a territorialized environmentalism, the media coverage disrupts fixed and narrow former conceptions of what environmentalists do by showing how the GBM connects environmentalism to advocacy for good government, women's empowerment, and human rights. This connected environmentalism is a reterritorialized environmentalism.

Challenging Government

Media coverage presents the GBM's environmentalism as a challenge to political authority by showing the intersection between advocating for change in the environment and in the government. In reporting the opposition of "local environmentalists"—including Maathai and the GBM—to the construction of a 60-story office tower in the "tree-studded" Uhuru park, the first in a series of *New York Times* articles highlights the political implications of environmental protest (Perlez, 1989a). The article situates the environmental opposition to the KANU-backed development project within the Kenyan context where KANU is "the country's sole political power" and "opposition to official projects is voiced with care" (Perlez, 1989a). This suggests that the GBM's "environmentalist" opposition challenges not only the environmental impacts of the construction project, but by association, the authority of the Kenyan government. In detailing how Maathai and the GBM, "often praised in the past by President Moi," were

"denounced in a packed session of Parliament" and warned by the office of the President "to tread cautiously," the article paints a picture of "environmentalists" who upset structures of political power, not just environmental policies. Continuing coverage describes the GBM as an "environmental movement" that "was labeled 'subversive,' a code word generally interpreted as meaning anti-Government" (Perlez, 1989b). This further characterizes the GBM's environmentalism as advocating for both environmental and governmental change. In announcing the altered construction plans, a final article suggests that "[t]he attacks on Professor Maathai seemed to show the limits of allowable opposition in this one-party nation" (Perlez, 1990). Although this series of articles describes Maathai and the GBM as environmentalists, they also show how, as a form of opposition in Kenya, the GBM's environmentalism becomes quite political. The GBM's "environmentalist" opposition advocates for both environmental and governmental change.

In characterizing the GBM's advocacy as environmentalism, media coverage does not relegate the movement to a politically benign status. Representations of the Kenyan government's aggressive response to Maathai and the GBM highlight the environmentalists' challenge to political authority. A variety of media coverage describes how Maathai and GBM participants have been arrested or beaten by Kenyan police. For example, an article that explains Maathai's receipt of the 1991 Goldman environmental prize recalls that Maathai "has suffered beatings and arrest by police trying to silence her efforts to stop deforestation and overdevelopment" (Manning, 1994). Another article describes how "[s]he was beaten and jailed during the rule of President Daniel arap Moi for challenging state policies that threatened Kenya's parks, wildlife and

forest" (Tyler, 2004). A television news broadcast describes how Maathai was called "a threat to the order and security of the country…has been clubbed and tear-gassed and arrested…was denounced by the Kenyan government" (Jennings, 2004). In describing the violent government suppression of Maathai's environmentalism, news coverage portrays the environmental advocacy as politically threatening. One article explicitly discusses how Maathai interweaves the GBM's "fight to preserve open land" with "political causes" (Toufexis & Bloch, 1992, p. 49). The article connects the arrests and violent suppression of the GBM to the political significance of the environmental advocacy. It describes how "[p]ersecution of activists appears to be worst in developing countries, where environmentalism has become entwined with the struggle to ensure basic rights for the underprivileged and disenfranchised" (Toufexis & Bloch, 1992).

News coverage additionally shows how the GBM's advocacy for environmental change challenges government structures by quoting Maathai. Although Maathai self-identifies as an environmentalist, the version of environmentalism she presents is inextricably connected to other forms of advocacy (French, 1992). For example, one article quotes Maathai as saying, "[y]ou cannot fight for the environment without eventually getting into conflict with politicians" (Maathai, as quoted in "Saviors of the planet," 1991). In another article, Maathai explains that the GBM's advocacy threatened the government because of "the educational component, the civic and environmental education… that touched on governance, touched on democracy, respect for human rights, respect for environmental rights, protection of natural resources, equitable distribution of resources" (Maathai, as quoted in Duke, 2004). She explains that "[a] corrupt, evil government will support logging and deforestation" to show how

environmental protection and good governance are linked (Hallett, 2005). In a television interview, Maathai describes how she realized "that it is very difficult to protect the environment if you have bad governance any place; that you need governments that responded to the needs of the people" (Brown, 2005). By quoting and interviewing Maathai, the media captures the openness embodied by the GBM's deterritorialized environmentalism, connecting the advocacy for environmental change to advocacy for political and governmental change as well.

Although labeled environmental, the GBM presented by the media also works in the political realm. By showing how the GBM's environmentalism confronts political authority, describing the aggressive response the GBM's environmentalism elicits from the government, and presenting the connections through Maathai's words, news coverage reterritorializes the "environmentalist" label to encompass advocating for good government. Media coverage further expands the boundaries of environmentalism by describing the GBM's environmentalism in terms of women's empowerment.

Empowering Women

By referring to the GBM's work in terms of women's advocacy, showing how the GBM responds to women and involves women, and incorporating testimony from Maathai, media coverage incorporates the empowerment of women into GBM's environmentalism. In addition to identifying the GBM as an "environmental movement," the media also classifies its work in terms of women's advocacy by referring to the GBM as "a popular women's movement," a "women's movement," a "female activist group" led by an "African feminist," and a "movement that empowered women" (Perlez, 1989b;

Lacey, 2004; Wax, 2004). One article explains how the GBM has "nurtured as many women as it has acacias or cedars… has always been as much about women as about trees" (Lacey, 2004). These descriptions do not negate the GBM's environmentalism, but rather show how, by advocating for the environment, the GBM also works for women's empowerment. By discussing Kenyan environmental degradation and restoration in terms of the impact on women's lives, media representations further emphasize the GBM's role in working to empower women (Grant, 2004; Brown, 2005). Because women bear the burden of "walking the miles for firewood and water when resources are squandered," and women must cope with feeding their families "when crops fail because the soil is depleted," tree planting functions "as a way of helping the women living in rural parts of Kenya" (French, 1992; Grant, 2004). Media coverage connects the restoration of the environment with the improvement of women's lives by explaining how the GBM's tree planting meets women's immediate needs and eases their daily struggle to survive.

News coverage also makes women's empowerment a component of environmental advocacy through descriptions of the participants of the GBM. Articles describe the GBM as "A Women's Brigade of Tree Planters," a movement with women "foot soldiers," "a national movement for women by women," "a national tree-planting program run by women," a "band of mothers and grandmothers," and an organization that draws "links between the environment and women's rights" ("More heroes for mother nature," 1990; Duke, 2004; Perlez, 1989b; Golden, 2000; Polier, 2004). This shows that GBM not only works to meet women's needs, it also involves women as participants. A number of articles highlight how this participation functions to empower

women. For example, one article describes how "[r]elegated to a subservient status in traditional African society, women are empowered and educated through Maathai's work about better ways to grow food, care for their livestock, feed their families. They earn a wage for nurturing their tree seedlings" (Duke, 2004). The education and income provided to women by the GBM challenge traditional women's roles while providing resources to improve women's lives.

Participating in the movement gives "women a sense of accomplishment and self worth that wasn't previously part of the culture" (Polier, 2004). Empowering women to plant trees challenges "African tradition," "sexual inequality," and the status of women as "second-class citizens" (Perlez, 1989c; French, 1992; Wax, 2004). Because the GBM "pays a woman for each tree that takes root… it is about empowerment, too" (Lombardi, 2005). Much of the news coverage also emphasizes the large number of women involved with and employed by the GBM ("More heroes for mother nature," 1990; "Iran: France settles repayment of $1b," 1991; French, 1992; Wax, 2004; Lacey, 2004; Polier, 2004; Brown, 2005).

As with the challenge to governmental authority, news coverage also shows the overlap between environmentalism and women's empowerment by quoting Maathai. In a televised interview, Maathai describes how "when the environment is degraded, when there is no firewood, when there is no water, when there is no food, it's usually the women who feel it first" (Brown, 2005). By identifying women as the victims of environmental degradation, Maathai lays the groundwork for understanding how restoring the environment will lighten the burden on women. One article quotes Maathai's explanation that "[w]hen you start working with the environment seriously, the

whole arena comes: human rights, women's rights, environmental rights, children's rights, you know, everybody's rights" (Maathai, quoted in French, 1992). As Maathai blurs the border between environmental and women's rights, she also opens up the territory of environmental advocacy to include working for human rights in general. Another article shows how Maathai blurs the lines further: "I don't see a distinction between environmentalism and feminism… It's difficult for me to differentiate whether I'm campaigning as a woman or just as a human being trying to ensure everyone gets their rights" (Polier, 2004). These quotes reterritorialize the GBM's environmentalism to incorporate women's empowerment, feminism, and human rights.

Working for Human Rights

Media coverage shows how the GBM's environmentalism includes advocating for human rights by quoting Maathai and making explicit and implicit connections. In addition to the above quotes that present advocating for human rights as a part of the GBM's environmental advocacy, Maathai explains in a television interview:

> [Y]ou also need people, citizens…to understand that some of our human rights are environmental rights. You have a right to a clean and healthy environment. You have a right to clean drinking water. You have a right to fresh air, and drink and eat food that is not polluted or that is not poisoned. (Brown, 2005)

By overlapping environmental and human rights, Maathai pushes open the boundaries of environmental activism. News coverage also makes explicit connections between advocating for the environment and for human rights. Articles refer to Maathai as both

an "environmental and human rights activist," characterize the GBM as "a landmark environmental and human rights organization in Africa," and describe how they have "helped plant more than 30 million trees… while promoting human rights (Stevens, 2005; Polier, 2004; Hallett, 2005). Identifying the overlap between the GBM's environmental and human rights advocacy blurs the boundaries of what constitutes environmental advocacy.

Although most media coverage about Maathai's receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize highlights her work as environmental, some also makes connections to the GBM's human rights activism. One article describes the Nobel Committee's recognition of Maathai's work with the GBM as an emphasis on "the environment, democracy building and human rights" (Wax, 2004). In describing the unprecedented Nobel recognition of environmentalism, another article notes that the Nobel committee had previously recognized "human rights activism," implying that this aspect of Maathai's advocacy fits with pre-established understandings of peace. This acknowledges human rights activism as a part of Maathai's environmental advocacy.

Some news coverage identifies specific elements that may be classified under the broad category of "human rights." After identifying Maathai as an "environmental activist," one article describes how "[s]he campaigned on issues such as poverty, malnutrition, corruption, women's low economic status and the lack of media freedom in Kenya under the former regime" (Dixon, 2004). Another describes the GBM's tree planting as a way of "holding back Kenya's advancing desert," but also as a response to hunger and poverty ("More heroes for mother nature," 1990). Other coverage describes tree planting as a response to poverty, an effort to improve quality of life, a way to share

resources and responsibility equitably, and a way to challenge an oppressive government (Brokaw, 2004; Brown, 2005; "Then & Now: Wangari Maathai," 2005; Lombardi, 2005; Robinson, 2005). These kinds of representations link environmental activism with the fight for human rights generally and with the fight against hunger, poverty, and oppression specifically.

Although many articles describe the GBM as environmental, they also make connections between the GBM's work and other forms of activism in ways that resituate and reterritorialize environmentalism to include challenging governments, empowering women, and working for human rights. In the next section I examine how news coverage also reterritorializes the GBM visually.

Visual Reterritorialization

In addition to discursive challenges to narrow constructions of environmentalism, media images also present Maathai and the GBM as pushing against the boundaries of and reterritorializing who can be an environmentalist and what environmentalism means. Rhetorical scholars increasingly attend to and analyze the power of images (DeLuca, 1999a, DeLuca & Peeples, 2002; Hariman & Lucaites, 2003; Finnegan, 2003). DeLuca (1999a) emphasizes that understanding "the rhetorical force of the televisual/imagistic public sphere requires a 'reading' of images that resists using our ready-to-hand theoretical tools, or at least resists using them in familiar ways" (DeLuca, 1999a, p. 19). DeLuca and Peeples (2002) highlight the power of images as they suggest that "most, and the most important, public discussions take place via 'screens'—television, computer, and the front page of newspapers" (p. 131). Hariman and Lucaites (2003) assert the

importance of visual rhetoric as they explore the deliberative qualities of the "Accidental Napalm" photograph and identify how "[i]conic photographs are calls to civic action, sites of controversy, vehicles for ideological control, and sources of rhetorical invention" (p. 54). Finnegan (2003) attends to the significance of rhetorical circulation as she examines the FSA photographs as "circulating images that made some poverty stories more rhetorically available than others" (p. xi).

As I examine how the images associated with news coverage of Maathai and the GBM make available certain narratives and constructions of a reterritorialized environmentalism, I incorporate analysis of the text as well. In doing this, I do not mean to privilege the verbal over the visual, but rather recognize how the two intersect to create meaning. Like Hariman and Lucaites (2003) who recognize that "photojournalism can do important work within public discourse, work that may not be done as well in verbal texts adhering to the norms of discursive rationality," I assert that images do work that may not be done in verbal texts (p. 40). Like DeLuca (1999a), I assume that "the meaning of images is not captured by captions" (p. 19). However, like Finnegan (2003), who works from Mitchell's theory of the "imagetext," which recognizes "the interdependence of images and texts," I argue that the surrounding text provides important information that impacts how image are viewed (p. xvii). Finnegan (2003) works from the assumption that "photographs cannot productively be separated from the texts they accompany, nor should they be viewed as mere supplements to those texts" (Finnegan, 2003, p. xv). Because visual and verbal media are mixed together, I analyze the image with and against the associated text.

As I analyze the images associated with news coverage of the GBM, I recognize the openness inherent to visual rhetoric. Hariman & Lucaites (2003) refer to the "ambiguous potentiality of photojournalism" (p. 38). They describe how "visual images are complex and unstable articulations, particularly as they circulate across topics, media, and texts, and thus are open to successive reconstitution by and on behalf of varied political interests" (Hariman & Lucaites, 2003, p. 37-38). In recognizing "the complexity, nuance, and rhetorical force of the images themselves," Finnegan (2003) reminds us "of the multiplicity of ways in which the photographs visualized and interrogated the relation of poor citizens to the social world, and to representation itself" (p. 222).

In the following section I analyze how images function as a resource for reterritorializing and disrupting conventional beliefs about what environmentalism is. By picturing Maathai and other African women as environmentalists, the news coverage pushes the boundaries of who can participate in environmentalism. At the same time, images of Maathai rehearse normative conceptions about the inherent connection between women (and indigenous cultures) and the environment, normalizing the role of African women as environmentalists. This visual "folding back" may make the challenge to established forms of environmentalism easier to accept because it "looks" familiar. In addition to visualizing environmentalists as poor, black women, media coverage also pictures a reterritorialized environmentalism that works to restore and utilize the environments in which people live, rather than protect pristine wilderness.

Picturing Environmentalism

With the exception of two illustrations, Maathai appears in all of the images associated with print coverage of the GBM ("Debate: Aid from USA can rescue the hungry," 1989; Maathai, 2004c).[11] She appears in many of the frames of television broadcasts, and she is often the only person in the picture (Sciolini, 1985; Perlez, 1989b; "Saviors of the planet," 1991; French, 1992; Toufexis & Bloch, 1992; Mutiso, 1998; Golden, 2000; Gibbs, 2004; Jennings, 2004; Wax, 2004; Brokaw, 2005; Hallett, 2005; Lombardi, 2005; Robinson, 2005; "Then & Now: Wangari Maathai," 2005). Even in pictures with other people, Maathai alone occupies the foreground, appears in sharp focus, or wears light colors in contrast to others pictured ("More heroes for mother nature," 1990; Corliss, 2004; Dixon, 2004; Lacey, 2004; Tyler, 2004; Brown, 2005). Taken together with text that identifies Maathai as an environmentalist, emphasizes her central role in the GBM, and highlights her accomplishments, Maathai's visual prominence reduces representations of the GBM from a mass movement to an individual environmentalist.[12] This visual and discursive focus on Maathai as an individual may decrease the political potential of the GBM by classifying it as the success of an exceptional individual, rather than an organized movement. Highlighting Maathai individually may also bolster conceptions of environmentalism as an individual activity, rather than a mass movement in the public domain.

---

[11] One of these illustrations could arguably be a representation of Maathai. In the illustration a black female figure is both clothed by and embracing a forest below (Maathai, 2004c).

[12] Numerous articles identify Maathai as "head," "founder," "creator," of the environmentalist GBM and describe her many firsts, including: "first woman in Kenya to earn a Ph.D. … to become a professor at the University of Nairobi," and "first African woman to win Nobel Peace Prize" (Perlez, 1989b; Corliss, 2004; Dixon, 2004; Toufexis & Bloch, 1992; "Saviors of the planet," 1991, Wax, 2004).

Although images of a lone Maathai may reinscribe territorializations of environmental advocacy as apolitical and individual, a closer examination of the images of Maathai viewed in conjunction with the text suggests how these photographs may also erode stereotypical boundaries and identities of environmentalists, thus reterritorializing environmentalism. Images of Maathai portray her not only as an individual, but as black, female, and African. Independent of the text, pictures present Maathai as a black female. The darkness of Maathai's black body shows even in black and white photographs. Maathai's features, dresses, jewelry, headscarves (often with prominent bows), and long braided hair signify her gender (see for example, Perlez, 1989b; "Saviors of the planet," 1991; Mutiso, 1998; Hallett, 2005; Robinson, 2005). Maathai's traditional African dresses also hint at her African identity, but may not be as obvious as her blackness and femaleness without the associated surrounding text. Although Maathai's status as a black (African) female may be ascertained from the images alone, the text is required to identify her as an environmentalist. Images of Maathai, together with text that identifies her as a "leading environmentalist," a "Green Militant," an "ecoactivist," and an "environmental activist," present a visual representation that shows us that a black African woman can be an environmentalist ("Saviors of the planet," 1991; Toufexis & Bloch, 1992; Wax, 2004; Dixon, 2004). This pushes and reterritorializes the environmentalist identity by including those often left out of formal environmental movements.

As images of Maathai reterritorialize the environmentalist identity, they may also reify stereotypes of gender and culture. For example, images of Maathai, a sturdy and mature black woman in traditional African dress, standing outside in a field or

surrounded by trees, [13] portrays Maathai as a traditional African woman, connected to the environment not by her activism, but by her own identity and affiliation as "Mother Earth" (see for example, Williams, 2004; Jennings, 2004; Hallett, 2005; Robinson, 2005). These images allow the GBM's environmental activism to be filtered through stereotypical expectations for women, particularly African women, of caring for the environment to which they are intimately connected. By naturalizing the connection between African women and caring for the environment, the images may decrease the novelty of the GBM's (de)(re)territorialized environmentalism, making it less challenging and easier to accept. In this sense, pictures of the black, African, and female Maathai fold back and exploit stereotypes in a way that may advance the GBM's activism, similar to the way I discussed the GBM's tree planting as a critique of affirmation that folds back systems of aid and development. We can accept African women fulfilling their role as "Earth Mothers" without feeling a rupture to our own beliefs.

In addition to picturing environmentalism through representations of Maathai, other aspects of the images also construct a reterritorialized version of the GBM's environmentalism. A few print images show other people in the pictures, and television news coverage presents a variety of images that focus on people other than Maathai. As with Maathai, the race and gender of these "environmentalists" opens up understandings of who can participate in environmental activism. With the exception of some individuals at the Nobel award ceremony and what appear to be a few journalists, all of the people appearing in media coverage are black (for exceptions, see Brown, 2005). In one television broadcast, groups of black women stand around Maathai, sit at the edge of

[13] In all of the print coverage, Maathai appears to be outside, or the location is unclear due to close cropping or blurred backgrounds (see for example, Perlez, 1989b; Toufexis & Bloch, 1992; Mutiso, 1998; Tyler, 2004a; Robinson, 2005)

a field, and plant and care for trees as the narrator describes how the GBM works mostly with women and provides jobs and income for women (Brown, 2005). In another broadcast, women carry bundles, plant, water, and care for seedlings (Jennings, 2004). Although a number of shots in the television news broadcasts show men moving in the background or as part of larger groups of people, men are most prominent in scenes that show them destroying forests, opposing Maathai as armed soldiers, voting in an election, and shaking hands with Maathai (Jennings, 2004; Brokaw, 2005; Brown, 2005). Viewed in conjunction with the narration, the video segments visually suggest that women work with and for the GBM, while men either work against it or are passively involved. By showing black women in more primary and active roles, the video positions them as environmentalists.

The television news broadcasts also provide visual references to the class of the GBM participants. As narrators describe the GBM's tree planting as "a response to a growing problem affecting the lives of the poor" or "a grassroots movement to fight poverty," the camera pans across scenes of implicit and explicit African poverty (Brokaw, 2004; Brown, 2005). Dirt roads, simple buildings, and few signs of development or infrastructure provide the landscape for Maathai and the plain-clothed people who surround her (Jennings, 2004; Brokaw, 2004). Black women and children, many barefoot and in worn-out and faded clothing, sit, stand, and move in a crowded stretch of a dirt road (Brown, 2005). A woman stirs a pot over a fire on the ground, while those around her sit on the dirt ground ("Then & Now: Wangari Maathai," 2005). Later images again show crowded dirt streets, littered with garbage between the shacks (Brown, 2005). Pictures of the GBM participants show barefoot women in worn clothing

sitting on the dirt ground or caring for seedlings with makeshift tools made of sticks, small branches, and plastic bags (Jennings, 2004; Brown, 2005; "Then & Now: Wangari Maathai," 2005). Even without the accompanying voiceover, the poverty of the African women participants is evident. At various speaking events, the audience is most often shown sitting on the ground or standing, the only equipment for the assemblies being a few wooden benches or a microphone Maathai uses to address the audience (Jennings, 2004; Brokaw, 2005). The noise, dirt, and crowds associated with these scenes of poverty become more stark in contrast to scenes of the Nobel Ceremony in Oslo, where men and women dressed in suits sit quietly in the spacious, clean, and quiet City Hall where Maathai is recognized for her work with the GBM (Brown, 2005). As with race and gender, the visual representations of the class of GBM participants challenge the possibilities of the environmentalist identity.

Visual representations of the environment in media coverage push against an environmentalism of pristine wilderness preservation. From images of crowded dirt streets with only a tree or two visible in the background to pictures of disturbed environments such as plowed fields or cleared land with only stumps remaining, many images suggest that the environment in which the GBM works is not one of untouched wilderness, but one that is occupied and used (Mutiso, 1998; Corliss, 2004; Jennings, 2004; Brown, 2005; Hallett, 2005). In this sense, the images associated with news coverage of the GBM function like "[t]he rhetorical efforts of environmental justice activists to dislocate and redefine nature as the places people inhabit" (DeLuca, 1999a, p. 78). Not all of the images follow this pattern, however. Pictures and video clips also show Maathai and other women planting and caring for seedlings in areas surrounded by

lush green, with no buildings in sight (Brown, 2005). Panning shots of thick forests, footage of deforestation occurring in areas of lush green, and backgrounds of lush green behind Maathai appeal to an environmentalism of pristine wilderness (Jennings, 2004; "Then & Now: Wangari Maathai," 2005). Although these sorts of images suggest a more pristine version of the environment, a territorialized environmentalism, they again challenge wilderness preservation because they show women planting trees—suggesting a restoration, rather than preservation form of environmentalism (Brown, 2005). Images that show Maathai and other women holding tools, such as a hoe, rake, or shovel, and planting or caring for seedlings further advance the idea the that GBM's environmentalism does not merely protect, but actively works to restore the environment (Tyler, 2004; Hallett, 2005; Brown, 2005).

My analysis of the images associated with news coverage of the GBM shows how these images function as a resource for challenging what environmentalism is, the territorialized environmentalism. By picturing a reterritorialized environmentalism, the visual news coverage both disrupts former territories of environmentalism and harnesses the deterritorialized lines of flight. The images challenge and disrupt environmental territory, but at the same time reinscribe and normalize boundaries for environmentalism.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have analyzed how U.S. news representations act on the GBM's deterritorialization of environmentalism. Although U.S. news coverage emphasizes the GBM as environmental, I argue that this classification functions as a reterritorialization rather than a territorialization. The descriptions and images harness the GBM's openness

in order to challenge a narrow conception of environmentalism, exploding and recreating new boundaries for environmentalism. Even in assigning labels that shut down the openness and difference of the GBM's deterritorialized environmentalism, news coverage captures some of the connections and relations in the reterritorialization. The reterritorialized environmentalism works, therefore, not only for the preservation of pristine wilderness, but for good government, women's empowerment, human rights, and protecting the environment where we live. It involves people often excluded due to race, class, gender, and nationality. This expanded realm or reterritorialization of environmentalism offers more than former territorialities of environmentalism.

Utilizing the Deleuzian concepts of (de)(re)territorialization has enabled me to examine how media representations of the GBM both identify the GBM as environmentalism and, in doing so, challenge what environmentalism means. Examining the environmentalism represented in U.S. news coverage as a reterritorialization highlights its difference from the former environmental territorialization. The GBM's deterritorialization of environmentalism pushed and fueled the expansion of what became a reterritorialized environmentalism. Distinguishing between territorialized and reterritorialized environmentalism removes the potential for missing the change encouraged by the GBM. Although the label, environmentalism, remains, movement has occurred. Deleuzian (de)(re)territorialization pushes us to recognize that the label does not necessarily continue to do the same thing over and over again.

In my analysis, I separately identified territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization, but these movements overlap, connect, and form complementary relationships in a respective play (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Deleuze & Parnet, 1987).

Deleuze & Guattari (1987) describe how territories "are shot through with lines of flight testifying to the presence within them of movements of deterritorialization and reterritorialization" (p. 55). The movements of deterritorialization and the processes of reterritorialization are relative, such that deterritorialization "has reterritorialization as its flipside or complement" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 54). We cannot have deterritorialization without reterritorialization. We cannot have an explosion of environmentalism, a flow of action and difference, that escapes without components of the territory accompanying it, "forming passages or perceptible landmarks for the imperceptible processes" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 303). Although Deleuze and Guattari (1987) identify the radical and revolutionary potential of deterritorialization for "causing particles to spin off the strata, scrambling forms by dint of speed or slowness, breaking down functions by means of assemblages or microassemblages," they also recognize the danger of absolute deterritorialization and destratification (p. 270). They caution that "[s]taying stratified—organized, signified, subjected – is not the worst that can happen; the worst that can happen is if you throw the strata into demented or suicidal collapse, which brings them back down on us heavier than ever" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 161).

Reterritorializing and maintaining the environmental label or identity is not the worst thing for the GBM or other activist movements. Although reterritorialization works "to plug the lines of flight, stop or interrupt the movements of deterritorialization, weigh them down, restratify them, reconstitute forms and subjects in a dimension of depth," it also prevents "suicidal collapse" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 270). The environmental label may stop some lines of flight, but it also provides important

structure. The GBM's deterritorialization of environmentalism creates openness and engages a multiplicity of audiences, but reterritorialization helps us to make sense of these movements. Reterritorialization enables us to access the leaps and ruptures encouraged by the creative communication and ideology of relations of deterritorialized environmentalism by reframing the GBM's creative communication into a unified and coherent movement. By reterritorializing the GBM's advocacy, media coverage makes the GBM's connections, openness, creative communication, and ideology of relations accessible. The media's reterritorialization of the GBM as environmentalism may close down some of the openness and possibilities offered by deterritorialization, but it also provides a structure of support.

This is not to say that experimentation, expansion, and deterritorialization are unproductive, but rather that we need not completely explode the system. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) recommend that we "find potential movements of deterritorialization, possible lines of flight, experience them, produce flow conjunctions here and there, try out continuums of intensities segment by segment, have a small plot of new land at all times" (p. 161). The GBM's deterritorialization productively unravels the organization and identity of environmentalism to explore the different groups, interests, and people that inhabit environmentalism. This deterritorialization pushes the boundaries of environmentalism so that even as reterritorialization "re-ravels" environmentalism, it does so with a greater understanding of the different groups, interests, and people that inhabit environmentalism. Taken together, the GBM's deterritorialization provides the creative rupture necessary to introduce the openness and movement that reterritorialization uses to incrementally move forward. Although advocates of social

change may desire immediate rupture and change, the inseparable movements of (de)(re)territorialization suggest that even as ideas are mobilized and ideology destabilized, they are already heading back toward fixed foundations through reterritorialization. Deleuzian theory pushes advocates for social change to keep creating, connecting, becoming, and deterritorializing in order to maintain movement in the face of constant reterritorialization. My engagement of the GBM, Deleuze, and rhetorical theory suggests that doing environmentalism, or any other form of advocacy, does not mean copying previous advocates, but rather activating all the forces of difference and movement that deterritorialize, rupture, and create movement.

CHAPTER 5

OPENNESS RETERRITORIALIZED: POSSIBILITIES FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

"The great ruptures, the great oppositions, are always negotiable; but not the little crack, the imperceptible ruptures" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 131).

The GBM's tree planting ruptures conventional conceptions of environmental advocacy, rips apart dominant power structures, and shatters traditional forms of argument. Maathai's use of shifting personae tears open ideas of stable identities, bursts notions of a unified audience, and breaks apart understandings of ideology as universal. At the same time, many of these ruptures, rips, tears, bursts, and breaks remain imperceptible as U.S. media coverage, and indeed the larger international community, celebrate the advocacy of this "environmental" organization. The openness of the GBM's advocacy enables its "ruptures" to work through "little cracks" because openness allows—even encourages and invites—reterritorialization. Through reterritorialization, the advocacy of the GBM gets taken up and incorporated into accepted practices and mainstream understandings of how environmentalism works. By adopting an openness that allows it to work within the systems it challenges, the GBM effectively and powerfully advocates for social change in the international arena.

I began this project with a series of questions about how the GBM's advocacy worked and what the significance of this advocacy was for my exploration of the possibilities of environmental and social change. Throughout the project I utilized and critiqued Deleuzian theory and rhetorical theory and criticism in my investigation of the

GBM's advocacy. Rather than assuming a purely Deleuzian perspective, I engaged aspects of Deleuzian theory relevant to my analysis of environmentalism, social change, and rhetorical scholarship, embracing and also challenging various components of Deleuzian theory as I examined the possibilities for social change. In this chapter I return to the questions from my introduction as I summarize my analysis of how the GBM moved from local tree planting to international advocacy and consider the implications for social change. I conclude with a reflection on my engagement of Deleuzian theory.

From Tree planting to Social Change

How did the simple act of local tree planting become part of a larger global movement for social change? Although the entirety of my project works to provide a nuanced answer to this question, the expansive, yet abbreviated answer is: "openness." The GBM's advocacy works through an openness that makes it available to different audiences in different contexts and invites a diversity of readings. This openness explodes the boundaries of environmentalism and enables the GBM to work in both local and global arenas. While not strictly Deleuzian, a number of Deleuzian concepts inform my conceptualization of the GBM's openness. As an idea that embodies movement in between, connections, lines of flight, deterritorialization, and work along borders, openness does not seem to provide the focused direction and drive often associated with charted paths of social change. However, I argue that the GBM's openness supplies the creative movement that propels change, so that when the GBM's advocacy inevitably becomes reterritorialized, some of that movement is captured and categorized into a more organized social movement. The GBM's tree planting works, then, not only through

openness, but also through openness reterritorialized. Before moving on to discuss how the GBM's advocacy facilitates this openness, I briefly summarize what openness does and how openness reterritorialized works.

Openness bursts narrow conceptions of environmentalism. It invites other forms of advocacy into the realm of environmentalism and blurs the lines that distinguish environmentalism from more human-oriented causes. The GBM's openness creates connections between a multiplicity of advocacy issues. Through openness the GBM embodies and works for a diversity of causes, including environmental conservation AND social justice AND democratic governance AND women's empowerment AND economic development AND environmental restoration AND civic education AND political reform AND poverty reduction AND sustainable development AND human rights AND…. Openness provides the GBM with the rhetorical resources to expand the domain of environmentalism. This broadens the base of potential supporters and resources, assembles diverse groups of advocates, and depicts separation between advocacy groups and social causes as false divisions. In addition to attracting a multiplicity of audiences, which I discuss more below, the GBM's openness further erases the divide between humans and nature, challenging and reorienting conceptions of how humans interact with their surroundings. As the GBM connects humans to the environment, it encourages movement and advocates for different relations and forms of interaction. Through openness the GBM also disrupts dominant forms of power and authority. Openness incorporates a diversity of forms of agency and authority, challenging any one form as superior. In doing so, it cracks open political, scientific, and international structures of power. Openness enables the GBM to occupy the ground in

between and along the constructed boundaries of environmentalism, nature, humanity, and power structures.

In addition to opening the realm of environmental advocacy to a diversity of causes, the GBM's openness also creates a form of advocacy that works in both the local and global arenas. In Chapter 1, I called attention to the importance of attending to forms of advocacy from different cultures and contexts that work in the international arena. As globalization connects even distant and remote communities and environmental problems become increasingly widespread and global in nature, the need for international solutions to global problems becomes more and more pressing. The GBM's openness becomes particularly significant in light of this need for strategies for social change that work on an international scale. Although the GBM is a Kenyan organization, its openness allows it to work in a diversity of contexts, both locally and globally. Openness facilitates international dimensions of advocacy by simultaneously engaging diverse cultures, perspectives, and audiences. The open form of the GBM's advocacy may illustrate new possibilities and function as a model for globalized social protest and change. Because the form and content of the GBM's advocacy is open, it invites a diversity of readings. This openness means that the same advocacy can be successful locally and globally, in a variety of different contexts, for different reasons. As I mention above, the GBM's openness attracts a multiplicity of different audiences. Maathai speaks to collectivist AND individualist AND woman AND non-woman AND African AND non-African AND Kenyan AND non-Kenyan audiences. This potential to bridge different cultures and encompass different readings in different contexts contributes to the rhetorical force of the GBM. As a resource for advocates of social change, openness can act as a tool of

assemblage, rather than unification. This may reduce resistance from prospective participants or opponents by including and accepting their perspectives rather than rejecting or condemning them.

Throughout this project I borrowed a number of Deleuzian concepts to clarify and develop my conceptualization of openness. The GBM's openness works through Deleuzian connections, creative movement in the middle, and deterritorialization. Openness connects, assembles, creates rhizomatic alliances, and embodies the AND. The Deleuzian AND is "neither a union, nor a juxtaposition, but the birth of a stammering, the outline of a broken line which always sets off at right angles, a sort of active and creative line of flight" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 9-10). As the GBM's openness connects various forms of advocacy and a diversity of audiences, it also creates and affirms movement. Rather than closing down or continuing on fixed paths to change, the GBM's advocacy initiates multiple lines of flight that move in many directions to intervene, unsettle, fold, reconfigure, and invent new possibilities. The GBM creates openness and movement as processes that always occur in between, in the middle, and along borders. This shifts attention away from fixed goals or endpoints and emphasizes the importance of connecting and creating movement along the way. Openness enables the GBM to move creatively in between audiences and advocacy campaigns. As I described in Chapter 4, the GBM's openness deterritorializes conceptions of environmentalism, lifting and unraveling boundaries to embrace flows of difference. Deleuzian deterritorialization "liberates… undoes codes, it carries expressions, contents, states of things and utterances along a zigzag broken line of flight… releases a becoming which no longer has any limit,

because each term is a stop which must be jumped over" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 72-73).

Through openness, the GBM disrupts the boundaries of environmentalism, human/nature relationships, and dominant structures of power and authority, creating connections and movement that engage audiences in many different contexts and invite a multiplicity of readings. Although provocative, this openness constructed by the GBM's advocacy does not provide focused direction for adopting and achieving concrete advances for social movements. The question (and objection) then becomes, if everyone is reading the GBM's advocacy differently, if openness invites many different perspectives and engages a diversity of social causes, how can advocates of social change use openness to move forward, to accomplish desired change? I answer this by returning to my discussion from Chapter 4 about how the GBM's openness, its deterritorialization of environmentalism, cannot be separated from movements of reterritorialization that capture, categorize, signify, and classify the GBM's openness. Deleuzian theory suggests that "[t]here is no assemblage without territory, without territoriality and reterritorialization" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 72). I argue that the inevitable reterritorialization makes the ruptures created by the GBM's openness palatable for programs of social change. Although the GBM's openness may not seem productive (and at times even appear counterproductive) in the sense that it is not clearly moving toward a fixed and unified goal of social change, reterritorialization takes the connections, assemblages, creative movements, and ruptures and puts them into a program, an organized movement. The openness of a deterritorialized environmentalism that embraces different audiences and social issues provides the creative movement

needed to make advances, but reterritorialization frames these ruptures in an acceptable and organized manner. The GBM's advocacy, then, works for change through openness AND openness reterritorialized. In the next section I examine more specifically how the GBM achieves these movements of (de)(re)territorialization and consider the implications for social change.

Possibilities for Social Change

In order to consider the implications and possibilities for social change suggested by the GBM's openness, in this section I highlight more specifically how the GBM's advocacy works through openness and openness reterritorialized. If advocates can change the way people think and/or act toward the environment through openness, how do we get this openness? How does this openness become reterritorialized? Throughout my examination of the GBM's advocacy, I identified "creative communication" as the primary way through which the GBM achieves openness. More specifically, I focused on the GBM's tree planting in Chapter 2 and Maathai's shifting personae in Chapter 3 as forms of creative communication that function as modes of rhetorical invention. In Chapter 4 I examined how U.S. media coverage reterritorialized the openness created by tree planting and shifting personae, but I also recognize the possibility for other forces to work to reterritorialize the GBM's openness. After reaffirming the significance of tree planting and shifting personae as creative communication, I suggest how my own analysis of the GBM has also functioned as a reterritorialization.

There is no universal path or one way to create the movements, connections, and ruptures that characterize openness. As I implied in Chapter 1, the GBM's work across

advocacy issues resonates with the connections the American environmental justice movement draws between environmental concerns and issues of race, class, and sex (Gottlieb, 1993; Szasz, 1994). In Guha's (1989) critique of "North Atlantic" brands of environmentalism, he too suggests the possibility for environmental protection that is tied to issues of equity and social justice. By engaging Deleuzian theory and the GBM's advocacy, this project offers *one* answer to the question of how to create openness as a rhetorical resource for social change. In the next section I return to discuss how creative communication engages and challenges Deleuzian theory, but in this section I focus on how the GBM utilizes creative communication to create an open form of advocacy as I briefly recount how tree planting and shifting personae encourage openness, flows of difference, relations, and connections.

In Chapter 2, I examined tree planting as the mode and substance of the GBM's argument. As a nondiscursive, affirmative, and open form of advocacy the GBM's tree planting creates resonances, positive connections, and new productive lines of flight. Although rhetorical scholars are beginning to attend more to nondiscursive forms of rhetoric, the affirmative and open mode of tree planting encourages repatterning traditional notions of social movement rhetoric. The nondiscursive form of tree planting provokes movement, links content and expression, and allows the GBM's advocacy to work with various contextual forces and constraints. By enacting a critique of affirmation, tree planting remains open to different readings as it creatively and playfully folds existing systems to affirm alternative structures of aid, forms of development, and women's roles. As a familiar and universally recognizable process, tree planting invites readings from any number of contexts and circumstances. This creative mode of

communication supports the substance of the GBM's argument. The connections and openness facilitated by tree planting link humans to their environment and environmental causes to human causes in a way that allows the GBM to work with and against existing structures of power in different contexts.

In Chapter 3, I analyzed Maathai's use of shifting personae as a form of creative communication that constructs openness by enabling her to speak to a multiplicity of audiences. Changing pronouns, inconsistent speaker positions, and open content facilitate an open form of advocacy that allows Maathai to navigate in between different cultures and contexts. As a challenge to current rhetorical theory on personae, Maathai's use of shifting personae legitimates appeals to unstable and shifting identities and audiences as a source of rhetorical invention. Shifting personae encourage an openness that enables Maathai and the GBM to constitute multiple audiences simultaneously, diversifying and expanding the reach of their advocacy. By identifying with different possible audiences, Maathai opens space for the GBM's advocacy to be read and used in a number of ways. As a discursive pattern, shifting personae extend and reinforce the openness established by the GBM's tree planting as a creative form of communication. Through shifting personae, Maathai encourages openness through connections, assemblages, rhizomatic alliances, and the AND that recognizes flows of difference rather than discrete identities.

As Maathai's use of shifting personae facilitates openness, it also creates the opportunity for an ideology of relations, an opportunity to make ideology responsive. Rather than a unifying universal or transcendent ideology, my conceptualization of an ideology of relations recognizes the possibility for an ideological position that embraces

difference, movement, and responsiveness through openness. Although the ideology of relations suggested by Maathai's shifting personae challenges the tendency for social movements to organize around clear, achievable goals and ideologies, it also creates an alternative path for advocates of social change that offers continual movement and creation regardless of what milestone is achieved or not achieved. An ideology of relations encourages a responsiveness to relations and situations that can provide the structure to assemble advocates of social change without a unifying goal or method. This becomes particularly significant for social change on the global scale because the openness and ideology of relations created by shifting personae can eliminate the need and search for *one* solution, allowing for different perspectives, cultures, and forms of advocacy to assemble to work together to respond to what is.

In Chapter 4 I examined how U.S. media coverage reterritorializes the openness of a deterritorialized environmentalism. By categorizing the GBM's advocacy as environmental, media coverage shuts down the open flows of difference set in motion by the GBM's tree planting and shifting personae. However, this reterritorialization also expands the boundaries and pushes beyond the former territory of environmental advocacy by including political reform, women's empowerment, and human rights as part of the GBM's environmentalism and representing poor African women as environmentalists. Because the movements of deterritorialization and reterritorialization are inseparably overlapping and connected, the GBM's openness pushes and explodes the boundaries of environmentalism AND also works through more restrained and incremental channels of social change.

Without the categorization and containing movements of reterritorialization, many aspects of deterritorialized openness seem to defy the possibility for its programmatic use as a strategy for social change. Similarly, the creative communication used to deterritorialize and facilitate the openness of the GBM's advocacy does not appear to function as a rhetorical tool that is ready to be picked up and used to hammer away at any social cause at hand. Just as reterritorialization makes the GBM's advocacy available as a resource for social change by reclassifying and reorganizing it, my analysis of the GBM's creative communication in this project functions to reterritorialize the connections, flows of difference, and openness into resources available for rhetorical invention for advocates of social change. By using Deleuzian and rhetorical theory to engage and classify the GBM's creative communication—to identify how tree planting and shifting personae work—I repattern the notions of rhetorical invention deterritorialized by the GBM's advocacy. Like U.S. media coverage, this project functions as a reterritorialization of the GBM's openness. By breaking apart and analyzing the openness and ruptures, I expand the possibilities for environmentalism and the rhetoric of social change, but my project is a reterritorialization that shuts down the openness and flows of difference present in the GBM's advocacy. My use of discrete labels and crude oppositions such as Kenyan and non-Kenyan in my descriptions of the different audiences Maathai shifts between in Chapter 3 provides a concrete example of how my analysis reterritorializes and shuts down the open flow of different identities. My larger project of extracting from the GBM's advocacy implications and resources for the rhetoric of social change similarly reterritorializes.

As with the U.S. media's reterritorialization of the GBM's advocacy, my reterritorialization both advances and shuts down the possibilities for the advocacy of the GBM. However, I argue that it is through reterritorialization that flows of differences and openness become meaningful. Although Deleuzian theory pushes for deterritorialization, becoming, and creation, as I highlight at the end of Chapter 4, it also recognizes the hazards of absolute deterritorialization. Deterritorialization and openness offer creation and lines of flight, but also hold the potential of ending in collapse, death, and catastrophe (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Deleuze & Parnet, 1987). Rather than maintaining absolute deterritorialization or revolutionary openness, I argue that it is the "respective play of territorialities, reterritorializations and movements of deterritorialization" that offers productive movement (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 99).

Conclusion

"Politics is active experimentation, since we do not know in advance which way a line is going to turn" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 137).

Colebrook (2002) suggests that Deleuze "speaks to a political and social context that requires us to make new forms of connection between one configuration of ideas and power and another" (p. vi). By engaging Deleuzian theory through my analysis of the GBM, I have tried to venture into and experiment with these new forms of connection as they relate to the rhetorical possibilities for social change. As I suggested at the end of Chapter 4, advocating for environmental and social change does not merely require copying previous successful advocates, but activating all the forces of creation, openness, and deterritorialization that facilitated their successful movement. Accordingly, throughout my analysis of the GBM's advocacy I have attended to movements of

openness and deterritorialization that emerge through creative communication as resources for rhetorical invention. To conclude this project I briefly consider how my analysis challenges Deleuzian theory.

Although Deleuze and Guattari (1987) make blanket statements rejecting communication and representation, they also leave room for using communication to fold systems of representation and communication back on themselves. Deleuzian theory encourages poaching on and maintaining "supplies of significance and subjectification, if only to turn them against their own systems when the circumstances demand it" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 160). As I discussed in Chapter 2 with respect to Deleuzian affirmation, Deleuzian theory recognizes the need to maintain aspects of the systems against which you struggle, by "putting on the mask" of those systems in order to "[m]imic the strata" (Deleuze, 1983, p. 5; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 160). Massumi (1992) expands upon this idea as he asserts that "[t]actical sabotage of the existing order is a necessity… but for survival's sake it is just as necessary to improve the existing order, to fight for integration into it on its terms" (p. 104). Because "[e]scape always takes place *in* the World As We Know It," and our world relies on forms of communication, Deleuzian theory leaves some room for utilizing and engaging communication (Massumi, 1992, p. 105). For example, Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) discussions of being a foreigner in one's own tongue and utilizing the word AND less as "a conjunction than the atypical expression of all the possible conjunction it places in continuous variation," recognize the creative and resistive potential of communication (pp. 98-99).

However, because I structure my analysis around communication, this project operates as a major challenge to and deviation from Deleuzian theory. I do not adopt a purely Deleuzian perspective, but rather engage in a conversation that uses and pushes back against Deleuzian theory. My engagement of communication is not as a critique of affirmation, in which I use communication to fight and turn against itself. Instead, I challenge Deleuze and Guattari's dismissal of communication by arguing that communication can function as a form of Deleuzian creation. While I agree with Deleuze's assertion that creation "isn't very compatible with circuits of information and communication, ready-made circuits that are compromised from the outset," I part ways with Deleuze by rethinking the possibility for forms of communication that are creative (Deleuze, 1995, p. 61). By examining tree planting and shifting personae as creative communication that facilitates openness, I expand conceptions of communication and the rhetoric of social change. In addition to pushing back against Deleuzian theory on communication, I used the GBM to introduce the possibility for an ideology of relations that challenges the Deleuzian rejection of ideology.

Through the movements of (de)(re)territorialization, the GBM's creative communication and openness offer possibilities for social change to work through slight cracks that then build into nonnegotiable ruptures. Although the openness, deterritorialization, and becoming encouraged by the GBM's advocacy do not offer a pragmatic "how to" for achieving social change, this does not remove the revolutionary potential and importance of these movements. After all, Deleuzian theory suggests that "[t]o become is never to imitate, nor to 'do like', nor to conform to a model…There is no terminus from which you set out, none which you arrive at or which you ought to arrive

at" (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 2). Deterritorialization offers important movement and resources of invention, which reterritorializing forces may harness into more programmatic forms of social change. By seeking to capture the creation, possibilities, and movement offered by the GBM and Deleuzian theory, I have collected the resources, rather than prescriptions, for social change. The GBM's advocacy highlights the revolutionary potential of openness that creates new bonds between people and issues through Deleuzian relations, movements, and assemblages.

REFERENCES

Abrams, I. (2001). *The Nobel peace prize and the laureates: An illustrated biographical history, 1901-2001* (Centennial ed.). Nantucket, MA: Science History Publications/USA.

Ahmad, I. (2005). Nobel peace laureate Wangari Maathai: Connecting trees, civic education, and peace. *Social Education*, 69(1).

Anderson, S. H. (1991, July 19). Chronicle. *The New York Times,* p. B5.

Andrews, J. R. (1969). Confrontation at Columbia: A case study in coercive rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1*, 9-16.

Bayet, F. (1994). Overturning the doctrine: Indigenous people and wilderness—being Aboriginal in the environmental movement. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), (1998) *The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 314-324). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Biography. Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.wangarimaathai.com/biography.php

Black, E. (1970). The second persona. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56*(2), 109-119.

Booth, W. C. (1983). *The rhetoric of fiction* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Breton, M. J. (1998). *Women pioneers for the environment*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Brokaw, T. (2004, October 8). Nobel peace prize: Maathai. On *NBC Evening News*: NBC.

Brown, J. (2005, January 25). Conversation: Peace prize winner. On *NewsHour With Jim Lehrer*: PBS.

Browne, S. (1994). "Like gory spectres": Representing evil in Theodore Weld's American slavery as it is. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 80*(3), 277-292.

Burch, E. A., & Harry, J. C. (2004). Counter-hegemony and environmental justice in California newspapers: Source use patterns in stories about pesticides and farm workers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 81*(3), 559-577.

Burgchardt, C. R. (1980). Two faces of American communism: Pamphlet rhetoric of the third period and the popular front. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 66*(4), 375-391.

Burgess, P. G. (1968). The rhetoric of black power: A moral demand? *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54*(2), 122-133.

Callicott, J. B. (1991). The wilderness idea revisited: The sustainable development alternative. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), (1998) *The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 337-366). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Callicott, J. B., & Nelson, M. P. (1998). *The great new wilderness debate*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Campbell, K. K. (1973). The rhetoric of women's liberation: An oxymoron. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59*(1), 74-86.

Carbaugh, D. (1996). Naturalizing communication and culture. In J. G. Cantrill & C. L. Oravec (Eds.), *The symbolic earth: Discourse and our creation of the environment* (pp. 38-57). Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky.

Carbaugh, D. (1999). “Just listen”: “Listening” and landscape among the Blackfeet. *Western Journal of Communication, 63*(3), 250-270.

Carcasson, M. (2004). Global gridlock: The American presidency and the framing of international environmentalism, 1988-2000. In T. R. Peterson (Ed.), *Green talk in the White House: The rhetorical presidency encounters ecology* (pp. 258-287). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the peuple Québécois. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 73*(2), 133-150.

Chaudhary, A. G., & Starosta, W. J. (1992). Gandhi’s salt march: A case study of Satyagraha with rhetorical implications. *World Communication, 21*(1), 1-12.

Cohen, S. (1999). Promoting Eden: Tree planting as the environmental panacea. *Ecumene, 6*(4), 424-446.

Cole, L. W., & Foster, S. R. (2001). *From the ground up: Environmental racism and the rise of the environmental justice movement*. New York: New York University Press.

Colebrook, C. (2002). *Understanding Deleuze*. Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.

Conrad, C. (1981). The transformation of the “old feminist” movement. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 67(3), 284-297.

Corliss, R. (2004). Seeds of inspiration and controversy. *Time, 164*(16), 20.

Cothran, G. (1995, September 24). Global chic: Gorby’s bash by the bay; a plenary session to resolve such matters as saving the planet. *The Washington Post,* p. C01.

Cuomo, K. K., Adams, E., & Richardson, N. (2000). *Speak truth to power: Human rights defenders who are changing our world* (1st ed.). New York: Crown Publishers.

Darsey, J. (1991). From "gay is good" to the scourge of aids: The evolution of gay liberation rhetoric, 1977-1990. *Communication Studies, 42*(Spring), 43-66.

Debate: Aid from USA can rescue the hungry. (1989, November 24). *USA Today,* p. 12A.

Deleuze, G. (1983). *Nietzsche and philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza, practical philosophy* (R. Hurley, Trans.). San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972-1990* (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* (H. Tomlinson & G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (1987). *Dialogues*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Delgado, F. (1999). Rigoberta Menchú and testimonial discourse: Collectivist rhetoric and rhetorical criticism. *World Communication, 28*, 17.

DeLuca, K. M. (1999a). *Image politics: The new rhetoric of environmental activism*. New York: Guilford Press.

DeLuca, K. M. (1999b). Unruly arguments: The body rhetoric of Earth First! Act Up, and Queer Nation. *Argumentation & Advocacy, 36*(1), 9-21.

DeLuca, K. M., & Demo, A. T. (2000). Imaging nature: Watkins, Yosemite, and the birth of environmentalism. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 17*(3), 241-260.

DeLuca, K. M., & Peeples, J. (2002). From public sphere to public screen: Democracy, activism, and the "violence" of Seattle. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 19*(2), 125-151.

Diamond, J. M. (2005). *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed*. New York: Viking.

Dixon, R. (2004, October 9, 2004). Kenyan environmentalist awarded peace prize: The Nobel panel honors Wangari Maathai for her push to fight poverty by protecting forests. *Los Angeles Times,* p. A1, A11.

Dow, B. J., & Tonn, M. B. (1993). "Feminine style" and political judgment in the rhetoric of Ann Richards. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 79*(3), 286-302.

Doyle, R. (1994). Dislocating knowledge, thinking out of joint: Rhizomatics, Caenorhabditis elegans and the importance of being multiple. *Configurations*, 2(1), 47-58.

Doyle, R. (1998). "Give me a body then": Corporeal time images. *symploke*, 6, 26-37.

Duke, L. (2004, December 26). From the ground up: Wangari Maathai's plan for cultivating peace is taking root in Africa. *The Washington Post,* p. D01.

Evernden, N. (1992). *The social creation of nature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Finnegan, C. A. (2003). *Picturing poverty: Print culture and FSA photographs*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Books.

Fiske, J. (1986). Television: Polysemy and popularity. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 3*(4), 391-408.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (1st American ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foreman, D. (1998). Wilderness areas for real. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), (1998) *The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 395-407). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

French, M. A. (1992, June 2). The woman & mother earth: Kenya's Wangari Maathai, linking lives to the planet. *The Washington Post,* p. D1.

Gibbs, W. (2004, December 10). Nobel peace laureate seeks to explain remarks about AIDS. *The New York Times,* p. A21.

Gibbs, W. (2005, December 11). Accepting Nobel, ElBaradei urges a rethinking of nuclear strategy. *The New York Times,* p. 9.

Golden, F. (2000). Century of heroes. *Time, 155*(17), 54-57.

Gottlieb, R. (1993). *Forcing the spring: The transformation of the American environmental movement*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Government critics arrested in Kenya. (1992, January 14). *The Washington Post,* p. A14.

Grant, T. (2004, October 11). 30 million trees, one peace prize: Kenyan woman wins Nobel. *The Washington Post,* p. C14.

Green Belt Movement. (2003). *Special annual report*. Retrieved November 1, 2005 from http://www.greenbeltmovement.org

Green Belt Movement. "Achievements." Retrieved December 1, 2005, from http://www.greenbeltmovement.org

Green Belt Movement. "About GBM Kenya." Retrieved March 26, 2006, from http://www.greenbeltmovement.org

Guha, R. (1989). Radical American environmentalism and wilderness preservation: A third world critique. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), *The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 231-245). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Guha, R. (1998). Deep ecology revisited. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), (1998) *The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 271-279). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Hallett, V. (2005). Her trees bring peace. *U.S. News & World Report, 138,* 56.

Halsey, M. (2004). Environmental visions: Deleuze and the modalities of nature. *Ethics and the Environment*, 9(2), 33-64.

Hardt, M. (1993). *Gilles Deleuze: An apprenticeship in philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hart, R. P. (1997). *Modern rhetorical criticism* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hariman, R., & Lucaites, J. L. (2003). Public identity and collective memory in U.S. iconic photography: The image of "accidental napalm." *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 20*(1), 35-66.

Harold, C. (2004). Pranking rhetoric: "Culture jamming" as media activism. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 21(3), 189-211.

Heinz, T. L. (2005). From civil rights to environmental rights: Constructions of race, community, and identity in three African American newspapers' coverage of the environmental justice movement. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 29*(1), 47-65.

Hogan, J. M., & Williams, L. G. (2000). Republican charisma and the American revolution: The textual persona of Thomas Paine's common sense. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 86*(1), 1-18.

Hyma, B., & Nyamwange, P. (1993). Women's role and participation in farm and community tree-growing activities in Kiambu district, Kenya. In J. H. Momsen & V. Kinnaird (Eds.), *Different places, different voices: Gender and development in Africa, Asia, and Latin America* (pp. 30-45). London; New York: Routledge.

Inskeep, S., & Montagne, R. (2004, December 10). Wangari Maathai, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, discusses her environmental work in Kenya: National Public Radio.

Iran: France settles repayment of $1b. (1991, July 19, 1991). *USA Today,* p. 4A.

Jasinski, J. (1997). Heteroglossia, polyphony, and *The Federalist Papers*. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 27*(1), 23-46.

Jasinski, J. (2001). *Sourcebook on rhetoric: Key concepts in contemporary rhetorical studies*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Jennings, P. (2004, October 8). Person of the week: Wangari Maathai. On *ABC Evening News*: ABC.

Johns, D. M. (1990). The relevance of deep ecology to the third world: Some preliminary comments. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), (1998)*The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 246-270). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Jungck, J. R. (1985). Wangari Maathai, "afforestation of the desert." *The American Biology Teacher, 47*(2), 76, 90.

Kanogo, T. (1988). Kikuyu women and the politics of protest: Mau Mau. In S. Macdonald, P. Holden & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Images of women in peace and war: Cross-cultural and historical perspectives* (pp. 78-99). Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Keep America Beautiful. "Trees of courage." Retrieved January 27, 2006, from http://www.kab.org/aboutus2.asp?id=573

Kembo, S., & Webb, V. N. (2000). *African voices: An introduction to the languages and linguistics of Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

"Kenya." (2005). Retrieved March 6, 2005, from http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ke.html

Killingsworth, M. J., & Palmer, J. S. (1995). The discourse of "environmentalist hysteria." *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 81*(1), 1-19.

Lacey, M. (2004, October 9). Like a tree, unbowed: Wangari Muta Maathai. *The New York Times,* p. A7.

Lacey, M. (2005, January 1). World briefing Africa: Kenya: Call for Nobel laureate's promotion. *The New York Times,* p. A9.

Lake, R. A. (1983). Enacting red power: The consummatory function in native American protest rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69*(2), 127-142.

Lake, R. A. (1990). The implied arguer. In D. C. Williams & M. D. Hazen (Eds.), *Argumentation theory and the rhetoric of assent*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Lake, R. A. (1991). Between myth and history: Enacting time in Native American protest rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77*(2), 123-151.

Lappé, F. M., & Lappé, A. (2003). *Hope's edge: The next diet for a small planet* (1st trade pbk. ed.). New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Liyong, T. l. (1972). *Popular culture of East Africa: Oral literature*. Nairobi, Kenya: Longman.

LocalHarvest. About local harvest. Retrieved November 13, 2005, from http://www.localharvest.org/about.jsp

Lombardi, K. S. (2005, March 27). From bare saplings, great freedoms grow. *The New York Times,* pp. 14WC,11.

Lundestad, G. (1994). The meaning of the Nobel Peace Prize. In A. C. Kjelling & K. Holl (Eds.), *The Nobel Peace Prize and the laureates: The meaning and acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize in the prize winners' countries* (pp. 7-10). Frankfurt; New York: Peter Lang.

Maathai, W. (2004a). *The green belt movement: Sharing the approach and the experience* (3rd ed.). New York: Lantern Books.

Maathai, W. (2004b). Wangari Maathai Nobel lecture. Retrieved January 30, 2005, from http://www.wangarimaathai.org.ke/documents/NobelLecture.pdf

Maathai, W. (2004c, December 10). Tree for democracy. *The New York Times,* p. A41.

MacDonald, M. (2005, March/April). "Something wonderful happens when you plant a seed": A Kenyan environmentalist wins the Nobel Peace Prize. *Sierra,* 10-11.

Manning, A. (1994, October 25). Eco-crusaders celebrate Goldman prize. *USA Today,* p. 4D.

Massumi, B. (1992). *A user's guide to capitalism and schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari* (A Swerve ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Mayor, F. (1995). Preface. In M. Thee (Ed.), *Peace! By the Nobel peace prize laureates: An anthology* (pp. 5-6). Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Meister, M., & Japp, P. M. (2002). *Enviropop: Studies in environmental rhetoric and popular culture*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

Michaelson, M. (1994). Wangari Maathai and Kenya's Green Belt Movement: Exploring the evolution and potentialities of consensus movement mobilization. *Social Problems, 31*(4), 540-561.

Miller, A. N. (2002). An exploration of Kenyan public speaking patterns with implications for the American introductory public speaking course, *Communication Education* (Vol. 51, pp. 168-182): National Communication Association.

Moemeka, A. A. (1997). Communalistic societies: Community and self-respect as African values. In C. G. Christians & M. Traber (Eds.), *Communication ethics and universal values* (pp. 170-193). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

More heroes for mother nature. (1990). *Time, 135*(17), 80.

Morris, C. E., & Browne, S. H. (2001). *Readings on the rhetoric of social protest*. State College, Pa.: Strata Pub.

Morris, C. E. (2002). Pink herring & the fourth persona: J. Edgar Hoover's sex crime panic. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 88*(2), 228-244.

Motavalli, J. (2002, July/August). Africa's green belt: Wangari Maathai's movement is built on the power of trees. *E: The Environmental Magazine*.

Munene, M. (2004, December 11). Kenyan Nobel laureate calls for sustainable environmental management. *Daily Nation (Kenya)*.

Murphy, J. M. (1992). Domesticating dissent: The Kennedys and the freedom rides. *Communication Monographs, 59*(1), 61-78.

Mutiso, C. (1998). Her women's army defies an iron regime. *Time, 152*(24), 73.

Naess, A. (1995). The third world, wilderness, and deep ecology. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), *The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 280-292). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Nealon, J. T. (1998). Refraining, becoming-black: Repetition and difference in Amiri Baraka's blues people. *symploke*, 6, 83-95.

Nfah-Abbenyi, J. M. (1997). *Gender in African women's writing: Identity, sexuality, and difference*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Obi, C. I. (2005). Environmental movements in sub-Saharan Africa: A political ecology of power and conflict, *Civil Society and Social Movements Programme* (Vol. 15): United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Olson, K. M., & Goodnight, G. T. (1994). Entanglements of consumption, cruelty, privacy, and fashion: The social controversy over fur. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 80*(3), 249-276.

Oravec, C. (1981). John Muir, Yosemite, and the sublime response: A study in the rhetoric of preservationism (book). *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 67*(3), 245-258.

Peritore, N. P. (1999). *Third world environmentalism: Case studies from the global south*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Perlez, J. (1989a, November 26). Plan for sun-hogging tower angers Kenyans. *The New York Times,* p. 5.

Perlez, J. (1989b, December 6). Nairobi journal: Skyscraper's enemy draws a daily dose of scorn. *The New York Times,* p. A4.

Perlez, J. (1989c, December 29). Kenya's plan for tower annoys aid donors. *The New York Times,* p. A5.

Perlez, J. (1990, February 11). Kenya will alter planned high-rise. *The New York Times,* p. 15.

Peterson, T. R. (1997). *Sharing the earth: The rhetoric of sustainable development*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press.

Pezzullo, P. C. (2001). Performing critical interruptions: Stories, rhetorical invention, and the environmental justice movement. *Western Journal of Communication, 65*(1), 1-25.

Pezzullo, P. C. (2003). Touring "cancer alley," Louisiana: Performances of community and memory for environmental justice. *Text & Performance Quarterly, 23*(3), 226-252.

Plumwood, V. (1998). Multiple meanings of wilderness in Australia. In J. B. Callicott & M. P. Nelson (Eds.), *The great new wilderness debate* (pp. 652-690). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Polier, A. (2004, October 9). A tree grows in Kenya. *Newsweek, Web Exclusive*.

Railsback, C. C. (1984). The contemporary American abortion controversy: Stages in the argument. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*(4), 410-424.

Robinson, S. (2005). Wangari Maathai. *Time, 165*(16), 98.

Rodda, A. (1991). *Women and the environment*. London; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed.

Salih, M. A. R. M. (1999). Introduction: Environmental planning, policies and politics in eastern and southern Africa. In M. A. R. M. Salih & T. Shibru (Eds.), *Environmental planning, policies and politics in eastern and southern Africa* (pp. 1-17). New York: St. Martin's Press in association with Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa.

Saviors of the planet. (1991). *Time, 137*(17), 66-67.

Schmied, J. J. (1991). *English in Africa: An introduction*. London; New York: Longman.

Sciolino, E. (1985, July 18). "Joyous adventure" at Nairobi forum. *The New York Times,* p. C1.

Seager, J. (1996). "Hysterical housewives" and other mad women: Grassroots environmental organizing in the United States. In D. Rocheleau, B. Thomas-Slayter & E. Wangari (Eds.), *Feminist political ecology: Global issues and local experiences*. New York: Routledge.

Shellenberger, M., & Nordhaus, T. (2004). The death of environmentalism: Global warming politics in a post-environmental world. Retrieved November 15, 2005 from http://www.grist.org/news/maindish/2005/01/13/doe-reprint

Short, B. (1991). Earth First! And the rhetoric of moral confrontation. *Communication Studies, 42*, 172-188.

Silliman, J. M. (1999). Expanding civil society, shrinking political spaces: The case of women's nongovernmental organizations. In J. M. Silliman & Y. King (Eds.), *Dangerous intersections: Feminist perspectives on population, environment, and development: A project of the committee on women, population, and the environment* (pp. 133-162). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Simonson, P. (2001). Social noise and segmented rhythms: News, entertainment, and celebrity in the crusade for animal rights. *The Communication Review, 4*, 399-420.

Stein, L. (2004, October 18). The Nobels. *U.S. News & World Report, 137,* 20.

Stevens, D. (2005, May 20). Children trapped in labor, with few reasons for hope. *The New York Times,* pp. EPT1, 26.

Stewart, C. J. (1980). A functional approach to the rhetoric of social movements. *Central States Speech Journal, 31*, 298-305.

Szasz, A. (1994). *Ecopopulism: Toxic waste and the movement for environmental justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Then & now: Wangari Maathai. (2005, December 13). On *Evening News Segment*: CNN.

Thiessen-Reily, H. (2000). A woman's place is in the house—the house of parliament: The political and economic empowerment of women in Kenya. In Watson, M. A. (Ed.), *Modern Kenya: Social issues and perspectives* (pp. 47-73). Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of American, Inc.

Thobhani, A. (2000). Political developments during the 1990s. In M. A. Watson (Ed.), *Modern Kenya: Social issues and perspectives* (pp. 1-21). Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Toufexis, A., & Bloch, H. (1992). Endangered species. *Time, 139*(17), 48-50.

Tonn, M. B. (1996). Militant motherhood: Labor's Mary Harris "Mother" Jones. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 82*(1), 1-21.

Topouzis, D. (1990, November-December). Wangari Maathai: Empowering the grassroots. *Africa Report,* 30-32.

Trees for Life. "About trees for life." Retrieved January 27, 2006, from http://www.treesforlife.org/about/

Tyler, P. E. (2004, October 9). Peace prize goes to environmentalist in Kenya. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Udvardy, M. L. (1998). Theorizing past and present women's organizations in Kenya. *World Development, 26*(9), 1749-1761.

Utne, N. (2005, May-June). Voices of peace: Revolutionary mothers and daughters speak out for justice. *Utne,* 6.

Vivian, B. (2000). The threshold of the self. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 33(4), 303-318.

Vivian, B. (2004). *Being made strange: Rhetoric beyond representation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Waggoner, G. (2000). Economics and the environment: What is Kenya doing? In Watson, M. A. (Ed.), *Modern Kenya: Social issues and perspectives* (pp. 75-88). Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of American, Inc.

Wallace, A., & Gancher, D. (1993). *Eco-heroes: Twelve tales of environmental victory*. San Francisco: Mercury House.

Wander, P. C. (1984). The third persona: An ideological turn in rhetorical theory. *Central States Speech Journal, 35*, 197-216.

Ware, B. L., & Linkugel, W. A. (1982). The rhetorical persona: Marcus Garvey as a black Moses. *Communication Monographs, 49*(1), 50-62.

Wax, E. (2004, October 9). Kenya's "green militant" wins Nobel peace prize. *The Washington Post,* p. A01.

Weeks, L. (2000, September 10). Doing good, rocking out, pushing poets, and. Banning books. *The Washington Post,* p. X13.

Werbach, A. (2004). Is environmentalism dead? Retrieved November 15, 2005 from http://www.grist.org/news/maindish/2005/01/13/werbach-reprint/

White, R. (1995). "Are you an environmentalist or do you work for a living?" Work and nature. In W. Cronon (Ed.), *Uncommon ground: Toward reinventing nature* (1st ed., pp. 171-185). New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Wichelns, H. A. (1925). The literary criticism of oratory. In A. M. Drummond (Ed.), *Studies in rhetoric and public speaking in honor of James Albert Winans*. New York: The Century Company.

Williams, B. (2004, December 10). Nobel peace prize. On *NBC Evening News*: NBC.

Wölte, S. (2002). Claiming rights and contesting spaces: Women's movements and the international women's human rights discourse in Africa. In M. Braig & S. Wölte (Eds.), *Common ground or mutual exclusion? Women's movements and international relations* (pp. 171-188). London: Zed Books.

World Bank. International Economics Dept. Development Data Group. (2005). World development indicators. Cd-rom. Washington, DC: IBRD World Bank.

Worthington, N. (2003). Shifting identities in the Kenyan press: Representations of Wangari Maathai's media complex protest. *Women's Studies in Communication, 26*(2).

Xiao, X. (1995). China encounters Darwinism: A case of intercultural rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 81*(1), 83-99.

Zarefsky, D. (1977). President Johnson's war on poverty: The rhetoric of three "establishment" movements. *Communication Monographs, 44*(4), 352-373.