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BLUEWATER NETWORK (BWN) is known as the non-profit, environmental organization that spearheaded the boycott of Ford Motor Company (FMC) products. Spurred into action by Environmental Protection Agency research that links FMC vehicles to a documented history of the lowest miles per gallon cars in automobile industry, BWN's Global Warming Prevention Project (GWPP) initiated the “Anti-Ford Campaign (AFC).” The AFC gained the support of many in the environmental community with a series of popular ads in the “Detroit News” (Plungis, DN 2/6/04) and “New York Times” (Warner, NYT 2/26/04). The ads depicted FMC Chairman William Ford Jr. as a long nosed Pinocchio, for claiming on the one hand to be a “lifelong environmentalist”, but doing little to improve the miles per gallon (MPG) of Ford cars. He in fact colluded with the Bush Administration to relax fuel emissions standards.

BWN’s organizational culture is a mixture of paid and volunteer staff dedicated to the environmentally related aspects of grassroots organizing/activism, political strategy/lobbying, and legal action. These environmentalists, from divergent social backgrounds, and with varying experience levels and diverse skill sets, were organized by BWN into the GWPP; Part of which is the AFC. The latter an ongoing, multifaceted project with the goal of turning FMC into a more environmentally responsible corporate citizen and holding the Bush Administration accountable for its anti-environmental legislation.

For 300 plus hours, from February to September 2004, I interned at BWN’s San Francisco headquarters and conducted applied anthropological fieldwork on the social organization of the AFC. During the course of my internship I was involved in a full spectrum of event planning and coordination, grass roots organizing and public awareness
activities. These gave me insight into the culture and internal workings of BWN in
general and the AFC in particular. My work included organizing and participating in: a
hybrid car parade through the Stanford University Campus and the city of Palo Alto, CA;
working with CSU, EB faculty on an environmental elicitation project; several anti-global
warming media events at Ford dealerships; and social action grant writing. These
activities allowed me to both observe the organizational culture of BWN and the hearts
and minds campaigns waged by environmentalists and the corporations arrayed against
them. BWN’s struggle to end any and all anti-environmental collusion between FMC and
the Bush Administration, and my applied anthropological internship/social action
research with the AFC, are analyzed in my thesis within the theoretical framework of
political ecology.

Political ecology theory is a rich admixture of: 1. Applied anthropology, i.e. the uses
of anthropology to understand and work in human organizations; 2. Economics, i.e. the
ways in which societies choose to distribute their resources, and; 3. Geographic-
Environmental Science, i.e. the mapping and analysis of the political interaction between
populations, resources, and ecosystems. Applied anthropologists use political ecology
theory to document, describe and interpret how and why human organizations such as
BWN, FMC and the Bush Administration, provide conflicting environmental policies and
legislation.

The focus of my internship/thesis is on the political-ecological interaction between
BWN’s, AFC, the FMC and the Bush Administration. The emergent problem of my
thesis centers on FMC’s environmental irresponsibility. In specific terms, FMC
produces, when compared to other manufacturers, the lowest overall gas mileage in its
fleet of vehicles. Bush Administration policies allow FMC to continue production of the
gas guzzling vehicles, that: 1. Create dangerous levels of tail-pipe emissions; 2. Produce
ozone depleting green-house gases, and; 3. Cause global warming. This thesis documents
my social action research on, and participant-observation of the political-ecological
interaction between the pro-environment BWN-AFC, and the anti-environment FMC, and
Bush Administration.

**PRIMARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The theoretical lens of political-ecology studies enables me to understand why social
organizations like BWN initiate environmental movements like the AFC to hold both
government and corporations accountable for the sustainable use of the earth’s finite
resources. The government is charged with fact finding, legislative regulation, and
enforcement. This process is unduly influenced by corporate pressure to lessen
environmental regulation, and to increase profit, and to create the economic incentives
that will stave off foreign competition, and keep multinationals from moving their
operations offshore. To insure environmental regulations are “business friendly”,
corporations employ lobbyists, who constitute a revolving door between government and
big business. They leave office and use their clout to influence the creation of pro-
business environmental legislation in ways that benefit the corporations they used to
regulate.

Ultimately my advocacy as an applied anthropologist was ethically motivated. I was
enthusiastic to support the BWN in its exposure of the FMC’s environmental rhetoric in
the hopes of diluting FMC’s undue corporate influence over the governmental creation of
environmental policy.
CHAPTER I.
ANTHROPOLOGY INTERNSHIP
AT BLUEWATER NETWORK

BlueWater Network (BWN) is a newly independent, non-profit, environmental organization. From 1996 to 2001, BWN operated under the fiscal auspices of the Earth Island Institute (EII). In 2002, BWN moved out from under the EII fiduciary umbrella to became an independent fiscal entity and a wholly independent environmental organization.

BWN is the brainchild of Dr. Russell Long, a Ph. D. in environmental studies. Prior to establishing BWN, Dr. Long did scientific research in the Indian Ocean. His efforts helped to save the blue waters of the Kerala region from the pollution caused by two-stroke outboard boat motors. Dr. Long’s successes in India led him to propose an incubator project to EII. He parlayed the seed money and technical expertise provided by EII into the BWN, a non-profit organization with the expressed mandate of turning big business polluters into environmentally responsible corporate citizens.

As Director, Dr. Long’s liaise faire management style sets the tempo and mode for BWN’s organizational culture. There are no complex chains of command or hall monitors at BWN. Instead Dr. Long preaches what social scientists describe as the “loose structure, loose control” (Long, 10/22/04) an “iterative” (Larmen, IEEE 6/03) approach to organizational culture. This is made possible largely because BWN’s employees and volunteers already share an independently derived holistic commitment to the ethics of political ecology. Thus avoiding counterproductive red tape-spheres of influence that stifle cooperation and creativity in profit motivated organizations.
The core staff of BWN is comprised of nine paid Caucasian American employees, four females and five males. They come from a wide variety of socioeconomic backgrounds. What unites these highly qualified ecologists, lawyers, and former park service officials, and what brings them to the BWN is their shared mission to bring about, and if necessary to enforce, corporate responsibility for the sustainable use of our earth's finite resources. They dedicate themselves to do this through education, social action and environmental justice.

**Internship Experience**

My passion for applied studies and environmental advocacy led Dr. Laurie Price, then my Pre-Internship Instructor, and I to search for an environmental organization to conduct my internship fieldwork and thesis research. I learned about BWN from Ms Rachel Harold of Green Corps, a company that provides environmental leadership training. Rachel was contracted to coordinate BWN's Northern California AFC. With the permission of Professor Price, I interviewed with Rachel, who was phasing out her contract with BWN. I agreed to take on some of her BWN responsibilities, and to conduct my internship as a “student advocate” for the AFC campaign.

I met with Rachel and her staff to put the finishing touches on a hybrid car parade from Stanford University, through Palo Alto, California, to the Peninsula Ford Dealership. This parade was Rachel's last event with BWN. Co-coordinating it with her enabled me to take on her responsibilities and to become part of the AFC team, a dedicated group of people working towards the greater environmental good of the planet.
As stated, BWN is based in the San Francisco Bay Area [Appendix B-1]. Located in a vintage tan building at 311 California Street, in the heart of San Francisco’s financial district, BWN’s offices occupy a large suite on the fifth floor. The suite consists of a cluster of office spaces, meeting rooms, and nondescript cubicles (such as the ones I and other student interns occupied).

For over three hundred hours from February to September, 2004, I interned with BWN a requirement of the California State University East Bay, MA Program in Applied Anthropology. The purpose of my internship was to practice applied anthropological fieldwork and research methods as a student advocate for BWN’s Anti-Ford Campaign. During my eight months of internship fieldwork I observed the organizational culture and social relations of BWN, and participated in social action research with the AFC. My duties were to work with AFC staff to promote awareness of the FMC’s poor environmental record, and to help hold the corporation accountable for its significant role in global warming by encouraging the boycott of all FMC products.

**Activities, Aims, and Learning Objectives**

The overall aim of my internship was to practice applied anthropology in an organizational culture. As an applied anthropologist, I conducted ethnographic fieldwork. As a student change advocate, I helped the organization mobilize, create grassroots awareness, and lobby for socially just policies and practices.

In a departure from the supposedly neutral stance of past social science research, applied anthropologists no longer sit on the sidelines, but actively advocate for the
peoples, cultures and clients they study and work with. It is not unusual for an applied anthropologist to take sides, when advocating for a client in local, national and international disputes.

**First and most important learning objective** as a change agent advocate was the realization that the goals of BWN and the AFC each represent “a subjective truth” and not necessarily the “objective whole truth.” During my applied anthropology internship with BWN, I would advocate for the AFC’s anti-global warming truth, and work to create awareness of the FMC’s ruthless emphasis on profit and power over environmental wellness and social justice.

**My second learning objective** as an intern in applied anthropology was to learn how to work with, advocate for, and further the goals of an organizational culture. As a BWN intern, I used participant-observation and social action research to help further the goals of the AFC.

My internship experience with BWN’s AFC provided me with ample opportunities to practice the applied anthropological role of change agent advocate. Being a self starter, and never having been one to sit on the sidelines, I hit the ground running at BWN’s AFC. I used my skills as a participant observer to study the differences between the cultural ideology and cultural practices of the AFC’s organizational culture. The organizational culture as it applies to BWN’s full time employees truly is “loose structure-loose control.”

Each of these nine core employees works independently on their own projects. As campaign managers they are free to set their own agendas, marshal their own resources, form their own alliances, and develop their own action plans. They are, on the other hand,
free to seek the help, guidance, and the expertise of their BWN counterparts, and if necessary, to work with them in close collaboration.

As a BWN intern, there was more of a gap between cultural ideology and practice. In the best tradition of “loose-loose”, [Long, Pers Comm. 2004, see Appendix C] culture, I could accept or reject projects offered to me, and I was free to seek out and choose my own projects. However, once I chose a project, I was required to work closely with a mentor who helped me clarify and structure my goals, set benchmarks, and who met with me weekly to monitor my progress.

Another gap between ideology and practice occurs in the battle between BWN’s AFC and the FMC. BWN sets high compliance goals for it’s corporate adversaries, demanding that they adhere to both the letter and the spirit of the law, and that they cooperate as full partners in the formulation and execution of environmentally just policies, regulations and practices. In other words, BWN works to insure that FMC is in full legal compliance with environmental law.

However, BWN’s AFC tactics go beyond letters of reprimand, mass mailing campaigns, and legal action. For the AFC mandate is to use any and all means of social action necessary to force the FMC to put the environment before profit. I found out just how far the AFC team was willing to go when I took over for Rachel Harold and assumed my duties as student advocate. I participated in planning meetings to: Organize a publicity campaign to villainies FMC, CEO William Ford, Jr.; Be party crashers and create havoc at FMC dealership promotions, and to; Protest at major FMC product unveilings and publicity events.
When the BWN brain trust met to plan strategy, they were fully aware that interns and
student advocates may be arrested for their actions, and that the AFC would disavow
knowledge of these environmental foot soldiers and leave them to seek their own legal
remedies. In other words, the command and control structure of the AFC played the part
of upstanding activists, who worked within the law and proper channels to defend the
environment against corporate injustice. They were, on the other hand, quite ready to send
expendable volunteers on guerilla social action missions to create public awareness and
mass sympathy for the environmental movement by sabotaging corporate enemies and
being arrested.

My last learning objective involved the use of an, "environmental elicitation"
[Appendix D], or a refined poll of my classmates, to form a bridge between my research
in the class room and the frontlines of the conflict between environmental organizations
and their corporate adversaries. The co-created elicitation of environmental concerns
identified the political-economic power of corporations and the effect of gas guzzling cars
on the environment, as primary concerns. With the help of Dr. Price my in-class
elicitation turned the political-ecological concerns of my fellow students into a viable
research tool.

In this way, my Internship Advisor Dr. Price, my BWN Preceptor Ms Alysa Lynch and
I, began to establish the foundation for my ethnographic study of the: Culture of BWN
and the AFC’s struggle with the FMC. We forged connections between various
university departments and the BWN social organization, between my research project
and the AFC environmental campaign, and between my aspirations as an applied
anthropologist and environmental justice.
I then used this elicitation to create a "Pile Sort Analysis" [Weller & Romney. 1988: Abstract E, F, G], and, with the continued help of Dr. Price and Ms Lynch, I was able to construct a series of "Key Informant Interview" (Ervin 2000:69) questions. I then used these interview and survey tools to conduct an ethnographic study of the CSU, East Bay Environmental Studies Department faculty.

My ethnographic study of the CSU East Bay Environmental Studies Department began after I had refined my in-class elicitation into a Pile Sort Analysis (PSA) of thirty-five environmental issues, centered around the question "What do people do that hurts the environment?" I administered the PSA to a sample cross section of three professors, or roughly fifty percent of the tenured faculty. As noted experts in the fields of geographic and environmental studies these professors are qualified to assess environmental priorities and gage public interest. Their specializations include, but are not limited to, cross cultural relations, socioeconomic structure and process, political-ecological systems and impact, geomorphology/climatology, and cartography/geographic information systems.

Each faculty member signed the requisite informed consent agreement. I held the PSA's and the Key Informant Interview (KII), in a Robinson Hall meeting room. I prepped this conference room for each PSA by randomly distributing thirty-five cards – each card had on it one of the original elicitations complied during my applied anthropology seminar --on a large table, [Appendix B-2]. As individuals each Environmental Studies Department faculty member analyzed and sorted the cards into piles. Then, treating each stack of elicitation cards as a category, they labeled each sorted pile using terms like corporations and their "Obsession with fossil fuels", "Indirect consequences of a petroleum economy", and "Industrial related pollution…" to expose
environmental injustice and demand societal accountability [Appendix H].

After finishing their PSA's, each instructor then completed a KII, by answering twelve questions about how the aggressive marketing of unsustainable SUV’s and other gas guzzling vehicles by automotive corporations, is a major cause of global warming. When tabulated, the three Environmental Studies professors PSA’s and KII responses provided a detailed analysis of the need for action similar to those taken by NGO’s like BWN and it’s AFC, to stop corporations such as FMC from being environmentally irresponsible corporate citizens.

To summarize their findings: First, using sophisticated marketing strategies, FMC promotes environmentally unsustainable consumption patterns on a mass scale; Second, if left unchecked, FMC’s production, marketing, and distribution of gas guzzling vehicles will further contribute to global warming, decreasing diversity of species, and ultimately to an uninhabitable planet, and; Third, that government by itself either cannot, or in the case of the current administration, is unwilling to stem corporate influence, and so NGOs like BWN/AFC must create public awareness of corporate environmental irresponsibility and work to hold both regulatory agencies and big business accountable for the manufacture of environmentally unsustainable products.

However, my learning objectives were not confined to on-the-job or in-the-class training. The results of my research have been published in “The Pioneer” the CSU, EB newspaper of record. My work with the AFC has been archived by the BWN, and distributed on the WEB. And last, I wrote a grant proposal, [Appendix I], that if funded will form a cross-disciplinary think tank of FMC shareholders and AFC staff, who will pioneer ways for NGO’s and corporations to work in partnership for the environment.
Internship and Emerging Analysis

My thesis research on the relationship between environmental organizations, government, and corporations takes place within the theoretical domain of political-ecology studies. My political ecology theory documents how and why a social organization like BWN initiates an environmental movement like the AFC. To anticipate, the AFC came into existence because government environmental regulators are unduly influenced by corporate pressure to lessen environmental regulation. Lobbyists insure environmental regulations are "business friendly" by using their influence to create pro-business environmental legislation that benefits corporations like the FMC.

Social organizations like BWN’s AFC, are created to insure that powerful corporations like FMC do not run roughshod over government regulators. BWN’s AFC is a necessary part of a democratic representative government because it provides a much needed counterweight against all powerful pro-business/anti-environmentalist forces.

I use political ecology theory to study the organizational culture and environmental activist mission of BWN’s AFC and to document the integral role BWN’s AFC plays in maintaining the checks and balances between government, and pro-business/anti-environmentalist forces.

In addition, I advocated for the AFC by planning and participating in numerous individual projects and group activities that furthered environmental causes and exposed corporate dishonesty. My applied anthropological fieldwork is inspired by the “ethical realism,” (Lieven, & Hulsman 11/29/06), inherent in political ecology, that pushes researchers past arm chair activism.
“Ethical realism” also leads researchers to act as advocates for countermeasures against the marketing of unsustainable products and the corporate influence peddling that softens our government’s environmental policy.
CHAPTER II.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Political Ecology is the subfield of Applied Anthropology that provides the theoretical framework for my Master's Thesis. Through Political Ecology it is possible to study the interaction between three powerful social forces: 1. Politics, or, for the purpose of my thesis, the power of a nation-state to legislate unequal public policy outcomes between profit driven anti-environment corporations and non-profit/pro-environmental organizations; 2. Economics, or, for the purposes of my work here, how a political administration, transnational corporation, and a non-profit/pro environmental organization attempt to influence how the bottom line effects the earth’s finite and vulnerable natural resources, and; 3. Ecology, or, for the purposes of my research, the struggle between the: unsustainable political-economic priorities of corporations; environmental organizations that promote sustainability, and; the impact their efforts have on environmental legislation.

My thesis question, “What is the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy and a profit driven unsustainable environment?”, is derived from the Political Ecology subfield of Applied Anthropology. In particular, my research is focused on the political, economic, and ecological interaction that takes place between the pro-business Bush Administration, anti-environment Ford Motor Company (despite their public claims to the contrary) and Blue Water Network; the pro-environment non profit organization that spearheaded the Anti-Ford Campaign and sponsored the internship research upon which my thesis is based.
To answer my thesis question, I make my data address the inconsistency between, on the one hand, a democratic government’s mandated role as neutral arbiter for the common good, and, on the other hand, the Bush Administration’s numerous conflicts of interest and avowedly pro-business, anti environment stance. I simultaneously explore how the FMC claims to be a model corporate citizen and a good steward of the environment, even as it uses it’s political influence to create loopholes in fuel efficiency standards, promote gas guzzling vehicles, and ignore the consequences of global warming. Last, I contend that all that stands between the Bush Administration, corporations like the Ford Motor Company, and the unsustainable use and consumption of our natural resources, is the environmental community in general and, in particular, pro-environmental organizations like BWN and it’s AFC allies.

History is often defined by the clash of powers. And so it is today in the United States where there is an ongoing power struggle between unsustainable corporate business practices that put profit over the environment, the willful failure of government agencies to regulate the green-house gas emissions that threaten the earth’s biomes, and a broad spectrum environmental movement that is determined to retake the political initiative, thwart corporate influence, and stop global warming.

What is at stake in this intersection between politics, economics and ecology, is “global warming” [Appendix J], or the “human induced increase in the average temperature of the earth’s atmosphere, sufficient to alter climates and damage ecosystems” (EPA, 4/06). If corporations and current government regulators prevail, it will be business as usual and the effects of global warming will be downplayed, even ignored. If, on the other-hand, the environmental community can rally public support and
force the enactment of political legislation that acknowledges the harmful effects of global warming, the government will be forced to regulate unsustainable business practices.

**The Anti-Environment Political Climate Created by the Bush Administration.**

In a representative democracy, government acts through legislation to mediate disputes between opposing groups. While the outcome may eventually favor one side over the other, the process to achieve a particular decision is supposed to be just, fair and unbiased. And in ideal situations, there is no winner-take-all scenario, but each side gives ground and moves towards the center to achieve a sustainable compromise. In sum, legislative outcomes are intended to benefit the common good over special interests that promote a one sided agenda.

To effectively mediate and make an informed decision, public policy makers need unfettered access to unbiased data on, in this case, global warming. My thesis question, “What is the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy, and a profit driven unsustainable environment?”, is essentially the same question that many in the scientific community, who are concerned about global warming, are trying to answer. Global warming, these scientists contend, does not occur in a vacuum, but is the result of, in part, Bush Administration policies that promote unsustainable corporate business practices and do not protect the environment.

For example, in order to define and then prove that a profit driven unsustainable economy has serious long-term environmental consequences, scientists must be free to create and distribute unbiased experimental findings, which can then be used to conduct collaborative research. The creation of unbiased data and the unfettered sharing of
scientific research is being actively stifled by the Bush Administration, which has placed “minders” (Eilperin, WP 2/11/06).

It is the job of these minders to attack findings that run counter to Bush Administration corporately influenced, profit driven policy goals by ignoring, omitting or even falsifying environmental science. In addition, these minders play an active role in trying to stifle the free speech of scientists who would speak out against the environmental unsustainability of the Bush Administration pro-business agenda.

So government scientists and researchers must subject any and all work prepared for public presentation to these minders who then selectively edit out information that runs counter to the Administrations party-line. In addition, these “in-house” (Hansen in Eilperin, WP 2/11/06), appointees of the Bush Administration have further limited the free speech and sharing of information by government scientists and researchers by instituting policies that prohibit them from public speaking or being interviewed without the presence of a minder who has the power to intervene and/or terminate the interview at any time.

Let me be clear, it is not possible to blame the Bush Administration for each and every individual environmental transgression that has occurred on its watch. It is however, possible to blame the Bush Administration for creating the climate of permissiveness and misinformation that promotes unsustainable economic practices, influences the creation of environmental policy that circumvents existing laws and enforcement mechanisms and otherwise ignores the checks and balances put in place to prevent global warming.

A case in point involves the continuing efforts of Bush Administration appointed minders to stifle the free speech of Dr. James Hansen, one of the government’s most
respected climate change experts, and thus curtail the free flow of much needed research
driven data to the policymakers who decide the fate of our environment. Dr. Hansen and
his colleagues, who have been studying global warming for twenty years, have recently
complained that Bush Administration appointees in NASA’s Public Affairs department
have tried to blunt his outspoken criticism of administration policy and force the omission
of his findings that “...we are passing the point of no return [on the irreversible road to
global warming] and the biggest offender is motor vehicle tail pipe emissions” (Spector,
TNY 3/13/06:62). David Doniger, a senior lawyer for the Natural Resources Defense
Council, confirms Hansen’s work with his statement that “[one] of the biggest
contributors to global warming [is] motor vehicles...deal with [that] and you deal with
more than two thirds of the problem” (Hakim, NYT 11/26/05).

Dean Acosta, Deputy Assistant Director of NASA’s Public Affairs department denies
Hansen’s accusations, saying "'that's not the way we operate here at NASA,' Mr. Acosta
said. 'We promote openness and we speak with the facts.' He said the restrictions on Dr.
Hansen applied to all National Aeronautics and Space Administration personnel. Mr.
Acosta said other reasons for requiring press officers to review interview requests were to
have an orderly flow of information out of a sprawling agency and to avoid surprises.
'This is not about any individual or any issue like global warming,' he said. 'It's about
coordination’" (Revkin, NYT 1/29/06). However, Hansen and his colleagues accuse John
Duetsch, Special Presidential Appointee, Public Affairs Writer and Editor, of attempting
to “...exert political control over the flow of information to the public” (Revkin, NYT
2/8/06). Duetsch, who was involved in the Bush re-election campaign, was recently
forced to resign after it was revealed that his “resume was falsified and that he had no
qualifications in the area of environmental sciences” (Censoring Truth, NYT 2/9/06).

These attempts by the Bush Administration to selectively edit and thereby corrupt the scientific research on global warming, create a climate of impunity for those who would run roughshod over conservation legislation and leave law makers with inconclusive evidence on which to base their climate change policies. The Bush Administration’s corporately influenced misinformation campaign runs counter to the overwhelming consensus that the burning of petrochemicals, and their dispersion as tail pipe emissions, is a primary cause of global warming.

Despite the fact that “one hundred and thirty two countries put forward legislation intended to limit greenhouse gas emissions” (Gore 2006:282). The American congress has, on the grounds that global warming science is incomplete, chosen to ignore these consensus findings and to withdraw from the Kyoto Protocols. “While global warming and what contributes to it have been controversial issues in the United States, a wide body of international science has linked it to health and environmental dangers, including increases in rates of asthma and infectious disease and threats to coastlines from rising sea levels” (Hakim, NYT 11/26/06). America’s minority position on global warming is based largely on the advice of Bush Administration officials like Phillip Cooney, who, it was later revealed, had close ties to the oil industry, and had “repeatedly altered government climate reports in order to minimize the relationship between [tail pipe] emissions and global warming” (Specter, TNY 3/13/06:62). “Cooney who has no scientific training was authorized by President Bush to edit and censor EPA reports on global warming: 1. Links between increased glacial melt and potential flooding by dangerous runoff levels; 2. Seasonal ecosystem imbalances that will damage resources
used by indigenous peoples, and; 3. The intensification of large scale hydrologic events like violent storms, floods, rising sea levels and receding coastlines. Cooney’s position paper was leaked to media watchdogs and he was forced to resign by an embarrassed Administration. The very next day, Cooney reported for work at Exxon-Mobil” (Gore 2006:264). This revolving door relationship was again highlighted when Exxon-Mobil’s profits surged a record 40%, but because of strong ties to the Administration and a sympathetic congress, it’s tax bill rose a paltry 14%.

In sum, the aforementioned examples are but a representative sample of a much larger pattern of abuse of power by the Bush Administration and it’s appointees and minders. In a continuing effort to push a pro-business agenda and promote oil consumption, Bush Administration officials have attempted to curb the free speech and alter the scientific findings of some of our countries most respected climate change scientists. While these appointees and minders have not totally silenced critics and discredited their research, they have had the effect of skewing the data enough to keep legislators who are on the fence from ratifying much needed anti-green-house measures like the Kyoto Protocols.

Last, in April 2006, President Bush put forth an “energy policy with a plan to confront high gasoline prices” (President Bush, The White House. 4/06). As part of his plan to lower the price of gasoline, he directed then Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton to investigate the possibility of drilling for oil in Alaska’s Artic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), an area “about the size of South Carolina” (Norton, U.S. Department of the Interior 8/7/01), just east of Prudhoe Bay’s North Slope region. Secretary Norton implemented a three part plan in which she was commissioned to: 1. Produce an environmental impact report; 2. Invite those pro and con to submit best practices
recommendations, and; 3. Develop a sustainable plan for extracting oil from ANWR, thus reducing our nation’s dependency on foreign oil and lowering gas prices.

Norton’s recommendations to drill for oil in ANWR were met with a wide spectrum chorus of protest. A close reading of the report presented, revealed that Congress “played fast and lose with the numbers” (Some Shaky Figures on ANWR Drilling, TIME 5/3/06). Norton claimed that "The impact will be limited to just 2,000 out of 1.9 million acres of the refuge" (Krugman, NYT 3/1/02).

Critics pointed out that Norton’s report was full of misleading information. For instance, she included in her environmental impact sections “only equipment that actually touched the ground” (Some Shaky Figures on ANWR Drilling, TIME 5/3/06). So thousands of miles of pipeline and the estimated 200, ten acre drilling platforms that are suspended off the ground went unmentioned and only the square footage of the stanchions that hold this equipment aloft were included. Also ignored by Norton was the fact that these pipelines and the roads needed to service them ‘dissect ecosystems’, and pose a direct threat to wildlife corridors, “migration routes and the breeding grounds of many artic wildlife species” (Arctic Refuge drilling controversy, Wikipedia 12/11/06).

Prominent environmentalists and climate change “scientists claimed that the recommendations they submitted were summarily ignored and that they weren’t included in the decision-making process” (Revkin, NYT 10/19/04, Specter, TNY 3/13/06:62). Those familiar with the Exxon Valdez oil spill say that despite Secretary Norton’s claim that “The strictest most all encompassing environmental protection measures ever initiated on Federal land will apply...to ANWR” (Norton, U.S. Department of the Interior 8/7/01), there is no comprehensive plan for dealing with environmental disaster and that
the report was entirely too optimistic about the effects of day to day contamination from ongoing operations.

These same environmentalist critics now point to a March 2006 leak in the North Slope pipeline system. Undetected corrosion of the pipeline caused a 270,000 gallon crude oil spill: the “worst environmental disaster in North Slope history” (Reuters, QCN 6/13/06). There is now an ongoing criminal investigation of those accountable for BP’s pipeline maintenance and environmental safety standards. Legislators and environmentalists from both sides of the aisle are now questioning why the March 2006 pipeline disaster did not make the news before Secretary Norton’s energy policy task force approved exploration and drilling in ANWR a month later in April 2006.

Last, the “1.4 million barrels per day, or 10.4 billion barrels of total recoverable reserves that ANWR would supply is, environmentalists claim, only enough to provide the nation with 215 days of gasoline” (Arctic Refuge Drilling Controversy, Wikipedia 5/12/06), or a state-like “California with fuel for 16 years” (U.S. Department of the Interior 10/15/06). While these are marginally significant numbers, the ANWR supply can in no way be considered part of a sustainable short or long term energy policy. Many in the environmental community suspect that the Bush Administration’s ANWR policy is directly influenced by none other than Exxon-Mobil, who, in their own press release state that they “own more of the [North Slope] region than any other company” (Exxon Mobil 2001). In fact, Alaska’s Republican Governor, Frank Murkowski, a staunch ally of the Bush Administration and its oil company allies, has already “negotiated oil and natural gas contracts with Exxon-Mobil” (Volz, AN 7/13/06). Amidst growing evidence of
adverse impact on the region, the protests of environmental groups appear to be falling on
deaf ears.

In conclusion, the examples offered here illuminate a representative cross section of
the Bush Administration’s efforts to stifle criticism of its profit before the environment
ethos. Their attempts to: Replace free speech and data driven science with
misinformation; Use selectively edited, rhetorically biased position papers to persuade
decision-makers that green house gas emission estimates and global warming treaties are
based on incomplete science and a threat to the economy, and last; Their attempts to
downplay the environmental impacts of oil drilling on the ANWR reserve by
manipulating the numbers, are not only a violation of the public trust, but a calculated
attempt to gain short term profit from long term, perhaps irreversible, environmental
destruction.

**Ford Motor Company profits from the Bush Administration: ‘Protection of the
ethos that what is good for the environment is bad for business as usual’.**

There is an atmosphere of pro-business permissiveness created by the Bush
Administration. First, the Administration has rewarded the FMC despite its industry wide
lowest average fuel economy, by purchasing an average of “3,000 gas guzzling vehicles
every year” (Automotive Fleet 06), since President Bush first took office. This, despite
the fact that the 18.8 mpg average of today’s Ford vehicles is over two miles per gallon
less than the 21 mpg industry average and less than that of the Model T, Ford’s first car
that started rolling off the production line in “September of 1908; With an estimated 25 to
30 mpg” (Wikipedia 11/06).
The Federal government continues to purchase gas guzzling FMC cars for the Departments of Central Intelligence, Commerce, Labor, Transportation and the Veteran’s Administration. This, despite the fact that a “March 2006 ruling found the Bush Administration in criminal violation of a 1992 law that mandates that high mileage alternative fuel vehicles be phased into the government fleet at a rate of 75% per year; So that the overall fleet would be comprised of 30% hybrid and other alternative fuel technology cars by 2010” (BWN, CBDP 3/7/06).

Second, the FMC, in July of 2000, pledged to dramatically increase the fuel economy of its SUV’s by 2005” (Maynard, NYT 7/16/06). The Bush Administration has at the behest of auto industry lobbyists, allowed FMC to side-step these obligations by classifying it’s SUV’s as light trucks, which are subject to less rigorous fuel economy standards.

In May of 2006, California and nine other states filed a class action lawsuit against the Bush Administration, saying that the loose fuel economy standards set by the Federal government do not “fully consider [the] potential damage to the environment [and]...don’t do enough to combat global warming” (Baker, SFC 5/3/06). These states will no doubt use an April 2004 EPA report done by the Office of Transportation and Air Quality, which demonstrates conclusively that industry-wide FMC has had the worst fuel economy standards since measurements were first taken 29 years ago in 1975.

Third, and last, FMC has joined with seven other automakers and filed a counter suit to block California’s new stricter greenhouse gas emission standards. Ford and the seven other car companies are represented in the suit by the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, (Hakim, NYT 12/7/04), a powerful lobbying group that favors the Bush
Administration’s looser “...federal law[s]...designed to ensure a consistent fuel economy standard across the country” (Hakim, NYT 11/26/05 Archives).

Because California’s clean air act “predates the Federal government’s, other states may chose it’s standards over the Bush Administration’s. In November of 2005, New York State joined California in requiring a phased-in 30% reduction in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases by 2016. In their counter suit, Ford and it’s lobbyists claim that the new fuel efficiency standards will raise the price of cars by an average of $3,000, and create a “jalopy effect” (Hakim, NYT 11/26/05), that actually increases pollution by forcing people to keep their old, more heavily polluting vehicles on the road longer.

David Freedmen, Senior Analyst with the Union of Concerned Scientist said, “They said seat belts would put them out of business; they said air bags would put them out of business; [and now they are saying] that fuel and emissions standards [will] put them out of business” (Hakim, NYT 11/26/05). In fact, Davis Doniger of Natural Resources Defense Council says it is the “height of hypocrisy for car companies to claim that stricter fuel standards and greater fuel economy cause more pollution” (Hakim NYT 11/26/05).

Last, in a flurry of legislative activity FMC has tried to block passage of a bill by California Assemblywoman Fran Pavley that “would allow single drivers of hybrids with a fuel consumption average of greater than 45 mpg to be eligible for car pool lanes” (Long, SB 9/21/04). This good for the environment legislation nevertheless drew counter-legislation from Ford and it’s allies who claim that only Japanese automakers would benefit from Pavley’s bill because only their cars get anywhere near that kind of mileage. Another clear example of Ford’s ethos, what is good for innovation, marketplace competition and the environment is not good for Ford” (Long, SB 9/21/04).
Global Warming, Blue Water Network and the Anti Ford Campaign.

A green-house is an enclosed structure in which glass lined walls trap ambient sunlight and/or man-made heat to create an artificially warm environment. The “green-house effect” (Appendix J), occurs when the earth’s atmosphere is overloaded with gases like chlorofluoro-carbons, dioxide derivatives, methane..., which cause it to act like the glass lined walls of a greenhouse; Keeping solar radiation and the thermal energy generated from industrial processes and tail pipe emissions within the gaseous mass that envelopes our planet, and artificially warming the average temperature by forcing the earth’s surface to absorb, reflect and intensify the trapped heat. These trapped greenhouse gases artificially increase the planets average temperature thereby creating “global warming” (Sullivan, NYT 7/17/91). As the earth’s temperature is artificially driven upwards, reflected heat from the surface depletes the atmosphere’s protective o-zone layer, which is then unable to repel the increased levels of ultra-violate radiation that are making the earth’s ecosystems uninhabitable and causing species extinctions on a unprecedented scale.

Despite the Bush Administration’s disinformation campaign and Corporate America’s all-out lobbying efforts, there is a growing realization within the United States that we are behind the curve, and that the international consensus that global warming is not only correct, but that we are placing ourselves in eminent danger by ignoring it. Scattered calls to stop global warming were first united “on June 21, 2004, when forty-eight Nobel Laureates signed a letter to President Bush saying, ‘By ignoring the scientific consensus on global climate change [President Bush and his Administration] are threatening the earth’s future’” (Gore 2006:268-269).
This call to action is reflected in the suit filed by California, New York, and eight other states, (Hakim, NYT 5/2/06), challenging the section of the Bush Administrations energy policy that “fails to improve fuel economy” (Becker in Hakim. NYT 7/28/05). The suit contends that this legislation coddles the Ford Motor Company and other automobile manufacturers and does nothing to reduce the link between global warming and the greenhouse gases emitted by the tailpipes of gas guzzling vehicles. The suit contends that despite the Bush Whitehouse’s proclamations that “fuel economy is directly related to energy security” (Hakim, NYT 7/28/05), that the “[Bush] Administration did not do a rigorous enough analysis of the environmental benefits of [improved] fuel economy regulations” (Hakim, NYT 5/2/06).

However, while the Bush Administration, the automotive industry in general and the Ford Motor Company in particular, continue to resist calls for policy change and the dire warnings of the links between tailpipes that emit greenhouse gases and global warming, others in corporate America are beginning to ride what environmentalists are calling the “green wave effect” (Wald, NYT 5/17/06).

There are several “industrial goliaths that have conceded what environmentalists are calling the “green wave effect” on the free market. The “first wave“ (Wald, NYT 5/17/06), is the growing recognition among staunch free marketers that it is now a "‘lifestyle choice’ of consumers to buy products which have no negative impact on the environment. In addition, the CEO’s of firms like the energy company Cinergy, Wal-Mart, and British Petroleum now acknowledge the ‘second wave,’ that being associated with degrading the environment and affecting the health of consumers creates a bad public image. Now, recognizing that the free market has spoken, the ‘third wave’ is
beginning to wash over these and other firms who now want to be seen as 'Jolly Green Giants'” (Wald, NYT 5/17/06), by being leaders in green technology and using environmental stewardship to add long-term value to their businesses and profit margins. Green titles like “Director for Sustainable Business Strategies”, “Chief Sustainability Officer”, and “Vice President for Health, Safety, and the Environment” (Deutsch, NYT 5/17/06), are now on the corner office doors of Fortune Five Hundred Companies. In other words, “The New Black…and what is kind to nature is good for profits” (Wald, NYT 5/17/06).

What I see as the “fourth wave” is the growing number of green partnerships being forged between corporate boardrooms and environmental organizations. As “Fred Krupp, President of the Environmental Defense Fund, says “Our informal motto used to be ‘Sue the Bastards’….Now our official tagline is ‘Finding ways [to be green partners] that work’” (Deutsch, NYT 5/17/06).

While environmental groups still have the arrows of public criticism, boycotts, and lawsuits in their quivers, they have convinced many in the corporate world that green partnerships are mutually beneficial.

First, groups like the Environmental Defense Fund, Rainforest Action Network and the Sierra Club have co-lobbied with corporations to set regulatory standards. Many in the corporate community now see the government as too slow to legislate or change and out of touch with public sentiment on the global warming threat. So environmental groups have convinced their “corporate allies that by working together as green partners to shape environmental legislation, businesses can create a predictable regulatory market and by extension a predictable market share for their products” (Deutsch, 5/17/06).
Second, a growing number of corporations are taking leadership roles in the green movement. Tiffany and Company co-authored with the environmental group Earthworks a green policy manual for the sustainable mining of gold and silver and plans to send accountability officers into the field to make sure their best green practices are implemented. “Federal Express worked with the Environmental Defense Fund to come up with a plan, now in progress, to convert its former gas guzzling delivery vehicles into an entire fleet of fuel efficient hybrids. DuPont corporation now has green officers working on every step of its nanotechnology initiatives, looking for ways to synergize links between profitability and sustainability” (Deutsch, NYT 5/17/06).

Last, while the Bush Administration is seen as out of touch with the American public and the international community on environmental issues, and as it is beginning to lose corporate allies because of its lack of leadership on green initiatives, the government of Japan is working in close cooperation with Japanese automakers to build-in profitability by subsidizing the research and design of hybrid technology and other carbon neutral fuel alternatives. As part of their commitment to the Kyoto Protocols on cutting the tailpipe emission of green house gases, the Japanese government has offered subsidies to auto-suppliers who create the most fuel efficient hybrid batteries.

To quote one Detroit insider, “Nearly a decade ago the [Japanese] government [subsidized the building of] hybrid batteries, which are one of the most expensive components of today’s hybrid vehicles. That gave them a head start. Today these batteries are in high demand and in short supply. We need to develop the capabilities to build these batteries here in the U.S.--or we will find ourselves increasingly hostage to foreign components....” The irony here, is that this seemingly enlightened quote about how
automakers and a government can form a public, private partnership on green initiatives and create long term profitability through environmental leadership, was uttered by none other than William Ford Jr. CEO of the FMC (LaRouche, EIR 12/9/05), who has long worked with the Bush Administration to ignore and/or mislead the public on the global warming issue, and who has worked to stifle research on alternatives to his companies gas guzzling vehicles.

As the Bush Administration continues to undermine global warming science and environmental initiatives, the FMC continues to build gas guzzling cars and it’s lobbyists work to create an energy policy that favors oil consumption and toxic green house gas generation over ecosystem stewardship; The environment hangs in the balance. The collusion of the Bush Administration’s anti-environmental politics and the FMC’s unsustainable economic practices, has made them both targets of the environmental community.

On May 21, 2003, [Appendix K], Dr. Russell Long, CEO of the environmental group BlueWater Network set aside resources and marshaled allies to begin the AFC. His reasons for targeting FMC were simple and straightforward. First, despite its’ numerous public proclamations of environmental leadership, “FMC has the worst average fuel economy in the automotive industry” (Hakim, NYT 6/12/05), and William Ford Jr. “also personally lobbied Congress against raising national fuel standards” (BWN, 2/4/04).

Second, FMC has twice reneged on pledges to be the “great green hope” (Maynard, NYT 7/16/06). Once, on “July 27, 2000 FMC promised to increase the overall fuel efficiency of it’s fleet by 25%” (Maynard & Bunkley, NYT 6/30/06). But as it’s overall market share sagged, sales of FMC’s gas guzzling SUV’s soared and CEO William Ford
Jr. put an indefinite hold on plans to increase fuel efficiency. Next, “FMC has long claimed a strong commitment to hybrid technology, stating that the company would build 20,000 Ford SUV hybrids a year, and 250,000 hybrids overall by 2010” (Maynard & Bunkley, NYT 6/30/06). Daniel Becker, Director of the Sierra Club’s “Anti Global Warming Program”, says he is “appalled that company CEO William Ford has said in recent statements that FMC is scaling back on it’s commitments” (Maynard & Bunkley, NYT 6/30/06), to build fuel efficient hybrids. Third, rhetoric aside, FMC factories produce more greenhouse gases and more global warming pollution, “an estimated 8.4 million metric tons or 18 billion, 500 million pounds in 2004 alone” (Ford Says…NYT 12/21/05), more than any other automaker in the United States.

After making this clear-cut case for singling out FMC, long an industry leader in pollution and long an industry laggard on protecting the environment, Dr. Long issued this statement… “When push comes to shove [FMC] is unwilling to do what’s necessary to confront the issue [of pollution and global warming] in a meaningful way. There is a consequence in the real world to breaking one’s commitments” (Plungis, TDN 2/6/04). That consequence is the AFC.

The BWN case against William Ford and his company’s strategists and bean counters is urgent and compelling because FMC continues a disinformation campaign that portrays itself as an environmental steward even as it’s cars produce most of the tail-pipe related greenhouse gases. Russell Long and BWN took the lead in forming the AFC, an alliance of environmental organizations with the expressed mandate of reversing the trend towards global warming; or the dramatic rise in the earth’s surface temperature which almost all experts now agree is having detrimental effects on the global environment and...
pushing life on earth towards the brink of extinction.

From the beginning, BWN's AFC strategy has been to first make overtures to CEO William Ford Jr. and to offer to partner with FMC in devising strategies to implement green technology, increase the company's profits even as it reduced its contribution to global warming, and to help FMC redefine itself as a true and uncontested environmental leader. In BWN's initial May 2003 letter and in ongoing communiqués with CEO William Ford, AFC liaisons were quick to point out that shares of the company stocks fell, in one case a record, "18 cents in one day" (Ford Says...NYT 12/21/05), every-time documents revealed that FMC factories and cars were regarded as worst in the industry and contributors to global warming.

In the AFC archives are the response letters from FMC. These responses range from outright denial, counter accusations, pleas for more time, to incomprehensible bureaucratic ramblings. Instead of responding with any concrete proposals or actions, FMC ran a series of ads that attempted to "green-wash" (Deutsch, NYT 5/17/06), their ongoing transgressions with cosmetic projects like a "factory with a living roof" (Maynard, NYT 7/16/06), and plans in the works for a zero emissions Ford Focus subcompact vehicle; Which to date is not off the drawing board. In the midst of what some at BWN were calling a "great green hoax" (Maynard, NYT 7/16/06), media campaign that the AFC leadership was confronted with the realization that CEO William Ford had chosen to ignore the first step 'let's work together' overture letter. In February 2004, some six months after the initial overture letter, AFC leadership began a step two; A 'civil disobedience' action plan.
Working with its alliance partners, the AFC quickly mobilized thousands of boycotters who signed pledges not to buy FMC products. Next, college students from all over the country held “call-ins” (Grewal, MD 1/22/04), in which so many complaint calls were made to FMC headquarters that all forms of electronic communications were either disrupted or shut down completely at times. When FMC changed phone numbers instead of its environmental policy, the AFC conceived and implemented an extremely effective media campaign in which CEO William Ford Jr. was portrayed with a long Pinocchio nose, [Appendix L]. This unflattering caricature that portrayed Ford as a liar, was accompanied by text that juxtaposed his public proclamations of green leadership with his anti-green business strategies and his behind the scenes anti-environment political lobbying.

When FMC and its CEO again dug in their heels and refused to address the corporation’s significant contributions to global warming, Dr. Long and the AFC brain-trust upped the ante. Regular press releases that revealed the difference between FMC’s green rhetoric and polluting reality, [Appendix M], were sent on a regular basis to thousands of media outlets. AFC staffers raised public awareness by placing anti-FMC signs on vehicles and parading through small town America to Ford Dealers where volunteers chanted, sang, and sat-in demonstration. FMC threatened legal action, (BWN 2/27/04), but was forced to withdraw its suit when the disclosure of documents requested by the AFC promised to reveal internal communications that showed FMC planned to stay the course and keep on polluting.
The step 2, civil disobedience campaign reached its crescendo when AFC staffers infiltrated and disrupted car shows and an annual FMC shareholders meeting. While AFC personnel were eventually escorted out or arrested, FMC shareholders began to demand a long-term green business strategy, and the establishment of short-term benchmarks that would signal the company’s commitment to end global warming.

To date, AFC goals have been largely successful. First, BWN mobilized thirty-three environmental organizations and thousands of grassroots volunteers into an AFC juggernaut. Second, the AFC raised public awareness of the links between FMC pollution and global warming. Third, many of the predictions made by the AFC are coming to fruition and may even lead to the FMC’s demise. In just a few of the many AFC statements that have come true, the campaign accurately predicted that FMC’s over-reliance on gas guzzling SUV’s would: A. Lead to an over-dependence on foreign oil; B. Come back to haunt the FMC when its gas guzzling SUV’s were priced out of the market, —“dropping in sales by 55% in 2005” (Freeman, WP 10/4/05), in part by skyrocketing foreign oil prices, and C. That FMC’s lack of research on alternative carbon neutral energy sources and high mileage vehicles was irresponsible to the environment, public trust, shareholders, and would ultimately place the company behind its competitors and in financial jeopardy.

So the aforementioned research on the political-economic-environmental interaction between the anti-environment Bush Administration, FMC, and the pro-environment BMN’s AFC addresses and answers the thesis question, “What is the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy, and a profit driven unsustainable environment?”

The collusion between the Bush Administration’s “pro-business, anti environment
stance" (Specter, TNY 3/13/06:62), and the FMC’s green is bad for business ethos, have created a short term profit over long term environmental degradation scenario.

However, despite their misinformation campaigns, catering to special interests and lobbying efforts, the unsustainable anti-green business plans of the Bush Administration and the FMC are slowly being over-ridden by a geopolitical majority that is concerned about global warming and being over-ruled by a grass-roots green wave effect that is washing over corporate America.

The Kyoto Protocols, public-private partnerships that have given the Japanese a definitive advantage in the hybrid car market, “Fortune Five Hundred companies who now see green as the new black” (Wald, NYT 5/17/06), the lawsuit challenging Federal greenhouse gas emission standards filed by “California, New York and seven other states, and the recent pro-green business meeting in California between Britain’s Prime Minister, Tony Blair and Governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger” (Martin, CSB 8/1/06), are all signs of the trend away from a profit driven unsustainable environment and a growing movement towards an ecologically sustainable economy.
CHAPTER III.
METHODS AND EMERGENT PROBLEM

The late Edmund Leach (Leach 1989) once said that "anthropologists are not so much scientists as bad novelists." This in mind, the "Methods and Emergent Problem" section of my thesis presents a narrative of my fieldwork on Blue Water Network’s, Anti-Ford Campaign. While true in and of themselves, the interwoven episodes and events included in this novella are, when taken as a whole, a composite of my two years of research and field experience. In other words, I combine vignettes otherwise separated by time and space, into a storyline of my fieldwork on the relationship between the politics, economics, and the ecological aspects of the environmental movement in general and Blue Water Network in particular.

A Novel Approach

My interest in the relationship between politics, economics and the environmental movement became the focus of my applied anthropology thesis research when I became impassioned with this question, "What is the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy and a profit driven unsustainable environment?" I turned this question over in my mind as I stepped off the cable car and walked towards BWN’s world headquarters at 311 California Street [Appendix N], in downtown San Francisco in February of 2004. This was the heart of one of the world’s most prominent environmental districts. I wondered, as I pushed my way through the revolving doors and into the lobby, just how to connect the methodological dots between my applied anthropological fieldwork courses and my ethnographic internship at BWN’s AFC. As the elevator doors opened onto the fifth floor and I walked purposefully towards BWN’s suite 510, I sought
a mental formula for how to turn this complex relationship between three powerful social forces into an anthropological analysis. I tried to envision the spheres of influence that connect this social organization to its allies and adversaries.

The receptionist introduced me to Elysa Lynch, who was to be my internship mentor at BWN’s AFC. In response to my question about how BWN got started, she replied, “Dr. Russell Long, who is the founder and now the Director of BWN, once worked on a project for ‘EII’ [Appendix O] in the Indian Ocean. Because he was so successful in lowering waterborne pollution along the Kerala coastline by convincing fisherman to stop using inefficient two stroke engines, EII gave him the seed money to start BWN.”

“So BWN is an incubator project of EII?” I asked. Elysa nodded, and replied, “Yes, and EII’s philosophy of how an organization should be run has greatly influenced the way BWN and the AFC are set up. “Dr. Long has taken what were formerly different business and grassroots activism models and combined them into an effective social action organization.” I purposefully put on my puzzled but interested face to draw her into a “thicker, emic level description” (Geertz 1973:38), of BWN and the AFC.

Elysa motioned a co-worker to come over and join our conversation. “This is Carl Schneebeck. He is our Public Lands Campaign Manager”. Carl nodded, smiled and shook my hand, “Hey yah, how can I help?” he asked. Elysa leaned towards him conspiratorially and half whispered, “Can I ask you to help me explain Dr. Long’s organizational philosophy?”

“Do my best,” he answered. “Call Sean Smith and see if he has time to be part of our coming-in party for James.” As Elysa picked up the telephone handset and punched in an extension, Carl got comfortable and gave me the “company saga.” “BWN is first and
foremost a think tank, in which leadership, paid staff, and volunteers work collaboratively to identify target issues, like what you’ll be working on, the links between FMC and global warming. Once a problem to be solved has been identified, the brainstorming gets some teeth attached to it, when we put someone in charge, like Elysa is in charge of the AFC, and then allocate staff and resources. From there Elysa is free to work individually or to develop an action plan with the help of other BWN campaign leaders like me or Sean, who is a Campaign Director for Public Lands, and with outside allies as well, like Rainforest Action Network, Green Peace, Tides Foundation….”

Carl, now somewhat enthusiastic, went on, and here is what makes Dr. Long’s workplace philosophy and organizational culture so different. Elysa, like the rest of us paid staff, has the title of Director, or Campaign Leader, but this in no way implies a strict top-down hierarchy. In fact, these titles are used primarily for outside consumption, so that we can direct visitors to the right person. But internally, amongst ourselves, there is virtually no hierarchy. BWN leadership, paid staff, and volunteers cultivate an atmosphere of egalitarian collaboration. We’re all committed environmentalists, everybody knows what has to be done, and so there is no need to ride herd or micromanage.

Sean Smith entered the small briefing room. As we were introduced, both Elysa and Carl brought Sean up to speed on the pace of my “rites of passage” (van Geenep 1983:11), in this introduction to the organization. I wondered if Carl’s emic explanation of BWN’s organizational culture would match my upcoming “etic analysis.” As Elysa and Carl checked their cell phones and leafed through over-flowing manila folders, Sean took up the narrative, “As per Dr. Long’s philosophy, we use ‘iterative’ methods to keep
our lines of communication open and flowing. In other words, leadership, paid staff, volunteers and interns like you can choose your own project, or are free to be part of a larger project like the AFC, and set your own benchmarks and goals.”

Periodically, we meet for “iterative” (Larman & Basili 6/03) discussions, in which all who are involved in a project engage collaboratively with one another about the state of the campaign. In other words, we dialogue about the progress we’ve made, both as individuals and as a group, the challenges we face and any suggestions for combining resources or if necessary, changing course.

This is what Dr. Long calls ‘Loose-Loose’ [Appendix C] social organization. The first loose is ‘loose structure,’ a kind of self imposed individualized system of checks and balances without any monitoring from a centralized authority. The second loose, is ‘loose control,’ or the ability to take an idea all the way from conception, through planning, to social action with allies, if you so chose, or with little or no interference from people with red tape.

“It’s all about individual initiative”, said a multitasking Elysa, who did not look up from her folder as she chimed-in. Sean looked for a moment at Elysa, as he considered her point. “That’s right” he said, ending his introspective pause. “We are all committed environmentalists who know what needs to be done. Dr. Long’s iterative method and loose-loose organizational style gives us plenty of wiggle room to work for environmental justice by effectively blending individual initiative and egalitarian collaboration.”

“What”, I asked for the sake of clarification, “are the shared values that each of you bring to BWN and the AFC?” Sean again paused for a moment. Feel free to chime in any time, he said looking at Elysa and Carl. Elysa smiled and Carl grunted to show their
assent, as Sean pushed ahead. First and foremost, it’s what social scientists call a “collective consciousness” (Emile Durkheim 1895 in, McGee & Warms 2000:89-98), about taking responsibility for the environment. Each of us has dedicated our lives to promoting a grassroots awareness of sustainable life ways, working constructively to turn big business polluters into powerful corporate allies, and retaking the political initiative to create public policy that protects the environment. The basic message that sustains our dedication is the fact that by saving the environment we are in effect saving ourselves and generations to come. We, like everything else on the earth, are living creatures who can and will go extinct if or when we create a toxic enough environment. Big business polluters in general and FMC in particular are creating global warming, an environment toxic enough to cause extinctions on an unprecedented mass scale. These extinctions are like dominoes, and they are falling towards us. We are not the first to be knocked down, to go extinct so to speak, but go extinct we will if global warming trends are not stopped and reversed. We are trying to prevent humankind from creating a toxic legacy that threatens to make all the earth’s ecosystems uninhabitable.

Here, according to ethnographic methods were my first key informants at BWN. As primary sources, Carl, Elysa and Sean had between them eloquently stated not only the work place philosophy and social organization of BWN, but also the core beliefs of environmentalism. Their combined explanation dovetailed nicely with the emerging problem of my thesis: how do dedicated environmentalists, a relatively small segment of the population, take on powerful corporate polluters and turn them into allies by mobilizing grassroots awareness and holding politicians accountable for creating and enforcing policies that protect the earth’s diverse ecosystems and natural resources?
I could now, in theory answer my thesis question, “What is the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy and a profit driven unsustainable environment?” A profit driven unsustainable environment puts money, influence, and the bottom line before life on earth. But profiting from pollution is short-sighted and will eventually cause self extinction. On the other hand, an ecologically sustainable economy can only be achieved when environmentalists, the public at large, corporations, and governments realize that green technology can create a robust, carbon reducing, sustainable economy that promotes the continued health and prosperity of the world’s ecosystems. In effect, this not only stops the dominoes, but reverses their direction away from toxic legacies and mass extinctions. It will be a world in which economic prosperity and healthy biomes are compatible and not competing goals.

Sean continued, “I understand you have a meeting with Rachel Harold of Green Corps in a few moments?” “That’s right” I answered, “I will be working as a student advocate, and taking over some of her responsibilities as Northern California AFC Project Leader.”

“Good”, he said. "You can co-plan the hybrid car parade with her. That will be a good way to phase her out as she ends her contract and phase you in as you begin your internship.” As Sean paused to collect his thoughts, Elysa looked up and asked, “So Jim, what is an applied anthropologist?”

“Well”, I replied, with my let’s establish rapport voice, “anthropology is the cross cultural, comparative study of people and cultures. An applied Anthropologist like myself, not only studies an entire culture or a social organization like BWN’s AFC, but advocates on its behalf.” “So will you be studying us, “she asked? “Are we some kind of human experiment?”
“No, you’re not an experiment, I replied. But BWN’s, AFC in general, and you in particular, are part of my research on the relationships and interconnections between local, national and international environmentalism, business and government. I used the upcoming hybrid car parade through Stanford University and Palo Alto as an example. “On the one hand, I study it phenomenologically, that is, from a nuts and bolts perspective, as something that is painstakingly organized behind the scenes and executed as it moves into the public realm from the starting point at Stanford University to its conclusion at a local Ford dealer. On the other hand, I study the entire event from a hermeneutic frame of analysis in which every individual behavior and social action associated with the parade can be interpreted from multiple perspectives and a symbolic point of view.”

Grassroots organization, getting the common people aware, involved and marching, sends a powerful symbolic message to FMC that consumers are against polluters and favor green technologies and business practices. Also, the use of hybrid cars is highly symbolic, since they dramatically reduce pollution. FMC is not only behind the industry-wide curve in its utilization of this technology, but as per fleet average, it is the biggest polluter in the automotive industry. Next, the choice of Palo Alto itself is highly symbolic, as it is seen as an environmentally enlightened community. A parade through Palo Alto to the local Ford Dealership sends a highly symbolic message that a community like Palo Alto that has proven itself to be an environmental steward is playing a part in holding FMC accountable for its ‘protecting the environment is bad for business ethos.’

Each of these symbols can be viewed from multiple perspectives. For instance, hybrid cars are viewed by environmentalists as a necessary step towards reducing pollution.
Someone who is on the fence might see a hybrid as a Japanese import that, although it reduces pollution, takes away jobs from Americans. Someone at FMC might view the hybrid car parade as a threat to business as usual.

In addition, each of these perspectives is not monolithic. I’m sure there are environmentalists who see any car as a liability, while there are probably some at FMC who are going against the corporate grain, so to speak, and advocating for alternative fuel vehicles.

As Elysa sat in thoughtful contemplation, Carl asked “Jim, explain to me the advocacy piece?” I began my explanation with a little history lesson. “In the past anthropologists were required by the rules of ‘participant-observation’ (Ervin, 2000 p.142), to remain neutral.” He looked puzzled so I threw in an example. “You know,” I said encouragingly, “like the ‘prime directive’ on Star Trek, where the crew of the Enterprise is allowed to study others, but in no way alter the peoples and cultures through their research.” Carl nodded knowingly. “Well, traditional anthropology had that same kind of hands-off, stand on the sidelines approach.”

As an applied anthropologist, I chose a problem I would like to be involved in solving, like how to help the environmental community prevail over polluters and how to save the earth from global warming. I then chose an organizational culture like BWN and its AFC to not only study, but to use as a kind of on the job advocacy training, in which I learn who you are and why you do what you do. I bring my skills as an applied anthropologist to promote environmental awareness, hold governmental regulators accountable, and help stop the FMC from polluting biomes and adding to global warming.
The telephone rang and Elysa answered. After a few moments of back and forth “phatic communion” (Malinowski 1923), she asked Sean and Carl to join her in a conference call. They obliged and while the three of them huddled around the phone and talked in hushed tones, I took some time to run down a mental checklist of the applied anthropological analytical tools I was putting into play.

One, I had established my first “key informant network at BWN.” Elysa was my mentor and as the campaign leader; an insider. Carl and Sean shared the same value system, but were informants who were not involved with the AFC per se, but could offer necessary and important outsider perspectives on the internal workings of the AFC’s cultural organization.

Two, each of my key informants had presented me with an “emic” (Wikipedia11/5/06) or ideological version of the company mythos or saga. Each of their accounts had centered on an unstated difference between the rigid, stifling corporate world and the egalitarian, loose structure, loose control that is the supposed hallmark of BWN and the AFC. Drawing on lessons from my applied anthropological seminars, I knew enough to withhold judgment, but also enough to suspect that a detailed etic behavioral analysis would reveal that there was a more complex cultural organization behind the ideology.

Third, while the role of an applied anthropologist is that of a “change agent” and an “advocate”, I had in my conversation with Carl, Sean, and Elysa, also made them aware that my study has its personal and professional limits. So, even through I am not practicing traditional “on the side-lines” anthropology, I have to be free to set ethical research guidelines. As such, invitations for me to participate in the AFC’s radical social actions would be a constant exercise in “self conscious” reflection. For example, it is not
uncommon for the foot soldiers of the environmental movement to get arrested for the cause. While there might be benefits to a rite of passage arrest, a police record would automatically exclude me from high profile galas, fundraisers, and brain trust meetings. I wanted to be clear: I had to be free to choose my own battles. I am proud to be a practicing change agent advocate and will do whatever it takes to uphold the ethical standards of applied anthropology and further the cause of BWN’s, AFC.

I was thrust out of my internal dialogue and back into the present when Elysa broke away from the conference call with a loud, “Excuse me.” She stepped quickly around the table, peeked into the hallway and called after a young women who had just entered the headquarters and walked by. “Rachel!”

A moment later an authoritative female voice answered, “Elysa, what’s the good news?” “Jim Munson is here,” she replied. “Let the transition begin.”

Rachel followed Elysa into the conference room, nodding to Carl and Sean as she walked over to me and introduced herself. “Rachel Harold of Green Corps,” she said, shaking my hand. “I am so glad to meet you, and to help with your student advocate training and transition into the leadership team of the Northern California AFC. Elysa, if you, Carl and Sean have time I’d like to huddle and bring Jim up to speed?”

Elysa interrupted Sean and Carl. “Can we continue the conference call later? Since we have both Rachel and Jim here, let’s transition Rachel out and put Jim on the launching pad.” Elysa, suddenly all business, closed the conference room door, and Sean and Carl hung up, as we all took our places around a well worn oblong table. Elysa again took charge.
Jim, I’m the national AFC leader. BWN contracted Rachel from Green Corps a non-profit environmental leadership organization, to coordinate the Northern California AFC. Her last project with us is a “hybrid car parade from the Stanford Campus, through Palo Alto, and to the Peninsula Ford Dealership” (Alemozafar, SDN 2/9/04), where we will hold a rally and a demonstration. Rachel and I both agree that this would be the perfect project to phase her out of her contract with us, and to phase you in as her replacement on the Northern California AFC leadership team. Elysa nodded to Rachel, who picked up where she left off.

Rachel passed me a piece of paper with writing on it in outline form. “Jim”, she began, “This is the format of a typical BWN campaign and it’s also the same checklist we’re using for the AFC, of which the hybrid car parade is a part. I’m going to bring you up to speed on the hybrid car parade, and hand the leadership and coordination responsibilities for it over to you. But, I also need you to take on a separate project as well. FMC has been questioning the scientific validity of our data. They claim our research is fringe science and not part of the scientific mainstream. Rachel looked at Elysa who nodded in agreement. “Elysa says that you have connections with the Environmental Studies Department at CSU, Hayward.”

I nodded in assent, and in a cautious yet committed voice said, “I do”.

Rachel gave me her ‘this is a defining moment’ stare. Can you get your distinguished professors to endorse our scientific findings and our position on global warming?”

I looked back at her with my ‘this is what I can do’ expression. As a rule, my professors won’t align themselves politically, even though they agree with your conclusions. But I think I can get them to take part in an anonymous ethnographic
survey, in which they as a group compile a list of environmental priorities that legitimizes your work and puts FMC on the hot-seat. Their unbiased, non-aligned criticism of corporate polluters who contribute to global warming will validate the AFC and neutralize FMC rhetoric.

Rachel looked around the table to make sure everyone had an outline. She then paused for a moment, seemingly to gather her thoughts, and asked, "Is everyone ready?" She turned to each one of us for our specific assent and then began her presentation.

This action plan outline comes from BWN founder Dr. Long. First, we identified an area of concern; in this case global warming. Second we researched and problematized the data; leading us to the automotive industry in general, as tailpipe emissions are a major cause of global warming and FMC in particular as the worst offender. When compared to the rest of the automotive industry, FMC is vehicle by vehicle —especially their SUV’s—fleet vs. fleet, and factory by factory, the worst of the worst when it comes to tailpipe emissions that can be linked to global warming.

Third, on 5/21/06 we sent FMC, CEO William Ford Jr., a registered letter [Appendix K], notifying him of scientific findings that: 1. Prove his company has the dubious distinction of leading the automotive industry in pollution that contributes to global warming; 2. Asking him to cease and desist, and; 3. Offering to partner with him to develop profitable green business strategies. We closed out the letter with a promise to act against FMC and in defense of the environment, by every social, civil and legal means at our disposal. When, as expected, our attempts to communicate were met with stalling tactics, we moved into step 4 of the campaign; we formed the AFC, put Elysa in charge, and began to devote resources and mobilize allies for the next phase.
Rachel continued: “We began our AFC rollout with a boycott FMC products media blitz. Simultaneously, our college campus connections staged call-in days where we flooded their world headquarters with so many phone calls, e-mails, and faxes that the FMC communication network was virtually shut down. When FMC changed their phone numbers instead of contacting us, we ran a series of very effective ads in major media markets that included a drawing of William Ford Jr. with a Pinocchio nose (Appendix L), and juxtaposed all his claims to be a green leader with scientifically based counterclaims that prove he is lying and challenged his disinformation rhetoric. When FMC attempted to retaliate with a we will sue you ‘cease and desist letter’, (BlueWater 3/3/04) we sent, by return post, a letter outlining the documents and witnesses we would seek in the discovery phase of a trial. William Ford Jr. backed down, but continued rhetorical green-washing tactics aimed at misleading the public and discrediting the AFC.

Rachel then said “Jim, here is where you come in. As my replacement, your work as a co-leader of the hybrid car parade and as a student-advocate liaison to the Environmental Studies Department at CSU, Hayward will help the AFC with the last phase of Dr. Long’s campaign scenario; Keeping pressure on FMC until there is a breakthrough.”

I cleared my throat, and responded, “I can lay these resources on the line. First, I will review the plans in progress for the hybrid car parade and add my thoughts to the mix.” Elysa interjected, “Jim, your resume lists some pretty impressive credentials as a demonstrator for environmental causes. Don’t be afraid to stray from the strictly academic and call on your past environmental activism background.”

I responded: “I wouldn’t have it any other way. I will then conduct a PSA survey and individual ethnographic interviews of the Environmental Studies faculty to compile the
beyond dispute, scientific information necessary to challenge FMC disinformation
rhetoric, [Appendix M], and to call into question their attempts to smear AFC
environmental science as marginal. Further, I pledge to take seriously my co-leadership
role and contribute ideas from an applied anthropological perspective to the AFC cause.”

Elysa turned the meeting back over to Rachel, who said “Welcome to the AFC, James.
I suggest a two-pronged time management strategy. First, let’s overlap co-leadership
roles on the hybrid car parade. I will update you regularly and ask for your input on how
we can increase the parade’s symbolic value, and how best to mobilize our allies for the
demonstration. Second, if you will work independently with the CSU, Hayward
Environmental Studies Department to show that our links between corporate polluters
and global warming are mainstream and legitimate science that will move us forward.”

**Environment as a Cognitive Domain**

I met with Dr. David Larson, Chair of the CSU, Hayward Geography and
Environmental Studies Department. Dr. Larson agreed to promote faculty collaboration,
and he was enthusiastic about my plans to use a PSA survey and individual ethnographic
interviews to elicit data that linked the FMC to global warming.

Next, my CSU, Hayward Internship Coordinator Dr. Laurie Price, agreed to let the
students in our applied anthropology internship seminar create a brainstorm list of
environmentally themed best topics for my PSA. By seminars end we had created an
“environmental elicitation” [Appendix D], list that included the ten principal challenges
to the environment. I then transferred the list onto file cards that could be sorted and piled
by the Environmental Studies faculty, and analyzed by me.

I used the Environmental Studies Department conference room and randomly
distributed the file cards around a large table. As each faculty member entered the room they signed a “consent form” [Appendix P]. I explained how my seminar created the environmental elicitation that was now on the table to be sorted, piled and analyzed. The three faculty members were given thirty-two single subject cards that they then sorted into thematically interconnected piles. These key informants then gave names to each of their free listed piles.

The results of this sample cross section revealed that change, both by individuals as well as on a larger scale by big business and government, are necessary. The fact that global warming was high on the list confirmed the AFC science was both mainstream and legitimate. The dominant, interrelated themes that emerged were: 1. How corporate control of the media contributes to a pro-business, anti-environment agenda that is linked to; 2. Over-consumption of, and dependence on, foreign oil as the determining factor in the subversion of anti-global warming public policy, and; 3. The role of the Bush Administration in fostering environmental degradation by allowing corporate influence to dictate the legislative process and the creation and enforcement of public policy [Appendix E,F,G,H]. In fact the Bush administration has gone as far as to alter, delay and falsify climate reports to pave the way for self interest and big business; which in some cases are one and the same. For example there are long ties between the oil industry and the Bush administration.

I then conducted ethnographic interviews in the next phase of my work with the Environmental Studies Department, [Appendix Q, R, S]. Each of the instructors narrowed their focus to what they saw as the relationship between: 1. Government and corporate collusion to ignore, downplay or outright falsify how their pro-automotive
industry, anti-environment policies are directly related to the intensification of global warming; 2. How pro-business, big polluters influence the creation of environmental legislation that makes global warming worse, while environmentalist forces are excluded from any decision-making role on global warming concerns, and; 3. How Non-governmental organizations are one of the few checks and balances left between saving the earth on the one hand, or a total environmental melt-down at the hands of corporately influenced government regulators.

My work at BWN drew upon: Applied anthropology seminars; related background research; my introduction to BWN and the AFC by Elysa, Sean, Carl and Rachel and my PSA and ethnographic interviews of the CSU, Hayward Environmental Studies Department. Through each of these four experiences the methods and emergent problem section of my thesis came into focus. I began to better understand the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy and a profit driven unsustainable environment.

First, an ecologically sustainable economy is driven by cooperation between government policymakers who partner with the environmental community to provide incentives and rewards for corporations to invest in the green carbon reducing technology that turns back and eventually eliminates global warming.

Second, a profit driven unsustainable environment is characterized by the conflict between environmentalists opposed to a government unduly influenced by corporations and their lobbyists. Equally damaging would be to stay the course and conduct business as usual in ways that shock global ecosystems and awe researchers like Dr. James Hansen of NASA with the ever increasing rate of extinction and global warming.

The emergent problem is between two scenarios: 1. Cooperation between government,
corporations and the environmental community to go green and stop global warming, as opposed to; 2. The current conflict in which government and corporations conspire to freeze out environmentalists, green wash the public with self serving rhetoric and raise the global warming threat level to a red alert status.

As an applied anthropology “student change agent” my methodological solutions to this emergent problem are to advocate for BWN and the AFC by: 1. Using the PSA, Environmental Studies Department ethnographic data and the Hybrid Car Parade to legitimize anti-global warming science and mobilize a grassroots alliance; 2. Holding government and big business accountable for their pollution and misleading rhetoric, and; 3. By turning policymakers, regulators and corporations into partners who know that green technology is not just good for the environment, but profitable as well.

**Reality Based Symbols**

Elysa, Rachel and the other members of the AFC sat patiently as I presented the results of my CSU, Hayward Environmental Department PSA and ethnographic data. As I methodically tied together the broadly scoped PSA environmental elicitation and the more narrowly focused ethnographic interviews, the “kinesics” (Ember & Ember 2007:64), or “body language” (Bonvillain 2006:80), around the conference room table showed an increased, interest. Campaign members began nudging each other as I went over points that supported the case they were trying to make. At the end of my presentation, Elysa and Rachel enthusiastically embraced my findings and began directing their co-workers as to how the Campaign should employ this mainstream data to counter FMC “fringe science claims” against environmental communities in general and the AFC.

Rachel, Elysa, the other members of the AFC leadership team and I turned our
attention to the hybrid car parade. Rachel began, “First Jim, the route for the hybrid car parade starts on the Stanford Campus near the environmental science building where we will hold a kick-off rally and media event. The parade route, which we plan to line with supporters, runs along University Avenue, through downtown Palo Alto and ends at the Peninsula Ford Dealership” (Alemozafar, SDN 2/9/06). We have created an impressive alliance of environmental organizations that are canvassing nearby neighborhoods and institutions to turn out a boisterous pro AFC boycott crowd. Any ideas?”

“Well” I began, “As an applied anthropologist, I understand the importance of symbolism in human communication. You see, symbols, which run the gamut from forests, cars and global warming are themselves arbitrary and without any inherent meaning. We assign these symbols with meaning and infuse them with the emotion that creates a high profile cause. If we make a strong enough case, the symbol is no longer negotiated, but its meaning becomes an agreed upon fixed definition and is then given the weight of tradition. What we need to do is incorporate symbols into the hybrid car parade that give the AFC the moral high ground to challenge FMC’s record and rhetoric.

For instance, I continued, the choice of Stanford and Palo Alto is highly symbolic. Each stands for an enlightened pro-environmental, green is good perspective. Stanford scientists like Dr. Anne Ehrlich have a long and respected track record as champions of the environment. Her association with this event would send a highly symbolic message that leaders in the field of environmental science are involved with the parade and support the goals of the AFC.

Another useful and highly symbolic tactic would be to compare and contrast some simple, yet important facts about hybrids and FMC gas guzzlers. Japanese “hybrids get
on average 40-60 mpg” (Alemozafar, SDN 2/9/04. Long, SB 9/21/06), and run on clean
burning electric batteries in stop and go traffic. Whereas FMC cars, trucks and SUV’s get
an industry worst “18.8 mpg” (Hakim, NYT 7/12/05). That is ten miles per gallon less
than the 1923 Model T, which averaged 25 mpg, (Wikipedia11/5/06). By establishing
symbolic links between Bush Administration government complicity, gas guzzling FMC
cars, and global warming, we will have gained the symbolic high ground.

After exchanging glances Rachel and Elysa gave my ideas their stamp of approval.
“Have someone contact Dr. Erhlich”, Elysa said. Rachel chimed in with, “And get as
many hybrid cars as you can for the parade.” Another staffer added, “We’ll need a Ford
SUV that we can decorate with anti FMC slogans.”

As the brainstorming session continued, Elysa pulled me aside. “Jim” she said
conspiratorially, “there may be a civil disobedience piece at the FMC Dealership. Are
you willing to be arrested for the cause?”

After some contemplation I answered with an emphatic “No. The ethics of
anthropology (In Borosky 2005:102-03), demand that I, as a participant observer, “do no
harm.” My getting arrested may do damage to my advisor, department, and my
university’s reputation, not to mention to the AFC cause. I am not on the sidelines,
because the second ethic of applied anthropology is “just compensation”, which I am
giving the AFC in the form of social action research as a student advocate in return for
the information I need to finish my thesis. Last, the ethics of anthropology demand “full
disclosure of my intent” which is to act in a leadership role as a change advocate.

Elysa’s request allowed me to see behind the egalitarian, no structure, no control
BWN, AFC emic ideological rhetoric. While nowhere near as cut-throat as many for
profit corporations, from an “etic” (Harris 1979), observation of the actual behavior and perspective, some at BWN’s AFC were in a hierarchical position to sacrifice others.

**Grandma Goes on Parade**

The “hybrid car parade was an unqualified success” (Alemozafar, SDN 2/9/06). All manner of local dignitaries turned out, there was full media coverage and the parade route was lined with enthusiastic, chanting supporters. Over twenty hybrid cars took part, each decorated with slogans extolling their anti-global warming virtues. My grandmother rode along with me, passing out literature and candy to supporters and detractors alike.

At the FMC dealership, we presented the owner with a cake, emblazoned with the words “Clean Cars are a Piece of Cake” (Alemozafar, SDN 2/9/06). Faced with the overwhelming support of activists, townsfolk, scientists, and local luminaries, the dealership owner crossed the company line by admitting, and here I paraphrase,

‘I hope FMC does a better job stopping pollution.’ It was then that I realized how anthropology is applied, and how applied anthropologists advocate for the causes they believe in, and the world they want to live in.

In summary, the influence that corporations have over the governmental regulation of environmental issues is considerable and it would go unchecked without the countervailing influence of social organizations like the BWN’s AFC. As a pro-environment interest group, BWN’s AFC is a necessary part of the democratic process, providing a much needed check and balance against the otherwise unchallenged influence of pro-business/anti-environmentalist forces in both public and private sectors. The work of BWN’s AFC campaign provides an excellent example of an organizational culture which operates within the parameters of environmental activism.
My novel approach to fieldwork, the environmental elicitation analytical tool or PSA and thesis research ties into these larger spheres of influence and enables me to be a “change agent advocate” (Conyne 7/1977:17), for a pro-environmental social organization. As a student intern, I advocated for the AFC by planning and participating in numerous projects and activities designed to further environmental causes. The objectives were to promote corporate accountability and create public awareness of the ecological irresponsibility of the FMC.

In conclusion, my work with the AFC was a learning experience that enabled me to help expose the FMC’s corporate rhetoric. I, along with the other AFC staff, found that time after time the FMC has claimed to be pro-environment, while simultaneously lobbying our government to promote policies and practices that are detrimental to the environment. As a change agent advocate, my applied anthropological fieldwork with the AFC helped maintain the checks and balances that influence the political-economic process and protect the public trust.
CHAPTER IV.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In a previous chapter, I stated that the intersection of politics, economics, and environmentalism became the focus of my thesis when I conceived of and became impassioned with this question: “What is the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy and a profit driven unsustainable environment?”

While my intellectual and ethical fascination for this question remains central to this thesis, indeed to my academic life, my enthusiasm has been intensified by the increased sense of urgency over how we as a species answer this question. To be answered correctly, local, national and international cooperation must be established according to the recent work of Nicholas Stern, a Senior British Government Economist, calls an imperative “…transition…to a low carbon economy through… policies supporting the development of low carbon and high [fuel] efficiency technology, and changing the public’s attitude towards energy efficiency” (Murphy, SFC 10/31/06). If we follow these recommendations, we will have the “ecologically sustainable economy” I explain in this thesis.

If this questions is ignored or answered incorrectly, we as a species face what the aforementioned Stern calls “…a catastrophic reduction in worldwide productivity on the scale of the Great Depression that could devastate food resources, cause widespread [extinctions and] deaths, and turn hundreds of millions of people into refugees.” (Murphy, SFC 10/31/06). My passion for this question cannot over-ride my fear of current practices that favor a “profit driven unsustainable environment” and its irreversible effects that I warn against in my thesis. In addressing this question, there is
reason for hope and cause for concern. I am deeply concerned that our government, which is mandated to be a neutral arbiter for the common good has, under the Bush Administration been swayed by oil and car company lobbyists, I say this because the Bush Administration: 1. stifles the work of renowned climate change experts like Dr. James Hansen of NASA, who warns that if we do not reduce tailpipe emissions soon we will “pass the point of no return on the road to irreversible global warming” (Spector, TNY 3/13/06:62); The administration also ignores the Kyoto Protocols, which call for each and every nation to transition to a low carbon economy through a combination of taxes and regulations to make carbon [tailpipe] emissions more costly.. George W. Bush and his officials seem blind to the fact that not developing fuel efficient vehicles or investing in alternative energy sources is making us dependent on other countries and perilously insecure politically, economically and environmentally. Finally, this government is manipulating the numbers in order to unsustainably exploit finite resources like ANWR and perpetuate policies that do not improve fuel efficiency and contribute to global warming.

I found reason for hope in the applied anthropology courses that prepared me to be a “change agent advocate” and to see the nexus and overlapping spheres of influence in the politics, economics, and environmentalism of the Bush Administration, Ford Motor Company and Blue Water Networks, Anti-ford Campaign. It was in my graduate anthropology courses that I learned how to conduct the applied style of participant observation in which I was not entirely an “objective” passive bystander, also a “subjective”, active, ethically driven advocate for BWN’s AFC. Second, the environmental elicitation skills I learned in class enabled me to conduct the pile sort
analysis’s and key informant interview’s necessary to legitimize the anti-ford campaign’s scientific data. Third, the social action case studies we read and discussed were directly applicable to the organizational work I did for the hybrid car parade. Fourth, the seminar discussions about rapport, advocacy, and ethical realism formed the backbone of my ethnographic inquiries into the nature of the relationship between BWN, the AFC, FMC, and the Bush Administration.

I was profoundly motivated by my ability to use applied anthropology to not only document the ongoing relationship between the social forces of politics, economics and environmentalism, but also by my ability to contribute to a unique understanding of these larger forces through my case study of the AFC, FMC, and the Bush Administration.

This thesis uses my internship experiences to analyze the “political, economic and ecological study of the interaction between BlueWater Network’s Anti-Ford Campaign, the Ford Motor Company and the Bush Administration.” In the thesis I ask “What is the difference between an ecologically sustainable economy and a profit driven unsustainable environment?” I conclude that asking the right questions is an important step to helping solve the problem of “global warming. Such is the power of applied anthropology; such is the hope of the applied anthropology graduate student who seeks environmental justice.

The theoretical framework of my thesis, political ecology, enables me to evaluate and expose the politics of the Bush Administration, beholden as it is to corporate polluters by conflicts of interest, campaign contributions, and lobbyists thus promoting an unsustainable economic agenda. The theoretical framework also looks at how BWNs, AFC advocates for the protection of the environment through political legislation, the legal system, and positive social action. Some of these social actions I took part in were
economic boycotts, and campaigns that promoted public awareness of the links between FMC and global warming.

Symbolic anthropology is the study of how humans interpret the world through symbols that are at first arbitrary and void of meaning, then given culturally specific meaning by social groups. Symbols, then endowed with traditional meaning over time allowed me to see both their subjective and dynamic nature. I was able to see how symbols can also become contested territory. The environment takes on a symbolic value to pro-business forces that see only a resource to be extracted for profit. Unfortunately, they give little if any thought to long term ecosystemic consequences. In contrast, BWN’s AFC sees the environment as imperiled by these practices, promotes the symbols of anti-global warming and encourages sustainable, economically positive environmental use.

Working as a student intern, my social action fieldwork and the creation of an environmental elicitation research tool or the PSA, assisted BWN’s to promote public awareness of our symbolic points of view. These points of view concluded that the FMCs unsustainable business practices promote global warming. We also believe that the Bush Administration and FMCs view that “What’s good for the environment is bad for business” (Romm, 1994) symbolism is misleading. Both the Bush administration and the FMC continue to promote this rhetoric which is inconsistent with both public sentiments here in America and with growing international consensus regarding the links between tail-pipe emitted greenhouse gases and global warming.

I was able to use symbolic anthropology to quantify the political, economic and environmental anti-global warming symbols used by the AFC. My collaboration with Dr. Price and our graduate seminar produced a defined spectrum of symbolic environmental
concerns. I refined this data into a narrowly focused environmental elicitation tool known as a pile sort analysis or PSA and conducted key informant interviews with CSU, Hayward Environmental Studies Department faculty. The results of my PSA were a validation of the AFCs use of pro-environmental symbols to justify their criticism of an anti-environment political agenda. An agenda that gives FMC and others free economic reign to produce excessive fleets of fuel guzzling, green-house gas emitting vehicles that contribute heavily to global warming.

However, my environmental elicitation tool, the PSA was not just about collecting raw data. The PSA made the qualitatively symbolic aims of my internship quantifiable. I was able to measure the knowledge, opinions, values and beliefs of my professors on important environmental issues. My moral stance that the use of the environment must be sustainable was validated through the PSA by scores of overwhelming concern for the environment in the collected data. My belief in ethical realism, that I must use my professional training to act as a change agent advocate for the anti-global warming cause was validated by the effectiveness of this tool in highlighting the concerns of environmental experts. My use of political ecology to illuminate the overlapping spheres of influence between politics, economics and the environment was validated as the elicitation linked my applied anthropological internship to local, regional, national, and international issues. Last, the pro-environment symbols derived from my elicitation analysis enabled me to refine both my fieldwork theory and practice and enabled me to make a substantial contribution to the anti-global warming campaign.

Remembering that all of the aforementioned took place during my internship in applied anthropology is important. As a learning experience, my applied anthropological
internship allowed me to conduct fieldwork that informed my theory. In other words, I was able to capture and analyze the actual interaction between Bush Administration politics, FMC economics and AFC environmentalism using political-ecology theory.

Just as important, I used theory to support my refined political-ecology background data with the dynamic relationships and symbols generated by both sides of the struggle. Big corporations believe environmentalists want to save the planet, at the expense of the economy. I and the AFC advocate using a social activism to expose green-washing fraud, promote a sustainable green economy and create an anti-global warming ethos. Those are the only ways to reverse damage already done to the environment and promote a healthy ecosystem for the future. My internship was the perfect laboratory to understand the human condition in general, the struggle over the environment in particular and to apply the analytical tools of applied anthropology. These tools include social action fieldwork, change agent advocacy, data gathering and analysis, harnessing the power of contested symbols and balancing the interplay between theory and practice. This experience allowed me to push beyond the boundaries of the student role and become a professional learning, researching and contributing to the emerging field of applied anthropology.
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A APPENDIX

While at lunch with the Regional Environmental Officer at DOI’s Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance (OEPC), Our guest was Sarah Creachbaum, Superintendent of War in the Pacific (WAPA), National Park Service (NPS).

We were talking about Ms Creachbaum’s background and work at NPS Yellowstone. I asked if she was familiar with BlueWater Network, She said “yes” she was “very familiar” in a tired sounding voice. I mentioned that I had previously been a BlueWater Network, (BWN), Intern and that the organization had good intentions. It was my intent to express a neutral standpoint on BWN in the hopes of encouraging her to talk about her experiences. Ms Creachbaum said “Yes, I guess they, (BWN), have their place”. I suggested that in way organizations like BWN help maintain a balance in Democracy by hindering and questioning lobbyist influence over Government and its policies. Ms Creachbaum said “yeah, everybody has a role and their role is to be a pain in the ass”.

1/10/06 1:00 pm
James,

Thanks for your great work on our Ford campaign. Elisa says that you were an excellent self-starter, and that's an important thing for success in this movement.

The culture of bluewater is what business schools would call "loose/loose", meaning that we are loose with both formal and informal controls, giving campaigners lots of rope with which to succeed in their campaigns. Minimum oversight, but as much input as they need from others in the organization (within reason). The downside is that if a campaigner doesn't handle things well, that's bad for them and bad for us.

The opposite is a "tight/tight" organizational style which would constrict all formal and informal communications, campaign strategies, fundraising, etc. There's no doubt that much more can be accomplished in the former regimen, but that comes with some real risks that you could find in organizational behavior literature, including the risk of sheer bedlam and complete disorganization if there is no oversight at all.

As for background, I suggest going to our website and reading this prior to my answering further. It might explain all you need.

regards -- Russell
REVISED ELICITATION QUESTION: WHAT DO PEOPLE DO THAT HURTS THE ENVIRONMENT?
5/10/04 ANTH 4310 REVISED 5/12/04

1. INDUSTRIAL HUMAN WASTE DUMPED IN WATER
2. DRIVE GAS GUZZLER (DRIVE POLLUTING CARS)
3. RANCHING LARGE POPULATIONS OF ANIMALS
4. DRIVE TOO MUCH
5. URBAN SPRAWL (BAD URBAN PLANNING)/DEVELOPMENT OF
6. DRIVE, NOT PUBLIC TRANSIT OR CAR POOL
7. GREEN SPACES/Destroy ANIMAL HABITATS
8. OVERPOPULATION
9. COAL BURNING (INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS/FACTORY EMISSIONS)
10. LOGGING COMPANIES (DEFORESTATION)
12. WAR
13. ACCIDENTAL DUMP TOXIC WASTE/OIL SPILLS
15. BURNING TRASH
16. PUBLIC EXCESSIVE USE OF RESOURCES (CONSUME TOO MANY NATURAL...)
17. NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS (NUCLEAR WASTE)
18. OIL SPILLS
19. GLOBAL WARMING
20. CORPORATIONS
21. GO OFF ROADING
22. INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS
23. LITTERING
24. USE AEROSOL CANS
25. FACTORY FARMING/AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS/PESTICIDES (WASTE)
26. OIL IN DRAINS/GUTTERS ON CITY STREETS
27. GENETIC ENGINEERING
29. ROAD BUILDING
30. LANDFILL
31. MINING WASTE/STRIP MINING
33. PURPOSELY INTRODUCING INVASIVE SPECIES
34. NOT RECYCLING
35. INTENTIONAL IMPROPER DISPOSAL, HAZARDOUS WASTE
PILE SORT DATA ENTRY
INTERVIEWER: James Munson
INTERVIEWEE: Dr. David Woo
DATE:

PILE 1: 27, 25, 10, 3, 7.
REASONS: Related to Agricultural Pollution

PILE 2: 18, 26.
REASONS: Oil

PILE 3: 12, 8.
REASONS: Cause and effect..... Overpopulation = War

PILE 4: 33.
REASONS: Purposely Introduced Invasive Species

PILE 5: 31
REASONS: Mining

PILE 6: 24, 19.
REASONS: CFC- Global Warming

PILE 7: 1, 16, 22, 9.
REASONS: Industrial Related Pollution

PILE 8: 35, 17, 5, 30, 15, 34, 23, 13
REASONS: Urban Related Pollution.

PILE 9: 29, 4, 21, 2, 6.
REASONS: Driving

PILE 10:
REASONS:
PILE 1: 34, 35, 33, 24, 26, 15, 23.

REASONS: Irresponsible actions on the part of individuals, households committing a insult to the environment. If they went doing it the world would be a better place.

PILE 2: 30, 3, 25, 10, 7, 31.

REASONS: LARGE SCALE CONTINUED INSULTS TO THE ENVT

PILE 3: 13, 17, 1, 22.

REASONS: INSULTS TO THE ENVT. AS A RESULT OF INDUSTRIAL SALE SOCIETIES

PILE 4: 12, 16, 8.

REASONS: OUR OBSSESION WITH FOSSIL FUELS, COAL & PATROLIEM

PILE 5: 27

REASONS: GENETIC ENGINEERING

PILE 6: 19, 5, 18, 29, 21, 2, 4, 6, 9.

REASONS: OVERPOPULATION LEADS TO OVER CONSUPTION LEADS TO WAR.
PILE DATA ENTRY
INTERVIEWER: James Munson
INTERVIEWEE: Prof. Scott Stein
DATE: 5-12-04

PILE 1: 1, 3, 10, 25.
REASONS: LAND USE

PILE 2: 5
REASONS: URBAN SPRAWL

PILE 3: 12
REASONS: WAR

PILE 4: 8
REASONS: OVER POPULATION

PILE 5: 27
REASONS: GENTIC ENGINEERING

PILE 6: 20
REASONS: CORPORATIONS

PILE 7: 9, 17, 22.
REASONS: POWER GENERATION

PILE 8: 26, 18, 13, 35.
REASONS: INDIRECT CONSEQUENCES OF POTROLEIM ECONOMY

PILE 9: 19
REASONS: GLOBAL WARMING

PILE 10: 29, 31, 30, 7.
REASONS: URBAN LAND USE
PILE SORT DATA ENTRY
INTERVIEWER: James Munson
INTERVIEWE: Prof. Scott Seine
DATE: 5-12-04

PILE 11: 34, 24, 2, 15, 23, 21, 4, 6, 16.
REASONS: DECISIONS OF INDIVIDUALS

PILE 12: 33
REASONS: INTRODUCTION OF INVASIVE SPECIES

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:

PILE
REASONS:
Correlated Pile sort analysis of all three Professors:

PILE #1. Irresponsible actions on the part of individuals.

15. BURNING TRASH
23. LITTERING
24. USE AEROSOL CANS
26. OIL IN DRAINS/GUTTERS ON CITY STREETS
33. PURPOSELY INTRODUCING INVASIVE SPECIES
34. NOT RECYCLING
35. INTENTIONAL IMPROPER DISPOSAL, HAZARDOUS WASTE

PILE #2. Urban sprawl, large scale insults to the environment often related to agriculture.

3. RANCHING LARGE POPULATIONS OF ANIMALS
7. GREEN SPACES/ DESTROY ANIMAL HABITATS
10. LOGGING COMPANIES (DEFORESTATION)
25. FACTORY FARMING/AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS/ PESTICIDES (WASTE)
27. GENETIC ENGINEERING
29. ROAD BUILDING
30. LANDFILL
31. MINING WASTE/STRIP MINING

PILE #3. Overpopulation, over consumption, our obsession with fossil fuels = WAR
12. WAR
16. PUBLIC EXCESSIVE USE OF RESOURCES (CONSUME TOO MANY NATURAL....)
17. NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS (NUCLEAR WASTE)
18. OIL SPILLS
19. GLOBAL WARMING
2. DRIVE GAS GUZZLER (DRIVE POLLUTING CARS)
20. CORPORATIONS
21. GO OFF ROADING
22. INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS
4. DRIVE TOO MUCH
6. DRIVE, NOT PUBLIC TRANSIT OR CAR POOL
8. OVERPOPULATION
9. COAL BURNING (INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS/FACTORY EMISSIONS)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a committed environmental organization, since 1996 the Bluewater Network is fighting to improve environmental awareness and stop global warming. Their campaigns are “supported by Green Peace and Public Citizen of California, among others” (NY. Times 2/26/04). Too often, government and big business distort reality when it comes to environmental policy. Bluewater Network has a long standing, dependable reputation in the environmental protection community. The proposed project focuses on just such a big business (Ford) in the anticipation that if Ford is persuaded to comply with pro-environmental ideals as laid out by Bluewater Network, the other major automobile makers in America will follow suit. The project will organize a rallies on multiple college campuses and in public locations in the San Francisco Bay Area in the attempt to educate the public and get media attention. The next step in the proposed project is the creation and facilitation of a high level corporate-environmentalist think tank. The think tank will consist of approximately 20 expert environmentalists and 20 high level managers/product designers from Ford. The aim is to establish sustainable dialogue for future negotiations and environmental advocacy. The majority of grant funding obtained will be used to facilitate this think tank including environmental experts and representatives from Ford in Hawaii, this summer, 2004 with the hopes this neutral and relatively unspoiled paradise setting will encourage participation and dialogue. With this grant funding Bluewater Network can try to establish a long lasting rapport with Ford Motor Company to work
toward reasonable environmental protection standards for automobile companies in America. In the third phase (if there is a low response from Ford) we will be asking consumers not to buy Ford vehicles. This phase will organize a boycott of Ford Motor Company. With support from over three dozen environmental organizations, Bluewater will unleash a nationwide pledge drive and advertisement campaign demanding Ford protect the planet. Our goal is to see a reduction of Ford sales and increased anti-Ford sentiment. This ultimately will most likely result in Ford’s compliance with Bluewaters environmentally driven objectives. This project will cost $64,618 of which we are requesting $59,268. Please consider supporting this project to stop Global Warming, “one SUV at a time.”

INTRODUCTION

Bluewater Network’s mission is to champion innovative solutions and inspire individuals to protect the earth’s finite and vulnerable ecosystems. Since 1996, Bluewater Network has promoted critical policy changes in government and industry to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and eradicate other root causes of air and water pollution, global warming, and habitat destruction.

The story of Bluewater Network begins in the province of Kerala, along the coastline on the western side of India’s peninsula. Dr. Russell Long, world-class sailor and environmental activist, traveled there to work with traditional fishermen to design watercraft that could serve the community as well as reduce environmental impacts on Kerala’s waterways. What he found was that the pollution from two-stroke outboard engines was destroying the way of life for these fishermen and their environment.
In the United States, two-stroke engines are responsible for 1.1 billion pounds of toxic emissions each year (for more information about the environmental problems associated with two-stroke engines, read our Two-Stroke Engine Fact available on website). In addition to his experience with the fishermen in Kerala, Russell Long founded Bluewater Network in 1996 as a project of Earth Island Institute. The organization then waged an extraordinarily successful campaign to reduce the pollution caused by two-stroke engines in the United States. Subsequent accomplishments include following. The major marine engine manufacturers, including American Honda and Mercury Marine, report that sales of two-stroke engine craft have decreased as sales of cleaner four-stroke technology have increased well past projections. Bluewater Network convinced the California Air Resources Board to develop the strongest regulations for marine motors in the nation. Bluewater Network developed the first eco-labeling program in the nation for marine motor. Bluewater Network soon expanded these efforts to address the damage caused by personal watercraft and snowmobiles and automobiles.

In the ensuing years, Bluewater Network has grown rapidly from one person to a staff of nearly ten people tackling the myriad of air and water quality problems caused by the transportation sector. Bluewater Network, Rainforest Action Network, and Global Exchange held a demonstration at the S&C Ford Dealership in San Francisco, kicking-off a national campaign and demand that Ford Motor Company protect the environment, national security, and public health by living up to its pledge to make cleaner vehicles.
PROBLEM STATEMENT

Once, all climate changes on earth occurred naturally. However, during the Industrial Revolution, we began rapidly altering our climate and environment through changing agricultural and industrial practices. Before the Industrial Revolution, human activity released very few gases into the atmosphere but now with population growth, excessive fossil fuel burning, and deforestation, we are dangerously affecting the mixture of gases in the atmosphere. Certain activities add to the disproportionate levels of these naturally occurring gases: Carbon dioxide is released to the atmosphere when solid waste, fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), and wood products are burned, (EPA).

Just last month Ford reneged on its pledge to boost SUV mileage by 25 percent. And last year, after countless public statements vowing corporate environmental stewardship, William Ford personally lobbied Congress against increasing federal fuel mileage standards (Bluewater Network). Bluewater Network is applying for this grant in order to further the campaign against Ford Motor Company’s reckless environmental policies. Ford has reneged on a commitment made in 2000 to produce more fuel efficient vehicles, yet now continues to mislead consumers and the environmental community with eco-rhetoric and false promises. Ford is refusing to implement today’s available climate-friendly technologies. Previously, Bill Ford Jr. (Grandson of the original car maker) reneged on a pledge to boost SUV fuel mileage by 25%, he personally lobbied Congress against improved fuel mileage standards. This testimony was given after he promised to preserve and protect the environment in a written statement. Bill Ford Jr. is maintaining the unfortunate 100-year old Ford legacy of global warming and petroleum oil dependence; a legacy that jeopardizes the planet and our children’s future. Ford vehicles
are one of the largest sources of global warming (greenhouse gas emissions) and pollution in the U.S.

Ford has intentionally ignored environmentalist concerns and done little to reduce emissions from vehicles they produce. Furthermore, Ford has pompously campaigned against laws that would mandate a decrease in overall vehicle emissions in the US. “Once again Bill Ford Jr. has broken his promise to protect the planet. After more than six months of negotiations, Ford executives failed to propose a plan to reduce global warming emissions from vehicles, as they had promised Bluewater Network in meetings held with them in Dearborn, Michigan in 2003. Previously, Bill Ford reneged on his pledge to boost SUV fuel mileage by 25%, and personally lobbied Congress against improved fuel mileage standards after pledging to preserve and protect the environment. By continuing to mislead consumers and the environmental community with eco-rhetoric and false promises and by refusing to implement today’s climate-friendly technologies, Bill Ford Jr. is maintaining the unfortunate 100-year old Ford legacy of global warming and oil dependence, a legacy that jeopardizes our children’s, and the nation's future. Ford vehicles are one of the largest sources of global warming pollution in the U.S. (Bluewater Network.org)”.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Increase Bluewater Network membership and involvement of concerned citizens by organizing rallies on multiple college campuses in the San Francisco Bay Area and distributing informational flyers and bumper stickers. At all college and public events, media advisories and releases will be sent out to local news resources to encourage them
to observe, participate and publish the event. This will promote an increase in public awareness of the need for fuel efficiency and Ford’s poor anti-environmental policy.

2. Negotiate with Ford executives to compel an increase in the fuel efficiency of all its vehicles by 20%, no later than 2007. This goal will be furthered by organizing a week long conference or “think tank” between 10 scholarly environmentalists and 10 high level board members and project designers from Ford Motor Company.

3. If cooperation is not forthcoming from Ford we will organize a boycott of Ford that will result in a decrease in the number of annual vehicles sales by (at least 500). A postcard drive will be initiated such that each concerned individual will pledge by their signature not to purchase Ford vehicles until all demands are met.

METHODS

Once the student force is established, protest and awareness rallies will be held by students at various off campus locations to engage the public and enlist participation in the pledge/campaign against Ford. Flyers, post cards and letter writing information will be provided to involve and educate the public at large.

At all college and public events, media advisories will be sent out to local news resources to encourage them to observe, participate and publish the event. To make it easier, news releases will be sent out to news agencies independently in case they didn’t attend or missed something at the event. This media inclusion gives Bluewater the opportunity to present aspects of the campaign to a larger audience with less chance of miss interpretation.

Campaign rallies on college campuses will be coordinated by the students at individual colleges in the San Francisco bay areas as well as at multi campus events
utilizing students from all campuses at a central location and/or a rotating protest from
campus to campus. Postcard mailing tools that are being used in this campaign.

The Postcard:

Dear Mr. Ford:

Ford Motor Company vehicles create more global warming pollution than virtually any company in
the world. Even with that knowledge, you reneged on your pledge to significantly raise SUV fuel
mileage efficiency, and you personally lobbied Congress against improving the nation's fuel
mileage standards. To protect our children's future and the planet, I pledge not to buy your
vehicles (including Volvo, Mazda, Jaguar, and Land/Range Rover) until your vehicles are built to
be climate-friendly, and you make significant attempts to convince Congress to double the
nation's fuel mileage standards.

Name ________________________________________________

Address ________________________________________________

City, State, ZIP ____________________________________________

Email _____________________________________________________

Students will initially be contacted by Bluewater Network via class room
announcements at which time postcards will be distributed and mailed, emphasizing that
students recognize the urgency of this campaign and check the corresponding box if they
wish to participate beyond sending the postcard. All students indicating an interest will be
contacted within 24hr’s. In these contacts, future meetings will be arranged and
task/responsibilities will be delegated according to the student’s individual skills and
interests. These student Coordinators will then go on to organize groups with other
students who will facilitate the rallies/protests. Bluewater Network will promote “call in
protest” days by encouraging people hundreds of to call the direct number to Bill Ford’s
office thus effectively shutting down business at Ford for that day. This method of protest
has been very effective in the recent past resulting in Ford taking out a law suit against
Bluewater Network. This is a major victory for Bluewater Network because it proves that
our efforts to get their attention have been successful. In the event Ford does actually go
all the way to court (which is unlikely); the information found in the discovery phase of litigation would be of great value to the environmental community and may pave the way for future lawsuits of our own. Furthermore, everything Bluewater has done, said or published regarding Ford is truthful and well documented. Ford has no case. Bluewater will not stop until Ford changes its behavior in regards to the environment. If we can get Ford to lead the way, other US automobile manufacturers will follow suit, hopefully resulting in large decreases of Carbon dioxide in our atmosphere and major steps towards stopping Global Warming. Costs will include long distance telephone charges. In addition to call in protest days, postcard mailings will be held in the attempt to both get people involved with the Bluewater Network as well as to send a huge amount of postcard in mass to Bill Ford's office effectively dominating the mail room. Each card will have a box that can be checked in the event that particular person wants to become more involved. In this way we will build our network of supporters and ultimately increase the size of the campaign and assure campaign sustainability. Costs will include the production of postcards, postage and telephone charges to call back interested members. Weekly updates and periodic meetings will be held between Bluewater and these student Coordinators to insure progress.

We will also host a week long think tank including representatives from both sides of the issue in an attempt to encourage Fords board members and product designers to put the environment before the pocket book. The proposed conference or think tank will be facilitated by Bluewater Networks intern evaluator/coordinator. The think tank will be held in Hawaii at the Kai Marriot resort. This exotic paradise location will likely entice even the most rigid board members to participate in dialogue, perhaps for the first time with professional environmentalists. In addition to 10 Ford representatives, 10 members representing/environmentalist leaders, and a Applied Anthropology Intern as an evaluator/coordinator will be attending.
The intern will be responsible for:

- Identify and invite appropriate participants from both sides of the issue.
- Secure funding, a conference room and hotel accommodations at the Kili Marriott Resort.
- Arrange ground transportation, meals, entertainment and participant acknowledgement awards.
- Compile resource and presentation materials that might be needed.
- Arrange for future meetings and ongoing dialogue between Bluewater Network and Ford Motor Company.

All cost of this think tank will be paid for by Bluewater Network. These costs will include air fair, hotel fees, and a per diem for meals expenses, etc.

In the event that Ford has a low response to demands, the Bluewater Network has formulated a standard pledge letter asking the public to make a pledge not to buy Ford vehicles. The pledge can be acted upon by writing letters to Bill Ford, calling Ford in protest or sending post cards. Bluewaters Networks web site provides an opportunity for anyone to easily write a pledge/letter to Ford. Bluewater will then pay the cost of forwarding the letter to Ford Motor Company.

The Pledge:

"Protect Our Children’s Future - Bluewaternetwork.org, Groups that have supported the pledge and taken it themselves: Bluewater Network, Greenpeace, Environmental Working Group, Public Citizen (CA), The Fund for Animals, Earth Rights International, Tides Foundation, The David Brower Fund, Circle of Life, Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Safe Energy, Sustainable World Coalition, Renewable Energy Action Project, Turtle Island Restoration Network, Council of Canadians (Victoria, BC), Free The Planet, Environmental Advocates, Salmon Protection and Watershed Network, Campaign to Safeguard America's Waters, Center for Environmental Health, Ocean Advocates, Southern
Rockies Watershed Network, Living Rivers, Kettle Range Conservation Group,
Environmentalists Against War, Mangrove Action Project, Global Compliance Research Project,
Sacred Land Film Project, West Africa Rainforest Network, Travel Just, Baikal watch, Bay Area
Wilderness Training”.

Sign the pledge. Tell your friends.

Name: ______________________ Date: ______

Pledge online at: www.bluewaternetwork.org

Bumper Stickers will be generated depicting the Ford logo with an Ø symbol
over it. These will be given out at various rallies. However, the cost of production is high
so the amount of stickers will low in comparison to the number of flyers and post cards.
Flyers will be generated that reflect comprehensive breakdowns of “Ford motor
company’s “RHETORIC vs. REALITY” with detailed foot notes legitimizing the claims
made by Bluewater in the flyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
<th>Month 5</th>
<th>Month 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organize students</td>
<td>Organize 1 rally</td>
<td>Organize 2-3 rally</td>
<td>Organize rallies 4-6</td>
<td>Facilitate/record</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Ford</td>
<td>Think Thank</td>
<td>Hold 1st three rallies</td>
<td>Hold 2 three rallies</td>
<td>Think Thank</td>
<td>Report on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Think Thank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setup boycott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION

The intern/coordinator will record, evaluate and coordinate both the local
campaign and the week long think tank/conference. The first assignment of the intern
evaluator will be to monitor Bluewater Networks attempts to rally students to the
environmental cause against Ford. The intern/coordinator will monitor and facilitate
eleven rallies and the corresponding media activity covering these events taking place
between 05/02/04-08/08/04. The intern/coordinator will examine the 800 postcards used
for recruitment/Ford boycott and there effectiveness in this campaign.

The intern/coordinator will assess the effectiveness of Bluewater Network’s
program to encourage consumers to pledge not to buy Ford vehicles. Pledges will be
made via e-mail post cards and call in days (when hundreds of protesters will fill Ford
phone line and effectively stop business as usual). Also, the intern will assess whether
this method is an effective recruitment strategy.

The second task to be covered by the intern/coordinator includes both recording
and transcription of the meetings held during the week long conference/Think Tank
session which is scheduled for August, 12-19, 2004. The intern/coordinator will also do
interviews with all members of the think tank prior to the conference as well as an exiting
interview at the end of the week long conference and initial contact of participants. The
information will used to examine how future events can be enhanced to assure maximum
effectiveness and assure accountability from all sides of the issues.

Desired changes that are anticipated or planed for the future resulting from this
campaign:

a. Established rapport between Ford’s people and environmentalist, humanizing the
conflict.

b. Plan further talks on a less formal level at each others offices.

c. Establish dialogue on a semi-regular bases.

These three above mentioned goals are the key to project sustainability.

The maximum benefits of this campaign will occur if Ford complies with the demands
made by Bluewater and the popular protest of the environmental community. Ideally
other American automobile manufacturers will also then proceed on the road of pro-
environmental sustainability.
FUTURE FUNDING

In the past our members have supported Bluewater Network in protecting the environment on many fronts. Bluewater Network promotes critical policy changes in government and industry to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and eradicate other root causes of air and water pollution, global warming, and habitat destruction. Future funding will be made possible with donations from our increased supporters in the community as a result from projects like these.

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Requested</th>
<th>Total Donated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$61,741</td>
<td>$56,391</td>
<td>$5350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Personnel

A. Intern/Coordinator $6251  $6251  -0-

II. Non-Personnel

A. Space Cost $13,000  $10,000  $3,000
B. Equipment $2,350  -0-  $2,350
C. Supplies $7,020  $7,020  -0-
D. Travel $8,400  $8,400  -0-
E. Per Diem $8,820  $8,820  -0-
F. Telephone $1,200  $1,200  -0-
G. Hotel $14,700  $14,700  -0-
## BUDGET DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Intern/Coordinator</td>
<td>$6251</td>
<td>@$4,167/mo. x 25% x 6mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Non-Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Kai Marriott Conference Room</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>7 days 9am – 3 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Kai Marriott Resort Fees</td>
<td>$14,700</td>
<td>Rates $100 per night x 21 x 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Air Fare</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$400 per round trip ticket x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Per Diem Meals.</td>
<td>$8,820</td>
<td>Minimum $60 per day, per guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Door Gifts, Prizes</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$50 x 20 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Flyers</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>Production costs –$.20 each 800 Flyers x $.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Postcards</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>Index Card Stock 800 Postcards x $.20 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Postage</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>Cost of 10,000 mailings to Ford 10,000 x $.37 Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Bumper Stickers</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$.50 per sticker. $.50 x 800 Stickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Rallies</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>Student participants/coordinator Pizza $100 per rally x 11 rallies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Cell Phones</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>Two phone bills six months @ 2 x $100/mo. x 6/mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Certificates of Acknowledgement</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Gifts for student Coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expense

| M. Desk | $500.00 | Computer desk |
| N. Chair | $150.00 | Leather arm chair |
| O. Computer | $1,200.00 | IBM P4 |
| P. Office Space | $3,000 | 30sqft. x $100 per. sq.ft. |
| Q. Envelopes | $500 | 10,000 Envelopes $.05 |

### Total Funds Needed

$61,741

### Total Donated Materials

$5,350

### Total Requested

$56,391
BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

I. Personnel

A. The Intern coordinator is a highly skilled Applied Anthropological Graduate student with vast training in both environmental awareness and advocacy. With guidance from academic resources and top professionals in education the intern will record, evaluate and coordinate both the local campaign and the week long think tank/conference.

II. Non-Personnel

A. Space Cost.
1. The office space will be located at 311 California St. in San Francisco. The cost of the space will be paid for by the Bluewater Network.

B. Equipment

1. One computer desk will be needed by the Intern/coordinator. The desk will be donated by the Bluewater Network.

2. One chair will be needed by the Intern/coordinator. The chair will be donated by the Bluewater Network.

3. One computer will be needed by the Intern/coordinator. The computer will be donated by the Bluewater Network.

C. Supplies

1. Envelopes for mailing letters to Ford once they are sent in by supporters. These envelopes will be provided by the Bluewater Network.

2. Certificates of Acknowledgement will be given to all the students who put some time into promoting the boycott against Ford by coordinating and participating in rallies and other activities to better the environmental cause.

3. Flyers will be a major tool in promoting rallies and educating the public.

4. Postcards are a major tool for both sending a message as well as recruiting supporters for Bluewater's campaign against Ford.

5. Postage is necessary to mail the large volume of letters submitted by the boycotters to Bluewater (via the website) to be forwarded to Ford.

6. Bumper Stickers are used to get the message out to the general public in addition to giving the user the opportunity to make a statement in support of Bluewater Network's campaign against Ford.
The Ford Motor Company (often referred to simply as Ford; sometimes nicknamed Ford's or FoMoCo, (NYSE: F) is an automobile maker founded by Henry Ford in Detroit, Michigan, and incorporated on June 16, 1903.

Ford radically reformed the methods for large-scale manufacturing of cars, and large-scale management of an industrial workforce. Ford implemented the ideas of Eli Whitney, who developed the first
The average surface temperature of earth has increased more than 1 degree Fahrenheit since 1900 and the rate of warming has been nearly three times the century-long average since 1970. Almost all experts studying the recent climate history of the earth agree now that human activities, mainly the release of heat-trapping gases from smokestacks, tailpipes, and burning forests, are probably the dominant force driving the trend. The gases add to the planet's natural greenhouse effect, allowing sunlight in, but preventing some of the resulting heat from radiating back to space. Drawing on research on past climate shifts, observations of current conditions, and computer simulations, many climate experts say that without big curbs in greenhouse gas emissions, the 21st century could see temperatures rise 3 to 8 degrees, weather patterns sharply shift, ice sheets shrink and seas rise several feet. Articles and multimedia about global warming published in the New York Times appear below.
May 21, 2003

Mr. William Clay Ford, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Ford Motor Company
One American Road
Detroit, Michigan 48126

Dear Mr. Ford,

Ever since you pledged to position Ford Motor Company as the environmental leader among automobile manufacturers, Bluewater Network and the environmental community have monitored developments in your company with great anticipation. The fact that one of the world’s leading automobile manufacturer professed that it would make driving more sustainable for the planet has provided cause for optimism, especially given the enormous global pollution burden generated by your industry.

Unfortunately, in the past few months, it has become clear that Ford Motor Company’s actions have fallen far short of your professed vision and promises.

In response, this month Bluewater Network will launch a national campaign urging consumers not to purchase Ford vehicles until such time as you take action to protect the planet. This can be accomplished by developing the cleanest possible vehicles, and working to enact mandatory standards for reducing emissions of all types in the United States and globally.

Your recently-broken pledge to improve SUV fuel mileage, and your personal lobbying of Congress not to increase fuel mileage (CAFE) standards come while the United States is battling the escalating consequences of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions on many fronts. Hospitalizations and deaths from pollution-related cardiovascular and respiratory illness strike tens of thousands of Americans annually. The world’s climate authorities have prescribed a massive reduction, if not a total elimination, of greenhouse gas emissions to avert catastrophic climate change impacts during this century. Furthermore, America’s dependence on imported oil jeopardizes our political and economic security more than ever.

Over the last two years, Bluewater Network sponsored Assembly Bill 1493 (formerly AB 1058) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the passenger vehicles operating in California. The landmark bill was signed into law by Governor Gray Davis in July of 2002. I wrote you on two occasions attempting to enlist your participation in working with us on this legislation, but you did not respond. Instead, Ford Motor Company, through the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, actively opposed our historic greenhouse gas legislation.

With real commitment, Ford Motor Company could lead the automobile industry to protect America’s children and future generations. So far, it appears to be the commitment, and not the technology, that Ford lacks. Technology is readily available to more than double the fuel efficiency of the Ford vehicle fleet.
Environmental Group Depicts Ford's Chief as Pinocchio

By FARA WARNER
Published: February 26, 2004

Ford is demanding that the group, Bluewater Network, which is based in San Francisco, stop "unlawful conduct" in a print and Internet campaign that attacks Ford's environmental policies.

Bluewater began running an ad in national and college publications earlier this month that said William Clay Ford Jr., the company's chairman and chief executive, had failed to make good on a promise the company made in 2000 to increase the fuel efficiency of its sport utility vehicles 25 percent by 2005.

The ad features a line drawing of Mr. Ford with an extra-long nose and the words: "Bill Ford Jr. or Pinocchio? Don't buy his environmental rhetoric. Don't buy his cars."

Ford's letter, sent by the law firm Kirkland & Ellis in Washington, says that Bluewater Network's campaign violates several laws.

The company contends that Bluewater is unlawfully using Ford's blue oval trademark on its Web site and that Bluewater has orchestrated a telephone call-in campaign to Mr. Ford's office that could be considered harassment.

Bluewater Network says it will not back down from its advertising campaign criticizing Ford.
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The director of Bluewater, Russell Long, said that the group had provided Mr. Ford's number to its organizers on college campuses but that it was given only to individuals who wanted to express their opinions and was never printed or posted on the group's Web site.

The letter does not demand that the group stop its campaign, and a Ford spokesman, Jim Vella, said the company understood the right of groups to make their opinions known.

But the letter does make clear what the company's position is on the caricature of Mr. Ford. "Your personal attacks on Mr. Ford are gratuitous and offensive, well beyond the scope of responsible and civil public dialogue, and strong evidence that you made the misrepresentations with malice," the letter reads. "We know you understand the seriousness of falsely and maliciously maligning the men and women of Ford Motor Company."

Mr. Long said that he had discussed the letter with his lawyers and would continue with the campaign despite what he called "Ford's intimidation tactics."

This recent dispute highlights the divide between environmental groups and Mr. Ford, whom they once considered an ally. It also reflects a growing difference of opinion among environmental groups on what tactics will work to force the industry to build cleaner and more fuel efficient vehicles.

In 2000, Mr. Ford pledged that the company, which was founded by his great-grandfather, would increase the fuel economy of its sport utility vehicles by 25 percent over five years. General Motors and DaimlerChrysler made the same pledge soon afterward. "When Bill Ford made his announcement, it was a golden moment," Mr. Long said. "We had found a single company willing to be a change agent."

But Mr. Long said that after three years Mr. Ford had done little to make good on his promise and had undermined legislation drafted by Senators John McCain, Republican of Arizona, and John Kerry, Democrat of Massachusetts, that would have doubled the industry's overall fuel economy to 36 miles a gallon by 2015.

Federal regulations require the auto industry to meet a corporate average fuel economy of 27.5 miles a gallon for its cars and 20.7 miles a gallon for its light trucks. Under revised regulations, light trucks must meet a standard of 22.2 miles a gallon by the 2007 model year.

Ford acknowledged in its corporate citizenship report last July that it had not met its promise to increase the fuel efficiency of its S.U.V.'s by 25 percent. In a letter included in the report, Mr. Ford wrote that the company was unable to make the investments in technologies needed to meet his goal. Since he became both chairman and chief executive in 2001, the company has grappled with declining revenue and market share.

But the company did note that the fuel efficiency of its S.U.V. fleet increased 5.2 percent in 2003; in 2002, its sport utilities were 8.4 percent more efficient than those in 2000. The company also points to the introduction of a hybrid electric version of the Ford Escape, a small S.U.V., as a sign that it continues to work on environmental initiatives.
Despite those explanations, several environmental groups have become disenchanted with the man and company they once thought would help compel Congress to increase fuel-economy regulations, which remained virtually unchanged through the 1990's.

They are, however, taking different, less adversarial tactics than Bluewater Network.

Last year, the Sierra Club ran ads during Ford's 100th anniversary celebrations depicting the company as a laggard in innovation. The ads featured innovations like the iPod music player that have replaced old technologies like the wind-up phonograph. Then it showed a Ford Model T, which got 25 miles a gallon, compared with the Ford Explorer, which gets 16 miles a gallon.

But the Sierra Club declined to sign on to Bluewater's Pinocchio ad, which was supported by Greenpeace and Public Citizen of California, among other groups.

"It wasn't our message," said Dan Becker, a global warming expert with the Sierra Club, which has 700,000 members. "We didn't want to be associated with it."

Mr. Long, a former America's Cup skipper, founded Bluewater Network eight years ago. It now has about 20,000 members and "e-activists," or people who have signed up online, and a budget of about $1 million, he said.

The group has been active in the battles to ban snowmobiles and personal watercraft from national parks. It also sponsored legislation in California to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from cars and trucks by 2009. The legislation was passed in 2002, but regulations on how to achieve the reductions will not be settled until 2005.

Although Mr. Long said he respected the tactics of other groups, he said environmental advocates had to take some responsibility for the lack of progress in increasing the auto industry's fuel efficiency.

"Environmental groups have been ineffective," he said. "Despite spending millions of dollars in this battle, we've failed."

Get home delivery of The Times from $2.90/week
Advertising: Environmental Group Depicts Ford's Chief as Pinocchio
"Corporations should be a major force for resolving social and environmental concerns in the 21st century."¹

"We have pledged to go beyond the requirements of the law to preserve and protect the environment."²

2000: Committed to increase Ford's average U.S. SUV fleet fuel mileage 25% by 2005.⁴

"Ford Motor Company believes that climate change is a serious environmental issue... We believe that appropriate actions should be taken now to address this long-term problem."⁶

"I want my company to be a leader in driving the transition to sustainability."⁸

Bill Ford personally lobbied Congress last year against increasing fuel mileage standards.

Ford's new cars and trucks are less efficient than the average for other major U.S. automakers, and in many class sizes, Ford offers the least-efficient models.³

2003: Publicly reneged on promise.⁵

Ford's new cars release more global warming pollution than any other major automaker in the country.⁷

Ford's new cars, SUV's, and trucks average only 23 miles per gallon, even though technology is readily available to produce vehicles nearly three times more efficient.⁹
Our Mission

Life on earth is imperiled by human degradation of the biosphere. Earth Island Institute develops and supports projects that counteract threats to the biological and cultural diversity that sustain the environment. Through education and activism, these projects promote the conservation, preservation, and restoration of the Earth.

Origins and Purpose

Earth Island Institute (EII), founded in 1982 by veteran environmentalist David Brower, fosters the efforts of creative individuals by providing organizational support in developing projects for the conservation, preservation, and restoration of the global environment. EII provides activists the freedom to develop program ideas, supported by services to help them pursue those ideas, with a minimum of bureaucracy (see our Staff Directory to contact members of our network services team).

Earth Island's Project Network consists of more than 30 projects worldwide (see our Project Directory for program and contact information). Through innovative education and activist campaigns, we are addressing many of the most pressing social and environmental issues:

- Protecting rainforests, marine mammals, sea turtles, and indigenous lands
- Promoting organic and sustainable agriculture, ecological paper alternatives, and the emerging Russian environmental movement
P. **APPENDIX**

**Informed Consent Agreement**

**Project Description:**

Global Warming is a growing concern in our society and the world. The goal of this project is to increase environmental consciousness of the problem, assess the current level of awareness and understand how that awareness is realized on the CSUH campus.

Participants are invited to take part in this project by filling out a sample survey or participating in one on one interviews. The student researcher as well as the environmental community will benefit from doing this research i.e. collecting the data.

By volunteering to participate students and staff have been told and understand the following:

1. My participation in this project is voluntary; there is no penalty for refusing to participate, either from the researcher or CSUH.
2. My name will not be used in any transcription or report unless I give specific permission.
3. The interview will take about one hour and will take place at a location agreed upon by me and the researcher.
4. The interviews will be tape recorded with my permission, however I may ask that the tape be turned off at any time for topics I prefer not to record.
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Environmental Issues Key Informant Interview
Informant: Dr. David Larsen
Date: 5/26/04   Time: Approx. 6 p.m.
Interviewer: James Munson

Interviewer: What are the ten most important environmental problems in the world today?
If you can't think of a full ten, then just think of what you can think of.

Respondent: "Does it have to be in rank order, or just 10 that come to mind?"

Interviewer: What comes to mind.

Respondent: "Overpopulation, or rapid population growth; Global Warming; Increasing scarcity of fresh water; Reduction in arable land, land that food crops can be grown on; Massive deforestation, particularly in world's tropics but also in the mid-latitudes; Industrial pollution, particularly air; Over consumption of everything, by everybody; Proliferation of nuclear armaments; Species extinction on a very large if not unprecedented scale with human experience."

Interviewer: Relative to other environmental problems how important would you say global warming is?

Respondent: "What did I list it at number two, It was the first or second thing that came to mind after massive population growth. I think the two are intertwined. Given the percent of the world's population that lives on coastal margins of the continents, whose homes would be compromised with significant rise in sea level, I would say global warming is very close to the top of our concerns in our lifetime."

Interviewer: Great.
How does mpg or Miles per gallon in our vehicles relate to global warming, as you understand it?

Respondent: "Well uhm its relationship is one of uhm fewer miles per gallon uhm the larger the consumption of petroleum products, uhm, the uhm the larger the consumption/burning of fossil fuels of internal combustion engines, and develop greater the likely hood of greenhouse gas formation and subsequently the link to global warming. I'd say the direct correlation uhm the lower the miles per gallon vehicles the more uhm than likely the ramifications of global warming will visit us in the near future."

Interviewer: "Yeah."
Do you drive an SUV, why or why not?

Respondent: "No, uhm it's an excessive billboard for a uhm consumption style that I don't appreciate."

Interviewer: Would you consider buying an SUV if it were a hybrid?

Respondent: "Yes, because I believe uhm that uh hybrid technology is probably a way to buy us another couple of centuries at current global consumption patterns. But I would recommend that, that entire vehicle fleet be hybrids. Mandatory."

Interviewer: "I will show you my anti-Ford campaign stuff after this."
Interviewer: Do SUV owners have any effect on United States foreign policy, if so how would you describe these effects?

Respondent: “You know, I would say that the owners of SUVs don't have a direct effect on foreign policy. Certainly the global automobile makers have made a decision to produce and market these vehicles and American consumers especially are have shown themselves to be easily seduced by producers and marketers. I think the reason the are so many SUVs is that this was a decision by Detroit and Japan to produce vehicles that got around cafe standards, umh and then sold them to American public that was all to eager to buy what’s new.

Interviewer: “Good Answer.”

Why are automobile makers so slow in designing fuel-efficient vehicles?

Respondent: “No pressure. Uhm, No pressure from the legislature branch. They got them all bought off. We have what we have we have congress that makes laws in this country and if there were much more astringent fuel efficiency standards, every vehicle from Chrysler Mini Coopers to 18 wheelers would be more fuel efficient. The technology is there. Remember, we put people on the moon 35 years ago and brought them back three different times. We can make more fuel-efficient vehicles in 2004. We are a technology superpower. We can do it.”

Interviewer: “We could. Were you done with that?”

Respondent: “Uhunm.”

Interviewer: “OK.”

What ideas or suggestions do you have to decrease fossil fuel dependence in America?

Respondent: “Uhm. In the, the, larger metropolitan areas of our country, there has to be much more efficient mass transit. Affordable. Safe. Efficient mass transit. Between larger urban areas, we need a network of high speed dedicated rail transportation. Some people say bullet trains, I would say something maybe uh, uh, not quite so evocative, but certainly high speed ground transportation that would provide a pleasant alternative to interstate freeways. And then ultimately down to the vehicle level itself, uhm, a legislation that would pretty much phase out starting immediately and over the course of 5 years present configuration of internal-combustion engines replace them with hybrid technology or fuel cell vehicles. So it’s a multi-pronged approach you know invest the info-structure in public mass-transit in places where you have people piled up. They are already there, give them an alternative to uh, burning their own private fossil fuel stash. Yeah.

“Stanbar all the way around the bay.”

Interviewer: How do you feel about the current condition of the local environment and can you give a few specifics?

Respondent: “By local I presume you mean our bay area uh, or are you talking about the east bay? What is the scale on local environment?

Interviewer: “Yeah, Bay Area.”

Respondent: “Well, whenever I uh, travel to other metro regions of the United States, almost without exception, I am reminded how well off we have it here in the Bay Area. Largely due to uh groups of individuals a generation or two ago or three ago that had the foresight to preserve our most precious resources uh, basically the rich lands that surround San Francisco Bay are roped off from development and Bay Area Ridge Trail, uh, the individuals that banded together 40 years ago
Interviewer: Why does the environmental behavior of other countries have an effect on the United States?

Respondent: "I am not quite sure of the intent of that question. How could you interpret that?"

Interviewer: "You know, I almost thought that it was how does the environmental behaviors of other countries effect the United States. I am not sure how it got changed or what."

Respondent: "Certainly that feeds right in to American, American's society's belief that consumption and cheap products are an American birth right. UHM whether its hum uhm, whether its furniture from exotic woods in Tropical Africa or south America or Southeast Asia, or cheap oxycyte from Jamaica, cheap aluminum for aluminum products in America. There are parts around the world where that have pretty much opened their doors to exploitation, destructive exploitation of their national endowment. Uhm largely to produce products that would be marketed uh to the industrial world, western Europe, America, Canada, Japan. Yeah, uhm, the effects on the US are this rapid sorta destructive environmental behavior that in the developing world, tropical world uhm is results in keeping the US consumer amply supplied for everything for on the cheap. We are not truly paying a true earth cost for our products. These other countries are subsidizing our wanton consumption patterns.

Interviewer: "OK"

What do you see as the most serious environmental destructive activity over the next 50 years?

Respondent: "Well since uh, since about 1984, I have been convinced that the age of petroleum will peak and start sliding down somewhere around 2040-2045. So, uh, that's just literature that I had read in mid 1970 that I bought in, it's almost my bible. You believe these petroleum geologists that said the age of oil will end by the middle of the 21st century there's not going to be any. So, what I see is an absolute massive run-up to sort of the end of oil. A free for all just like the California gold rush. And anyone who can get in on it, will get in on it. The price will rise as scarcity looms. Uhm there will be massive consumption. There will be ..The big players will already have the next thing ready. The reason why we do not have fuel cells on all these vehicles is that we still have about 50 years of oil left. There is a very good reason why 20 years ago the major oil companies were buying firms that manufactured Carabonic dishes and other solar equipment. They wanted to be ready for the next. They wanted to have it. And uhm why oil companies have always invested very heavily in uranium mining for whatever goes back in a big way to nuclear power. Who owns the uranium? The oil companies do. So the most seriously destructive environmental activity would probably be continual massive use. By use I mean burning of fossil fuels—coal for the developing world, petroleum for the industrialize and industrializing world, and the consequences of petroleum fossil fuel burning would include many things most probable global warming, but Jesus, acid rain, and uhm other localized air-pollution effects, public health-consequences of very bad pollution, It all comes back to fossil fuels for me.

Interviewer: "Awesome."
Environmental Issues Key Informant Interview
Informant: Dr. David Woo
Date: 5/26/04 Time: Approx. 5 p.m.
Interviewer: James Munson

Interviewer: What are the ten most important environmental problems in the world today? If you can’t think of a full ten, then just think of what you can think of.

Respondent: “Ten”

Interviewer: or as many as you want to come up with.

Respondent: “Overpopulations; Urbanizations, what they can sprout in that sense; Ugh, War which is maybe an indirect, ugh, impact on the environment; uhm, Technological Breakthroughs, especially in terms of the environmental engineer I think there is potential problems; Fossil Fuel Exploitations. About how many?”

Interviewer: That’s about five.

Respondent: “Is that good enough?”

Interviewer: Yeah, yeah, whatever you feel comfortable with. OK

2) Relative to other environmental problems how important would you say global warming is?

Respondent: Could you say it again?

Interviewer: Relative to other environmental problems how important would you say global warming is?

Respondent: How important global warming is? That’s one of the results of the problems. I think, uhm, I would not rank Global Warming as among the most important, because Global Warming in a sense, the concept, is still under debate. And, uhm, also, we are dealing with a more longer-term effects. And, uhm it maybe a problem that is uhm that is uhm beyond human control; it might be something that is a natural cycle occurrence, and, ugh, so I think that it is a problem, it’s a concern, but I would not rank it as the immediate importance.

Interviewer: OK.

3) How does mpg or Miles per gallon in our vehicles relate to global warming, as you understand it?

Respondent: How many miles?

Interviewer: Miles per gallon, how many miles per gallon your car gets.

Respondent: How many miles is related to global warming?

Interviewer: Some would say that gas emissions, the injection of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere is directly related to a large part of the amount of gasoline we use in our vehicles.

Respondent: Yes, uhm, but I don’t understand the question. How many miles per gallon that is relate to contribute to global warming?

Interviewer: Say I am driving an SUV, and I have this SUV that gets 15 MPG and you are driving a Lexus TS 300 or something and you get 25 MPG. So how would that effect or the two different vehicles effect global warming?
Respondent: “It depends how often you drive.”
Interviewer: Same amount of time.
Respondent: “Same distance, the same amount of time? Well then, of course, the lower the gas mileage, the greater the contribility to the global warming.”
Interviewer: OK.
Respondent: “OK, but it was based on a lot of assumption, though.” (Both parties laughing)
Interviewer: As long as you understand it.
Respondent: 4) Do you drive an SUV, why or why not?
Respondent: Uhm, my wife has an SUV. Once in a while, I drove her SUV, does it qualify?
Interviewer: Yeah, Yeah.
Interviewer: 4) Would you be more inclined to buy an SUV if it were a hybrid?
Respondent: No. I don’t like SUV to start with.
Interviewer: 5) Do SUV owners have any effect on United States foreign policy, if so how would you describe these effects?
Respondent: Well, you can link indirectly, with a lot of assumption again. For example, the more uhm, SUV drivers there are in the US, the higher the ugh demand oil or the oil consumption, the higher, the greater dependency the US is on foreign oil. In addition, of course we, many people think that our foreign policy is very much related to our supply of the oil from the Persian Gulf and other places. So you can say that indirectly, that the SUV drivers have an indirect impact on our foreign policy. But, I don’t think it is a very direct link, though, because it all depends on, uhm, our presidency and who sets the priority in foreign policy and uhm, for example, uhm, if uhm, our presidency is willing to force the big three auto company to work on technological breakthroughs in terms on increasing gas mileage of SUV, and that will counteract the SUV’s effect on US policy, of oil driven US policy.
Interviewer: When you say, big three, you mean Chrysler, ....
Respondent: Chrysler, Ford, and GM. (more talking, unable to make it out.)
Interviewer: 6) Why are automobile makers so slow in designing fuel-efficient vehicles?
Respondent: We have too many special interests groups uhm, in Washington D.C. to lobby the uh, legislature, Congressmen, and the Administration in such a way that uhm, that they are uhm, thinking about uhm, immediate economic term profit maximizing of the companies, instead of looking at the long run, I don’t think America is lacking behind in terms of technology in improving gasoline mileage its just that ugh the government for one thing is not pushing hard enough ugh, and the second thing is that uhm, uhm, the big three administrator, uhm, committed in developing that technology. You can look at contrast for the Japanese companies for example, look at Toyota, Honda. I don’t think our big three companies anything lack in terms of technology and funding in terms of hybrid fuel cell alternate technology. Its just that a matter of commitment of our
resources. And um, we always blame the public about their taste. They like the big cars, they like the powerful cars, which is of course one of the problems. But, then again, we can always produce big and powerful fuel-efficient cars. We have the technology to do that. It’s just that we don’t have the political atmosphere to force us to do things like that.

Interviewer: Good Answer.

7) What ideas or suggestions do you have to decrease fossil fuel dependence in America?

Respondent: “Decrease fossil fuel dependence in America? Higher prices of gasoline it will help. Because it is very hard to convince regular drivers in terms of their environmental consciousness. Its much easier to convince/persuade them by using economically terms. If the gasoline price is over $4 a gallon, our uh, regular assistants will drive less whether they are an environmentalist or not. It’s not that they like to protect the environment, but that they want to protect the purse of their wallet. It seems that it would work more efficiently that way. So, this is one of the way I would think a very needed, a effective way of reducing oil consumption of the public.”

Interviewer: Then, we are hurt.

8) How do you feel about the current condition of the local environment and can you give a few specifics? By local, I mean the Bay Area.

Respondent: Oh, current conditions, you mean environmental conditions?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: Comparatively, um, I think we are living in one of the better conditions area or regions in America. Uh, partly because of the lay of the land, the locations the weather, the uh, and the other that the general public in the Bay Area is more environmentally friendly and conscientious and that helps. And, thirdly, we don’t have that high population density in the Bay Area that we had in the San Diego area. So, uh, of course we do not live in paradise, an environmental paradise, but I mean we are living in an environmentally healthier region than many places in the U.S.

Interviewer: All right.

9) How do you feel about the current condition of the global environment and can you give me some specifics?

Respondent: Current conditions of the global environment is deteriorating really fast, for example I do concern about China. The rapid economic development in China, uh, has set the priority in such a way that, uh, economic returns is most important determinants, uh, of policies being dictated. Uh, and of course at the expense, the large expense of the environment. Uh, for example, china right now is one of the biggest importer of American industrial waste, or urban waste from recycling facilities. For example we are sending old cell phones, car batteries, computer parts and all these things back to China for them to recover whatever chemicals or parts they can recover from those wastes. This is one way for the US to get rid of the waste and the other way for the Chinese to get some economic return out of this at the expense of the environment. And, uh, it’s the way that China’s been developing, which is regionally uneven, mostly in the coastal area which also draw a lot of imbalance a surge of population moving from the interior China into coastal area, concentrating the population density along the coastal area which of course will result, or quicken the deterioration of the environment. And now the problem is being China is 1/5 the world’s populations and they have a cultural engine cultural production engine that is slowing down at the expense of economic more industrial development and that means there will be more demands
of food imported from outside. And that also cause a concern. Another problem is when China started industrialize, there will be more demand on fossil fuel globally and more demand on materials uhmm, and there will be greater creation of waste due to industrializations and organizations and all these things all contribute to the degradation's of the environment. Wars of course in the Middle East have been a constant and of course and more degradation's go with any kind of conflicts. These are just some of the example. And of course, Africa, let’s look at Africa and the civil wars and the or uh, things that are happening in Sudan and Ethiopia, and uhmm, in Central and Eastern Africa. Aids epidemics and all these things have negative impacts on the environment.

Interviewer: 10) How does the environmental behavior of other countries have an effect on the United States?

Respondent: “Say that again.”

Interviewer: 10) How does the environmental behavior of other countries have an effect on the United States?

Respondent: “How does environmental behavior, uh”

Interviewer: You just said one. Well, they are allowing us to dump our waste there because their laws are different.

Respondent: Well, it actually is, you should ask it in reverse. How does the U.S. behavior effect other county? I think that is a much more prominent problem than the other way around. The U.S. is the biggest consumption of energy, the fossil fuels, and also the biggest creator of garbage, of waste, uhmm, we have been constantly shipping, getting rid of waste at the expense of others. And uhmm, our foreign policy is not environmentally friendly. But then again, uhmm, to answer your questions,

Earlier I mentioned about the development of China, it seems that the U.S. has been using that as a part of the explanation of high gasoline prices these days. Because of the increase of global demand of oil coming from the development of China or maybe perhaps of upcoming India. Uhmm, I think the U.S., the way that we have been operating in this global village is that we operate in more or less in isolation in especially in context of environmental concern. We are out of the proper protocol and we have been more or less working at our own pace at our own will in terms of our interpretation of environment. I do not think we have much of a global cooperation in that sense and uhmm the Japanese and Europeans has the much more in terms of the government policies have a much more environmental friendly than ours, especially in the past few years.

Interviewer: 11) What do you see as the most serious environmental destructive activity over the next 50 years?

Respondent: (Laughing) “I don’t know in the next 50 years (more laughing), in the past 50 years I may be able to speculate and answer, the next 50 years, I do not know. Uhmm... Probably I guess, things related to nuclear energy. Its about this answer that I do worry about that. Uhmm, Of course, 50 years from now our population should have already doubled and uhmm, so uhmm, so overpopulation should be a major problems that goes with of course lack of water—water resources in terms of competition in terms of water resources and mineral resources, illness and Aids those types of epidemics are going to be a fact of life. But, I do bear much concern about nuclear related problems maybe through conflicts or maybe through accident, uhmm, eventually we are going to run out of oil and nuclear energy is going to be picked up again for in terms of development. And, uhmm, NASA will come up with technological breakthrough real quick in terms of how to deal with nuclear waste and it is going to be a big potential problem in part for environmental problems. Yeh, uhmm, I think that’s my prediction.”
Interviewer: All right. Well, that’s the end of the questions, I thank you very much for your time.

Respondent: “You’re very welcome”.
Interviewer. This is a taped interview with Dr. Scott Stein. Today is May 12th, approximately 3 p.m. We have a series of questions we feel reflect Cal State Hayward and its staff, and its environmental department. This study is looking at different ways that environmental education is realized at Cal State Hayward. This is a comparative study with Abu Clark, who is doing a study in the community surrounding the same questions on awareness of environmental issues.

Interviewer. What are the important environmental problems in the world today?

Informant. You know, the tendency will be for me to have been reminded of certain things by going through the list here. I don’t know if that’s the intention or not. [crosstalk about interview procedure] Are these supposed to be ranked, or the ten most important ones?

Interviewer. The ten most important ones.

Informant. I would say that one of them is overpopulation, and that’s a very, very important one. I would say a second one is over consumption of goods, particularly by industrialized countries, but particularly by the United States. I would say third is an undereducation of the populace on environmental issues, and I would include there, at the very top of the list, not countries where people don’t get to go to school. I would say the United States of America. I would say we have no education whatsoever as to the consequences of our own actions. We have an underdeveloped sense of consequence, and as a result, we can bemoan all we want the environmental problems of the world while we are
driving our SUVs, and drinking Coca Cola and throwing the cans away, or even recycling the cans – it doesn’t matter – buying little tiny containers of yogurt rather than buying big containers and reusing the small containers to take to work with us, and stuff like that. I mean, we are just absurdly undereducated as to the consequences of our actions, and that is hugely environmental.

Fourth, I would say that there are lots of inadvertent actions, among them, the transport and release of organisms into the environment. I’m not talking about the purposeful release, like introducing quail, because it’s a nice hunting bird, into New Zealand, or introducing pheasant, because it’s a nice hunting bird, into the United States. I’m talking here about the inadvertent transport of organisms – macro and microorganisms all over the planet.

And in some cases, these are disease-size organisms like viruses like AIDS, and in other cases, they are larger things like the zebra mussel, for example, that’s coming in in the ballast of ships. Ships come from Asia into San Francisco Bay, and they unload their cargo, or they take on cargo. Let’s say they take on cargo in San Francisco Bay. As they sink lower and lower in the water, they then have to let out water from their ballast system in the hull of the boat that they took on in China. When they let out that ballast water that they took on in China, they’re releasing Chinese organisms into San Francisco Bay.

And this is something that is just hugely problematical now, and will probably result in the demise of dozens, if not hundreds of species, extinction of dozens, if not hundreds of species, in the world. Because these new things come in, they don’t have any predators in their new environment, and they completely take over an environment. So, that would be a big one as well. Another one would be ... let’s see, we’ve solved a hell of a lot of the world’s problems if we can become aware of those things. I would have to say that putting a leash around the
The capitalist system is very, very important as well. By that, I don't mean to imply that therefore, we need to go communist. There are lots of people, when they hear criticism of capitalism, immediately they jump, "Therefore, you're for communism." It isn't that at all. I just think that we need to get on a sustainable economy and on a sustainable way of life in terms of consumption of goods that can be sustained indefinitely through natural processes without degrading the systems and the processes, and the biological and physical entities, and the energy systems on which we all depend. We've got to get on this sustainable system. And to do that is to buck the corporations, and the corporations have the media – so how do you get through to people that commercials are inherently brainwashing, and all the commercials are trying to do is get you to consume a particular item, which is resources. It constitutes resources. How in the world do you get to people? How do you get information to people other than through the media, which is corporate-controlled? So, it's a big problem. You bring those under control, and most everything else is going to fall into place. I might go back and say that in the matter of population, it in many ways boils down to educating women. And I don't mean men educating women, and I don't mean training women to have fewer children. I mean allowing women to have access to information and knowledge and education. And educated women have smaller families, and fewer children, and so, that's one of the things that we really need to do, in terms of bang for the buck – we ought to be educating the world's women to the extent that we can, and providing all women who want it with birth control. Cheap, cheap, cheap – for pennies we could be doing this. Pennies per woman. Again, it ought to be women educating the women. Men have had their say, and it hasn't been a very good say. So anyway, women should have access to other women to educate in the big, capital E sense of the word.
Interviewer. That was seven. Are you happy?

Informant. Yes. Eight, we’ve got to eat lower on the food chain. We’ve got to eat lower on the food chain. This idea of thinking that we need to consume meat is ridiculous, and it really does despoil huge amounts of land in the world that could then be allowed to go back to nature.

Interviewer. Relative to other environment problems, how important would you say global warming is?

Informant. It’s funny that I, as a climatologist, didn’t mention global warming. I just think that global warming is a result of these other things. It’s one manifestation of all these other things. How important do I think it is? Amongst the manifestations of the problems that I talked about, I think it’s hugely important, hugely important. In fact, there are some other interviews that I have to do later this week about exactly that. Yeah, I would say climate change, human-induced climate change is horribly important, and it isn’t just global warming. That’s what the media and, in fact, environmental organizations, it’s how they express the problem, but there is much more to the problem than just a warming climate. There’s a redistribution of mass in the atmosphere, some areas that are now wet are going to turn dry, some areas that are now dry are going to turn to turn wet. It’s going to be a mess. And it has huge implications for the natural flora and fauna of the world. So, yeah, I’d put it way, way up high.
**Interviewer.** How does the mileage per gallon in our vehicles relate to global warming as you understand it?

**Informant.** It's one of the very big factors. If Americans were to drive half as much, or drive vehicles that got twice as many miles per gallons, then that halve the amount of carbon, and therefore halve the amount of carbon dioxide that presently results from driving. Now, that isn't everything, because a lot of the food we eat has been delivered by trains and planes and they're all contributing carbon, too. So, just the fact that we're going to a store and eating, even if we walk to the store, means that we're consuming a hell of a lot of ... indirectly dumping a lot of carbon. We're responsible for dumping a lot of carbon, but our driving is a big, big part of it. So, it's a big element of it. Drive half as much, or drive cars that get twice the gas mileage, and we cut back by a factor of two on our carbon input from driving to the atmosphere.

**Interviewer.** Would you consider buying an SUV if it was a hybrid?

**Informant.** No. I wouldn't. Not even if it was a hybrid. No.

**Interviewer.** Do you drive an SUV? Why or why not?

**Informant.** The SUV is a strange term. Sports Utility Vehicle is by law a very certain thing, and it's a term that was devised by lawyers for the automobile to get them – the automobile industry – around CAFE standards. CAFE standards – C-A-F-E stand for Corporate Auto Fuel Efficiency standard. And the way the law was written means that every corporation producing or selling cars in the United States had to be producing and selling cars that on average got ... I think it was 27.5 miles per gallon. But pickup trucks were exempt from that, because after all, pickup trucks are used by industry, and they're used by farmers, and they're
used ... and that was legitimate. You don’t want to include this in there – they get horrible gas mileage. Well, the auto industry then wanted to start producing these big vehicles, and started to produce these big vehicles that later became called SUVs, but they were throwing off the ability - the automobile industry’s ability to make this 27.5 miles per gallon limit that the United States had set, that you’ve got to get this on average. And so, the auto industry, with the help of legislators from auto-producing states and others, simply defined their way out of it. They simply said, we won’t call these vehicles here “cars.” We won’t call them automobiles. We’ll come up with a new name: Sports utility vehicle. So, there’s this very specific definition of what constitutes a sports utility vehicle that allows the car industry now to produce these things that no longer fall under the laws of Corporate Auto Fuel Efficiency standards. And so, with that in mind, what was the question again is …?

**Interviewer.** Would you consider buying an SUV if it was a hybrid? And if not, why not?

**Informant.** Actually, no, it’s a little trickier than that. I have a 1982 Toyota Land Cruiser, four-wheel drive that I use for field work, and only for field work. It gets 16 miles per gallon.

**Interviewer.** So that would be a science utility vehicle.

**Informant.** Well, no, the fact of the matter is, and I’m not trying to split hairs here. That was made before this definition came out, and therefore, it is not a sports utility vehicle. It is not, by legal definition, a sports utility vehicle. I’m sounding like Clinton here, I realize. So, I do drive, when during field work, when doing science, and when doing the consulting – and only, even then, when I have to drive on dirt roads and may have to do four-wheel drive. Not going off-road, but just shitty roads. I take that thing. Would I buy an SUV? No, I wouldn’t. I wouldn’t for two reasons: A) I wouldn’t want to contribute to what SUVs
rewarded for driving a little by not having to pay much in insurance. Those who drive a lot, or drive vehicles that consume a lot, would end up paying a lot of insurance, as they damn well should, not only because they’re on the road more, but in the case of the bigger vehicle, they’re out there doing more damage to other people than people who drive small cars. So they ought to be paying, if only for that, more in insurance. So, there would be … I don’t know what I have you, three or four different ways of using the good old capitalistic system to cut away subsidies, to be more fair, to raise the price of gasoline, and to get people to drive … to get people to consume less gas.

**Interviewer.** How do you feel about the current condition of the environment in the Bay Area? Can you give specifics?

**Informant.** Yeah, we have way too many people. We’re blessed with this single-family Bay that not only keeps our air far fresher than it would otherwise be, but allows us, and most places in the Bay Area, to be able to see beyond the city. Most people in the Bay Area can look in some direction and see beyond the city, and see big, huge wide open spaces, which I think are important to the human mind. But these are things that are just naturally here. We’re doing our damndest to wreck them. Water quality is going down, because we continue to bow to big agriculture. Air quality is going down, because we continue to bow to industry. Urban sprawl continues to go out in the margins, and will continue to as long as gas is cheaper than Coca Cola, because people can afford to commute, as long as gasoline is artificially cheap. And it’s becoming more and more commercialized all the time, which is environmentally – to me, environmentally degrading. On the good side, in addition to having the relatively fresh air, being right here on the Bay, right on the Western edge of the Pacific, the mother of all oceans. We have things like East Bay Regional Park District, which is
phenomenal, and it maintains huge amounts of open space that we have access to. So that
would be my sense of the Bay Area.

**Interviewer.** How do you feel about the current condition of the global environment?
Specifics?

**Informant.** In a sense, I had that in mind when I answered your first question. The global
environment is very rapidly being degraded in the name of consumerism and the corporate
world on the one hand, and increased population on the other hand. Am I optimistic? Yeah,
no. I’m not pessimistic. Put it that way. I’m not pessimistic. I think that we stand a good
chance of doing some very bad things here in terms of the demise of species, the
bastardization of natural systems, on which we all depend. And I think we’re right on the
threshold here of some potentially very, very bad things of the sorts that I talked about in
your question number 1.

**Interviewer.** Do you think that ten is too redundant?

**Informant.** No, I don’t.

**Interviewer.** 11 – How does the environmental behavior of other countries affected the
United States?

**Informant.** I’ll give you two reasons. Effects on the United States – well, it has an
environmental effect on the United States in at least one way, in that some of our systems,
some of our current systems, like the ocean circulation system and the atmospheric
circulation system – they’re one system, they’re global. And so, if China, for example, is
putting huge amounts of carbon – they’re not up to American standards yet – but they’re
growing in their carbon production far, far faster than we are, and they’re going to overtake
us pretty damn soon, and go shooting way, way beyond us. And that is, of course, affecting
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Ford still makes America's worst gas guzzlers.

That's bad news for global warming.

When Bill Ford Jr. took the reins as Ford Motor Company's CEO, he proudly claimed to be a "lifetime environmentalist." He promised to turn his company into a force for environmental good by improving SUV fuel mileage and reducing global warming pollution.

While Ford hyped its new hybrid Escape SUV, it is also introducing new gas guzzling cars and trucks, negating the benefits of its hybrids. This means that new Ford vehicles, on average, continue to cause more global warming pollution than those made by any other major automaker - even GM, the producer of the behemoth Hummer. And Fords are more gas guzzling, on average, than its own century-old Model T.

Bill Ford: Genuine Environmentalist or Corporate Polluter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Bill Ford Sold</th>
<th>What Bill Ford Did</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000: &quot;Ford Motor Company believes that climate change is a serious environmental issue. Appropriate action should be taken now to address this long-term problem.&quot; - Bill Ford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000: Ford commits to increasing the fuel mileage of its SUV fleet 25% by 2005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000: &quot;I want my company to be a leader in driving the transition to (sustainability).&quot; - Bill Ford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004: Bill Ford expresses increasing fuel mileage standards which would reduce global warming and other pollution, and lower U.S. dependence on foreign oil.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2004: Ford's average new vehicles cause the most global warming pollution of all major U.S. automakers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The technology is sitting on the shelf to increase Ford's average fuel efficiency to 40 mpg. Converting the fleet to gas-electric hybrids would raise it to 60 mpg. That would be money in the bank for motorists hit by higher gas prices. And we would all benefit from cleaner air, and reduced risk of catastrophic global warming, dependence on foreign oil and related threats to national security.

Bill Ford has been negligent. He has betrayed our children's future. Tell him you won't buy his cars or invest in his company until he fulfills his promises.

Sign the coupon below or visit www.bluewaternetwork.org.

Don't Buy Bill Ford's Environmental Promises. Don't Buy His Cars.

Dear Mr. Ford:

You have repeatedly broken your promises to cut global warming pollution from Ford vehicles, raise its fuel efficiency and be a leader in "resolving social and environmental concerns in the 21st century." Indeed, Ford's environmental impacts have gotten worse under your leadership. To protect our children's future, I pledge not to buy your vehicles (including Volvo, Mazda, Jaguar and Land/Ranger Rover) until your vehicles are climate-friendly, and you convince Congress to double the nation's fuel mileage standards.

NAME ____________________________

ADDRESS ____________________________

CITY, STATE, ZIP ____________________________

EMAIL ____________________________

Bluewater Network
311 California St. Suite 510
San Francisco, CA 94114

I agree. I plan to call Ford this week to tell Ford this. I promise to call friends and tell them to do the same.

Sign the coupon below or visit www.bluewaternetwork.org.

Don't Buy Bill Ford's Environmental Promises. Don't Buy His Cars.

NAME ____________________________

ADDRESS ____________________________

CITY, STATE, ZIP ____________________________

EMAIL ____________________________
APPENDIX

Key informant interview Questions

1. What are the important environmental problems in the world today?

2. Relative to other environmental problems, how important would you say global warming is?

3. How does MPG in our vehicles relate to Global Warming as you understand it?

4. Would you consider buying an SUV if it was a hybrid?

5. Do you drive a SUV? Why, why not?

6. Do SUV owners have any effect on the United States foreign policy? If so how would you describe these effects?

7. Why are automobile makers so slow in designing fuel efficient vehicles?

8. What ideas or suggestions do you have to decrease fossil fuel dependence in America?

9. How do you feel about the current condition of the local environment in the bay area? Can you give some specifics?

10. How do you feel about the current condition of the global environment? Can you give some specifics?

11. Why does the environmental behavior of other countries have effects on the United States?

12. What do you see as the most serious environmentally destructive problem over the next fifty years?
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California State University Hayward
Department of Anthropology Internship Plan

Basic Internship Information

Intern: James Munson
Intern Phone: (510) 468-3852
Faculty Adviser: Laurie Price Ph.D.
Adviser Phone: (510) 885-3094
Committee Member: Alan Almquist, Ph.D.
Committee Member Phone: (510) 885-7509

Name of Placement: Bluewater Network
Placement Address: 311 California St., Suite 510
San Francisco, CA 94104

Preceptors Name: Elisa Lynch-Global Warming Campaign Director
Preceptor’s Phone: (415) 544-0790 #15
Preceptor’s Fax: (415) 544-0796

Description of Placement Organization

Mission Statement
Bluewater Network's mission is to champion innovative solutions and inspire individuals to protect the earth's finite and vulnerable ecosystems. Bluewater Network promotes critical policy changes in government and industry to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and eradicate other root causes of air and water pollution, global warming, and natural habitat destruction.

Bluewater Network conceived, drafted, and championed the California Climate-Friendly Car Law, (which was authored by Assembly Member Fran Pavley), and will provide technical and legal support to the state to ensure optimal implementation of the law, as well as its survival of an almost certain legal challenge from the auto industry. Because of California's economic size and the state's special status under the Clean Air Act, the California Climate-Friendly Car Law is poised to have significant impact on reduction of greenhouse gas production nationwide. This law is a substantial victory for Bluewater Network and the planet! Bluewater Network continues to educate policy makers about the benefits of efficient technologies and renewable fuels.

Bluewater Network helped bring to light the fact that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Transportation overestimated the average fuel economy of passenger vehicles, misleading Congress and consumers. Dr. Russell Long founded the Bluewater Network in 1996.
Description of Internship Work

My role as an Intern with Bluewater Network is to promote the demands and the boycott unleashed nationwide by Bluewater Network, asking Ford to comply with previous promises and to protect the planet. I will work with Bluewater Network to urge Ford to:

- Produce all Ford vehicles with zero tailpipe greenhouse gas emissions by 2017;
- Starting by offering a cost-competitive hydrogen-powered internal combustion engine vehicle by 2007;
- Immediately agree to honor its pledge to increase SUV fuel economy by 25 percent;
- Vigorously lobby Congress and the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers (AAM) to double CAFE standards;
- Actively support California’s new greenhouse gas legislation. AB 1493 by filing an amicus brief supporting the state in any legal challenge by the auto or oil industry, and refusing to participate in any legal challenge by the AAM;
- Support an international policy initiative to double passenger vehicle fuel efficiency and eliminate tailpipe greenhouse gases.

I will pursue ways of applying pressure on Ford in an on-going effort to get compliance with the above mentioned goals/demands. Some of these ways include, but are not limited to, recruiting coordinators at each bay area college who will assist in enlisting groups of student supporters from their individual colleges and local communities who will participate in the campaign through call-in days, postcard drives and public environmental education events. Some of these events will include multiple campus rallies to gain public awareness and support.

Methods used to meet these goals may include in class presentations and promotion/recruitment tables at multiple campuses. Once contacts have been established, immediate follow up will be made to encourage new involvement. Once a person has demonstrated an interest; responsibilities can be distributed to them in an attempt to encourage environmental leadership and prolonged involvement in the campaign against Ford. By taking these steps, we will insure further environmental protection in addition to activities to support the Ford boycott. As incentives, each student participant will receive a letter of appreciation for their work on the campaign.

My Time Commitment

I will work 30-40 hours a week as needed from February 27th to April a total of 8-10 weeks depending on the amount of time spent per week on the campaign. I will be available only by e-mail and cell phone from March 19-29. The majority of my time will be spent networking and finding recruits out in the field to assist in campaign events. Time in office will be used to consult with Bluewater advisors, conduct group meetings and perform other tasks deemed necessary by Bluewater Network. I anticipate using the San Francisco office as a central hub to coordinate with colleges throughout the bay area.
Deliverables

Each week, I will meet with project leaders/coordinators from each campus as I recruit them to the Bluewater Network campaign. The purpose of these meetings will be to update each other to any changes/results from the campaign as well as to brainstorm and plan new weekly/monthly events. I will write reports on all events; these reports will be turned in to Bluewater Network. News broadcast advisories and news media releases will be a part of each action taken that is seen to be news worthy by Bluewater Network. All news related items will be sent to Bluewater Network for approval and filing.

Learning Objectives

As an academically inspired environmental Anthropologist, my goal is to actively work on the frontlines to ensure environmental protection. Furthermore I hope to learn how political movements can help bring sustainable resource management to our communities and the world. I will be exploring how Applied Anthropological skills (such as ethnographic methods, advocacy, needs assessment and public forums) can help the fight against global warming. This in combination with my Geography and Environmental scholastic background, will effective the fight for environmental protection as a professional.

Items that would be helpful include;

1. Desk.
2. Computer.
3. E-mail address.
4. Phone with voice mail.
5. Periodic use of a conference room.
'Let's Sue the Bastards!' (or, 'Why Litigation Works')
by Russell Long

Years ago, Herbert Chao Gunther, the director of the Public Media Center, told me that suing one's adversaries in an environmental campaign is a great tactic because it not only provides a real opportunity to achieve victory, but it forces the other side to respect you.

Herb's time-tested words have been proven true for Bluewater Network. In the past five years, we've found that suing corporate polluters and obstructionist regulatory agencies elevates the status of a campaign that might otherwise just be considered a minor thorn in someone's side. It also forces the opposition to expend valuable time, expense and effort fighting our attack, both legally and in the court of public opinion.

Legal fights also provide a fabulous media hook, which has allowed Bluewater to tell the world our side of the story. This was just as true in our first lawsuit in 1996 as in our recent ones.

Our first (and still ongoing) campaign was a battle against recreational marine engine manufacturers who were dumping 150 million gallons of fuel a year into the nation's waters from the antiquated two-stroke engine designs powering their jet skis and outboards.

Bluewater Network hit them with a double dose of trouble, suing both the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for ignoring our petition to ban these engines, and nine marine engine manufacturers for ongoing sales.

We held a heavily attended press conference to announce the suits, during which we exhibited two clear plexiglass water tanks. One contained a dirty two-stroke engine and the other held a clean-burning four-stroke. Running the two-stroke for 30 minutes left a large oil slick in its tank—an image that was broadcast across the country on CNN. This image served as a wakeup call for an industry that had never before been aggressively pursued by an environmental organization.

Our lawsuits led to invitations to debate marine engine manufacturers before the nation's most important boating journalists at a national boat show. We were asked to submit op-eds to national magazines and to provide expert testimony for banning two-strokes in Lake Tahoe and other sensitive waters. These efforts culminated in a ban on the sale of conventional two-stroke jet skis in California and the development of a marine eco-label program that is now used across the nation. The suits against the manufacturers were finally settled for $300,000, which Bluewater redistributed to other environmental organizations.
When the Royal Caribbean-owned cruise ship *Mercury* dumped pollutants including detergents containing lead, cadmium, and arsenic into San Francisco Bay, it gave us the opportunity to tell the media about the millions of gallons of treated and untreated sewage and other cruise ship waste dumped into US waters every day. Bluewater sent Royal Caribbean a notice of intent-to-sue but, before we filed our claim, the US Department of Justice stepped in to take over the case. Media attention generated by the incident helped Bluewater get legislation passed in California and Alaska that should significantly reduce cruise ship pollution.

Bluewater also sued the EPA for refusing to reduce the tremendous levels of air pollution from the world's biggest ships, including oil tankers, container ships, and bulk carriers. These ships cause a staggering 14 percent of all global nitrogen-oxide pollution, which causes smog in port and at sea. It also causes 16 percent of all sulfur pollution from petroleum sources, which leads to acid rain, climate change and public health problems for vessel crews, dockworkers and people who live near major shipyards and port facilities.

When Bluewater settled its suit on January 16, the news was carried nationwide, helping to educate people about this unreported dark-side of international trade.

On December 20, Bluewater settled a suit against the National Park Service for allowing continued jet ski use in 21 national park units. The settlement will require those units to ban jet skis unless environmental impact reports can demonstrate that these craft will not cause environmental damage or otherwise impair those units for future generations.

This will be a heavy burden for the jet ski industry to overcome and will hopefully lead to a total ban within the park system. The media exposure helped us reinforce the message about the extreme environmental problems that these craft cause, and to publicly remind the agency that their primary mission is to make resource protection Job Number 1.

On December 22, Bluewater and Ocean Advocates won a lawsuit against the US Coast Guard (USCG) for ignoring the Oil Pollution Act. The Washington DC Circuit judges repeatedly admonished the USCG for its "blatant disregard" of the intent of Congress. The court will now force the Coast Guard to reduce the chances of oil spills by requiring shipping companies to put leak-detection devices on tankers operating in US waters. The courts also ordered the USCG to carefully consider requiring two tugboat escorts for all tankers operating in sensitive port areas. The media coverage accompanying our legal victory should prevent the Coast Guard from developing future bouts of regulatory amnesia.
Unfortunately, Bush administration policies will likely provide abundant opportunities to litigate to protect the nation's environment from coast to coast—from Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to Puerto Rico's Vieques military bombing range.

We hope that every environmental organization takes advantage of every legal opportunity to aggressively hammer irresponsible corporations and agencies, and to use these opportunities to inform the press about critical incidents of environmental destruction. Lawsuits serve not only to provide outright environmental victories, they can also help to educate the media, cultivate sympathetic public opinion, and build valuable support.

Become a member of BWN for $30 and receive the Bluewater News. Membership includes a subscription to Earth Island Journal.
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GROUPS SUPPORTING INITIAL FORD CAMPAIGNE

Bluewater Network,
Greenpeace, Public Citizen (CA),
The Fund for Animals,
EarthRights International,
Tides Foundation,
The David Brower Fund,
Circle of Life,
Sea Shepherd Conservation Society,
Center for Biological Diversity,
Center for Safe Energy,
Our Children's Earth,
The Ruckus Society,
Green Corps,
Sustainable World Coalition,
Renewable Energy Action Project,
Turtle Island Restoration Network,
Council of Canadians (Victoria, BC),
Free The Planet, Environmental Advocates,
Salmon Protection and Watershed Network,
Campaign to Safeguard America's Waters,
Center for Environmental Health,
Ocean Advocates,
Southern Rockies Watershed Network,
Living Rivers,
Kettle Range Conservation Group,
Environmentalists Against War,
Mangrove Action Project,
Global Compliance Research Project,
Sacred Land Film Project,
West Africa Rainforest Network,
Travel Just,
Baikalwatch,
Bay Area Wilderness Training
APPENDIX

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW # 1
Shawn
From BlueWater

Interviewer: I am kinda curious and am doing some follow up on the uh Blue Water..

Informant: Yeah.

Interviewer: and uh I was just trying to talk to some of the employees there and see what the culture’s like at Blue Water and how would you describe it?

Informant: Uhm, in what sense? Like work environment or ....

Interviewer: Why you dedicate yourself to environmental causes?

Informant: Well, I got hired roughly 8 years ago to basically, uh, work on issues regarding national park systems and uh for a park ranger so Russell, my boss offered me an opportunity to basically affect park service policy at a much greater level than if I had stayed with the park service and became a career employee. So, and since then, you know I have basically been on television and quoted in newspapers and been called to Washington to testify before Congress and done things that I would not have been able to do if I had stayed with the park services. And, I believe that in many senses positively effected the way the parks are managed in a whole host of ways. So, it’s primarily kind of a personal thing for me. I grew up in the national parks, my folks took us there about every summer and I really enjoy working for their protection...So, that’s about the short of it.

Interviewer: Aewsome. So you have been with Blue Water Network when it was still with Earth Island...

Informant: Yeah, I was the 3rd employee.

Interviewer: 3rd employee, wow!

Informant: Yeah, I have been here for a long, long time.

Interviewer: So, how has it changed for you since you were Earth Island?

Informant: We were much smaller. When I joined there were 4 of us, now there is ten of us. Uh, we had a much smaller budget and uh resources were more limited. Uh, you know we had a much more we kinda had an image of or people who saw us as a flight by night operation kinda thing. [laughing].

At one point, I didn’t even have a desk, so ....

Interviewer: Wow!

Informant: ...Yeah, so it definitely developed quite a bit, I have my own office now, and we have 10 employees who each have their own desk. We have definitely grown and expanded. Back then we did not even have any members and now we have I think we have something like 20,000 supporters so, we have definitely grown quite a bit. Again we are recognized as an expert on a whole host of issues and uh, effecting legislation not just on theragraft but on a wide variety of transportation issues, aircraft ships, tankers, automobiles, and that type of things so....

Interviewer: Yeah, I was working on the anti-Ford campaign with Alysa Linch and....

Informant: And that is still ongoing ....

Interviewer: Yeah.
Informant: and definitely will be campaigning for awhile.

Interviewer: Well, uhg, that's pretty neat. I can see why you went towards this. Now, do you have any idea, or have you ever talked to Russle on how he got into it because his degrees are kind of different then where he ended up?

Informant: Yeah... he started out with an MBA from Harvard and got some other degree from Columbia or something like that. But he does have is doctorate I think in developmental ecology, and he did his doctorate work in India. And, while he was there he started to see the impact that marine outboard engines were having on the local fisheries there. One would be two stroke dumping the pollution right into the water and a number of locals were complaining that the fish had a gasoline taste and two he noticed that the people who had the boats, this had been a stable fishery for years, and once the engines were introduced only people with the engines caught the fish...

Interviewer: Uhm.

Informant: and this introduced a level of need and basically despair to those who did not have it. It was no longer a single fishery, fisher, the resources only went to the people that had the engines.

So, anyway, he came to the U.S. after that and was determined to do something and found out more about two-stroke engines and saw that they were a major problem here in the U.S. and founded BlueWater in 1996 and we have been working on that issue and others basically ever since.

Interviewer: Oh that's great. So you were the third employee so who was the second?

Informant: Uh, it was our Development Director, Kenny Edmanger. He is no longer with us. Then there was Catherine Morgan she was the second and then there was me.

Interviewer: All right, so I guess would make you like the number two man there right now.

Informant: Yeah, I have the most seniority next to Russel of course.

Interviewer: Cool. Cool. I really appreciate your time. Is there anyone else in the office uhm I could talk to for a little bit?

Informant: Uhm,...I don’t see anyone...well let me see, I will transfer you over to Carl for a second. Hold on.

Informant: Jim

Interviewer: Hi.

Informant: Carl

Carl: Hi Jim.