

**Ford Community Forestry Dissertation Fellowship
Final Report**

I. Research Problem and Goals

This research examines the emergence of a new form of environmentalism that signals a fundamental shift in contemporary American ideas about nature. This 'entrepreneurial environmentalism' breaks with traditional environmentalism by consciously choosing to link environmental conservation to profit. Comparing the history of the mainstream environmental movement with this new trend reveals a conscious shift away from a belief in the central role of government and science in conserving natural spaces toward an increasing embrace of the market as the appropriate mechanism for determining resource distribution and use. The dissertation uses case studies of two environmental non-profits, founded in the early 1990s, to explore how this fundamental shift is articulated in both meaning and practice.

Environmentalists are typically in the business of saving nature. The history of American environmentalism is the defense of a green, pristine, wild, physical world from the ravages of industrial production. What those mainstream environmentalists separate from nature, in order to protect it, is work.¹ Work, business, profit, labor, and capital are relegated to urban centers. Meanwhile, the aesthetic beauty of an idyllic countryside or a quiet forest defines what is rural and natural. Environmentalists have historically taught us that the two ideas are mutually exclusive, that nature is safest when "shielded from human labor."² It is precisely this conceptual distinction that lends the virulent, and occasionally violent, "jobs versus environment" conflicts in the rural western states crucial ideological power. And precisely this distinction that is being challenged by a new trend within the environmental movement.

This dissertation examines the practice of a new trend in environmentalism, an environmentalism that attempts to open a dialogue about the *kinds* of work compatible with conservation on rural lands in the American West. New western environmental groups attempt to link the logic of economic productivity to scientific understandings of the processes of ecological change. In doing so, they take a position in the struggle over the appropriate relation between nature and labor. This project traces changing American concepts of environment and economy over time. It explores how those ideas are manifest in the concrete actions of institutions engaged in environmental advocacy, linking the philosophical categories of nature and work to the institutions of everyday life.

A growing cynicism about the ability of government and science to allocate and manage resources has led to an increasing emphasis on the market as the appropriate mechanism for determining resource distribution and use. Simultaneously, the surge of urban prosperity brought on by the so-called 'New Economy' has accentuated the desire, not just to be materially comfortable, but also to express core personal values through consumption and investment decisions. Due to patterns of land ownership that have given the federal government a strong local presence in the western states, and the concentration of the high tech economy along the Pacific coast, these trends have been particularly exaggerated in the west coast states. Therefore, this dissertation focuses on two organizations, one in Washington state and one in California, that exemplify potential institutional responses to the changing landscape for environmental advocacy.

Shorebank Enterprise Group, Pacific, provides capital and technical assistance for business and community development in the temperate rainforests of the coastal Pacific Northwest, and has focused on the Willapa Bay/Lower Columbia River region for its first five years. It attempts to build a more sustainable economy by altering the parameters that guide individual economic decisions, and helping entrepreneurs demonstrate the possibilities for economic pay-off through environmentally responsible harvest and production decisions. The Sierra Business Council is a membership organization of businesses in the Sierra Nevada mountains. It promotes local and regional development that enhances the qualities that give the Sierra Nevada a competitive advantage in attracting and retaining capital and labor, and in marketing Sierra products. The Sierra Business Council aims to change the structure of environmental politics by building a constituency of businesses which, as a group, believe that a 'healthy' environment is a fundamental part of the success of their economic ventures.

This dissertation uses these two organizations as a lens through which to understand changing American ideas of nature by answering the following questions:

1. What does this entrepreneurial environmentalism look like in these two institutions—specifically, what are their institutional practices and organizational goals?
2. How do these organizations adopt and adapt the ideas and practices of conventional environmentalism as it has historically been practiced in the western US?
3. How does this entrepreneurial environmentalism challenge (or appropriate) traditional American ideas of nature?

II. Data Collection and Field Experience

Over the course of the fellowship year and the additional six months I spent conducting field research, I explored how two innovative non-profits attempt to merge economic productivity and environmental protection. My project allowed me to study both how Shorebank Enterprise Group, Pacific (SEP), and the Sierra Business Council (SBC) function internally, and how they influence the communities and regions where they have focused their efforts.

Data Collection Experience

My substantive research goal was to explore the everyday practices through which conservation and capital were linked in this particular historical moment, both inside the environmental groups and in the communities where they worked. I spent one year living and working in the town that houses the headquarters of SEP, and focusing my attention on the two counties surrounding that headquarters. Those counties are also home to the majority of the businesses to which SEP has made loans. I then spent an additional six months repeating that procedure in the town and counties where the headquarters of SBC are located.

While I aimed to do participatory research, the specific communities where I worked, and my goal of working within both environmental institutions and 'the community' more broadly, forced me to develop a methodology that looked more like a multi-sited institutional and community ethnography. True participatory research would have allowed individuals who lived where I worked to have a large degree of control over the questions I worked on and the materials I created. But because I emphasized not only a commitment to community processes, but also a focus on the developmental history and everyday practices of specific environmental organizations, I gained access to a variety of materials that were not appropriate for wide public dispersal. Part of my solution to that problem was to attempt to contribute to the communities where I lived as a person as much as a researcher, and to find other ways of making my skills locally appropriate—reading with kids at the local library, researching new community development ideas for the county, acting as an informational resource for the local economic development council. The complementary piece of my solution was to work closely with an informal network of individual residents of the places where I worked to determine which aspects of the research I had designed might be adapted to be useful to institutions in the local area. I am committed to making sure that those portions of my research are returned to the towns where they might be valued.

In each location, I interviewed all of the staff of the environmental organizations, and followed ties of history and capital into other geographic areas, tracing SEP's links into Portland, Seattle, Chicago, San Francisco, and New York, and SBC's into Reno, Sacramento, San Francisco, and New York—interviewing organizational associates, founders, partners, members, and funders in those places. I also worked with each organization on a discrete project for a period of approximately three months while I lived near their headquarters. I did not receive payment for those projects, but a formal working arrangement gave me access to organizational offices and meetings. In addition, each organization made most of their files and records available to me. Board meeting minutes, grant proposals, research files, annual reports, newsletters and brochures provided important documentary evidence of the history of the development of these organizations and their ideas.

In order to gain a sense of community histories, goals, and concerns, I interviewed a wide variety of residents in the areas where these two groups work—residents formally involved with environmental or economic institutions, or institutions of government, those associated with organizational projects, those who speak out against organizational projects, those engaged in alternative advocacy projects, those owning, managing, and working in both resource-based and non resource-based businesses, and my neighbors. I also spent a great deal of energy becoming a member of the communities where I lived. I sang in local choirs, attended town meetings and community festivals, took aerobics classes with the

ladies in town, had innumerable coffees and beers in neighborhood restaurants and bars, volunteered for community programs, and took long hikes and drives exploring the area.

Field Experience

This project has allowed me to see the ways in which, like other social movements that aim for continued success over time, the environmental movement shifts institutional form in response to social, political, and economic change. Both of the organizations I worked with break from traditional environmentalism by consciously choosing to link environmental advocacy to economic goals. By making the 'environment' either part of the production process, or part of a business' competitive advantage in luring talented labor or marketing a premium product, these organizations realign the relationship between productive economic practices and a productive environment. This research has given me the opportunity to think creatively about whether market mechanisms have a place in environmental protection. And, if so, where and how?

My research focuses on the ways in which particular western histories set the context for contemporary debates over natural resources. Unlike most non-profits engaged in local stakeholder processes, the organizations I work with do not focus most of their energy on debates about public lands. They work with private landowners and business owners who control parcels and companies of various sizes. This difference means that their relevant regulatory arenas are most often the county and the state, not the federal government. Over the course of this year's research, I have developed an expertise in private land use regulation, and a familiarity with the role of county government in land use decisions.

This project also provided an opportunity for me to become more familiar with the structure of non-profit work in the West. I formed strong professional relations with many of the individuals involved in western environmental politics and activism. I also did not realize when I began the process how large a role the political economy of non-profits would play in my understanding of how an environmentalism could evolve that attempted to merge businesses and business priorities into its practices. In order to answer my larger questions, my research led me into sub-questions like: Who are the major funders for this type of work? How do foundations make their decisions about who to support in any particular financial cycle? How do the foundations and the non-profits actually engaged in on the ground projects communicate amongst themselves about their work? Who do they think does the same kind of work that they do? How do definitions of successful work differ from institution to institution? As I move to enter this same arena as a practitioner, I anticipate that these kinds of insights will help me strategize much more efficiently about how to get programs funded and projects accomplished.

The largest challenge I faced in my research was learning how to work with non-profits. I anticipated the challenges of working as an urban outsider in rural communities, but I was unprepared for the suspicion and anxiety my arrival might engender in the non-profits with which I chose to work. I expected it to be relatively easy to walk in the doors of these places, explain my project, and get started looking through their files and interviewing their staffs, partners, clients, and members. Gaining access to the documentary and narrative histories of these institutions took much more time, political sensitivity, and clarity about my objectives, and what the organizations might gain from cooperating with me, than I had first expected. Patience, diligent research prior to any interaction, and simply showing up regularly, willing to answer any question posed about my research (or about me), allowed me to slowly build relationships within these organizations over the course of my work.

Those relational skills also served me well as I arranged interviews and developed relationships in the various communities where these non-profits work. Being from Berkeley, having grown up on the East Coast and not in a resource dependent community, and being female, were additional challenges that confronted me in those communities, particularly as I tried to learn about extractive industries that relied largely upon manual labor and were traditionally male. These situations tested my ability to communicate with people who have a wide variety of interests and experiences, often significantly different from my own. By offering me vastly different perceptions of the questions that I asked and of the person I appeared to be, they also taught me to listen extremely carefully. On the more mundane side of the research, making sure that I have captured the words and experiences shared with me over the course of my time working on the project has proven to be an extraordinary test of my self-discipline. Taking good notes and organizing them so that I know where everything is, and can get to it efficiently,

has required learning how to be more explicit about how I think and more discerning about what exactly I think is important.

Finally, my research experience sharpened my sense of how I can work most effectively in rural communities, and I perhaps learned more about myself than I learned about anything else. I am more conscious of how I enter small towns, and of how to begin developing relationships across the multiple interests and issues that make up any locality or region. In addition, approximately 190 interviews later, I am confident that my ability to outline and conduct a meaningful interview is vastly improved.

III. Preliminary Findings and Analysis

The preliminary structure that I have outlined for my research analysis proceeds in three sections. I begin, in the first section, by introducing this new trend in environmental advocacy and the conditions for its appearance at this specific moment in history and in a particular physical geography. The second section describes the two organizations I have chosen to exemplify this new trend and the ways in which the new trend has so far been practiced in their operations. The third section analyzes three innovative ways this entrepreneurial environmentalism is tying nature and economy together. The third section focuses on specific discourses, crystallized in these environmental institutions, that alter common sense conceptions of nature and our role in it.

I begin the third section by suggesting that entrepreneurial environmentalism's discourses of community and home—who is part of a community, what it means to feel 'home' somewhere—are transforming the ways in which the geographic areas where these organizations work are imagined. The result is a shift in who is recognized as having legitimate interests in those regions. I then argue that its discourses of value, specifically around a consumer relation to nature, are binding urban capital and rural resources into an ever tighter union. They are also supporting a geographic change in both the location of production and ownership of the means of production. And I conclude by asserting that its discourses of efficiency, instead of providing the ground for federal centralization of environmental management as they did in the Progressive Era, are now promoting individual businesses as the appropriate arbiters of environmental decisions.

Environmentalism is not one stable entity. It responds to transformations in economic, political, social context, and different trends within the environmental movement in the United States gain and lose power with shifts in American political economy and social priorities. In the 1980s and 90s, several key political, social, and economic changes led to a situation ripe for the emergence of an American environmentalism more closely attuned to economics and business. Markets were increasingly touted as the appropriate site for all American decision-making, deposing government and science as the best arbiters of the public good. The incredible success of the technology and information industries, and the high growth rate of the national economy, seemed to underscore the positive outcomes of market dominance, while also providing an increase in disposable capital available for spending on environmentally responsible consumption and investment. Simultaneously, in the field of ecology, landscapes were gaining prominence as the appropriate unit for environmental management. Landscape level priorities made private lands increasingly visible as an important venue for environmental attention. Finally, the language of 'sustainable development' had begun to enter the terminology of business and industry, leading to an increasing focus on environmental decision-making as one realm of proactive strategic planning. These factors set the context for the development of a peculiarly entrepreneurial trend in American environmentalism.

Entrepreneurial environmentalism not only offers a new vision of the possible connections between environmental and economic priorities, it also differs from conventional environmentalism in institutional structure and practice. The guiding philosophy of conventional environmentalism has been that nature and production should not (and, to some degree, cannot) share a landscape. This philosophy appeared and matured in debates about how federal lands should be managed. Mainstream environmentalism has continued to focus its attention on those public lands. Entrepreneurial environmentalism instead emphasizes the mutually beneficial links between environmental stewardship and sustainable production on private lands. In this new environmental trend, as the target geography shifts from public lands to private lands, the targets of organizational advocacy undergo a similar transition. Conventional environmentalists addressed their concerns to the federal government and its land management agencies.

But the entrepreneurial environmentalists direct their advocacy towards individual land and business owners, and towards the county governments that are largely responsible for land use regulation on private lands. The form of their advocacy work is also different. Mainstream environmentalism has found exceptional success in litigation and political advocacy. While organizations that I label 'entrepreneurial' often share a focus on research and education with the conventional groups, they tend to build additional expertise in financial, business, and planning services, and to employ a much more consciously 'community-based' approach than most of the mainstream institutions. Shorebank Enterprise Group, Pacific, and the Sierra Business Council provide two exemplary cases of the different roles that this entrepreneurial environmentalism is playing in rural, western communities.

Shorebank Enterprise Group, Pacific, is a product of two parent organizations—the Shorebank Corporation, a development bank located in Chicago, IL, and EcoTrust, an environmental organization located in Portland, OR. Both parent organizations had an interest in conservation and development, but their institutional histories were radically different. They worked together to structure a new non-profit that could benefit from both kinds of experience brought to the project. Shorebank operates on the assumption that providing access to credit can drive economic development. The EcoTrust model is that careful environmental stewardship is more likely to take place in the context of a functional and prosperous local and regional economy. In the EcoTrust theoretical framework, the correlation between better economic situation and better environmental stewardship holds true at the level of an individual, a business, a small town, a region.

SEP exhibits characteristics of both of its founders. Like Shorebank, SEP believes that 'rational economic self-interest' is a driver for economic development, and that credit is one way to harness and direct that interest. But their philosophy also carries that logic one step further—if credit and economic self-interest can drive economic development then, by improving economic situations, they can also drive positive environmental change. SEP is committed to 'putting their money where their mouth is,' and making their organizational economic success dependent on the economic success of their clients. Success hinges on the willingness of (urban) consumers to put their money into green products authenticated through stories of both the environmental sustainability of their production and the natural, rural, communities where they come from.

Most of the work that SEP has done thus far focuses on two counties on the northwest coast— one in Oregon, and one in Washington. The coast there is largely distinguished by wind and rain falling on long flat beaches, a vast, shallow, protected bay, the mouth of the Columbia River, and uplands covered with Douglas Fir plantations. In Washington, Pacific County makes up most of the watershed for the Willapa Bay, and houses the Shorebank Enterprise headquarters. On the Oregon side of the river, the tidelands and forests fall under the jurisdiction of Clatsop County. The coastal areas of both counties are dependent on fishing and Portland and Seattle vacationers, while the economies of the inland areas are more reliant on timber and agriculture. Both counties, like many rural places in the West, are experiencing a decline in the percent of personal income derived from natural resource industries, and an increase in the amount coming from services, government, and non-labor income. The SEP revolving loan fund provided approximately \$7 million dollars in loans to 88 clients between 1995 (when they first opened their doors) and the first quarter of 2000. 72% of those loans were to clients within 65-70 miles of the office. The rest were spread throughout the entire region that SEP refers to as the 'Coastal Temperate Rainforest.' 63% of all of the loans were to businesses in natural resource industries. The other 37% were in community development, real estate, and local services.

The Sierra Business Council has no parent organizations. It emerged as the vision of Lucy Blake, who was working as the head of the California League of Conservation Voters in Oakland. When Blake turned her focus to the Sierra, she saw that many organizations were engaged in the battle over the future of the public lands in that region. However, private development ran rampant over the landscape, and no environmental organizations were working to address it. Blake reasoned that businesses in the area might have a legitimate interest in helping to guide development in ways that would be beneficial to their existing enterprises, but they had no forum through which to express those views, and no group to provide support for those ideas. SBC was constructed to provide an organized voice for Sierra businesses that see environmental quality as an essential element of their entrepreneurial success.

The SBC model may thus be understood as starting halfway through the SEP model. It assumes viable Sierra business as given, and does not recognize a need for the provision of additional capital to enable those businesses to function. While it, too, relies on a connection between profitable business and positive stewardship of environmental quality, SBC's model begins with viable businesses, and asks them, not to change their business practices, but to become aware of the role that the Sierra environment plays in their success. With this awareness, Sierra businesses can become a constituency with an economic interest in environmental protection.

SBC has worked more across its entire identified region more than has SEP. But the SBC region is more internally diversified than the Pacific Northwest. In the Sierra, the jagged east side of the range rises out of the arid Great Basin to high granite peaks, while the wetter west side of the range moves from steep forested slopes and stream-fed valleys down to the oak woodlands and chaparral of the foothills. Like the Northwest coast, the Sierra is historically the site of natural resource extraction and vacation for the nearby urban centers of Sacramento and San Francisco. And also like the Northwest, the region has seen its economy shift from a reliance on mining, timber, and agriculture to an increasing focus on tourism, services, and government. My work focuses on the two counties where SBC has had the longest and most active presence—Placer County and Nevada County.

SBC's headquarters are located in Nevada County, in what they have dubbed the north central section of the Sierra. The north central region also provided the early grounds for recruiting a business membership for the organization. Recruiters could move easily up and down the mountains along two major highways, and businesses in the area were many, prosperous, and had had time to see the changes wrought on small Sierra communities by increasing development and population pressure. Almost half of the businesses that currently make up SBC's membership are located here. SBC has also initiated two of their largest community projects to date in Placer and Nevada Counties. Working with the Placer County Board of Supervisors, in 1998, SBC started a land use and conservation planning exercise called Placer Legacy. The aim of the project was to develop a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the entire county. The HCP would be coordinated with the Placer County General Plan and zoning ordinances, making landscape level conservation an integral part of county land use planning. SBC and the Nevada County Board of Supervisors signed an agreement to attempt a similar project in Nevada County in May of 2000.

Although county boundaries provide useful research guidelines, place in a larger sense plays a central role in the work of both of these groups. Both focus their efforts on ecologically bounded regions, using factors such as average temperature, precipitation, landscape features, and primary flora and fauna to argue for the internal sense of the reach of their programs. SEP focuses on what it calls the 'Coastal Temperate Rainforest,' a stretch of the Pacific NW coast that reaches from northern California to southeast Alaska, and corresponds closely to what has been historically referred to as 'Cascadia.' SBC works within a region characterized by a mountain range—the Sierra Nevada—encompassing inland California and the high altitudes of western Nevada. For both groups, one essential landscape feature defines the place where they work—for SEP, the coast, for SBC, the mountains. And each uses that symbol of place to appeal to rural constituencies who make that place their home, and to urban constituencies who have built their own deep connections to that place.

Conventional environmentalism sold specific, typically remote, places devoid of people to a national audience as 'environments' in which they should take a proprietary interest. These groups focus on place as 'home.' Their places include people, and their rural constituencies live within the geographic regions that define their scope of action, while their urban constituencies typically live within a few hours drive. These organizations expect residents of particular places to have more knowledge of and more interest in their places than those who don't live there, and they then offer them an opportunity to sell those places to a national audience as stories that help to provide premium prices for specific regional products. While both organizations focus on rural residents as important participants in shaping the future of regional environments and economies, my evidence suggests that SEP's individually focused approach—providing capital to entrepreneurs—legitimizes a different set of participants in environmental decision-making than the community-based, collaborative visioning approach forwarded by SBC.

In addition to offering innovative models for drawing regional boundaries and determining critical environmental actors, these new groups also attempt to replace the conflict between environmental protection and economic production with a pragmatic union of the two. In order to support 'sustainable'

business decisions, these environmental groups strive to integrate moral values and practical economic choices. Both SEP and SBC explicitly try to translate moral values into economic value, bringing capital into rural communities in the form of economic return for commodity sales or for investments made in local environmental quality or community amenities. SEP urges rural businesses to sell their products to urban consumers who want to support environmental protection and a nostalgic vision of small-town life. Simultaneously, SEP urges urban foundations and regional banks to invest their capital in SEP programs, offering an opportunity for urban capital to do good in addition to producing a monetary return. The Sierra Business Council takes a different approach, framing the quality of the Sierra environment, recreation opportunities, and small-town history, as the economic future of the Sierra, precisely because those things can attract tourists and 'footloose' industry sectors to Sierra locations. If residents value their surroundings correctly, the argument goes, they will reap economic rewards. While this argument is partly about what current residents value, it also turns on prettying up to attract urban attention. Both organizations depend on tightening the connections between urban capital and rural resources; however, their ideas can also support a geographic change that moves production and ownership of the means of production closer to the rural resources that both tend to exploit.

The trope of efficiency plays a critical role in linking moral and economic values. Efficiency is assumed to be a business priority. A more efficient operation can compete more effectively in its industry, returning more capital to the company. Greater efficiency can be sought in how a business uses either resources or labor. Entrepreneurial environmentalism assumes that conserving natural resources is, by definition, the most efficient way of doing things. So both SEP and SBC encourage businesses to evaluate production and harvest practices to ensure that they are making complete use of every input. Sustainability is defined as showing businesses how to be most efficient in their production and harvest practices, thus making it possible for them to increase profit margins and be more effective competitors. Because it decreases the speed and intensity with which resources are used, this efficiency is assumed to be part of a positive environmental change.

Efficiency has traditionally played an important part in the American environmental movement.³ But it has most often been used in relation to arguments over how American National Forests should be managed. Entrepreneurial environmentalism changes the focus of the term. In the cases I describe, efficiency is the responsibility of the individual and corporate business owner and manager, not of a public land management agency. While the language is the same—sound management of resources, efficiency in exploitation, balancing immediate gain and long-term production—the reward is not in the greatest good for the greatest number, but in higher returns to the individual business. This shift signals a transformation in American ideas about how nature should be used and managed.

IV. Benefit to Community

The Ford Fellowship website describes the goal of community forestry as "fostering mutually beneficial relationships between human communities and the natural ecosystems with which they coexist and coevolve." Contemporary visions of what these mutually beneficial relationships might be almost always posit conservation and development as necessary halves of one whole. Building these beneficial relationships involves constructing connections between the environment and the economy.

Some of the most exciting work in terms of both framing those relationships for the contemporary American context, and actually working to produce those connections, is occurring in the dialogue between environmental organizations and rural communities. The recent proliferation of western non-profits engaged in conservation and development work represents an important new trend in the U.S. environmental movement, a trend that has critical implications for the practice of community forestry. The groups with which I collaborated on this project are institutionally committed to working on locally based, community-directed projects. My project documents and analyzes the processes through which rural communities and regional environmental organizations work together to develop and use links between conservation and economic development in the western U.S. Understanding the mechanisms through which these links are shaped requires attention not only to the community process, but also to the institutions working with local communities to imagine, plan, and implement changed visions of environmental protection.

While I add a component of institutional ethnography to theoretical understandings of how community forestry takes place, this component is not invoked as a replacement for community-based research. My research focus is the intersection between these new environmental organizations and rural communities. Because many successful local projects are supported by outside organizations, understanding their role in community-based natural resource management has broad implications for ensuring that community issues and concerns are addressed by participatory research.

V. Lessons Learned

Many of the personal lessons that I learned over the course of this research are listed under *Data Collection and Field Experience*, so I will use this section to speak specifically to the Ford program. I would love to see Ford deal more creatively with questions of what constitutes participatory research in the context of the United States. In my experience, it is difficult to gain community trust without devoting a significant amount of time to living and working in one place, and it is difficult to argue that you are working in that place if you arrive without research questions. I definitely support the long-term funding approach that Ford has taken by offering pre-dissertation fellowships that allow students to build relationships in the places where they will work, but I am not entirely sure that it is sufficient. Most of the projects that were offered to me in conversation with the residents of the communities where I worked in the Northwest and the Sierra were projects that would have firmly associated me with one particular interest group active in the area. Even if I had negotiated the specifics of my role in such a project to make myself comfortable, the mere fact of my formal association with any one group (yes, even a stakeholder group, or a group meant to be representative of the community as a whole), would have compromised my access to other groups and individuals.

I found that my best work took place when I could ask people to speak with me from a position as an independent researcher with my own priorities. Taking sides by volunteering for a 'community' project would have, in almost every case, had an enormous influence on who would talk to me and what they might say. While it might be possible in some places to by-pass those kinds of difficulties by forming a diverse advisory committee dedicated to your project, where I worked, the demands on people's time and the deep divisions in personal interests made that option impossible. I would find it immensely valuable if Ford would continue to explore (and publish, and promote) increasingly innovative methodologies for the field of domestic participatory research.

Most importantly, I want to say thank you. The monetary support I received from Ford allowed me to envision and complete a project that otherwise would have been impossible, and I deeply value the friendships and professional relationships I have formed at the annual Ford workshops. I have been delighted to be a part of such a fantastic program.

¹ Mainstream environmentalism for the purposes of this project is taken to be the cultural movement, most notable in the decades after World War II, which has articulated an increasing concern about protecting nature from the harms resulting from human actions (William Cronon, "Introduction: In Search of Nature" in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, William Cronon (ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996), 25). Its American intellectual, social, and cultural roots can be traced to the movements to protect wild nature that began in the mid-19th century, and gained national prominence with the struggle to protect Hetch-Hetchy in 1913. For good historical overviews, see Samuel Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959); Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1993); Mark Dowie, *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the End of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995), and Philip Shabecoff, *Earth Rising: American Environmentalism in the 21st Century* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2000).

² Richard White, "Are You an Environmentalist or Do You Work for a Living?" (*Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, William Cronon (ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996), 172.

³ Samuel Hays is the author most firmly associated with this idea. Please see, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959).