

Geography 534

Environmental Governance: Markets, States and Nature

Instructor: Dr. Morgan Robertson (mmrobertson@wisc.edu)

Office Hours: Tuesday 1-2pm; Thursday 2-3pm

Classroom: 444 Science Hall

Lecture Meeting Times: TTh 9:30-10:45

Governing people is hard enough, but at least as people we can give our consent and make our wishes known by participating in the social institutions of governance. Managing the rest of the natural world requires a complex set of regulations, institutions, conventions, incentives, and collective actions, all attuned to an imperfectly-understood and always-changing environment.

This class is designed to help students use social theory to answer real-world questions of how the environment is managed and governed through state policy, economics, and social institutions. Questions like the following:

- How does a government depend on civil society in controlling pollution?
- How do people act outside of government to manage the environment?
- What kinds of ecological science are best-suited to inform resource management?
- What happens to streams and forests when governments regulate them using markets in water and carbon credits?
- What role does the environment play in other policy goals and programs?

These are very similar to some of the basic questions that motivate the study of politics: How is the consent of the governed obtained? What institutions do the governing, and how are they distributed across states and societies? These are questions of both *government* and *governance*: in the case of the environment, *government* means acts by states to execute policy regulating flows of material and energy in the natural world. *Governance* refers to the broader set of social institutions mediating between the government and the governed, not all of which are part of the formal state apparatus. Clean air policy is set through *government*. Actual changes in air quality usually occur through *governance*. Managing the environment means making policy but also making the society in which policy takes effect. And for this, social theory is indispensable.

The **learning objectives** of this course will be:

- To familiarize the student with the concepts of governance and the tools for its analysis.
- To make students literate in the tools, concepts and controversies associated with market-based environmental governance and its origins in debates

- over the past century.
- To introduce students to a variety of traditions in understanding the relationship between states, civil society, and the environment.
 - To allow students to understand and articulate connections and common themes in environmental governance as they are expressed in a variety of settings such as economic globalization, urban planning, water resource development, conservation, and climate change.

Student evaluation: Students will receive a grade based on the following activities

1. Class discussion and reading response (40%): Grading will be based both on your class participation (10%) and your answers to questions based on the reading in a two-page (maximum) short-answer format assignment made available at the beginning of each new topic, and due after that topic's discussion period (30%). Each weekly assignment will be worth 3% of your grade – since there will be 13 assignments, your lowest three grades will be dropped in calculating this portion of your grade. Extra credit will not be given for handing in more than 10 of these assignments.
2. Paper proposal (10%): prior to the midpoint of the semester, students will hand in a description of the topics they will write their papers about.
3. Reflective papers: Two of these, each worth 10%. These can take a number of forms: the idea is to make you engage more deeply with the topic for a given week. You might examine a current policy or controversy through the lens of a weekly theme. You might do some of the suggested readings and report more deeply on the state of debate over a weekly theme. Or you might collect field or participatory observations drawn from your own experience and research into a reflective paper.
4. Paper (30%): students will write a report on aspect of environmental governance. The report will be approximately 2000-3000 words. **(Due date: Friday, May 6th. Please send this through email as a PDF)**
5. Each assignment will receive a percentage grade. Overall course grades will be given on the following basis A=93-100%, AB=88-92%, B=83-87%, BC=78-82%, C=70-77%, D=60-69%, F=0-59%. The student's final score will be rounded to the nearest whole number in calculating their final grade.
6. There will be no midterm or final exam.

Graduate Student evaluation

In addition to the work required of all students (listed above), graduate students will be required to perform the following:

- Graduate students must give a 15-minute presentation during the last week of classes, based on their paper. The student will receive no credit for their final paper without this presentation.
- The student will be expected to write their final paper on a topic that advances their progress toward the completion of their graduate thesis or dissertation.

Course Policies:

- ◆ You are expected to attend all classes and to take comprehensive notes on lectures and reading materials. You will not do well in this class if you do not follow that advice.
- ◆ There will be no make-up exams as a rule, except for 'excused' absences. Excused absences are those arranged with me **before a class** for official University reasons (per UW System Administrative Code) or those documentable as health- or crisis-related after an exam. You also are entitled to an excused absence for the purpose of observing a religious holiday; but you must notify me of your request for one during the first week of class.
- ◆ If you find yourself falling behind, or having trouble with any part of this course, please see me sooner rather than later.
- ◆ **Late work will be accepted at a 15% discount for each day late.**
- ◆ **NOTE: Class will not meet on February 25 and March 3.**

Classroom Civility

You are expected to contribute to an environment of mutual respect and open discussion. Actions or words which, in the opinion of the instructor, degrades the environment of mutual respect and open discussion may be met with disciplinary action. Efforts to disrupt the classroom environment will be subject to disciplinary action proportional to the severity of the disruption, and may include dismissal for the day and the forfeit of assignment grades.

Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct

It is assumed that you are familiar with University policy on cheating and plagiarism as set forth in UWS 14. UWS 14 is the chapter of the University of Wisconsin System Administrative code that regulates academic misconduct. UW-Madison implements the rules defined in UWS 14 through our own "Student Academic Misconduct Campus Procedures." UWS 14.03 defines academic misconduct as follows: Academic misconduct is an act in which a student:

- seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization or citation;
- uses unauthorized materials or fabricated data in any academic exercise;
- forges or falsifies academic documents or records;
- intentionally impedes or damages the academic work of others;

- engages in conduct aimed at making false representation of a student's academic performance;
- assists other students in any of these acts.

Examples include but are not limited to:

- cutting and pasting text from the web without quotation marks or proper citation;
- paraphrasing from the web without crediting the source;
- using notes or a programmable calculator in an exam when such use is not allowed;
- using another person's ideas, words, or research and presenting it as one's own by not properly crediting the originator;
- stealing examinations or course materials;
- changing or creating data in a lab experiment;
- altering a transcript;
- signing another person's name to an attendance sheet;
- hiding a book knowing that another student needs it to prepare an assignment;
- collaboration that is contrary to the stated rules of the course, or
- tampering with a lab experiment or computer program of another student.

Note especially:

- If you repeat **your own words** from an earlier composition, without citation or quotation marks, it is still plagiarism and held to the same standard.
- If you use the **exact words** from a source and do not put them in quotes, even if you provide the source in a citation, this is plagiarism.

If you are accused of misconduct, you may have questions and concerns about the process. If so, you should feel free to call SAJA at 263-5700 or send an email to dean@studentlife.wisc.edu.

(this section adapted from: <http://students.wisc.edu/doso/samplesyllabus.html>)

Class Schedule

Week 1 – State: *What is a state and how does it govern?*

Many classes on environmental governance or politics start and end with the state and its policies. But what appears to be a single, unitary thing is actually composed of a dizzying array of agencies, people, policies and interests at many different scales. This week we will consider the varying definitions of “the state” and how to think about it in the context of environmental management.

Keywords: Government, governance, hegemony, consent, state, civil society, class, interest group, structure, Milliband-Poulantzas debate

Required reading (64pp):

- Robertson, M. 2015. Environmental Governance: Political ecology and the state. In Perrault, T., G. Bridge & J. McCarthy (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Political Ecology*. New York: Routledge, 457-466.
- Whitehead, M., R. Jones & M. Jones. 2007. *The Nature of the State: Excavating the Political Ecologies of the Modern State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 23-55.
- Jessop, B. 1990. *State Theory: Putting Capitalist States in their Place*. College Station: University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. 24-34.
- Jessop, B. 2008. *State Power: A Strategic-Relational Approach*. New York: Polity Press. Pp. 1-11.

Additional Reading:

- Abrams, P. 2006. “Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State.” In A. Sharma & A. Gupta (eds.), *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Press. 112-130.
- Walters, W. 2004. Some Critical Notes on “Governance”. *Studies in Political Economy* 73:27-46.
- Barrow, C.W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Jessop, B. 2008. *State Power: A Strategic-Relational Approach*. New York: Polity Press. Pp. 83-100.
- Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Pp. 87-102
- Rose, N. & P. Miller. 1992. Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government. *The British Journal of Sociology* 43(2): 173-205.
- Asad, T. 2004. “Where are the Margins of the State?” in V. Das & D. Poole (eds.), *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press. Pp. 279-288.

Case: Occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, 2016 (25pp)

Malheur occupation, explained. *High Country News*, January 4, 2016.
McCarthy, Miles. 1992. The First Sagebrush Rebellion: Forest Reserves and States Rights in Colorado and the West, 1891-1907. The Origins of the National Forests: A Centennial Symposium. The Forest History Society
Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Titles I and VII.
Nevada Revised Statutes 321-596 (1979 Nevada Assembly Bill 413): Management of Certain Public Lands.

Week 2 – Hegemony: *How do states secure the consent of those they govern?*

Keywords: Gramsci, cultural Marxism, fascism, ideology, hegemony

Required reading (70pp):

Bates, T. R. 1975. Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 36 (2):351-366.
Rollins, W. H. 1995. Whose landscape? Technology, Fascism, and Environmentalism on the National Socialist *Autobahn*. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85(3):494-520.
Katz, E. 2014. The Nazi Comparison in the Debate over Restoration: Nativism and Domination. *Environmental Values* 23: 377-398.
Wilson, A. 1991. *The Culture of Nature: North American Landscape from Disney to the Exxon Valdez*. Toronto, ON: Between The Lines. Pp. 71-85.

Recommended readings:

Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers. Pp. 242-266.
Light, A. 1994. Hegemony and Democracy: How Politics in Restoration Informs the Politics of Restoration. *Restoration and Management Notes* 12 (2):140-144.
Wainwright, J. D., and K. Mercer. 2009. The dilemma of decontamination: A Gramscian analysis of the Mexican transgenic maize dispute. *Geoforum* 40(3):345-354.
Mann, G. 2009. Should political ecology be Marxist? A case for Gramsci's historical materialism. *Geoforum* 40(3):335-344.
Cain, M. 1983. Gramsci, The State and the Place of Law. In *Legality, Ideology and the State*, ed. D. Sugarman, 95-117. New York: Academic Press.

Case: 2015 Clean Power Plan Rules

Any one document (your choice) from this collection from the Union of Concerned Scientists: <http://www.ucsusa.org/our-work/global-warming/reduce-emissions/what-is-the-clean-power-plan#.VpV7WfHXqHw>

Any one document (your choice) from this collection from the US Environmental Protection Agency: <http://www.epa.gov/cleanpowerplan/clean-power-plan-existing-power-plants#CPP-final>

Heritage Foundation: <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/07/the-many-problems-of-the-epas-clean-power-plan-and-climate-regulations-a-primer>

Week 3 – Nature: *What does the state see when it looks at nature?*

Keywords: legibility, bracketing, simplification,

Required reading:

Scott, J. C. 1998. *Seeing Like A State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Pp. 11-52.

Blomley, N. 2008. Simplification is complicated: property, nature, and the rivers of law. *Environment and Planning A* 40(8): 1825-1842.

Whitehead, M., R. Jones & M. Jones. 2007. *The Nature of the State: Excavating the Political Ecologies of the Modern State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 86-116.

Recommended reading:

Coronil, F. 1998. *The Magical State: Nature, Money and Modernity in Venezuela*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cresswell, T. 1997. Weeds, Plagues, and Bodily Secretions: A Geographical Interpretation of Metaphors of Displacement. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87 (2):330-345.

Porter, T. M. 1995. *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Prudham, W.S. 2004. *Knock on Wood: Nature as Commodity in Douglas-fir Country*. New York: Routledge.

O'Connor, J. 1998. The Second Contradiction of Capitalism. In *Natural Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism*, ed. J. O'Connor, 158-177. New York: Guilford.

Case: Wetland assessment methods 1952-present

Week 4 – Natural Resources: *How have states attempted to manage nature as resources?*

(socio-nature, commons, Espeland, ITQs/Mansfield/McEvoy)

Keywords: tragedy of the commons, overpopulation, common-property institution, property regime

Malthus, T.R. 1798. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 9-22.

Hardin, G. 1968. Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162(3859): 1243-1248.

Meadows, D.H. et al. 1972. *The Limits to Growth*. New York: Signet. pp.161-188.

Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.1-28.

St. Martin, K. 2001. Making Space for Community Resource Management in Fisheries. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 91 (1):122-142.

Prudham, W.S. 2005. *Knock on Wood: Nature as Commodity in Douglas-Fir Country*. New York: Routledge. pp. 57-83.

McEvoy, A.F. 1985. *The Fisherman's Problem: Ecology and Law in the California Fisheries, 1850-1980*. New York: Cambridge. pp. 207-226.

Week 5 – Commodity I: What is a commodity? (Marx ch 1., commodity chain, Papaya, bananas)

Polanyi, K. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press. Pp. 43-77

Week 6 – Commodity II: How do we turn nature into a commodity?

Nature and ecosystems can be represented as commodities (or governable objects) only by ignoring a great deal about what makes them special to us.

Keywords: abstraction, taxonomy, categorization

Prudham

Week 7 – Market: What is a market and how are they supposed to work for the environment?

Keywords: ecosystem services, offsets, natural capital, neoliberalism, Fordism

Dales, J. H. 1968. Land, Water, and Ownership. *Canadian Journal of Economics* 1 (4):791-804.

Week 8 – Neoliberalism: How has this strategy become generalized as governance?

Bakker, K. J. 2005. Neoliberalizing Nature? Market Environmentalism in Water Supply in England and Wales. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 95 (3):542-565.

Lohmann, L. 2011. The Endless Algebra of Climate Markets. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 22 (4):93-116.

Robertson, M., and N. Hayden. 2008. Evaluation of a Market in Wetland Credits: Entrepreneurial Wetland Banking in Chicago. *Conservation Biology* 22 (3):636-646.

Case: SRI 1980 Program for Alternative Regulatory Approaches.

Week 9 – Policy: *How does environmental policy work on the ground?*

Doyle, M.W., R. Lave and M. Robertson. 2013. River Federalism. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103(2): 290-298.

Cashmore, M., T. Richardson, J. Rozema & I. Lyhne. 2015. Environmental governance through guidance: The ‘making up’ of expert practitioners. *Geoforum* 62: 84-95

Larner on fast policy transfer

Week 10 – Non-State Actors: *Who else engages in governance?*

A good deal of environmental governance takes place well outside the state, however considered. From informal collectives to Non-Governmental Organizations to banks that impose loan conditionalities, the management of the environment cannot be comprehended without widening our view and thinking outside of the statist box.

Keywords: ENGO, triple bottom line, corporate social citizenship, anarchy, collective, statism.

Prakash, A. & M. Potoski. 2006. Racing to the Bottom? Trade, Environmental Governance, and ISO 14001. *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2): 350-364.

Goldman, M. 2001. Constructing an Environmental State: Eco-Governmentality and Other Transnational Practices of a 'Green' World Bank. *Social Problems* 48(4): 499-523.

Karvonen, A. 2011. *Politics of Urban Runoff: Nature, Technology, and the Sustainable City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp.159-185.

Yearley, S. et al. 2003. Participatory Modelling and the Local Governance of the Politics of UK Air Pollution: A Three-City Case Study. *Environmental Values* 12(2): 247-262.

Week 11 – Development: *How is managing the environment part of a larger strategy of development?*

The management of the environment can be described as one part of the much larger task of governance called “development” – perhaps the most general term to gesture at the task of improving the human condition. Development can mean many things, and has often been understood to be in opposition to environmental protection, but since the 1970s governance strategies have attempted to frame the two as compatible. Environmental benefits are now seen as crucial to securing consent for development projects as often as the reverse is true.

Keywords: Fortress conservation, conservation refugees, ICDPs, Millenium Development Goals, CBNRM

Neumann, R. 2002. Primitive Ideas: Protected Area Buffer Zones and the Politics of Land in Africa. *Development and Change* 28(3): 559-582.

Goldman, M. 2011. Strangers in their own land: Maasai and wildlife conservation in Northern Tanzania. *Conservation & Society* 9(1): 65-79.

Ribot, J. 2002. *Democratic decentralization of natural resources*. Washington, DC: World Resource Institute.

Berkes, F. 2010. Devolution of environment and resources governance: trends and future. *Environmental Conservation* 37(4): 489-500.

Ostrom, E. 1999. Self-Governance and Forest Resources, Occasional Paper No. 20, Center for international Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, pp. 1-15. Available at www.cifor.cgiar.org/publications/pdf_files/OccPapers/OP-20.pdf

Week 12 – Science: *How do states make use of scientific information in exercising power?*

Scientific information plays a key role in selecting policy and governance strategies, but such strategies are never dictated directly by scientists. Therefore, there must be some more or less political/social way in which science is used to inform and direct environmental governance. It is one thing to develop the finest model of global climate change, but another thing entirely to design policy or urge action around that model. What kind of science ends up being taken up into governance strategies, and what kinds of science fail are left on the lab bench?

Keywords: sociology of science, circulating reference, biopower

Blair, E.S. 2001. Models in the Courtroom. In M.G. Anderson & P.D. Bates (eds.), *Model Validation: Perspectives in Hydrological Science*, pp. 57-76. New York: Wiley.

Jasanoff, S. 1992. Science, Politics, and the Renegotiation of Expertise at EPA. *OSIRIS*, 2nd series 7:195-217.

Engel-DiMauro, S. 2006. From organism to commodity: gender, class, and the development of soil science in Hungary 1900-89. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24: 215-229.

Week 13 – Environmentalism: *how do subjects learn to align themselves with state environmental goals?*

Michel Foucault once famously described governance as “the conduct of conduct”, and described the emergence of a social trait (he called “governmentality”) by which we internalize the behaviors and limits that make us easily governable people. Various subsequent scholars have written about how this applies specifically to the environment and our attitudes towards it (“environmentality”). In this week we dive inside our own heads to examine how we constitute ourselves through the iterative performance as environmental subjects.

Keywords: subject, subaltern, biopower, discourse, governmentality, environmentalism, difference, interpellation.

Foucault, M. 1994. Governmentality. In J.P. Faubion (ed.) *Michel Foucault: Power*. New York: The New Press. pp. 201-222.

Li, T.M. 2007. Governmentality. *Anthropologica* 49(2): 275-281.

Ferguson, J., and A. Gupta. 2002. Spatializing states: toward an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality. *American Ethnologist* 29 (4):981-1002.

Luke, T. W. 2000. Beyond Birds: Biopower and Birdwatching in the World of Audubon. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 11(3):7-37.

Goldman, M. 2005. *Imperial Nature: The world bank and struggles for social justice in the age of globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 181-220.

Braun, B. 2000. Producing Vertical Territory: Geology and Governmentality in Late Victorian Canada". *Ecumene* 7(1): 7-46

Week 14 – Globality: *How do we know we have global environmental problems?*

With economic and political globalization has come the globalization of strategies to manage the environment, and the incidence of environmental problems conceived as, themselves, “global”. On the one hand we must understand how the formal institutions of government work at the global scale, and in what kind of “civil society” that government is embedded. On the other hand, the move to “jump scale” to the global level can be a political one that disempowers actors at other scales and privileges the satellite’s-eye view of the world, available only to an expert few.

Keywords: Globalization, jumping scale, global managerial class, competencies, globalization.

Eccleston, C.H. & F. March. 2011. *Global Environmental Policy: Concepts, Principles, and Practice*. Boca Raton: CRC Group. pp. 86-107.

Biermann, F., et al. 2011. Transforming governance and institutions for a planet under pressure. Revitalizing the institutional framework for global sustainability: Key Insights from social science research. Planet Under Pressure Policy Brief.

Goldman, M. 2005. *Imperial Nature: The world bank and struggles for social justice in the age of globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 221-271.

Bridge, G. 2002. Grounding Globalization: the Prospects and Perils of Linking Economic Processes of Globalization to Environmental Outcomes. *Economic Geography* 78 (3):361-386.

Taylor, P. J., and F. H. Buttel. 1992. How do we Know we have Global Environmental Problems? Science and the Globalization of Environmental Discourse. *Geoforum* 23(3): 405-416.