

A Burkean Method For Analyzing Environmental Rhetoric

2009

John Stewart
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

STARS Citation

Stewart, John, "A Burkean Method For Analyzing Environmental Rhetoric" (2009). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 4078.

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact lee.dotson@ucf.edu.

A BURKEAN METHOD FOR ANALYZING ENVIRONMENTAL RHETORIC

by

JOHN E. STEWART
B.A. University of Central Florida, 1990

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of English
in the College of Arts and Humanities
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2009

Major Professor: Paul Dombrowski

ABSTRACT

The work of Kenneth Burke provides a method of rhetorical analysis that is useful in terms of bringing features of texts to the surface that are not readily apparent, such as how they produce identification in their audiences, and in revealing rhetorical factors related to but outside the text, for example the authors' motives. Burke's work is wide-ranging and open to many interpretations, so it can be difficult to apply. This study condenses some of his more important concepts into a simplified method which has several practical applications; it focuses on how Burke's theories can be applied to analyzing environmental texts, and helps reveal how those texts are rhetorically effective. This method is also shown to be useful for rhetoricians and other students of language in analyzing the motives and meanings behind complicated texts. An example analysis is developed in detail to demonstrate the utility of this approach for analyzing environmental rhetoric and help clarify how to apply it to other texts.

A publication by the Center for Ecoliteracy (CEL), a nonprofit organization engaged in environmental education, provides the basis for a concrete example of applying this method to a current work of environmental rhetoric. The CEL serves as an example of current environmental organizations and their rhetoric, and a Burkean analysis of its publications begins by revealing some of the principles operating in the texts that make them rhetorically effective. This analysis also goes beyond basic dialectics to question how the texts function as "symbolic action" and how they fit into Burke's hierarchic system of language. The method developed in this study not only determines how the text produces identification in an audience, but also the motives behind producing the text. The CEL's publications are good representative examples of current environmental writing, so the conclusions drawn from an analysis of the CEL's texts can be applied to other environmental rhetoric.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Groundwork	1
Central Questions	4
Purposes	4
Project Scope.....	5
Outline of Chapters	5
CHAPTER II: DESCRIPTION OF A BURKEAN METHOD	7
How This Method is Useful for Rhetorical Studies.....	7
Kenneth Burke and His Writings	9
How Burke’s Work is Specific to Environmental Rhetoric	11
General Outline of the Method.....	13
Formal, Structural, and Cluster Analysis.....	15
CHAPTER III: THE CENTER FOR ECOLITERACY.....	18
Context of the CEL, Their Website, and Their Publications	18
Description of the CEL Website.....	21
CHAPTER IV: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF A CEL PUBLICATION	26
Description of the <i>Rethinking School Lunch</i> Guide	26
Dramatistic Analysis of RSL.....	30
Patterns of Experience, Master Symbols, and Literary Form in RSL	36
Patterns of Experience in RSL	37
The School Garden as Master Symbol.....	38
Literary Form in RSL.....	40
Structural Analysis of RSL.....	42

Cluster Analysis of Section I: Road Map	44
Index for Section I.....	45
Concordance for Section I.....	49
Symbolic Actions and Hierarchies Represented in RSL	63
Rhetorical Criticisms of RSL	69
CHAPTER V: PRINCIPLES FOR ANALYSIS OF OTHER TEXTS	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	76
Background Texts	76
CEL Publications.....	79

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Groundwork

Environmental rhetoric is a genre that has taken on special significance in the larger world of current rhetorics, because it addresses issues that are fundamental to the sustainability of all other human systems of culture, economics, and politics. In the new millennium, the deeply humanistic classical rhetorical purposes of creating conviction and persuading to action find their most critical role in history when coupled with subject matter that involves issues of the land, hydrosphere, and atmosphere, and the life that depends on them for survival. Rhetoric as a human agency now plays a leading role in working for the sustainability of life on earth.

Kenneth Burke is one of the most important rhetorical theorists of modern times, producing a huge volume of texts that cover all the classical aspects and applications of rhetoric, and going beyond the traditional to invent new concepts and critical methods such as identification and dramatism. Although his theories can be applied to any type of text, this study demonstrates that they are particularly appropriate for analyzing environmental rhetoric for a number of reasons. For example, Burke worked out four major “hierarchic orders” that account for all human motives through language: the *natural*, the *verbal*, the *socio-political*, and the *religious*. His positing of the natural world as one of the four hierarchies with which he accounts for all human motives is one indicator that his theories are clearly relevant for analyzing environmental texts. He also draws important connections between the natural hierarchic order and the other orders, and these connections will be explored in this current study.

Burke’s work is voluminous and intimidating, but a number of writers have condensed his theories into a more manageable form. One of the foremost is William Reuckert. His Kenneth

Burke and the Drama of Human Relations summarizes all of Burke's work and, when supplemented with readings from Burke's original works, provides one of the best resources for extracting some of the more important analytical principles from Burke. These principles can then be assembled into a simplified method for rhetorical analysis that is distinctively Burkean—one that subsumes and goes beyond traditional rhetorical concerns (such as the three types of appeals), and makes use of Burke's "larger dramatic system and methodology" (Rueckert xiv), including his ideas about identification (39–46), "symbolic action" (56–63), patterns of experience (12, 13), literary form, and his methods of cluster and structural analysis (83–90).

When studying any rhetorical genre or movement, it is useful to select a text that can serve as a starting point and synecdoche for the rest of the texts in the corpus. Selecting a single text as representative of the whole helps reduce the scope of the study to manageable size and creates a frame of reference for continuing studies. Environmental rhetoric is a vast and varied genre, and not amenable to concise definition, but it is possible to select a representative publication with which to start. Such a starting point serves to help arrive at some agreement on what constitutes a good example of current environmental rhetoric, and provides subject material for an example analysis. Since many environmental texts are produced by organizations rather than individual authors and are collaborative in nature, a logical place to begin the selection process is to look at prominent and well-positioned environmental organizations and their publications. One such organization is the Center for Ecoliteracy (CEL), based in Berkeley, California.

The selection criteria that make the CEL a logical starting point include the following:

- It has an explicit focus on environmental issues. It has a clear and coherent position on environmental issues and a stated mission to promote that position to the public.

- It publishes a substantial number of texts that support its mission and it makes many of these texts freely available to a broad audience on its website.
- Its texts have a clear hierarchy, so the most important primary text can be easily identified.

The CEL's Rethinking School Lunch Guide is explicitly environmental in focus, has a well-developed and coherent position, is freely available from its website, and is clearly the most important of its publications because it provides a guide to its entire program. This text is a logical choice for the example analysis in this study. The example analysis serves the dual purposes of helping to define the characteristics of effective current environmental rhetoric, and illustrating how a simplified Burkean method of analysis can yield important insights into this type of text. The insights into the underlying principles operating in this type of text can be applied to analyzing other environmental texts to determine their effectiveness. The goals of this project are to outline a simplified Burkean method of rhetorical analysis, apply it to one of the CEL's publications, and demonstrate the sort of knowledge that can be derived from this sort of analysis, for example how the text creates identification in an audience and what motives the authors had in producing the text.

Central Questions

This project works toward answering the following questions:

1. What are some of the more important principles that we can derive from Burke's work that can be synthesized into a simplified, practical method of rhetorical analysis?
2. What useful information about the underlying rhetorical principles operating in environmental texts can we gain from applying a Burkean analysis to an example of current environmental rhetoric?
3. How can we apply the knowledge from this analysis to evaluating the effectiveness of other environmental texts?
4. What useful information can we derive about the author's motives and how the environmental texts function as symbolic action?
5. In general, where does environmental rhetoric fit within a Burkean hierarchic order, and what does this mean in terms of evaluating the motives behind the rhetoric?

Purposes

This project serves the following purposes:

- Outlines a method of method of rhetorical analysis based on the work of Kenneth Burke, including a discussion of how the method is useful.
- Shows how Burke's work provides a set of principles specifically appropriate to analyzing environmental rhetoric.
- Applies the method to an example of current environmental rhetoric.

- Outlines some ideas for applying this type of analysis to a broad range of environmental texts.
- Outlines some ideas for using this type of analysis to think about environmental rhetoric in terms of its role as symbolic action and its place in a hierarchy of language.

Project Scope

This project surveys several selected works of Kenneth Burke to derive material for the analytical method. Rueckert's Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations provides the most important critical overview of Burke's entire body of work and suggests the most important primary texts for this project: Counter-Statement, A Grammar of Motives, and A Rhetoric of Motives. To place the CEL and its publications in context of current environmental organizations and publications, this project surveys the range publications represented on its website. The example analysis focuses on portions of a single text, the CEL's Rethinking School Lunch Guide.

Outline of Chapters

Chapter I, the Introduction, lays the groundwork and states the central questions, purpose, and scope for the project.

Chapter II, Description of a Burkean Method, provides a brief background and history of Burke's contributions to rhetoric, shows how Burke is particularly appropriate for analyzing environmental rhetoric, describes the simplified Burkean method of analysis, and explains why the method is a useful tool.

Chapter III, The Center for Ecoliteracy, describes the CEL, places it in context with other environmental organizations, and provides an overview of its range of publications and its website.

Chapter IV, Rhetorical Analysis of a CEL Publication, applies the method to the CEL's Rethinking School Lunch Guide and offers an assessment of it as an example of current environmental rhetoric.

Chapter V, Principles for Analysis of Other Texts, summarizes how the method can be applied to other works of environmental rhetoric, and suggests how the knowledge derived from this type of analysis can be applied to gaining insight into how this type of rhetoric functions as symbolic action, how it creates identification in an audience, and how it helps to determine the author's motives.

CHAPTER II: DESCRIPTION OF A BURKEAN METHOD

How This Method is Useful for Rhetorical Studies

Any method of rhetorical analysis should be justifiable in terms of utility or usefulness—what information will it yield about a text, and how can that information be used? The tools of formal, structural, and cluster analysis take us beneath the surface features of a text and catalog the elements that make it up in an organized and relatively objective manner, like looking under the hood of a car, making a list of the engine parts, and sorting them into meaningful categories based on quantity and type. In the case of a car, this process provides information that would be useful if one wanted to understand how the engine worked. In the case of a text, these tools provide information that can be used for a similar purpose. Understanding the form and structure of a text, particularly in the context of other similar texts, is useful if one wants to understand how the parts of a text operate together to achieve rhetorical purposes. Taking the analogy a step further, this sort of understanding can also be used to refine the efficiency of an engine or the rhetorical effectiveness of a text. The purpose of this preliminary analysis is to classify the text, identify its important features, and lay the foundation for higher-level and more abstract analysis.

The more abstract tools help construct a model of how the text functions as a complex rhetorical machine—how the text produces identification in the audience, how it functions as symbolic action, what hierarchies are represented in the text, how it reads the hierarchies into one another, and what motivated the writers to create the text in the first place. Continuing the car analogy, for an engine this level of analysis produces information or knowledge that extends beyond the engine to the external forces and motives that brought it into existence—who manufactured the car, what sort of driver the manufacturer had in mind, and what sort of person

actually owns and drive the car. The same is true for the higher-level analysis of symbolic action and hierarchies in a text—they provide a method for inferring and discovering the confluence of forces and motives that resulted in the creation of the text, who the text is intended to influence, and what influence it actually has. Taken together, this body of information helps to construct an idea of the rhetorical effectiveness of the text.

Within the genre of environmental rhetoric, this method offers a way to read the motives of the organization or writer producing the work. This is important partly because environmental rhetoric, like any other dialectic, can work for or against its subject. For example, some environmental writing is aimed at weakening environmental protections, some at strengthening them, and the identity of the authors, their motives, and their intended audience is often not readily apparent. Like any other high-stakes rhetorical enterprise, this sort of writing uses deception as one way to manipulate its audiences and achieve its ends. Corporations produce “feel-good” environmental public relations advertisements while running their operations in a manner that may not be environmentally sound. Organizations that appear to have one agenda, including the CEL, may have a different one: who funds them, and what their interests and motives are, may not be clear. Analysis of a writer’s or organization’s rhetoric can reveal motives that are not apparent on the surface. This can be used in real-world applications, for example it can provide input for deliberative discourse that leads to decisions on public policy. The information derived from this type of analysis can help shape individual acts of conscience, social attitudes, and environmental laws and policies.

Kenneth Burke and His Writings

Nothing is ever merely simple in Burke.

William Reuckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations

Kenneth Burke's writings on rhetoric span half a century, and are largely focused on redefining and expanding the applications of rhetorical analysis. Before Burke, rhetorical analysis had largely been restricted to the classical concept of rhetoric as the study of persuasive speech and texts. Burke's rhetorical studies expanded on the classical concepts to encompass all types of language systems, including philosophy, politics, literature, religion, and science and technology. Much of his innovation and uniqueness as a rhetorical theorist originates in his background as a literary theorist. He brought the tools of the literary theorist to bear on texts that were not previously considered "literary," called attention to poetic elements in those texts, and conversely pointed out the rhetorical elements of literary texts. He was in the vanguard of theorists who broke down the artificial boundaries between rhetoric and poetics. Burke is basically concerned with human motives and how language influences and exposes those motives.

Starting with his 1931 Counter-Statement, Burke developed a theory of "symbolic action," which he defines in different ways over several decades of writing, depending on his context and the angle from which he is examining language as it relates to human motives. At one point he states that symbolic action is linguistic, at another time he says that it performs a representative function, and in another context he argues that it performs a purgative-redemptive function. His theory of symbolic action led directly to the theory of language for which he is best known in rhetorical circles, dramatism (Rueckert 56). Burke first began to develop dramatism as a way of exploring human motives in his 1945 A Grammar of Motives, and all of his work from

that point forward is written as either an application or extension of dramatism (xiii). His 1950 A Rhetoric of Motives develops his ideas on “identification” as an extension of the classical concept of persuasion, and greatly expands the traditional boundaries of rhetorical analysis (Burke, Rhetoric xiii). In a Burkean sense, “identification” means the state characterized by an individual aligning himself or herself with the values of another, denoting a sense of willing agreement as contrasted with the more traditional rhetorical concept of persuasion, which suggests more of a forceful push toward agreement. Burke argues that literature is not only poetic, but is also rhetorical and action-oriented persuasion. He further contends that literary forms, and by extension all forms of discourse, should be analyzed in terms of their rhetorical effects on audiences.

Taken together, Burke’s works comprise a grammar, a rhetoric, and a symbolic of motives; in other words, he progresses from exploring the ways that human motives are represented in literature using the mechanical elements of the language, through the ways that they are expressed in persuasive and argumentative features, and finally to the ways that motives manifest in the abstract and representational aspects of literature. He creates a complex methodology for analyzing language systems. Critics have noted that his method does not always seem logically consistent from one text to another—for example, his changing definitions of symbolic action—but must be read in the context of the times during which each text was written and in light of the ideas developed in the preceding works. Bizzell and Herzberg, in their highly regarded Rhetorical Tradition anthology, state that his works “seem to encompass almost everything” (1296, 1297). Because his works are so voluminous, wide-ranging, and sometimes seem inconsistent, it is useful to extract a few basic principles from the totality of his works and restate them in terms of a clearly defined, simplified method of rhetorical analysis. This allows

us to apply some of Burke's insights to rhetorical analysis while not getting lost in the maze constituted by his complete body of thought.

Burke's writings provide myriad tools for performing rhetorical analysis on any type or genre of text, and some parts of his theories are more applicable to specific types of texts, as this study shows. The dramatistic method outlined in A Grammar of Motives is essentially dialectical, and provides a method for systematizing any text in terms of his dramatistic pentad of act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. Dramatism is useful for understanding the form and structure of any text, but it is only a preliminary stage in his overall method, and is not particularly appropriate for any specific genre. The theories that Burke developed later, after he laid the foundations for dramatism, are more appropriate for specific types of texts, for example environmental rhetoric. Why is Burke particularly appropriate for analyzing this type of rhetoric? There are several reasons his theories are a logical source to draw upon for this type of analysis, and they are clearly shown in the books that followed his Grammar.

How Burke's Work is Specific to Environmental Rhetoric

The next step that Burke takes after his Grammar, in A Rhetoric of Motives, suggests a turn in his work that is explicitly applicable to environmental rhetoric. This text represents the completion of his system, and makes the leap from the dialectical methods of dramatism to hierarchy, which contrasts with the endless movement of dialectics in that it posits fixed goals and moments of stasis. Burke's rhetorical theory culminates in a vision of universal order, which ultimately leads to God at the top of all hierarchies (Rueckert 140). Burke worked out four major hierarchic orders: the *natural*, the *verbal*, the *socio-political*, and the *religious*. He divides the natural order into *animals*, *natural things*, *natural places*, and *the biological*. His positing of the

natural world as one of the four major hierarchies, the suborders he creates within the natural order, and the connections he draws between this order and the socio-political all indicate that his theories are clearly relevant for analyzing environmental texts. As Rueckert explains:

If one moves to the analogical relations among the four orders and their various suborders and to the cause-and-effect relations among the four, the whole of nature, human relations, and super-nature is opened to linguistic analysis. . . [Burke] is particularly interested in two things: reading the socio-political hierarchy backwards into the natural hierarchy and forwards into the supernatural one. (141)

He calls this study of hierarchies “socioanagogic criticism,” and it expands the concerns of linguistic analysis into social criticism. His theory clearly recognizes that the natural world, or at least our human conception of it, is a rhetorical construction based on language. He also connects it with the social and political forces that determine the outcome of all environmental debates and decisions. Rueckert goes on to summarize Burke’s theory on the relationship between the socio-political and natural orders:

One of the principal objects of dramatism is to study the cause-and-effect relation between the non-verbal, verbal, and meta-verbal as it is manifested in the natural, socio-political, and supernatural orders. By cause-and-effect relation, Burke means the ways in which language as cause affects man’s views of and relations to the non-verbal and meta-verbal, and the natural, socio-political, and supernatural hierarchies. . . In general, socioanagogic criticism calls for the analysis of everything as social allegory, with the socio-political hierarchy as primary cause, and attempts to show how man has read this hierarchy backwards into the non-verbal natural order . . . with disastrous results. (141)

Burke constructs nature as one of the four great hierarchical orders, views it as affected primarily by the social and political worlds, and recognizes that social and political hierarchies have “disastrous results” when humans apply them to the natural order (Rueckert 141). The reading of the socio-political hierarchy into the natural is accomplished by the use of language and rhetoric. Burke’s hierarchies provide clear linguistic and rhetorical connections between society, politics, and nature. The relationships between these hierarchies define current environmental issues and rhetoric. This hierarchical ordering and relationship provides a clear rationale for applying specifically Burkean analytical methods to environmental texts.

The method presented here does not attempt to exhaust all the analytical tools that Burke offers, as this is both impossible within the scope of this project and unnecessary; impossible because of the breadth and depth of Burke’s works, and unnecessary because just a few of his analytical methods are enough to extract some significant features from a text and gain some useful insights into the rhetorical principles operating both within and outside of the text. Also, any method derived from Burke is only one possible interpretation because he does not provide a clear and simple explanation of his methods or how to apply them. He presents his methods in a complex metaphorical and analogical way, using extended examples from literature, and this allows many valid interpretations. This project attempts to provide a method that is logically consistent within the frame constructed for the study, which necessarily sacrifices some of Burke’s richness in exchange for simplification and consistency.

General Outline of the Method

The method presented here takes some basic tools from Burke’s more important works and provides one interpretation of how they can be applied to rhetorical analysis. Within this

analytical framework, this method consists of two steps or levels: first it uses some structured methods for generating raw material from the text and performing some preliminary analysis, and second it uses this information to perform a higher-level analysis and an evaluation of the text's rhetorical effectiveness, how the text functions as symbolic action, and how it fits into Burke's hierarchic orders. For the first step, this method uses the following types of analysis:

- Formal analysis—To determine the literary and rhetorical form of the text. This assigns the text to one of several defined forms. Every text follows one of these forms.
- Cluster analysis—To determine what goes with what and why. This requires creating an index and concordance for the text, for which Burke has some specific requirements. This focuses on groupings of terms and ideas.
- Structural analysis—To determine what follows what and why. This focuses on the progression of ideas in a text.

For the second step, this method evaluates the text's rhetorical effectiveness based on the following rhetorical functions:

- How it produces identification in an audience.
- How it functions as symbolic action in terms of linguistic, representative, and purgative-redemptive functions.
- How it fits into Burke's hierarchic orders, for example how it reads the socio-political into the natural hierarchy.

Ultimately, getting back to Burke's main purpose for working with language systems, this two-level method helps reveal the motives of the writer(s) or organization that produced the text—motives of which even the authors may not be fully aware.

Formal, Structural, and Cluster Analysis

Burke states that all aspects of a literary work can be analyzed in terms of form, so it is important at the outset of a rhetorical analysis to determine the type of form that a work represents (Rueckert 35). The form is equivalent to a frame that allows an analysis based on the technique and formal appeal of the work. The various audiences should be able to anticipate and be gratified by the sequence in a work. In Burkean terms, the “formal charge” plus the “symbolic charge” of a work equals the eloquence of the work, so the form into which the content of the work is poured is important in determining how rhetorically effective the work is in producing identification in its intended audience. After determining the form of a work, the next step is to analyze it as symbolic action, which can be characterized as linguistic, representative, or purgative-redemptive.

The first stage in analyzing any literature as symbolic action is to perform a structural and cluster analysis. A structural analysis determines what follows what and why in a work of literature, which helps to determine, for example, what the text represents. This includes determining the characteristic progression in the work, the various types of which are summarized by Rueckert:

The most important of these [types of progression] are plot (sequence of external events); action (“spiritual movement,” or sequence of internal reactions); pattern of experience (the simple and complex patterns of psychic and physical experience resulting from conflicts within an agent and the interaction between agent, other agents, scene, and the like); spatial movement (up, down, in, out, north, south, east, west); tonal progression; chronological progression (seasonal progression, biological growth, historical change); scenic progression; and qualitative progression (from dark, to gray, to light imagery; from

rot, to purgation, to redemption imagery; from innocence to corruption to depravity). The first step in the analysis of a poem as symbolic action requires an exhaustive descriptive and analytic study of its structure in order to determine what follows what, and why. (83, 84)

Even though in this passage Rueckert refers specifically to “the analysis of a poem,” Burke makes it clear throughout his work that he considers poetry, literature, and rhetoric all amenable to the same sort of analysis, since they are all constructed from language. Analyzing the progressive forms of a text leads to the idea that all texts have other kinds of form as well. A cluster analysis can be used to generate data on those other kinds of form (84).

A cluster analysis determines what goes with what and why in the text. The method consists of creating an index and concordance for a work or group of works by the same author. The index is both statistical and descriptive. It is selective, and includes only terms of high “intensity” or frequency, which makes it both qualitative and quantitative; it is linguistic and mechanical, taking into account the technical features of the text, as well as rhetorical and poetic, taking into account the more abstract features. The number of times a term is used are important for the index, and so is the “intensity” or “emotional charge” of the term, since both frequency and intensity of terms within a text help indicate how the author produces identification in the audience as well as what motives led the author to create the text. High intensity terms include those that are emotionally charged, like *food*, *community*, *schools*, *organic*, and *family*, or terms that are significant for a particular author, for example *rethinking* and *food policy*. These examples show that terms can gain an emotional charge partly by having the potential to be associated not only with one value system, but with multiple value systems. For example, all audiences attach a high value to food because of its basic importance to daily living, but different

audiences attach different value systems—one audience values food that is fast, easy to obtain, and cheap, but another values food that is organically farmed, with less concern about cost; these value systems can lead to reasonable conclusions about the social, economic, and political characteristics of the different audiences. The specialized vocabularies often seen in scientific and technical writing are high intensity terms because of their usage by a specific author, which indicates their significance for that author. For example, terms like *rethinking* are used to suggest and define specific value systems.

The other half of a cluster analysis, the concordance, is the opposite of the index in terms of how much of the text it includes. The concordance aims to be exhaustive rather than selective. Every instance of a term, both implicit and explicit, and in every context, is included. The concordance functions as a cross-reference for the index, to find connections within the text that are not obvious. From this we derive equations that explain what equals what in the work, often revealing unexpected correspondences, for example *Food = Cognition*. The connections depend on the various contexts surrounding the terms identified in the index.

CHAPTER III: THE CENTER FOR ECOLITERACY

One of the best ways to make the application and usefulness of an analytical method clear is to apply it to a carefully chosen sample text. For a concrete example of applying this method to a current work of environmental rhetoric, this study uses a publication from the Berkeley, California-based Center for Ecoliteracy (CEL), an environmental education organization founded in 1995 by an eclectic group of writers and educators. Out of myriad environmental organizations, why choose the CEL? Besides the reasons outlined in the introduction, it is associated with a number of leading thinkers and writers through its board of directors and has carved out a prominent place for itself through its web presence and educational activities.

To situate the CEL in the context of other current environmental organizations, this chapter provides a general description of the CEL in terms of its mission, representative founders and board members, associated writers and thinkers, and publications, all of which are well-represented on their website. To contextualize the CEL's website in terms of its overall work and mission, an annotated site map provides details on how its website presents, organizes, and makes the CEL's publications available to a wide audience.

Context of the CEL, Their Website, and Their Publications

The CEL's stated mission is to promote "education for sustainable living," and one of the main methods by which it accomplishes this mission is to publish and promote a wide range of texts, including books, websites, and educational curricula. One of the central concepts that it develops in these texts is "ecoliteracy." Ecoliteracy is a relatively new term and concept in the larger context of environmental rhetoric, first gaining currency in 1992 through educator and writer David Orr's book Ecological Literacy. By publishing, promoting, and making a range of

environmental texts available to a wide audience through their website, the CEL promotes the idea that educating for this type of literacy requires a complete overhaul of our current educational model. It defines an “ecologically literate” person in terms of comprehension, concepts, and problem-solving abilities, not simply in terms of the ability to read words on a page. It defines ecoliteracy as based in culture and a specific set of shared values. These definitions coincide with the work of prominent literacy researchers like James Paul Gee, who emphasizes the importance of social practices to literacy, defining various discourses as “*saying (writing)-doing-being-valuing-believing combinations . . . which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes*” (525, 526). This view of literacy as based in social practices creates a clear connection between literacy—the ability to read Gee’s “combinations”—and rhetoric, the art and craft of creating these combinations for the purpose of creating identification in an audience. The CEL is particularly useful for this study, since it is promoting a relatively new and specific type of literacy, and the method outlined here provides a framework for sketching how the rhetoric used to promote ecoliteracy functions as symbolic action and how it fits into Burke’s concept of hierarchic orders.

The CEL’s ethos and credibility rest in a large measure on that of the people who write its publications and serve on its board of directors. For example, board member David Orr is currently a professor and chair of the Environmental Studies Program at Oberlin college and has written numerous books and articles, including his 2004 *The Last Refuge: Patriotism, Politics, and the Environment in the Age of Terror*. Fritjof Capra, who writes for the CEL and also serves on their board, boasts credentials including a PhD in theoretical physics from the University of Vienna, a teaching position at the University of California at Berkeley, and five international

bestselling books, including his 1975 The Tao of Physics. Typical of writers whose work is promoted by the CEL and who write essays for the CEL website is Michael Pollan, a contributing writer to the New York Times Magazine, Knight professor of journalism at UC Berkeley, and author of The Omnivore's Dilemma, voted one of the 10 best books of 2006 by the New York Times Book Review. These famous, successful, and highly educated writers and thinkers lend the CEL a high degree of credibility both within and outside the environmentalist community, and their biographies and writings are a prominent part of the website. This is how the CEL self-describes its mission on its website home page:

The Center for Ecoliteracy is dedicated to education for sustainable living.

The Center is a pioneer in providing tools, ideas, and support for combining hands-on experience in the natural world with curricular innovation in K–12 education. It administers a grant program and donor-advised funds, publishes extensively online and in print, and offers resources, seminars, and technical assistance in support of systemic change. It was founded in 1995 by Fritjof Capra, Peter Buckley, and Zenobia Barlow.

(Center for Ecoliteracy)

The CEL website (<http://www.ecoliteracy.org>) provides a professionally designed, comprehensive view of its mission, activities, and publications. The texts vary in length from a single page up to 175 pages. The site not only allows the general public to read its publications, but also allows site visitors to freely download many of its publications as fully formatted PDF files. The website provides access to various types of texts including simple web pages, descriptions of educational programs and seminars, books, user guides and technical manuals, and periodicals. The site also provides links to various related entities, for example other

educational organizations with similar missions and booksellers specializing in environmental texts.

Description of the CEL Website

This section, which provides more detailed information on the CEL website, is mostly informational rather than evaluative, but it is important to describe the website's structure in order to clarify the relationships between the many publications offered through the website and to contextualize the main publication that is used as the basis for the example analysis. Like any website, the CEL site is subject to change. This description is current as of January 2009.

The major elements of site navigation are fairly conventional, and consist of a set of links to the main pages arranged in a row across the top of each page and a set of links arranged in a column at the left side of each page. These navigational elements are supplemented by links to individual items embedded in the text on each page. There are typically several ways to link to each part of the site. The following paragraphs describe the major links on the home page, which correspond to the main pages on the site, and provide brief descriptions of each page, the texts associated with each page, and their relationships.

About—Describes the CEL's mission, board, and staff, including biographies.

Seminars—Describes the seminars that the CEL conducts for people from organizations and schools who want to learn about the concepts that the center is promoting and how to implement them. These seminars teach participants how to design hands-on lessons and use texts published by the center.

Programs—Provides a link to the 175-page Rethinking School Lunch Guide, which is freely available for download as a fully formatted PDF file. This is the primary text for the

CEL's educational program and is the publication used in this project for the example rhetorical analysis. This page also provides links to the following related publications, freely available for download:

- [Linking Food: A Visual Guide](#). This is a more graphics-based, lighter introduction to the [RSL](#) program.
- [Wellness Policy Guide](#). A technical guide for drafting a school wellness policy.

This page also includes links to a number of brief essays through the link “Thinking Outside the Lunchbox.”

Education for Sustainability—Provides the following links to short descriptions of concepts. These are high intensity terms which appear frequently throughout the CEL's publications:

- Sustainability
- Community
- Systems Thinking
- Competencies
- Sustainability and Schools

In Burkean terms, most of these terms belong to the socio-political hierarchy: “community,” “systems thinking,” and “competencies” are all most strongly either social or political constructions. “Sustainability” is the only term in this grouping that belongs clearly to the natural hierarchy, and even this term suggests a Burkean reading of the socio-political into the natural, since sustainability is concerned with how to use the natural world in a way that is viable over the long term for human purposes, and this is suggested even more strongly by the

concept of “sustainability and schools.” This short grouping begins to suggest how the Burkean hierarchic orders are represented by the CEL.

There is also a link “Exemplars” which connects with descriptions of the various projects that are described in more detail elsewhere on the site. There are also excerpts from longer texts, which provide references to some of the writers promoted by the CEL as well as outside sources for more in-depth study, expanding the educational connections and range of the CEL discourse community.

News—This page includes links to a number of articles, book excerpts (typically from established authors’ works and with links to booksellers’ websites where you can purchase the texts) and biographical information on the author, stories, events, and applications for various awards and programs. Three or four previous months of publications are also archived here.

Publications—Includes the following links:

- **Writings Online**—Includes links to a number of short essays by various authors.
- **Publications for Sale**—Provides short descriptions of the texts, critical reviews, and links to various booksellers’ websites.
- **Special Offer: Getting Started**—Allows educators to order the 50-page Getting Started: A Guide for Creating School Gardens as Outdoor Classrooms.

Resources—Provides an extensive list of “bibliographies, tools, organizations, programs, and other resources.” For each item, there is a brief description and a link to an external website. These links and descriptions help to place the CEL in context of the discourse community of environmental education organizations, and indicate how the CEL characterizes these associated organizations and how they relate to the CEL’s publications. This would be a primary source of information for a more extensive study of the CEL in the context of other

similar organizations, and of how to extract and apply some principles for this sort of contextualization to other organizations, however this is beyond the scope of the current study.

Grants—Provides a short description of the CEL’s grant program. The list of grantees includes links to external websites, which further helps position the CEL within the larger context of grant-making nonprofit organizations. These organizations are sorted into categories which provide clear classifications for the various types of activities in which the CEL is involved:

- Gardens, Food Systems, and Sustainable Agriculture
- Habitat Restoration and Watershed Work
- A Network of Educators
- Fostering Ecological Literacy
- Donor-Advised Funds

This grouping again suggests how the Burkean hierarchies are represented by the CEL. Here there is more of an emphasis on the natural order and the suborders within it (*animals, natural things, natural places, and the biological*). The concepts of “a network of educators” and “donor-advised funds” clearly belong to the socio-political order, but “gardens, food systems, and sustainable agriculture” and “habitat restoration and watershed work” belong to the natural order. “Gardens” most strongly suggests natural places and the biological in the sense that it represents concrete locations in the natural world as well as biological processes, for example growth and seasonal progression—which of course can also be read, in Burkean terms, as progressive literary forms—although this is not reflected in the structure of the text. “Habitat” most strongly suggests natural places and animals, since the restoration of concrete places

implies support for the animals that live there. Finally, “fostering ecological literacy” most strongly suggests the verbal and the natural orders, and the concept of reading one into the other.

Contact—Provides email links for inquiries on seminars and institutes, publications, speaking invitations, general inquires, media inquiries, and the mailing list. It also includes the physical address.

CHAPTER IV: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF A CEL PUBLICATION

Description of the *Rethinking School Lunch* Guide

The first section of this chapter describes the RSL, and is mostly informational rather than evaluative. However, it is important to describe the form of the text, the structure of the sections, and the relationships between the sections in order to set the guide in context for the rest of the analysis.

RSL is divided into the following sections, in this order:

- Road Map
- Food Policy
- Curriculum Integration
- Food and Health
- Finances
- Facilities Design
- The Dining Experience
- Professional Development
- Procurement
- Waste Management
- Marketing and Communications
- About Rethinking School Lunch

Each of the sections is designed to be free-standing, but they are all integrated and interactive as well. This guide is directed toward multiple audiences—district administrators, food service directors, educators, and parents; all these people are seen by the CEL as potential

partners in a new type of school lunch program, and the involvement of all these varied audiences is seen as necessary for a program like this to work and to be sustainable. With the multiple audiences in mind, making the sections free-standing serves the purpose, common to many technical manuals, of allowing each reader to select and read just the material that is relevant to the task that he or she wants to accomplish or the concept that he or she wants to understand, while still providing an integrated document in which all the sections work together and have logical connections with each other. For example, a food service worker might only read the section on the dining experience. However, as we see later in the analysis, in RSL, while there are some connections between the sections, there is no detectable literary progressive form, which is a critical element in fostering identification in an audience, and this lack of progressive form ultimately weakens the rhetorical effectiveness of the publication. This is a weakness that may be common to other similar publications, and is an aspect of environmental rhetoric that will be considered in the section of this study devoted to broader applications.

With the exception of the first and last sections, each section uses the same structure, presenting the same types of elements in the same order:

- An image that suggests the theme of the program, for example an image of fruits, vegetables, or children gardening or with trays of food.
- A quote from a person involved with some aspect of the program under the heading “Food For Thought” and a table of contents for the section. Perhaps in keeping with the apparent intent that the sections be free-standing, there is no overall table of contents for the entire publication; this also suggests the lack of any progressive form in the text, and a listing of the section titles also fails to hint at any progressive form.

- A succinct statement of the goal and challenge associated with the aspect of the program discussed in that section. For example, in the section “Food Policy,” the goal is “To undertake a food policy development process, driven by the shared leadership of school administrators, educators, school food service directors, and parent groups, that leads to the adoption of a district wide fresh food policy.” The challenge is “Working effectively and collaboratively over the long term.”
- A list of key points that summarize some of the opportunities and challenges for that aspect of the program. For example, the section “Food and Health” includes the following key points, with short discussions of each:
 - healthy food = better students
 - healthy food = healthy children
 - healthy food = healthy communities

These equivalencies suggest the results of a cluster analysis, where the index and concordance are cross-referenced to determine what equals what in the text, including unexpected correspondences. How does this fit into the Burkean hierarchic orders of “the natural,” “the verbal,” “the socio-political,” and “the religious?” Here, healthy food equals not only healthy children, which both belong to the natural order, but better students and members of the community, which suggests the socio-political order. This suggests the reading of the natural order into the socio-political; the equivalency of an agent from the natural order to agents from the socio-political order.

- A heading “Rethinking . . .” that restates the title of the section, for example “Rethinking Food Policy,” which leads into an interview or essay by someone who has practical experience with that aspect of the program and provides examples and concrete advice on how to accomplish the goals of the program, including successes and challenges. For example, the section “Curriculum Integration” includes an interview with Michele Lawrence, the superintendent of the Berkeley unified school district.
- One or more tools to help readers begin to accomplish the goal of that section; for example, the section “Food and Health” includes a set of seasonal lunch menus.
- An annotated list of resources, which vary according to the section’s content. For example, the section “Facilities Design” includes information on three professional organizations and two resource guides (for instance, [A Guide for Purchasing Food Service Equipment](#)). Most of the resources are associated with websites, and many of the websites, like the CEL’s website, provide freely downloadable documentation as PDF files, which means that the 175 pages of [RSL](#) provide links to thousands of pages of additional resource material. As noted previously, these links provide concrete information on how to position the CEL within the context of other similar organizations.

As stated earlier, the first and last sections are structured differently from the ten content sections. The first section, “Road Map,” includes the following major categories of information:

- Overview and conceptual information on how school lunch has influences on many aspects of school and community beyond the lunch room and lunch period.
- The CEL’s vision for a systems approach to implementing the program.

- Concrete implementation guidelines for assembling a team, forging partnerships, and business planning.
- Essays from various people that explain different aspects of such a project, including the potential difficulties and benefits.

The final section, “About Rethinking School Lunch,” provides some basic definitions of concepts, history of the CEL and the Rethinking School Lunch program, and discussions of the philosophy and values behind the whole program. While these definitions and other aspects of the program are implicit throughout the guide, they are made explicit here.

Dramatistic Analysis of RSL

As mentioned previously, Burke’s dramatistic theory was the culmination of his work, and was developed over a fairly long period and a number of books, so starting with a dramatistic analysis is in a sense beginning at the end. However, beginning with an overview of how a dramatistic analysis can be applied to a text allows the rest of the analysis to be done in terms of dramatism, rather than using Burke’s other methods, such as cluster analysis, as a buildup to a final dramatistic analysis. So, the terms of dramatism will set the scene for, and be returned to throughout, the rest of the analysis.

In A Grammar of Motives, Burke explains that dramatism uses the five terms *act*, *scene*, *agent*, *agency*, and *purpose* as “generating principles” for investigating all human motives:

In a rounded statement about motives, you must have some word that names the act (names what took place, in thought or deed), and another that names the *scene* (the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred); also you must indicate what person or kind of person (*agent*) performed the act, what means or instruments he used

(*agency*), and the *purpose*. . . any complete statement about motives will offer *some kind* of answers to these five questions: what was done (act), when or where was it done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose). (1298)

An initial attempt to apply Burke's dramatic terms to RSL could look like this:

- Scene: Schools, school districts, gardens.
- Act: Gardening, modifying the curriculum.
- Agents: Students, teachers, support staff, school administrators, district supervisors, CEL writers and staff.
- Purpose: Achieve ecoliteracy (the ability to comprehend concepts and solve problems related to sustainability).
- Agency: Education, gardening.

So in the case of the RSL, we could say that the students, teachers, support staff, school administrators, district supervisors, CEL writers and staff (agents) use education and gardening (agencies) that enable them to plant a garden and modify the curriculum (acts) in order to achieve ecoliteracy (purpose) in the schools, school districts, and gardens (scene). However, this does not seem quite right. As Burke points out, the next step in a dramatic analysis is to locate the motivation; where can it be located for RSL? The most logical term in which to locate the motive seems to be the purpose—to achieve ecoliteracy. It is fairly clear, as the initial list indicates, that the purpose for the CEL's work is not to garden; that is either an act, an agency, or both, and we will revisit the "transformability" of these terms, as Burke characterizes it, shortly. But for now, let us consider whether or not the CEL's end purpose is to achieve ecoliteracy. It seems likely that this is still just a means to an end, which is, in perhaps cynical terms, to "save the planet," or at least stop destroying it. This revision to the purpose leads back to the list of

agents, which can be revisited in light of revising the purpose. What agent on this list would be most strongly motivated to save the planet? Most likely the CEL writers and staff, since they are acting as agents of change by attempting to modify the curriculum. We can remove the students, teachers, and other agents from the original list because they are much less likely to be clearly motivated by “save the planet” thinking; they are more likely to continue with business as usual, otherwise there would be no need for the CEL to exist in the first place. What about the issue raised by the act/agency of gardening? Is it one or the other, or both?

Burke states that:

. . . certain formal interrelationships prevail among these terms, by reason of their role as attributes of a common ground or substance. Their participation in a common ground makes for transformability. At every point where the field covered by any one of these terms overlaps upon the field covered by any other, there is an alchemic opportunity, whereby we can put one philosophy or doctrine of motivation into the alembic, make the appropriate passes, and take out another. From the central moltenness, where all the elements are fused into one togetherness, there are thrown forth, in separate crusts, such distinctions as those between freedom and necessity, activity and passiveness, cooperation and competition, cause and effect, mechanism and teleology. (1300)

So, depending on one’s philosophical system, the motivation in a drama may potentially be located in any of the elements that make it up, and any term may potentially become any other. This is not the same as reducing everything to an absurdity, because of the “formal interrelationships” that prevail among the terms; in a drama, nothing happens without a motive, and that motive can be located in one or more of the terms. In this case, it can be located in the purpose, which is to save the planet. In the RSL, is gardening an act, and agency, or both? If the

motive is located in the purpose, and the CEL is the agent, is gardening the main act in this drama or the main agency by which they achieve their purpose? The CEL's most important act, in terms of its purpose, is not gardening, but educational reform; gardening is the main agency by which it achieves that reform. What about the scene, then? Gardening as an agency has to take place at individual schools, so we can dispense with the districts as scene, since that is an abstract entity and the schools are concrete, local entities. We can also dispense with gardens as a scene for gardening, because while that characterization could make sense in some dramas, for this case it is simply redundant, and it makes more sense that the schools provide the scene for some new act to take place, and that act is educational reform, which is effected in this case by gardening. We can now say that the CEL (agent) uses gardening (agency) in the schools (scene), which enables it to effect educational reform (act) in order to save the planet (purpose).

So for the purposes of this analysis, we now have a different list:

- Scene: Schools.
- Act: Educational reform.
- Agent: CEL.
- Purpose: Save the planet.
- Agency: Gardening.

This brief example illustrates several important points about dramatic analysis. As one reasons through an initial analysis, considering the formal interrelationships among the terms, the roles of each term in the drama become clarified and may change from the initial analysis. Also, the terms can change in interesting ways, but not at random; changing one term is likely to affect the others.

The next point to consider in terms of dramatic analysis are the “ratios” that exist between the terms. Burke defines the ratios between the terms as “principles of determination,” and explains that the five terms allow for ten ratios (scene-act, scene-agent, scene-agency, scene-purpose, act-purpose, act-agent, act-agency, agent-purpose, agent-agency, and agency-purpose). By “principles of determination,” he means that they help expose how, for example, the scene determines the acts that can take place within it. Three of these ratios are considered as more primary in importance than the others: scene-act, scene-agent, and act-agent. The first two are “positional,” and are concerned with placement in space, while the last one is concerned with time, with a sequence of events. In the scene-act ratio, the scene contains the act, and therefore constrains the range of possible acts. How does this apply to the RSL? The scene is the schools, and the act is educational reform, so the scene expresses in “fixed properties” what the act expresses in development. The scene both “*realistically reflects* the course of the action and *symbolizes* it.” The act of educational reform is clearly a developmental process that must take place in some sort of school, and the school is both the concrete place where reform can occur, and the symbol for the developmental process that is the essence of education. In the scene-agent ratio, there is a synecdochic relationship between the agent and the scene that contains them. In the RSL, the CEL writers and staff share the qualities of the schools; they exemplify the will of each society to educate its young citizens in a way that promotes the best interests of that society. In another synecdochic sense, just as the smaller takes on the qualities of the larger, the larger also is influenced by the smaller, but the case of the scene being influenced by the agent suggests more strongly that the scene is derived from the agent. So in the rhetoric of the RSL, the schools take on the qualities of the CEL, and are concerned with gardening as a way to teach sustainability, and to fulfill the CEL’s purpose of saving the planet. By expressing this

synecdochic relationship in their rhetoric, the CEL promotes identification with its purpose in its audiences and effects changes in the world of thought, which effects changes in the concrete, everyday world of the schools (1302–1312).

In the act-agent ratio, the agent performs acts that are in keeping with his or her nature, and conversely an agent's acts can influence the agent by their nature. In RSL, educational reform is performed by the CEL writers and staff in keeping with their nature as progressive agents of change—save-the-earth types—and the nature of this ratio would be expected to influence the CEL's nature—what acts the writers and staff could perform and still enable the CEL to retain its ethos. For example, if one of its board members were seen driving a Cadillac Escalade as opposed to a Toyota Prius, the ethos of the entire organization and its mission would be affected.

As a final note on this basic dramaturgic analysis, it should be apparent that this discussion has only barely scratched the surface of the analytic possibilities using the terms and ratios. Even just considering Burke's statement about the transformability of the terms, much more could be said about how "freedom and necessity, activity and passiveness, cooperation and competition, cause and effect, mechanism and teleology" interact using the specific terms applicable to the RSL. For example, to what degree does the scene (schools) allow freedom and dictate necessity to the agent, the CEL, and how is this manifested in their rhetoric? And in what sense would the reverse be true—the effect of the CEL on the schools? This should be discoverable in the language used to symbolize these concepts. However, within the scope of this project, we must move on to the analytical methods that, in terms of Burke's theory, precede dramaturgism.

Patterns of Experience, Master Symbols, and Literary Form in RSL

In Burke's view, a writer begins the process of creating a text by making three critical decisions about the work:

- What "pattern of experience" to use. A pattern of experience is a universal human progression from a "situation to emotion to attitude to action," for example loss–grief–despair–suicide (Rueckert 13).
- What master symbol to use. The writer uses a master symbol to "re-individuate the pattern," in other words to create a new instance of a well-known, immediately recognizable pattern in human life (20).
- What form to use. Burke considers forms as a type of rhetorical appeal because they represent "psychological universals" for which all humans are neurologically and psychologically programmed. He reduces all literature to four types of forms, all of which are intended to both create and satisfy an appetite in the mind of the audience. Since forms are sequences, one part of the work must make the audience anticipate subsequent parts, and subsequent parts must gratify the reader's sense of what is appropriate for the sequence (Burke, Counter-Statement 124).

Burke uses the terms *patterns* and *motives* more or less interchangeably, and argues that certain patterns in a work of literature and certain symbols will appeal most powerfully to most people at most times, so that by choosing a specific pattern and developing it in a work of literature, a writer can increase the likelihood of successfully appealing to a large number of people. One of these powerful patterns is the quest, which can take many forms: hunts to satisfy biological needs, such as food; ritualistic hunts; searches for adventure; voyages of discovery; quests for knowledge; and the master quest, the ". . . internal voyage of exploration and

discovery, the search for the self which seems to figure as the basic motive in any kind of quest” (Rueckert 20).

Patterns of Experience in RSL

What common human sequence of “situation to emotion to attitude to action” do the RSL’s writers follow? Again, as with the dramatic analysis, it is useful to make a preliminary rough sketch:

- Situation: Common in the genre of environmental rhetoric, the situation that the RSL addresses can be characterized as “we are in danger of destroying the environmental systems that support life.”
- Emotion: Danger situations can evoke a number of emotions: for example, fear, excitement, or alarm. The RSL seems to have a tone of alarm.
- Attitude: After assessing a danger situation, various attitudes may be adopted based on one’s temperament and values: for example, dismissive, concerned, defensive, or aggressive. The RSL conveys an attitude of concern.
- Action: Various actions can result from the various attitudes toward danger: for example, the agent may do nothing, strategize, run away, or attack. The RSL seems to present a strategy for attempting to neutralize the danger presented by environmental degradation.

So, the pattern of experience that the CEL’s writers follow in creating the RSL could be characterized as danger–alarm–concern–strategize. This is a universal human progression that is represented in the text. The next step in creating a text is, as Burke states, determining what

master symbol to use to “re-individuate” the pattern, to create an original vision of a familiar pattern.

The School Garden as Master Symbol

A master symbol “re-individuates” a pattern and also functions to universally represent the experiences and conditions of the pattern (Rueckert 20). The master symbol chosen by the CEL for its sustainability education is the school garden, so this symbol both provides a new individuation of the universal Danger–Alarm–Concern–Strategize pattern, and condenses that pattern into a compact symbol. All its educational work—its seminars, publications, and web presence—is contained in the symbol of the school garden. The CEL uses the school garden to represent the experiences of students and teachers, administrators, parents, and food service workers, and even beyond the school to the local farmers. The CEL develops the school garden into a universal symbol for education, for sustainability, and for community. Why choose this symbol to re-individuate the danger–alarm–concern–strategize pattern? The CEL’s basic premises are that the environment is in danger of being degraded to the point of not being able to sustain human life in the future, that humans are responsible for this state of affairs, and that humans can take action to reverse this trend, with the meta-method for reversing the trend being education, specifically education for sustainability, or ecoliteracy.

The school garden is particularly appropriate because it symbolizes all of the following concepts:

- Nature and the environment: The garden consists of growing, living, soil organisms, plants, and animals, and human gardeners. The garden as symbol clearly unites nature and environmental issues with human issues in a pragmatic way, and logically leads to the understanding that if the environment is in danger, so are humans.
- Sustainability: The garden produces food as a renewable resource and recycles its own waste products, creating a model for sustainability in larger systems. The garden symbolizes a viable strategy for responding to current sustainability issues.
- Community: The students, teachers, and other members of the educational and local community work on the garden together, which means that the garden also symbolizes the strength found in making common cause with others in the community as a defensive strategy, one possible response to danger.
- Appropriate use of technology: Cultivating a garden requires the use of tools and the knowledge of how to use them properly. The garden requires use of appropriate technology, which symbolizes another strategy for responding to danger—that of using tools and techniques to increase one’s strength and efficiency.
- Education: The garden is part of a school, and is a way of integrating all the various aspects of the curriculum. Here the garden symbolizes yet another strategy for responding to danger; learn more about it so that an effective defense can be formulated.

So, the symbol of the school garden not only unites the human and natural worlds in the most pragmatic way and provides a model for sustainability that can be scaled up to larger

systems, it evokes a number of effective strategies for responding to danger: creating community, utilizing technology, and cultivating new knowledge through education.

After deciding on the danger–alarm–concern–strategize pattern of experience and the school garden as master symbol, the CEL writers had to determine what form to use for the RSL. As we will see in the discussion of form, the preceding choices made as to the pattern of experience and master symbol more or less dictate what form can be used.

Literary Form in RSL

Of the various types of form defined by Burke, RSL represents what he calls the “conventional” form, which has two main distinctive qualities:

- The appeal of form as form; in other words, the form is prominent, immediately recognizable, and is appealing in itself.
- Categorical expectancy, which means that the audience has expectations which are anterior to reading, based on what they already know about a particular literary form (Rueckert 23).

The RSL has formal appeal because, as described earlier, the form is prominent and familiar. The text is immediately recognizable as a technical manual or guide and exhibits the formal qualities of this genre: highly structured, consisting of sections that are independent but still interconnected, and consistent from one section to another. Its form as a technical manual appeals to readers who are interested in a specific type of text—one that allows them to understand a new concept and perform a task. The type of information it contains is immediately apparent, and the organization makes it easy to find specific topics. Not only does the text as a

whole exhibit formal appeal, each of the ten sections of the guide repeat the same basic form, so the sections have their own formal appeal as independent yet interconnected texts.

The second characteristic of formal appeal, categorical expectancy, is related to the first and is also apparent in the overall genre that includes technical manuals. To a large degree, this genre dictates the type of information that can be logically included in a given text. Most readers are familiar with the various types of user guides, technical guides, and other technical documentation that have become part of everyday life, and have a clear expectation of what types of information will be included in such a text—in general, again, readers will expect the text to help them do something; they expect it to be an informative document, one that tells them conceptual information about a topic as well as procedural information on how to accomplish a task. They also expect it to be directed at a specific audience or audiences, and that the work can be read as independent sections, depending on the reader's current needs, rather than as a continuous narrative. The various audiences for the RSL can quickly determine what to expect from each section in the guide and decide which is most appropriate for their role in the program.

To summarize the basic terms, pattern, symbol, and form used by the authors of RSL: In dramatic terms, an analysis of RSL shows that the CEL uses gardening in the schools to effect educational reform in order to save the planet. The basic pattern of experience exhibited by RSL is danger–alarm–concern–strategize, and it uses school gardens to symbolize the union of human and environmental interests and a model of sustainability, as well as a response to the danger of environmental degradation using the strategies of community building, technology, and education. RSL pours these elements into the conventional literary form of a technical manual.

The next steps in the analysis concern the questions:

- What follows what and why?

- What goes with what and why?

To answer these questions, we turn to the tools of structural and cluster analysis.

Structural Analysis of RSL

Structural analysis, in Burkean terms, aims to outline what follows what and why in a literary work. The most important types of progression are summarized by Rueckert:

. . . plot (sequence of external events); action (“spiritual movement,” or sequence of internal reactions); pattern of experience (the simple and complex patterns of psychic and physical experience resulting from conflicts within an agent and the interaction between agent, other agents, scene, and the like); spatial movement (up, down, in, out, north, south, east, west); tonal progression; chronological progression (seasonal progression, biological growth, historical change); scenic progression; and qualitative progression (from dark, to gray, to light imagery; from rot, to purgation, to redemption imagery; from innocence to corruption to depravity). (83, 84)

One point to notice about this list is that it includes “patterns of experience” as a type of structure, a progression, and recall that this concept was introduced earlier when discussing the first decision a writer makes when creating a work—deciding on a pattern of experience precedes deciding on a master symbol and a literary form. So, the pattern can manifest again as the most prominent structural feature of a work, although it is clear from this listing that there are many other possibilities.

RSL is written in the conventional literary form of a technical manual, and organized so that the sections are independent though connected; however, in spite of the various connections

between the sections, it is difficult to find any sort of progression in the RSL as a whole; this is a rhetorical weakness which this study addresses later, in the assessment of the RSL's rhetorical effectiveness. The RSL introduction (“Road Map”) explicitly states that everyone should read the sections “Food Policy” and “Food and Health” as a general introduction to the concepts of the program, and goes on to state that different audiences will likely read different sections after that point based on their needs. However, within the sections there is a high degree of regularity, so it may make more sense in this case to look within the sections for a common sort of progression. To summarize the general progression of information in the sections, they each contain the following elements in the same order:

- Image
- Quote—“Food For Thought”
- Goals and challenges
- Key points
- Interview or essay—“Rethinking Food Policy”
- Tools
- Resources

What sort of progression does this arrangement suggest? Even here, it is difficult to see how the structure matches any of the major types of progression. Perhaps a case can be made that it represents a pattern of experience (“situation to emotion to attitude to action”), for example: ignorance–shame–desire to learn–read/think/practice. It is difficult to see any other way to characterize this pattern as progressive in any sense, and even this seems to be forced. The RSL, in common with most technical texts, starts with the premise that the readers are ignorant about some issue and need to be educated; they need to rethink. This has some limited appeal to certain

audiences, but seems to be a fundamental weakness in the RSL's rhetorical approach, which may be characteristic of many other works of environmental rhetoric—the premise that the audience is ignorant and that the text is going to shame them into wanting to become enlightened. This is explicit in works by writers such as Bill McKibben (The End of Nature), and is an attitude that is taken to task by writers such as William Cronon (“The Trouble with Wilderness; or Getting Back to the Wrong Nature”). It seems that an educational program like that proposed by the RSL would be more likely to create identification with a wider audience if it represented a progression that appealed (based on Burke's theories of universal attitudes) to a wider audience. Many options are possible, but the main point here is to point out this lack of progressive form in RSL as a serious weakness in their rhetorical approach; also the fact that this sort of weakness is not obvious, and can be brought to the surface using a Burkean analysis.

As Rueckert summarizes, “An analysis of the progressive forms of a work leads quickly to the realization that all works have other kinds of form as well, and that to do a structural analysis one must also do a cluster analysis” (84). So the cluster analysis—what goes with what and why—is an extension of, and complementary to, the structural analysis.

Cluster Analysis of Section I: Road Map

Since the cluster analysis requires some fairly detailed quantitative and qualitative work, the scope of this project requires this part of the analysis to be limited to one section of the RSL. “Section I: Road Map” was chosen because it is the introductory section for the text and sets the tone and expectations for the rest of the sections.

A cluster analysis begins by generating an index and concordance for a work or group of works by the same author. The index is selective, both quantitative and qualitative; it is

statistical as well as descriptive. Terms are included that have one or more of the following characteristics:

- They are significant in a particular work, which for RSL would mean terms like *rethinking* and *ecoliteracy*.
- They are naturally “charged,” meaning they have strong emotional associations for most people. In RSL, this would include terms like *food*, *community*, and *schools*.
- They are frequently repeated, which in RSL would include terms such as *food*; this points out the fact that charged terms may also be used frequently in a given text.

As Rueckert points out, the index by itself only points out features of the text that are fairly easy to discern. The concordance is the opposite of the index in terms of inclusivity—it aims to be exhaustive—including every instance of the index terms, even implicit or suggested instances, and the use of each term in every context. The concordance functions as a cross-reference for the index, providing insight into unusual or inconsistent uses of a term, revealing motives in the text that are not obvious. Cross-referencing terms between the index and concordance allows one to derive equations that explain what equals what in a work, like *Nature = God*. These equations are worked out based on the contexts in which the terms occur, and may reveal unconventional or unexpected equivalencies.

Index for Section I

The terms included in this index are grouped based on whether they are specifically significant for RSL, charged, or frequently used in the text. Within these three groupings, terms are further divided into clusters based on common associations, for example the *school* cluster includes terms like *academic*.

The first group of terms to consider are those that are especially significant for this particular work. *Rethinking* is not only significant for RSL, but frequent, appearing over a dozen times in the introductory section, as well as throughout the rest of the text. *Ecoliteracy* is significant in RSL, and appears in the CEL's name as well as throughout the text.

The next group of terms to consider are those that are "charged," and includes the terms *school, food, communities, sustainable, and business*, as well as associated clusters of terms.

School and associated terms are charged because they symbolize issues related to children, the best way to educate them, and the future for the country, the world, and the environment. Associated terms:

academic
children
classroom
curriculum
education
instruction
knowledge
learning
literacy
parents
skills
students
teachers
thought
tests
youth

Food and associated terms are charged because food and eating are one of the primary quests for survival, and also highly individualistic and cultural. This term is not only charged but frequent in the RSL introduction and throughout the text. Associated terms:

diet
farm
gardens
hungry

lunch
meal
nutrition/nutritious
Recommended Dietary Allowance

Communities and associated terms are charged because virtually everyone in the current political and social climate is engaged in some way with the ideas associated with living in a locale or community, and this often engenders strong feelings one way or the other, with many people at least paying lip service to the idea that a life focused locally is a positive social value; this is in clear opposition to the prevailing political tendency to promote globalization for its supposed economic advantages. Associated terms:

local/locally
relationships

Sustainable and associated terms are charged because to argue against the concept of sustainability would be to argue for the inevitable exhaustion of natural resources and, ultimately, the end of civilization; to argue about how to attain it is to argue about the fundamental principles and methods of how to move society forward into the future. Associated terms:

conserved
sustainability
natural resources
waste

Business and associated terms, including terms for political, economic, and cultural entities, are charged because of varying perceptions of these entities based on different values.

Related terms:

agribusiness
Berkeley
commercials
development

economy/economic
marketers
the media
partnerships
senior citizens
televised

From the foregoing list of index terms, we can see that the charged terms in Section I of RSL all revolve around ideas of school, food, communities, sustainability, and business or social entities. For the next step in the cluster analysis, the concordance, we list the contexts for the index terms, which allows us to cross-reference these terms to determine what equals what in the text.

Concordance for Section I

Ideally, the concordance includes every instance of all the index terms, including both explicit and implicit or suggested instances, and explores how each term is used in every context. Because of its limited scope, this study combines several methods to reduce the concordance to a manageable size while still providing some meaningful insights into the equivalencies in the text. The first section of this concordance focuses on the term that is probably most significant in this text, *food*, and lists every instance of that term. It then lists the equivalencies that can be derived from these instances, groups the equivalencies into clusters, and briefly analyzes each cluster of terms. The next section lists the most important high intensity terms in Section I—*rethinking*, *ecoliteracy*, *food*, *school*, and associated terms—and provides several longer examples of each term in various contexts along with more extensive analysis. This combination of a complete listing with brief context examples and an abbreviated listing with more extensive examples and analysis provides a coherent example of the complete method while keeping the length of the analysis within the scope of this study. Another purpose for conducting the analysis in this way is to demonstrate the potential utility of an abbreviated approach. While this project was conducted without the aid of programs to assist with the text analysis, certainly some of the more mechanical parts of the analysis could be automated, freeing the analyst to concentrate on the more abstract and higher-order analysis, and an evaluation of how to best use software to facilitate a Burkean analysis would be a project in itself. The current project lays the groundwork for such a study.

A total of 88 instances of the term *food* are included in Section I, and the following list summarizes all these instances, including enough of the surrounding text or phrase to suggest the

context in an abbreviated manner. The terms are in alphabetic order. If a term or slight variations of it appears more than once, the number of instances appears in parentheses after the term.

Capitalization is as it appears in the text.

<i>American School Food Service Association</i>	<i>food systems curriculum</i>
<i>attitudes toward food</i>	<i>food talks</i>
<i>banned food</i>	<i>fresh food (7)</i>
<i>buying food locally</i>	<i>freshly picked or prepared foods</i>
<i>Child Nutrition and Food Distribution Division</i>	<i>healthy, fresh food</i>
<i>children grow or prepare the foods they eat</i>	<i>high-fat foods</i>
<i>children's predisposition to these foods</i>	<i>junk food</i>
<i>eating better food</i>	<i>junk food generation</i>
<i>fast-food attitudes</i>	<i>local food sources</i>
<i>Food and Health (4)</i>	<i>local food system</i>
<i>food bought locally</i>	<i>local seasonal foods</i>
<i>food choices (2)</i>	<i>locally grown food</i>
<i>food energy</i>	<i>new attitudes toward food</i>
<i>food for children</i>	<i>non-nutritious foods</i>
<i>food for thought</i>	<i>nutritious food</i>
<i>food groups</i>	<i>packaged, processed foods</i>
<i>food in schools/school food</i>	<i>poor food choices</i>
<i>food knowledge</i>	<i>preschool children's food</i>
<i>food literacy</i>	<i>preferences</i>
<i>food needs to be delicious, attractive, and appealing to young people</i>	<i>processed food</i>
<i>food on children's plates</i>	<i>quality of food</i>
<i>food packaging</i>	<i>school food</i>
<i>Food Policy (4)</i>	<i>school food programs</i>
<i>food policy development process</i>	<i>shipping food</i>
<i>food preparation</i>	<i>televised food commercials</i>
<i>food preparation skills</i>	<i>food almost always becomes more attractive</i>
<i>food service director(s) (4)</i>	<i>food is there on the table</i>
<i>food service employees</i>	<i>food they eat</i>
<i>food service employees' jobs</i>	<i>land the food is grown on</i>
<i>food service personnel</i>	<i>what the school really believes about food</i>
<i>food service staff(ing) (6)</i>	<i>where food comes from</i>
<i>food service(s) (3)</i>	<i>wise food choices</i>
<i>food source</i>	
<i>food systems</i>	

As mentioned previously, the frequency of a term is important for this type of analysis, and by extension, so is the frequency with which a term is used in certain repeated contexts. For

example, “food service directors” appears four times in Section I alone, which indicates that RSL places these agents high in the hierarchy, but “food service staff or staffing” appears six times, indicating that the agents and act of staffing are even higher; “fresh food” appears seven times, more than any other context, so that this is at or near the top of the hierarchy. Capitalization is also be a clue as to how a term fits into a Burkean hierarchy; for example instances like “Food and Health” (4) indicate a heading that appears four times in the text, so this concept is near the top of the hierarchy for this text.

The purpose of the concordance is to determine what the author considers a term equivalent to—what it symbolizes for that author and work—from the context in which a term is used. From the preceding list of contexts for the term *food*, we can derive the following list of equivalencies; in other words, food = the following list of terms:

<i>America</i>	<i>literacy</i>	<i>predisposition</i>
<i>Association</i>	<i>groups</i>	<i>preferences</i>
<i>attitude</i>	<i>Health</i>	<i>preparation</i>
<i>attractive</i>	<i>health</i>	<i>wisdom</i>
<i>banned</i>	<i>high-fat</i>	<i>process</i>
<i>belief</i>	<i>jobs</i>	<i>processed</i>
<i>children</i>	<i>junk</i>	<i>programs</i>
<i>choice</i>	<i>knowledge</i>	<i>school</i>
<i>choices</i>	<i>local</i>	<i>seasonal</i>
<i>curriculum</i>	<i>locale</i>	<i>service</i>
<i>director</i>	<i>non-nutritious</i>	<i>skills</i>
<i>employees</i>	<i>nutrition</i>	<i>staff</i>
<i>energy</i>	<i>packaging</i>	<i>system</i>
<i>freshness</i>	<i>personnel</i>	<i>talk (speech)</i>
	<i>Policy</i>	<i>television commercials</i>
		<i>thought</i>

From this list of equivalencies we can derive some clusters of terms. Food equals the human cognitive faculties of thought, attitudes, choices, predispositions, preferences, beliefs, wisdom, knowledge, and speech. In these terms, food symbolizes the faculties that are most basic

to being human, the ability to think, to speak, to develop knowledge and wisdom, which are all fundamentally based in rhetoric, as conceived by theoreticians like James Berlin and others who argue that rhetoric is epistemic, knowledge-creating, and reality-shaping. So food, in this context, is rhetorical. Also implicitly rhetorical are food-as-agent's ability to form attitudes and beliefs, to make choices, and to have predispositions or preferences. In RSL food is equivalent in many respects to rhetoric, appeal, and persuasion, and to dialog and discourse; food equals thought or is at least a precursor to thought.

This concordance also shows that in RSL food is equal to a number of human-created cultural and political institutions: services, systems, policies, processes, staff, personnel, employees, director, jobs, skills, groups, America, associations, television commercials, programs, and the specifically educational institutions of school, curriculums, and literacy. These equivalencies position food as being the foundation for the basic concepts, such as policies, that provide the structure for most social and political institutions associated with the world of work and its hierarchies, with the term America at the top of the socio-political order. Food also equals education and literacy, and in particular ecoliteracy.

Food also equals energy, a locale, and something prepared, packaged, fresh, healthy, nutritious/non-nutritious, banned, high-fat, attractive, junky, seasonal, or processed. Food is an agency since it is the source of energy for human bodies. Alternately, food is a scene, because it defines a place. As a scene, it can be prepared, processed, and packaged, or banned, like stage scenery, and it can have positive or negative characteristics; fresh, healthy, nutritious, attractive, seasonal, or non-nutritious, high-fat, and junky. This is not only dialectical, but hierarchic, since RSL clearly characterizes the different types of food and elevates fresh organic foods above the typical American diet that tends toward packaged junky foods.

Perhaps most important for the purposes of creating identification, food equals children. In RSL, food is equivalent to the verbal, the language systems that constitute the educational system which shapes the values and attitudes of future citizens, and the energy that enables those systems and those future citizens to act. The audience for this text is adults who are concerned with educating those children, and the main rhetorical force of this text is directed at persuading those adults to identify with the concepts around ecoliteracy, one of the central ideas of which is that the best way to educate children about sustainability is to incorporate an organic garden into every school and to use it as a scene with which to integrate the entire curriculum.

The following section moves from covering all instances of a single term to analyzing the most important high intensity terms from the index for Section I in more depth. For each term, this section provides a limited number of example contexts in which the term is used. As this section of the analysis makes clear, a limited sampling of terms is enough to gain some meaningful insights into the symbolism in the text—what equals what. In this section, the terms are listed in italics, and following each term is a bulleted list of some of the contexts in which the term is used. The contexts are exact quotes, followed by parenthetical references and a brief note about what that specific instance of the term suggests about the term's equivalency in the text. Some of the context examples are fairly short, such as titles, and some are longer quotations. For terms that occur frequently in the text, since it is not practical to list all the instances, examples are taken from various locations in the text rather than all from one page. Some terms are used almost exclusively as part of certain phrases, and this is noted in the commentary. Some of the examples include more than one high intensity term, and so are used in the commentary for both terms, such as the terms *rethinking* and *school* in "Road Map: *Rethinking School* Lunch Guide."

These cases are useful for comparing and contrasting the equivalencies of different terms within the same context.

Following the list of contexts for each term is a discussion of what those instances taken together reveal about what that term equals in this text. Within each of the quotes, the terms are italicized for clarity. One of the purposes for analyzing a term and its associated terms in various contexts is to look for the degree of consistency in the equivalencies, and if an occurrence seems inconsistent with the others, to take note of the meaning suggested by that inconsistency.

Rethinking

Contexts:

- “Road Map: *Rethinking* School Lunch Guide” (cover). A map, a guide.
- “*Rethinking* School Lunch – A project of the Center for Ecoliteracy” (cover). A project.
- “Today the nation’s school lunch program is at a crossroads, faced with nutritional and service problems so serious they make news headlines. So many issues are involved—nutrition, facilities, food service, student disinterest—that it’s hard to know where to begin. *Rethinking* School Lunch reframes this challenge as an opportunity to embrace a whole-systems approach to education” (3). A transformer of challenges into opportunities.
- “*Rethinking* School Lunch envisions school lunch not as an isolated meal-a-day program, but as the vital center of an intricate connection of relationships among students, teachers, parents, and community” (4). Something that has a vision.

- “Another distinguishing characteristic of *Rethinking* School Lunch is its inclusion of an integrated curriculum approach” (4). Something that can shape education.

Rethinking is used primarily in the phrase “rethinking school lunch” and symbolizes both the program and the publication that represents the program. Rethinking, or the process that it suggests, is then a map, a guide, a project, and an agent that transforms challenges into opportunities, has a vision, and can shape education. All these equivalencies seem consistent; they all suggest an agent or an agency that can be used by the readers to effect change in the schools, which are the scene for the action in this text. The change is always effected through the lunch program, through food. Since rethinking has the attributes of an agent, a conscious entity, it can act and have agency and purpose. Rethinking appears many more times as part of the “rethinking school lunch” phrase before it starts to appear in other contexts. It appears in every section title, for example “Rethinking Food Policy,” and is repeated throughout the guide, almost always in the context of titles, serving as a consistent symbol of the program as an active agent with purpose.

One of the few places where rethinking appears both within the body text and partly dissociated from “school lunch” is in an interview that discusses a community-based process for crafting a policy: “It [the policy] can become the reinvention, the *rethinking* of school lunch, and the *rethinking* of where school lunch fits in an integrated school system and community” (20). Even in this context, the rhetoric closely associates rethinking with school lunch, and here it equals policy. The CEL writers explicitly define rethinking in the last section of the RSL: “The activity of ‘*rethinking*’ calls attention to a problem-solving approach that addresses root causes, rather than the treatment of symptoms” (172). So while the CEL defines it as a “problem-solving approach,” its rhetoric suggests that its writers think of it as a map, guide, vision, project, and

policy, as well as a shaper of these agencies. This suggests that the CEL's motive is actually to shape policy in specific ways rather than simply outlining a method for doing so.

Ecoliteracy

Contexts: This term appears in the text only as part of the phrase "Center for *Ecoliteracy*," in publication information and quote attributes. For example, the cover includes the text "Rethinking School Lunch – a project of the Center for *Ecoliteracy*." This term is not defined explicitly anywhere in the text, which seems curious since it is a relatively new term, and would be unfamiliar to many readers; this suggests that the CEL expects that its intended audience is already familiar with the concept of ecoliteracy, perhaps through the CEL's website or some of its other publications. In this context, ecoliteracy equals a center which can generate projects, and around which the acts that constitute ecoliteracy can be performed; thus it can be both a scene and an agent. Ecoliteracy equals the CEL and vice versa.

School and associated terms (*academic, children, classroom, curriculum, education, instruction, knowledge, learning, literacy, parents, skills, students, teachers/teaching, tests, thought, youth*)

Contexts:

- "Road Map: Rethinking *School* Lunch Guide" (cover). A map, a guide.
- "This *learning* can be linked to the *classroom curriculum*, experiences in the *school* garden and kitchen *classroom*, and visits to local farms. In an integrated farm-to-*school* approach, the lunch period and the lunch itself become *teaching* and *learning* opportunities in the daily life of the entire *learning* community" (2). A garden, a kitchen, a farm, lunch, a community.

- “*School* lunch feeds minds, bodies, and communities: *School* lunch is a vital issue in our society that goes far beyond the meal on the plate. It can be the doorway to a whole new way of providing *education for sustainability* with broad-reaching effects for our *children* and community” (2). Mind, body, community, society, meals, a doorway.
- “Vision: A program that uses a systems approach to combine farm-to-*school* concepts with an integrated curriculum” (2). An imagined scenario, possibly romantic or fanciful.
- “It’s time to implement a farm-to-*school* program: Marilyn Briggs, former director of the Nutrition Services Division and retired Assistant Superintendent of Public *Instruction* for the California Department of *Education*, outlines the urgent need for a farm-to-*school* lunch program and shares her experiences and thoughts on how it can be accomplished” (2). A bureaucracy, a program, experience and thought.
- “District-wide *educational* goals include integrating the *school* food service with the *academic* curriculum” (4). Food service, a body of educational materials and processes.
- “The most systematic and efficient means for improving the health of *America’s* *youth* is to establish healthy dietary and physical activity behaviors in childhood” (8). Health, behavior.
- “Centering the *curriculum* on food systems increases *ecological literacy* by focusing on how food reaches the table, as well as the impacts the food system has on the natural world” (4). A table, a place to gather for meals, the natural order.
- “Food for *thought*” (2). Food.

- “I have seen children take *food knowledge* home and really make a difference with their parents” (10). Children, home, parents.

School appears frequently paired with *rethinking* in the phrase “rethinking *school* lunch” and so symbolizes many of the same things; it is a map, a guide, a project, and an agent that transforms challenges into opportunities, has a vision, and can shape education. Like *rethinking*, *school* has attributes of an agent and can act, and can have agency and purpose. Unlike *rethinking*, *school* and associated terms appear extensively throughout the body text of the guide in many contexts, not just in titles, so it serves to link the meta-concept of rethinking with the rest of the text.

In the context of the other examples, *school* symbolizes many of the concepts that have traditionally been associated with schools: community, bureaucracy, a program, experience, thought, mind, society, children, home, and parents. In the RSL, *school* also symbolizes lunch, meals in general, and things connected with food, for example, a table and a kitchen—the furniture one eats on and the room where one prepares food—which also symbolize the family, a place to gather, and a place that provides sustenance. These contexts also make school equal to the places where food is raised; a garden, a farm, and finally, the higher-level order of the natural, which contains all means of food production within the suborders of animals, natural things, natural places, and the biological. These equivalencies are part of the RSL’s rhetorical strategy to link school with food production with school, and not just any type of food production, but the production of organically farmed foods using sustainable methods. Elsewhere in the text, school-related terms are used in contexts including *food literacy* and *nutrition educators/education*. RSL includes terms related to the physical body and health to the symbolic meanings associated with *school*. It also uses the metaphor of a doorway to symbolize a way to a

better life, making this symbol equal to school. By making school equivalent to food and nature, RSL implicitly develops the ideas around ecoliteracy, which includes education about food and its relationship to sustainability and the natural environment. RSL suggests ways of reading the socio-political order of the school environment into the natural order in a constructive rather than a destructive manner.

The text also uses school-related terms in contexts including *hidden curriculum* and *standardized tests*, which suggest sinister and mechanistic things, so they use *school* to symbolize negative as well as positive aspects of education, suggesting a dialectic that can go either way. These negative connotations are equal to schools as they are now, and provide a contrast to the way that they can be if the vision that the CEL has for schools is implemented. This rhetorical strategy clearly works toward inducing the audience to identify with all the positive qualities attributed to organic gardening, to make these qualities equal to educational reform, and to present them as a positive, achievable alternative to the current educational model that RSL equates to hidden, sinister motives, standardization, and the mechanization of education.

Food and associated terms (*diet, farm, gardens, hungry, lunch, meal, nutrition/nutritious, Recommended Dietary Allowance*)

Contexts:

- “*Food* for thought” (2). Thought, school.
- “When the *lunch* period is recognized as part of the learning day, new opportunities and responsibilities emerge for students, *food* services, and the district as a whole.

The *lunch* period is a window for critical learning and modeling of attitudes toward *food*” (2). Learning, school, a window, a model, an attitude.

- “The Center for Ecoliteracy has found that a school *lunch* program based on serving *fresh, locally grown food* is the heart of an innovative approach to learning and teaches children how to make intelligent choices that will benefit their health and create sustainable communities” (3). School, program, approach, learning, teaching, children, intelligence, choices, health, community.
- “By composting *kitchen* waste from *food* preparation, students connect their real-life experiences with science lessons on decomposition” (3). Waste, science, decomposition, rot, purgation.
- “Students see cause and effect in lessons about *food* packaging. By buying *fresh, local foods*, package waste is reduced and natural resources are conserved” (3). Packages, waste, natural resources.
- “According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, poor *diet* and physical inactivity are responsible for as many premature deaths as is tobacco—more than 1,200 deaths a day” (8). Bureaucracy, the body, death, tobacco.
- “One essential element in this web of interconnections is the *farm-to-school* model, which provides the school *lunch* program with fresh *food* from local, sustainable family *farms*” (4). Connections, school, a model, programs, family.
- “And when school *gardens* or *cooking* classes are also integrated into the curriculum, so that children grow or prepare the *foods* they *eat*, the *food* almost always becomes more attractive” (9). School, children, attractiveness.

- “But if kids aren’t in a position to learn because they’re *hungry*, or they don’t get enough *nutritious food* at home, then schools that don’t make the *nutrition/performance* connection in the *cafeteria* end up undermining what they’re trying to do in the classroom” (8). Kids, positioning, learning, home, school, performance, connections, sabotage.
- “Here’s what this vision of an effective school *lunch* program looks like:” (4). Vision, school, seeing.

In these contexts, *food* symbolizes school and all the terms associated with it in RSL, including bureaucracy, program, thought, learning, intelligence, teaching, children, family, community, connections, and home, which illustrates the principle of equivalency—that school and food are consistently equivalent to each other throughout all the various contexts in which these terms appear in RSL, and are practically interchangeable. Food also symbolizes various aspects of the body including the opposites of health and death. Food is further equated to the negative or purgative terms *waste*, *decomposition*, and *rot*, and also related the positive term *natural resources*. Food is equal to various elements that make up patterns of experience such as attitude, choices, approaches, positioning, performance, and sabotage. Similar to the way that the doorway metaphor is equated to school and used to symbolize a vision and a way to a better life, the metaphor of a window is equated to food and used to symbolize vision, seeing, and attractiveness, suggesting something that one would want to look at. As with the door metaphor for school, the window becomes a symbol equal to food that implicitly develops the ideas around ecoliteracy, which is essentially the RSL’s new vision for education. In RSL, food equals school, the body, the natural, patterns of experience, and vision.

As stated previously, the concordance aims to identify implicit as well as explicit usages of each high intensity term. The following examples show some of the implicit contexts in which *food* is used in Section I of RSL.

- “The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) identify diet as a ‘known risk’ for the development of the nation’s three leading causes of death: coronary heart disease, cancer, and stroke, as well as for diabetes, high blood pressure, and osteoporosis, among others” (8).
- “Studies repeatedly link good nutrition to learning readiness, academic achievement, and decreased discipline and emotional problems.”

These examples provide us with the following list of terms that are implicitly equivalent to food:

cancer
death
diabetes
disease
emotional problems
coronary heart disease
high blood pressure
osteoporosis
risk
stroke

In these contexts, food is equivalent to disease, death, and decay. This inclusion of negative equivalencies is similar to the way that *school* is used to symbolize the dialectic between the negative and positive aspects of education. In the case of food, these negative equivalencies are equal to the food that schools provide for students now (and by extension, to the food that people in the wider community are educated to accept, including “education” by the mass media), and provide a contrast to the food that schools can provide if the CEL’s vision for

school lunch is implemented. Beyond providing healthy food for the students while they are at school, these equivalencies make clear the role of schools in educating students—by concrete example and practical experience as well as theory—about what constitutes healthy food, both for their own nutritional needs and for the health of the natural systems that provide their food. Just as with school and associated terms, this rhetorical strategy works toward inducing the audience to identify with organic gardening and foods, equate them with educational reform, and to present this reform as a positive, achievable alternative to the way that students are currently fed and educated about food, a model that RSL equates to disease and death.

This list also suggests the scope that an all-inclusive rhetorical analysis would have to encompass in order to cover every implicit instance of a term in a text; clearly, for any substantial text this would require a far longer study than the current one. However, as with the explicit instances, it also illustrates the principle that many of the important equivalencies in a text can be determined from a sampling of the complete set of occurrences, and indeed that perhaps examining every occurrence of each high intensity term would not result in a more useful analysis than a well-selected sample set of terms and contexts.

Symbolic Actions and Hierarchies Represented in RSL

The introductory sections of this study note that Burke's dramatisitic theory was the culmination of his work, which he developed subsequent to his theory of symbolic action. However, we began our analysis of RSL with dramatism, in a sense beginning at the end, so that we could perform the analysis using the terms of dramatism. In those terms, we determined that the CEL (agent) uses gardening (agency) in the schools (scene), which enables them to effect educational reform (act) in order to save the planet (purpose). We then returned to the beginnings

of Burke's theories, analyzing RSL in terms of the decisions that all authors make as they conceive a work: choosing a pattern of experience for the work, choosing a master symbol, and choosing a literary form. We found that the RSL uses a pattern of experience that could be characterized as danger–alarm–concern–strategize, the school garden as master symbol, and the conventional form of the technical manual. After analyzing RSL in these most basic terms, we moved on to a structural analysis, because, as Rueckert paraphrases Burke, “The first step in the analysis of a poem as symbolic action requires an exhaustive descriptive and analytic study of its structure in order to determine what follows what, and why” (83, 84). And again, even though here Rueckert refers to poetry, Burke makes it clear that he considers poetry and rhetoric amenable to the same sort of analysis, since both are language. This brings us to an examination of what the structural and cluster analysis of RSL can tell us about the work as symbolic action.

Burke characterizes all language as symbolic action, which, as noted previously, can be characterized as linguistic, representative, or purgative-redemptive. What does it mean to state that symbolic action has these three aspects? For Burke, all verbal acts are symbolic action because “words are symbols which stand for things and ideas, and verbalizations are symbols in action” (59). This means that all literature is symbolic action, so in this most general sense, RSL, like any other literature, is symbolic action. RSL uses the school garden as its master symbol, which is equivalent to its ideas about food, school, and sustainability. RSL serves as the agency—the vehicle—for the symbol of the school garden to perform its action in the world. The school garden symbolizes healthy food, educational reform, and a reordering of the socio-political hierarchies in the socio-political and natural order. This aspect of language as symbolic action—the linguistic—suggests how the school garden as master symbol for this work serves to induce the audience to identify with the CEL's values, which place environmental protection and

liberal education at or near the top of its hierarchy. One point to notice here is that the school garden is the meeting point for these two major concerns, the action and symbol meant to induce the RSL's audience to identify with the values of environmental protection and liberal education. The physical garden in the ground and the verbal garden in the text serve the same rhetorical purpose. This tells us that although the entire text and the program it describes are permeated by the symbol of the school garden, another symbol could have been used to accomplish the purpose of promoting identification with these same values, so to some extent the symbols used to promote a given set of values are interchangeable with other symbols. However, this does not tell us much about the hidden meanings in RSL.

The second aspect of language as symbolic action concerns its representative function, where Burke starts to differentiate symbolic from practical acts. He distinguishes symbolic acts from practical acts because symbolic acts represent the "self" of the agent that performs them in some deep sense, and perform some "compensating function" which constitutes the symbolic meaning of the act. In this sense, symbolic action is private rather than public, hidden rather than obvious, and has psychological overtones (57). He explains that a person planting a vegetable garden to grow food so that he or she will have something to eat performs a practical act; but a person who writes a book about planting vegetables performs a symbolic act. The physical garden can also perform a representative function. If the person can easily go out and buy vegetables, yet chooses to plant a garden and grow them instead, this too enters the realm of the symbolic, because it becomes an act that represents the self and the person's value system. The distinction lies in the motive attached to the act. A physical garden can be either practical or symbolic, depending on the gardener's motive. Rueckert, quoting from Burke, says that "Representative-symbolic acts are images of the self which performs them, and analysis of such

symbolic acts will reveal ‘some underlying principle of the agent’s character, some fixed trait of his personality’” (59). The CEL writers are not subsistence farmers who have to grow their own food in order to eat, so planting vegetables is not a practical act for them. They are urban dwellers, and for them the act of growing vegetables in urban settings is an agency by which they perform the act of educational reform. RSL aims to induce its audience to rethink various aspects of education, using gardening as way to connect education with wider issues of sustainability and the environment. This clearly makes the writing of RSL a representative-symbolic act, since it is not practical in terms of being necessary for the authors to have food to eat, or for their audience to continue being able to do their jobs, whether they are food service workers or school administrators.

Of course, the Burkean distinction between practical and representative-symbolic is not simply either/or. He regards verbal acts, including literature of all types, as thoroughly practical because these acts achieve practical goals in the world, so any verbal act is in some sense practical. But beyond providing practical information on how to integrate gardening into the educational system, RSL represents the character of its authors, and the foregoing structural analysis and cluster analysis provide some evidence of this character. RSL uses the school garden as the master symbol to unite school and education with gardens and food, and the entire text is clearly dominated by terms associated with school and food. In RSL, statements about food are symbolic acts in which food, for RSL’s authors, represents school, the body, and the natural. What principle of character or personality trait does this reveal? Food and things associated with food can be a response to hunger, can provide pleasure, or can satisfy some deeper need. Perhaps the RSL’s focus on food suggests that its writers are hungry, not for sustenance but to reform the educational system along the lines of their vision, and to satisfy

some deeper need to change the hierarchy in the socio-political or natural order. They are hungry to be agents for social change and to leave their mark on the current hierarchy.

Finally, what about the third function of symbolic action, the redemptive-purgative? Examining this aspect requires some further discussion of hierarchies in Burke. Rueckert summarizes Burke's concept of hierarchy:

In the most general sense, hierarchy is any kind of order; but more accurately, it is any kind of graded, value-charged structure in terms of which things, words, people, acts, and ideas are ranked. Any hierarchy is simultaneously unifying and divisive in so far as it orders the whole by ranking according to some value-system and in so far as the ranking is a division into different classes of being. All hierarchies have inherent in them a progressive form which comes from the nature of language itself: the upward movement from lower to higher and the downward movement from higher to lower. Thus, any hierarchy generates for those who participate in it what Burke calls the "hierarchic motive:" on the one hand people are goaded by the desire to mount the hierarchy, either through action or possession; and on the other hand people are goaded by the threat of descending the hierarchy, again either by action or possession, but also by failure to act or inability to possess certain things. (131, 132)

Burke contends that humans are naturally burdened with what he calls "categorical guilt" because their use of language naturally tends toward abstraction and creating these hierarchic orders, where some things are higher than others; humans are constantly constructing abstract ideal selves and behaviors which cannot be attained, but which they use as a basis for judging themselves and others. Against the backdrop of the hierarchies, which provide a set of ideals and values, humans constantly generate "categorical guilt" because they perform the symbolic

actions of representing themselves through language, comparing themselves to these self-generated symbols, and finding themselves lacking based on their relative position in the social hierarchy. However, language also provides a method of redemption through symbolic action, which constitutes the purgative-redemptive aspect of language as symbolic action. How is this purgative-redemptive aspect manifested in RSL? To analyze this aspect of the text, we first determine what hierarchies are represented in the text.

As shown by the cluster analysis, school and food are at the top of RSL's hierarchies. School belongs to the socio-political order, and food belongs to the natural order, particularly the suborder of natural things (things you can eat), and to a lesser extent natural places, such as gardens, and the biological, for instance the natural cycles associated with raising food crops. RSL positions school, especially liberal education, at the top of the socio-political order and food, particularly foods identified with health—such as fresh foods—at the top of the natural order. In some sense, these are both inversions of the current prevailing socio-political order. Even though school and food are both important issues to most people, they have the status of necessary evils to many citizens as well as leaders. That schools are over-regimented and over-politicized, and that fast, cheap foods are preferred by many people, are current cultural commonplaces. That there are currently virtually no connections between farms and schools, farms and consumers, goes without saying. The language with which RSL represents school and food establishes a moral sense around these terms. *Hidden curriculum* and *standardized tests* are immoral, and *kitchen classroom* and *an integrated farm-to-school approach* are moral. *Fast-food attitudes* and the *junk-food generation* are immoral, and *new attitudes toward food* and *local seasonal foods* are moral. As Rueckert explains,

Burke believes that man is fundamentally a moral-ethical animal, and that he has built into his system a moral sense and the impulse toward alleviating the guilt naturally produced by moral consciousness. Man must continuously purge and redeem himself from the guilt that is as natural to him as breathing; such highly practical, purgative-redemptive moral action is the third kind of symbolic action. Any act, whether non-verbal or verbal, which performs this function, is a symbolic act. (60)

In RSL, the act of educational reform is not only verbal and representative, but also purgative-redemptive, because it enables the writers to purge themselves of the guilt generated by their membership in a society that does not value liberal education. The act of planting a garden, likewise, enables them to purge the guilt that comes from being part of a society that does not value healthy food. The confluence of school, children, farms, and food provides a rich vein of guilt. RSL brings the reader face-to-face with the fact that those who society is supposed to value most—our children—are stuffed into standardized curricula, fed hurried junk food meals, and educated to believe that these are acceptable ways to live. The writers of RSL redeem themselves by writing a technical manual about how to elevate school in the socio-political hierarchy and food in the natural hierarchy, and by doing so transfer the burden of guilt to their readers. In other words, after the readers are made aware of the moral wrongness of the current situation, and of a way to a better life, the guilt becomes theirs until they unburden themselves through some similar symbolic action.

Rhetorical Criticisms of RSL

As mentioned in the section on structural analysis, RSL does not seem to follow any sort of overall progression. While this is common to technical manuals, which often consist of

sections that are independent yet interconnected, the rhetorical effectiveness of RSL could be improved by introducing some form of progression into the structure. This would improve the rhetorical effectiveness because, as Burke observed, humans are neurologically and psychologically predisposed to respond to certain universal patterns, for example the progression of biological growth. This type of progression would seem natural for the RSL to incorporate into its rhetorical approach to implementing their program, since gardening is the agency by which they achieve their purpose of saving the planet, and it would be logical to use the biological progression of a garden as a pattern for the progression in the text. This could be accomplished, for example, by using a metaphor for preparing the ground in the first section and using language and symbols to match this metaphor to the appropriate introductory topics. The progression would then proceed through early stages of growth, maturation, the seasons, and harvest, finally composting the waste products so the cycle could begin again. The progression could also incorporate the Burkean ideas of redemption and purgation as a way to use the symbol of gardening as a way for humanity to redeem itself for its polluting of the earth. The main point here is that a Burkean analysis points out possibilities for improving the rhetorical effectiveness of this text.

In terms of symbolic action, RSL effectively uses the school garden as a master symbol to promote audience identification with its ideas about food, school, and sustainability. Their approach to environmental issues is a novel one, and at the same time constitutes a return to practices that were more commonplace in the last century. They are recasting the traditional arts of agriculture as a way to solve some of the most pressing environmental issues of the new millennium by incorporating gardens into schools. Their idea of the school garden is a powerful symbol both on the ground and on paper, a symbol of a return to a simpler time and a healthier,

more relaxed, less regimented lifestyle. It effectively and cleverly combines school and food to symbolize healthy diet and educational reform. By inducing the audience to identify with these values, they approach protecting the environment in a less threatening way than many other environmental organizations.

At the highest level of abstraction, RSL effectively reorders the hierarchies in the socio-political and natural orders, again primarily through their master symbol, the school garden. The cluster analysis, as well as the ways that the text functions as symbolic action, clearly show their motives to be returning school and food to the top levels of their respective hierarchies. If this were primarily a work of literature, it might serve the function of inspiring identification with their ideas but without providing a concrete method for taking the symbolic actions of the text and translating them into symbolic actions in the physical world. However, as a technical manual, it not only strives to inspire this identification with ideas, but also with methods. RSL provides a complete method for implementing their programs. While the text would probably be more appealing to a wider audience, as noted previously, if it were more unified in terms of progressive form, it is effective at promoting identification with its ideas and methods for its likely target audiences. In other words, RSL, to a certain extent, is preaching to the choir, but does a good job of both inspiring them to sing and providing some new tunes.

CHAPTER V: PRINCIPLES FOR ANALYSIS OF OTHER TEXTS

This study has condensed a few of Burke's more important principles for analysis into a simplified method that can be applied to any environmental text. The analysis of RSL provides an example of how to apply the method, although the application will vary depending on the features of each specific text. Following are the general principles determined by this study.

First, perform a dramatistic analysis to determine how the pentad (act, agent, scene, agency and purpose) is manifested in the text and which term in the drama contains the motive. This interpretation is partly dependent on the philosophical system used to interpret the terms, because of the potential for each of the terms to transform one into another. The ratios of the terms (or "principles of determination") should also be determined, to help expose how, for example, the scene determines what acts can take place within it. While there are ten ratios in all, and any one of them might be particularly relevant for a given text, the three most important ratios to begin with are scene-act, scene-agent, and act-agent. The first two are concerned with placement in space, while the last one is concerned with sequences of events.

Next, determine what essential decisions the author made about patterns, symbols, and form for the work:

- What pattern of experience the author uses, the progression of situation-to-emotion-to-attitude-to-action in the text. Certain patterns appeal most powerfully to most people at most times, for example the quest pattern.
- What master symbol the author uses to re-individuate the pattern. Certain symbols appeal most powerfully to most people at most times.

- Which of the four types of form the author uses: progressive, repetitive, conventional, or minor, and how the form establishes the formal appeal of the work.

The information about what pattern, symbol, and form the author uses provide a basis for determining the author's rhetorical skill and awareness of these universals, as well as more indications of the author's motives.

Next, determine the progression in the work; what follows what and why (Burke refers to this as structural analysis). Progression may take many forms, including a sequence of external events, spiritual movement, a sequence of internal reactions, a pattern of psychic or physical experience, spatial movement, tonal progression, chronological progression, scenic progression, or qualitative progression. Specifically, works of environmental rhetoric lend themselves to certain of these types of progressive structure that mirrors the natural world, which will likely add to their effectiveness in producing identification in an audience. For example, to use some of the more important types of progressions:

- A "spiritual movement" could be used to symbolize the inner process of humans moving from a state of unconsciousness about environmental problems to a higher degree of awareness.
- A spatial movement could symbolize moving across some landscape, so that the scene itself could be an agency by which attitudes could be changed. This would probably work best in conjunction with another type of progression, for example spiritual movement.

- The various types of chronological progression (seasonal progression, biological growth, historical change) are obvious choices for environmental rhetoric, and some of the most powerful. The seasonal progression and biological growth suggest themselves for any text that outlines a program of solutions for dealing with environmental problems. Historical change suggests changed landscapes, both looking back into the past and forward into the future.
- Scenic progression would be similar to spatial movement, except that rather than moving across a landscape, scenic progression could imply staying in one place, which could clearly overlap all the various types of chronological progression. In a Burkean method, all elements become interchangeable based on the dynamic principles he outlined.
- Qualitative progression most strongly suggests, in terms of purgation and redemption imagery, cleaning up environmental pollution, and the progression from innocence to corruption to depravity suggests a parable-like story of how humanity has arrived at this point of environmental crisis. Putting these two progressions together could look like this: Humans innocent of the damage they are capable of causing pollute some aspect of the environment, at first through ignorance, then for a profit motive (corruption), and proceeding to a sense that there is nothing to be saved so that profit becomes the only motive (depravity), then moving through purgation (cleaning up pollution) and redemption (achieving sustainability).

Next, perform a cluster analysis to determine what goes with what and why. This consists of two parts: an index and a concordance. The index should include terms that are either specifically significant for the text, “charged,” or frequently used in the text. The concordance

should include every instance of each index term, both explicit and implicit, along with the context for each instance. The concordance serves as a cross-reference for the index, and together they determine what equals what in the work, which helps to further determine the author's motives. They also provide the data for determining how the text functions as symbolic action.

Based on the cluster analysis, analyze how the text functions as symbolic action in terms linguistic, representative, and purgative-redemptive. What symbols are used in the work and what action do they perform? What do the various symbols in the work represent in terms of the author's character traits? How does the text function to purge or redeem the author from categorical guilt?

Based on how the text functions as symbolic action, analyze where the author positions the symbols in the text within the four hierarchic orders—the socio-political, the natural, the verbal, and the religious. For purposes of analyzing environmental rhetoric, it will be most important to note what symbol is positioned at the top of the socio-political order and the natural order, and what suborders within the natural are represented—animals, natural things, natural places, and the biological.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Two types of texts are listed in this bibliography:

- Background texts on rhetoric, environmental, and nature writing.
- CEL publications that were analyzed for this project.

Background Texts

Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg, eds. The Rhetorical Tradition. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 1295–1298.

“Brian Street.” Literacy Online. 6 July 1998. International Literacy Inst., Graduate School of Education, U of Pennsylvania. 21 August 2007. <<http://www.literacyonline.org/sltp/presntr/street.htm>>.

“Professor Brian Street.” 17 May 2007. King's College London, U of London. 21 August 2007 <<https://clearingatkings.com/schools/sspp/education/staff/bstreet.html>>.

Assn. for Study of Lit. and Environment. 27 Nov 2005. <<http://www.asle.umn.edu/>>.

Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. 1945. The Rhetorical Tradition. Ed. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 1298–1324.

Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.

Clark, Gregory. Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke. Columbia, South Carolina. U of South Carolina P, 2004.

Cronon, William. “The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature.” Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature. Ed. William Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton, 1995. 69–90.

- DeLuca, Kevin Michael. "Trains in the Wilderness: The Corporate Roots of Environmentalism." Rhetoric and Public Affairs 4. (2001): 633–652.
- Dombrowski, Paul M. "Humanism and Technical Communication." General Introduction. Humanistic Aspects of Technical Communication. Ed. Paul M. Dombrowski. Amityville, New York: Baywood Publishing, 1994. 1–13.
- . "Rhetoric of Science." Introduction to Chapter 2. Humanistic Aspects of Technical Communication. Ed. Paul M. Dombrowski. Amityville, New York: Baywood Publishing, 1994. 15–32.
- . "Social Constructionism." Introduction to Chapter 3. Humanistic Aspects of Technical Communication. Ed. Paul M. Dombrowski. Amityville, New York: Baywood Publishing, 1994. 81–96.
- Gee, James P. "Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction" Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook. Ed. Cushman, Ellen, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 525–537.
- Gross, Alan G. "Discourse on Method: The Rhetorical Analysis of Scientific Texts." Pre/Text 9. (1988): 169–185. Rpt. in Humanistic Aspects of Technical Communication. Ed. Paul M. Dombrowski. Amityville, New York: Baywood Publishing, 1994. 63–79.
- Harris, Allen R. "Assent, Dissent, and Rhetoric in Science." Rhetoric Society Quarterly 20. (1990): 13–37. Rpt. in Humanistic Aspects of Technical Communication. Ed. Paul M. Dombrowski. Amityville, New York: Baywood Publishing, 1994. 33–62.
- Herndl, Carl G. and Stuart C. Brown. Green Culture: Environmental Rhetoric in Contemporary America. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1996.

- Killingsworth, M. Jimmie. "From Environmental Rhetoric to EcoComposition and Ecopoetics: Finding a Place for Professional Communication." Technical Communication Quarterly 14 (2005): 359–373.
- Killingsworth, M. Jimmie. Ecospeak: Rhetoric and Environmental Politics in America. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1992.
- Leopold, Aldo. A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There. London: Oxford UP, 1949.
- Lyon, Thomas J., ed. This Incomperable Lande: A Book of American Nature Writing. New York: Penguin, 1991.
- McKibben, Bill. The End of Nature. New York: Random House, 1989.
- Murphy, Patrick, ed. Literature of Nature: An International Sourcebook. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1998.
- Murphy, Patrick. Farther Afield in the Study of Nature-Oriented Literature. Charlottesville: U P of Virginia, 2000.
- Rueckert, William. Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations. 2nd ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1982.
- Street, Brian. "The New Literacy Studies." Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy. Ed. Brian Street. London: Cambridge UP, 1993. 1–21. Rpt. in Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook. Ed. Ellen Cushman, Eugene R. Kintgen, Barry M. Kroll, and Mike Rose. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 430–442.
- Waddell, Craig. Landmark Essays on Rhetoric and the Environment. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

Walker, Charlotte Zoe, ed. Sharp Eyes: John Burroughs and American Nature Writing. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000.

Weaver, Richard. The Ethics of Rhetoric. 1953. Davis, California: Hermagoras P, 1985.

Welch, Margaret. The Book of Nature: Natural History in the United States 1825–1875. Northeastern UP: Boston, 1998.

Wiley, Farida A, ed. John Burroughs' America: Selections from the Writings of the Naturalist John Burroughs. Mineola: Dover Publications, 1997.

CEL Publications

Capra, Fritjof. “Ecoliteracy: The Challenge for Education in the Next Century.” Center for Ecoliteracy. 2008. Center for Ecoliteracy. 26 February 2008. <<http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications/pdf/challenge.pdf>>

Center for Ecoliteracy. 2008. Center for Ecoliteracy. 7 February 2008. <<http://www.ecoliteracy.org>>.

Getting Started: A Guide for Creating School Gardens as Outdoor Classrooms. Center for Ecoliteracy, 2006.

Gottlieb, Robert. “Imagining an Urban Nature Agenda.” Center for Ecoliteracy. 2008. Center for Ecoliteracy. 26 February 2008. <http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications/robert_gottlieb.html>.

Model Wellness Policy Guide. Berkeley: The Center for Ecoliteracy in collaboration with Slow Food USA and Chez Panisse Foundation, 2005. Center for Ecoliteracy. Center for Ecoliteracy. 7 February 2008. <http://www.ecoliteracy.org/programs/wellness_policy.html>

Orr, David. "The Carbon Connection." Center for Ecoliteracy. 2008. Center for Ecoliteracy. 26

February 2008. <<http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications>

[/david_orr_carbon_1.html](http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications/david_orr_carbon_1.html)>

Pollan, Michael. "We Are What We Eat." Center for Ecoliteracy. 2008. Center for Ecoliteracy.

26 February 2008. <<http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications>

[/rsl/michael-pollan.html](http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications/rsl/michael-pollan.html)>.

Rethinking Food, Health, and the Environment: Making Learning Connections. Center for

Ecoliteracy. 2008. Center for Ecoliteracy. 26 February 2008. <[http:](http://www.ecoliteracy.org/seminars/downloads/RethinkingFood-PDInstitute.pdf)

[//www.ecoliteracy.org/seminars/downloads/RethinkingFood-PDInstitute.pdf](http://www.ecoliteracy.org/seminars/downloads/RethinkingFood-PDInstitute.pdf)>.

Rethinking School Lunch: Linking Food, Culture, Health, and the Environment. Center for

Ecoliteracy. Center for Ecoliteracy. 26 February 2008. <[http:](http://www.ecoliteracy.org/programs/visual-guide/index.html)

[//www.ecoliteracy.org/programs/visual-guide/index.html](http://www.ecoliteracy.org/programs/visual-guide/index.html)>.

Rethinking School Lunch Guide. Berkeley: Learning in the Real World, 2004. Center for

Ecoliteracy. Center for Ecoliteracy. 7 February 2008.

<<http://www.ecoliteracy.org/programs/rsl-guide.html>>.

Stone, Michael K. and Zenobia Barlow, eds. Ecological Literacy: Educating Our Children for a

Sustainable World. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2005.

Stone, Michael K. "It Changed Everything We Thought We Could Do." Center for Ecoliteracy.

2008. Center for Ecoliteracy. 26 February 2008.

<<http://www.ecoliteracy.org/publications/straw.html>>.