2015

Breaking Through a Culture of Denial: Pathways to Environmental Activism in BC

Justine Nelson
Kwantlen Polytechnic University

Breaking Through a Culture of Denial:
Pathways to Environmental Activism in BC

Justine Nelson

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts, Honours in Criminology

Criminology Department
Faculty of Arts
Kwantlen Polytechnic University

May 2015

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to thank my faculty supervisor, Mike Larsen, who supported me through this journey and encouraged me to think outside the box.

As well as the following people, without whom this project would not have been as successful.

Lisa Monchalin and Gwen Barlee gave me wonderful and constructive feedback.

My colleagues Alex Devitt, Nisse Bourne, and Spencer Gillespie provided emotional and intellectual support.

My family and friends, some of whose names you will find in this writing. They endured my insanity, supported my dreams, and inspired me to keep going, and continue to do so.

Thesis Committee:

Mike Larsen, Criminology Department, Kwantlen Polytechnic University (Supervisor)

Lisa Monchalin, Criminology Department, Kwantlen Polytechnic University (Internal Reader)

Gwen Barlee, Policy Director, Wilderness Committee (External Reader)

Table of Contents

Introduction

Starting in November 2014, there was a battle being fought over Burnaby Mountain between the residents of Unceded Coast Salish territory in British Columbia and the Texas based oil giant Kinder Morgan, which has had the use of the local police force[1]. The battle grounds have included court rooms, the media, and the mountain itself. Protesters were camped out on the mountain for months in attempts to block Kinder Morgan employees from doing testing on the mountain. After a court injunction ruled in favour of Kinder Morgan the protesters were required by law to leave the mountain. Instead they stayed and the RCMP was sent in to arrest all those who crossed the line. More than 100 people were arrested[2] including two 11 year old girls[3], Indigenous leaders, Simon Fraser University faculty, and family members of the Canadian environmentalist David Suzuki (Luba, 2014; Darmarajah, 2014; Moreau, 2014).

The reason that so many people are willing to physically place themselves between Kinder Morgan and Burnaby Mountain, and even get arrested, is the proposed plans to twin a pipeline that goes from the Alberta tar sands to a terminal in Burnaby, BC. The new pipeline would increase the amount of oil travelling from the tar sands from 300,000 barrels a day to 890,000, also resulting in increased tanker traffic (Fumano, 2015). The protest started after attempts to legally ban the pipeline from being built were ineffective, regardless of opposition from citizens, Indigenous groups, business owners, and many Mayors along the proposed pipeline (Wilderness Committee, n.d.). This is only one of several pipelines being proposed throughout Canada, all of which are being met with intense opposition.

The situation on Burnaby Mountain is not unusual, it is only one example of the actions of the social movement that Klein (2014) calls Blockadia. Canada has a history of actions around environmental issues, including the Clayoquot Sound protest in 1993 (Tindall, 2013) and the more recent protests against fracking at the Elsipogtog First Nation (Schwartz & Gollom, 2013). The recent actions are fired by the stripping of federal protection for natural spaces (May, 2012) and the continually decreasing quality of National Energy Board (NEB) reviews (Linnitt, 2014). Across the country Canadians are taking direct action to protect the people and places that they love.

In a world where climate change is no longer avoidable, demonstrations against projects such as the Kinder Morgan pipeline are necessary to prevent the eventual destruction of our planet. In fact Naomi Klein (2014) believes that "…only mass social movements can save us now" (p.450). While there is no doubt that the effects of climate change are currently felt more intensely by those in developing countries, countries such as Canada and the United States are starting to face climate disasters. This can be seen in the drought currently occurring in

---

[1] In a report titled "Criminal Threat to the Canadian Petroleum Industry" the RCMP outlines the threat that anti-petroleum extremists present to Canada.

[2] The charges were luckily dropped thanks to a misunderstanding about where the injunction line that could not be crossed was located (Keller, 2014).

[3] The girls were technically detained rather than arrested. However, the point they were making is irrelevant to the fact that they were not charge.

California (McCarthy, 2015), the movement of ticks and other organisms (Tahirali, 2015), and effects predicted by scientists such as rising tides, acidifying oceans, and less precipitation (US Global Change Research Program, 2014). This means that climate change is now a global crisis, which is reflected in demonstrations across the world including the Peoples Climate March (2014) which drew an estimated 400, 000 people to New York, and a Quebec City march which drew 25, 000 people (Alarcon, 2015).

Climate change is the biggest threat to our world because it not only effects the environment through melting glaciers, rising tides and destruction of natural places, but in turn has enormous effects on the human way of life. The effects of climate change will result in cities and islands being swallowed by the rising tides, mass migration, extreme food insecurity, increased poverty and conflict, and a general destruction of our way of life. While the elite may be able to avoid these threats for a while, they too will eventually be overcome by the realities of a new world (Klein, 2014; White, 2011). Regardless of the mass global effect climate change will have, and the possibility of hitting a tipping point where we can no longer undo what we have done (The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d.), most of the leaders of the world seem unwilling to make the significant and necessary changes (Klein, 2014).

So far attempts have run short of what is necessary; the Kyoto Protocol, carbon taxing, and geo-engineering for example (Klein, 2014). Politicians have continuously fought over who is responsible rather than taking action; the wealthy countries not wanting to take on a majority of the change and the poorer countries feeling they should not pay for the actions of the wealthy (Klein, 2014). While recent collaboration between China and the United States on a joint effort to reduce carbon emissions is a step in the right direction, it pales in compassion to what is needed and will not come close to the reductions the International Panel on Climate Change says is needed (Biello, 2014). However unpleasant this reality is, it is not surprising within our capitalist society, where profit is based on the exploitation of people and the environment. Klein (2014) and White (2011; 2008) both acknowledge that effective change will be in contradiction to the foundations of capitalism.

In her book, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs the Climate,* Klein (2014) presents an argument for the connection between capitalism and both the creation of climate change and lack of action against it. Her past work has engaged with neoliberalism, disaster capitalism, and globalization, but she herself was in denial about the realities of climate change until recently. Throughout the book she discusses her journey to climate action, and how she stopped "looking away". Her work not only provides a basis for the discussion of the connection between capitalism and the climate but a view of the way forward.

The lack of action by those in positions of authority means that passionate people taking a stand will have a significant effect on what the future looks like. As Klein (2014) notes, "[p]ast social movements have 'had tremendous influence on…how the dominant culture evolved'" (p. 450). Around the world people are taking to the streets to oppose environmental crimes, both those defined as crimes legally and those that should be as a result of the harm they cause. While there is a large movement around these issues, a significant amount of society still has their head buried in the sand, attempting to ignore the changes that need to take place.

Denial is embedded in the issue of climate change. Even those who acknowledge it is real tend to deny its implications or continue to act in ways that suggest they are in denial. Currently, to completely remove everything that impacts the world's climate from our lives would be impossible. We need to eat and even the writing of this study has an impact on the world's climate. In our culture it is acceptable, even normal, to ignore the realities of climate change by continuing to consume at an unnecessary rate, things that are made from the destruction of the earth. We live in a culture of denial; a culture which is enforced by capitalism and neoliberalism, and the corporations and states that run under these ideals.

Capitalism is based on the continued increase in both consumption and production, without consideration for the effect this has on the planet. Within capitalism the market is supposed to be led by an "invisible hand", which allows the market to grow and change independently. However, with neoliberalism this invisible hand is removed and instead of less government involvement, the government directly interferes in the market with policies and laws that allow the market free reign above all else (Brown, 2006; Giroux, 2013). For example, within Canada this can be seen in the removal of environmental protections.

This way of thinking is spread past the economy, to other aspects of society such as schools, health care, and even individuals. Market values are imprinted upon our way of life, with everything being evaluated in terms of market trade value. Giroux (2013) explains that "[m]arket discipline now regulates all aspects of social life and the regressive economic rationality that drives it sacrifices the public good, public values, and social responsibility to a tawdry consumerist dream while simultaneously creating a throwaway society of goods, resources, and individuals now considered disposable" (p.257). The aspect of denial appears because of the fact that the earth has limits, and it is not possible to have never ending increases in consumption and production. Also, not everything should be valued in these economic terms, clean air and water, or a livable planet for example. For capitalism to survive, especially within the neoliberal ideology, it must create and enforce a society based on denial.

This research looks at those who have broken through this culture, and are now actively working to prevent further destruction of the earth, and the resulting contribution to climate change. Drawing on the work of Klein (2014), Cohen (2001), and Norgaard (2010), it discusses how a person comes to break through the culture of denial and also how we might encourage others down this pathway. A green criminological perspective is taken, which considers things that are legal but significantly harmful, such as climate change, as deserving of criminological inquiry. However, rather than focusing on those that are still in denial, this research looks at activism as the solution to climate change, and as the only thing that will remove the capitalist culture of denial. Through in depth interviews with five activists I have identified significant moments in their pathways, their framing of the issue, and a consideration for how to get others involved.

The concept of denial used in this study is based on the work of Stanley Cohen, who coined the term moral panic, and has explored the connections between deviance, media representation, and social reactions. In his book, *States of Denial,* Cohen (2001) expands these concepts and connects them to psychological concepts of denial, symbolic interactionism, and

the sociology of state crimes and human rights violations. By connecting all of this literature he creates a theoretical framework for understanding the connection between individual (micro) forms of denial, and official or cultural (macro) forms of denial. He makes sense of the different forms of denial, and in addition creates an argument for the politics of acknowledgement and moving past denial into action. His work around denial can be seen as attempting to create a moral panic around things that are deserving of one but, because of the social and political construction of the issue, are instead denied. He explains that, "[i]nstead of exposing moral panics, [his] own cultural politics entails, in a sense, *encouraging* something like moral panics about mass atrocities and political suffering – and trying to expose the strategies of denial employed to prevent the acknowledgement of these realities" (Cohen, 2011, xIi (emphasis in original)). Naomi Klein and other climate activists are attempting to create a sense of moral panic around climate change, since it deserves the attention but is instead denied. This research is adding to the ability to do this.

Denial is a way to protect ourselves from reality. Cohen (2001) states that "[o]ne common thread runs through the many different stories of denial: people, organizations, governments or whole societies are presented with information that is too disturbing, threatening or anomalous to be fully absorbed or openly acknowledged"(p.1). He explains that there are three main areas of denial: literal, interpretive and implicatory. To literally deny something is to contest its existence such as the belief that climate change is a hoax to destroy capitalism. This kind of denial may be based on an honest belief, a half- belief, or it may be an outright lie. An interpretive denial is to accept the basic facts but to deny their interpretation, or to place them in a different context. An example of this would be that climate change is happening but it will be a good thing for the world, since everyone likes warm summer days. An implicatory denial is a denial of the implication of the facts. This type of denial accepts the situation and its interpretation but denies that there is any reason for that person to be concerned. An example would be a person who does not believe they can change the effects of climate change, it is simply too big, so they rationalize their inaction (Cohen, 2001).

All three of these kinds of denial can happen at three different levels: personal, cultural, and official. Climate change denial happens at all three levels, all of which have their own motivating factors and dangers. There are also three agents of this denial, the victim, perpetrator, and the bystander. In the context of climate change we are focusing on denials by the perpetrator and by standers, which are usually the same in this situation. While the victims may be in denial of climate change, such as a town suffering from a drought being convinced it is gods will, they tend to both acknowledge what is happening and act against it. This can be seen in actions taking place around the world (Klein, 2014). These three agents are slowly merging into one category, since in many places people are contributing to climate change, being bystanders to it, and also becoming victims of climate disasters.

Denial then involves "cognition (knowing)…, emotion (feeling)…, morality (judging)…, [and] action (behavior)" (Cohen, 2001, p.23). The connection between denial and action is less obvious, in that we may completely acknowledge something but our lack of action, or continued action, suggests we are still in denial. Within the context of climate change this could be a corporation, or the person in control of it, continuing the use fossil fuels even though they know

it contributes to climate change. This kind of denial may be based on the idea that it cannot happen to them or may be results of "…political beliefs, cowardice, laziness, selfishness and sheer amorality" (Cohen, 2001, p.23). From this perspective the lack of action against climate change, at a group and individual level, can be seen as denial.

It is important to note that denials are based on some knowledge, whether it is conscious or unconscious. Even those who honestly are not aware of the truth, somewhere in their unconscious have some awareness. We cannot deny something if we have not heard of its existence. There are situations where a denial is completely justified and true, for example a person who is accused of cheating on their spouse, and has never come anywhere close to such an act, is denying an allegation that is actually untrue (Cohen, 2001). However, within the context of climate change denial is not as simple, since there is scientific and visual evidence to back it up. The denial of realities that have evidence of their existence can occur for many reasons. A person may use it as a defense mechanism to shut out unpleasant situations, a state may use it to cover up a human rights atrocity, or it may be in the form of a bystander looking away. Within these contexts denial is an active choice to not acknowledge something but within that choice we must also at some level acknowledge it. This is referred to as the denial paradox; knowing and not knowing at the same time (Cohen, 2001).

Our culture not only allows but encourages personal denial of climate change. It tells us that "[c]ontemporary humans are too self-centered, too addicted to gratification to live without the full freedom to satisfy our every whim" (Klein, 2014, p. 17). This is a lie but it is one that many people have internalized. Although there are still people who deny the existence of climate change, a majority of people accept that it is happening and their denial is interpretive or implicatory. The reasons behind this denial vary. There are people who are simply unconcerned with the effects of climate change, it is not their problem or they are unconcerned with the well-being of those in other countries. Of course this also holds the assumption that they are safe from the effects, which is not necessarily true. This type of denial is implicatory in that it denies the moral implications of the situation.

Other people deny by reinterpretation of the situation. 'Climate change is real but we will create a new technology that will save us and allow us to continue living as we are'. 'Economically it makes more sense to focus on money since it can protect us from extreme weather.' 'The world may be getting warmer but why is that a bad thing? I like the heat!' All of these are example of interpretive denial, especially since none of these alternatives are possible. Technology is not going to save us, at least not all of us. Money is irrelevant when cities are underwater, unless you are part of the capitalist elite; then money may help. And yes a little bit of warm weather is great but that is not what we are in for (Klein, 2014).

Another type of denial is that which keeps us from action. 'What am I supposed to do?' 'I'm only one person, I won't make a difference'. 'I buy locally, take the bus and limit my electricity use…I am doing my part'. 'I am too busy'. 'This is not my problem to fix'. All of these are what Cohen (2001) would call midrange denials where "…the painful or frightening implications of events or perceptions are denied, although the evidence itself is acknowledged" (p. 23). This stems from the belief that there is nothing that can be done on an

individual level, all there is "…to do is keep on denying how frightened we actually are" (p.4). This belief that we lack the ability to do anything stems from the culture of denial that we live in, based on neoliberalism and capitalism. This culture tells us that we cannot live without the continued consumption of the latest product, that we would never survive without fossil fuels, and that we are all self-centered. It denies us the ability to see past our neoliberal capitalist society.

Klein (2014) refers to personal denial as "looking away". We choose to avoid an unpleasant reality which we feel we cannot change. Within Cohen's (2001) concept of denial this is simply a defense mechanism to protect ourselves from the psychological distress of facing such an unpleasant reality. Within this we also deny the implications of our personal actions, perhaps by stating that our actions do not have a large impact. We may also condemn the condemner; 'all of those environmentalists drive cars and live in big houses'. These are all forms of neutralization, based on Sykes's and Matza's neutralization techniques for delinquents (Cohen, 2001).

Individuals may also use these neutralizations to rationalize or justify their actions before they do them. For example, a person who is planning on buying a new car that uses a lot of gas may convince themselves it is okay before even purchasing it. This may sound similar to: 'I know climate change is a problem but I really like this car and it is not as if not buying it will solve the climate crisis. Everyone else I know drives big trucks anyways…this car is not that bad'. These types of denial often actually go against our self-image, so we have to keep rationalizing with ourselves. A person who acknowledges climate change and its implications has to continually rationalize every act that contributes to the climate crises. While it may not be a conscious neutralization, it is a constant process in everyday life. This is a denial of their ability to change based on a culture of denial.

This also turns us all into bystanders to the climate crisis. While our state is a bystander nation, we are all individual bystanders. Within the context of seeing devastating footage of natural disasters caused by climate change in distance places, it is not strange for people to accept being bystanders. As Cohen (2001) explains it is difficult for people to open up their moral community to include people from other countries, or even from other cities. Our moral communities may be as small as our own family. At the other extreme there are people who care for the suffering of people across the world. This inability to open up our moral community is enforced by the neoliberal ideology that our capitalist society so adamantly enforces; everyone for themselves.

There are cases were the climate crisis comes closer to home. Developed countries have started to experience super storms and other variants of extreme weather. We also see demonstrations happening. A recent local example of this is the protests which occurred on Burnaby Mountain, discussed at the beginning of this section. There were a lot of people who showed support by showing up to protest or sending supplies to the camp, but there were also a lot of people who disagreed with the actions of Kinder Morgan and the police yet did nothing. This is a perfect example of being an internal bystander. There was minimal aggression, but these people were fighting to take action against climate change. Many people viewed the injunction

and the use of local police as a violation of the rights of citizens, yet only a portion of them took action. This of course stems from the same kind of neutralizations as discussed above; they are stuck in a culture of denial.

Even though our actions point to the continual denial of climate change, a recent survey revealed that half of Canadians are 'extremely' or 'definitely' worried about climate change, specifically about what the world will look like for future generations (McDiarmid, 2014). There are people who act out against the actions of our state and capitalism, calling for a change and effective action against climate change. What makes these people stop 'looking away'? How do they break through the culture of denial?

The question animating this research is, how does a person move from denial into acknowledgment and then to action, around environmental issues? There were three related secondary questions in my research, which I believed needed exploration. The first was how or why does a person come to be involved in civil disobedience? Or why not? While I do acknowledge that not all activism involves civil disobedience, it seems to be a large part of the movement, at least as it is visible in the media. Naomi Klein (2014) also emphasizes its importance within the movement.

The second question was how do people frame environmental harm? While I focused on environmental issues within British Columbia, I soon came to realize that these issues were not seen as just environmental. People's activism stemmed from other avenues, however their activism at the moment is related to the environment. The last question looked at how we can foster activism in other people, especially children/youth. While this movement seems to be strong and growing (Klein, 2014), there is still a significant amount of people living in denial. There is also some concern that the next generations will not have the same connection to nature, as current and past generations (Louv, 2008).

This paper begins with an overview of green criminology, which is a growing perspective and creates the foundation for research of this type. There will then be an overview of the "the problem". This starts by looking at the history of colonization, industrialization, and capitalism, as they relate to environmental crimes. It also includes an explanation of what climate change is and what it means for our world. These two sections will form the basis for this research and I have chosen to delve into them in some detail because of the fact that they are not necessarily well known. I believe that these sections create a strong argument for the connection between capitalism, a culture of denial, and the continued destruction of our planet. At this point we should have a firm understanding of what we are looking at. In the next section the methodology for the research will be discussed. I will then present the analysis with three main sections: "Pathways to activism", "An amalgamation of social movements: are we all environmentalists?", and "Helping others break through the culture of denial".

From here I will present my own journey. This research has been extremely self-reflective and has brought up many uncomfortable and empowering moments in my own life. I came to this research as someone who was already involved in activism, although this mostly involved doing park restoration, attending protests when I could, and attempting to limit my own impact. This research was my "moment of awareness", as I will discuss in greater detail in this

section. I will conclude with a discussion of the implications of this research and by answering the question of "what next?". If a social movement is the solution, and climate change needs to be acted on now, how do we get people to "wake up"? And how do we make this happen now?

<u>Green Criminology</u>

Traditionally the field of criminology has been concerned with the legal-procedural definition of crime. This means that what is considered to be crime is prescribed by laws and rules regulating human behaviour (White, 2009; Halsey & White, 1998). However, growing concern over the extreme negative impact that humans have on the planet, has led to the development of a new branch of criminological thought: green criminology (White, 2009; White, 2008). Green criminology takes on a socio-legal definition of harm that encompasses harmful or destructive practices which may fall outside of what is defined as illegal within existing laws (White, 2009; Halsey & White, 1998; White, 2003). This conceptualization of what is defined as crime, and therefore worthy of criminological inquiry, is extremely important with regard to environmental issues. This is because a large amount of environmental harms fall under socially accepted practices (Halsey & White, 1998); mining, clear cut logging, and hydraulic fracking for example. Green criminology has similarities to other work within the field of criminology on white collar crime (Sutherland, 1949) and discrimination (Schwendinger & Schwendinger, 1975;)(White, 2003; Halsey & White, 1998).

White (2009) explains that the aim of green criminology "…is to stretch the boundaries of mainstream criminology to accommodate issues of global significance, while also utilizing the insights of conventional criminology, to illuminate ways in which to understand and respond to environmental harm" (p. 2-3). The green perspective is based within critical criminology, which questions the assumptions that criminology is based on. There is a focus on inequality and power and how they influence these taken for granted assumptions (Uggen & Inderbitzin, 2010). There is a huge gap between what is defined as environmental crime by laws and regulations and that which actually causes destruction to the environment (Halsey & White, 1998). This is a result of the current view of the relationship between humans and the environment. Before a further discussion of green criminology, it is important to identify the different views of this relationship.

The human/nature relationship

There are three main philosophical viewpoints of the relationship between humans and the environment: anthropocentricism, biocentrism, and ecocentrism. Anthropocentrism is how our society currently interacts with the environment. This view point "…emphasizes the biological, mental and moral superiority of humans over all other living and non-living entities" (Halsey & White, 1999, p.31). This view point sees non-human nature as simply a tool, with its only worth being how it can benefit humans. There is little concern for the effect that humans have on nature, or the implications this effect may have for the future of the human race. Benefits and problems are only measured in economic terms. Any kind of environmental conservation is done for aesthetics or sustainable development, within a framework of 'green capitalism' (Halsey & White, 1998; White, 2008). The market is put above all else and any laws seem to work with rather than prosecute offenders. There is a focus on "…regulation…to contain instances specific to environment harms (e.g. oil spills), rather than to eradicate structural problems (e.g. reliance on fossil fuels)" (Halsey & White, 1998, p.33).

This kind of philosophical view of human superiority has had detrimental effects on how we interact with each other and the earth. Anthropocentrism is a huge part of capitalism and "…it is essential to those social systems which attempt to 'naturalize' the domination of humans by humans (capital over labour) and the domination of non-human nature by humans (capital over the natural environment)" (Halsey & White, 1998). Regardless of the disastrous effects of this view point it continues to be prominent and relatively unchallenged within our society (Halsey & White, 1998). A further discussion of the connection between anthropocentrism, capitalism, and environmental harm will occur in the next section.

In contrast to the anthropocentric view is the biocentric view, which sees humans as equal in all aspects to every other organism. Non-humans are seen as having moral worth, regardless of the value attributed to them by humans (Halsey & White, 1998; White, 2008). This point of view embraces natural selection and the idea that "when any species, including human beings, comes up against 'natural limits' then 'Nature' will, through various biological means, reduce its population to the 'carrying capacity' of a particular region" (Halsey & White, 1998). Any decisions from this point of view would be made with the aim of living life as closely to non-human beings as possible, in that we would be attempting to live within the constraints of mother earth.

Things such as famines and natural disasters are seen as nature's way of reducing the human population to live within these constraints. This view point lacks any response or consideration for social effects or injustice that may result from the application of these ideas (Halsey & White, 1998). Laws made under this philosophy "…would be to 'reiterate' biological and ecological laws, regardless of the penalties to be paid by significant sections of the human population" (Halsey & White, 1998, p. 36). Biocentrism lacks the ability to address the social and political realities of environmental issues (Halsey & White, 1998).

At the mid-point between these two views is ecocentrism, which gives consideration to the needs of both humans and non-humans but recognizes the special responsibility that humans hold as a result of the global effects they can have (White, 2008; Halsey & White, 1998). While humans are always going to have an impact on nature, they also have a need to work within the limits of the natural world and help it flourish. This is so that they can continue to survive. Ecocentrism has anthropocentric aspects in that it is concerned with the well-being of humans and their individual and collective interests. However, it also realizes that these interests can only continue to be met if the environment is preserved. Current methods of extraction, and the commodification of nature, go against human needs in that they are destroying that which we need to survive (air, water, etc.) (Halsey & White, 1998).

From this view point any decisions should be made within a framework of participatory democracy. While global issues are of concern these issues are seen as best addressed at the local, grass roots level, with "…a constant movement between local initiative and global solidarity" (Halsey & White, 1998). An ecocentric philosophy has five assumptions: "1) Everything is connected to everything else; 2) the whole is greater than the sum of its part; 3) Meaning is context dependent; 4) Process has primacy over parts; [and] 5) Humans and non-human nature are one" (Merchant, 1990, p.59-60 as cited in Halsey & White, 1998, p. 38).

Environmental issues are also placed within a social justice framework. For example, the clear cutting of forests would be a problem because of the negative effect on the eco-system but also because of the effects on indigenous communities living in that forest, along with other related social problems. Any legal changes would be made with these socio-environmental concerns as their basis (Halsey & White, 1998).

Justice for who?

Green criminology is ultimately concerned with who or what the victim of the harm is. It can be separated into three broad tendencies, which engage will all three of the above philosophical views: environmental justice, ecological justice, and species justice. Environmental justice is predominantly concerned with the rights of humans, which means that at face value it is anthropocentric. Concerns for this area involve how the health and well-being of people are effected by our ways of engaging with the environment. Of particular importance is the unequal distribution of harm from unhealthy environments, with consideration for the fact that those who are being harmed may not be aware of the realities of this harm. For example there is often pressure as a result of socio-economic status to accept a certain amount of environmental risk (White, 2008; White, 2003). While environmental justice is primarily concerned with human rights, it can also be ecocentric if it "…is based upon *enlightened human self-interest*" (White, 2008, p.18 (emphasis in original)). In other words it can be based upon the realization that human interests are intimately connected with the health of the environment.

Ecological justice on the other hand is primarily concerned with the health of the environment and the rights of other species, which are seen to have their own intrinsic rights. Humans are only one part of a vast ecosystem. Their actions should always consider this relationship and any possibility of harm to the environment. This point of view can differ in its understanding of the value of humans and their specific interests. At one end of the spectrum the biocentric view sees human rights, or individual rights, as insignificant to the well-being of the environment as a whole. Humans are seen as a problem and harms against them, such as famine, are simply ways of controlling the problem. At the other end of the spectrum is the ecocentric view which incorporates ecological justice into concepts of power and social justice. This view realizes that human and environmental exploitation are both a result of social forces (White, 2008; White, 2003).

It is important to note that the framing of environmental harm within ecological or environmental justice can be significantly influenced by socio-economic status. A person who is living in poverty and can only afford to live next to a factory which emits toxic pollution may not be able to look past their own needs. On the other hand, a financially wealthy person, who is most likely living in safe and comfortable accommodations, has the ability to look past human rights and focus on the rights of the environment (White, 2008). However, socio-economic status does not guarantee a specific view point. There are many who live in poverty that are concerned with the well-being of the environment and many who live privileged lives who are concerned solely with their own well-being. This contrast comes up as a main theme within this research.

The last area is species justice, which is concerned primarily with the rights of animals and may invoke the use of the term speciesism (discrimination of non-human animals). The rights of animals can also be seen on a scale, from a welfarist approach to one based on rights. The welfarist approach is concerned with treating animals as fairly as possible but not with the removal of exploitation; the main issue is the prevention of unnecessary suffering. This approach coincides with ecocentrism. A rights based approach is biocentric, in that it calls for the end of exploitation. This is based on the belief that all animals should be able to live their lives in freedom and that they should be right-bearing entities rather than property (White, 2008).

The question of which rights are most important and should be given the most weight is not easily answerable. Within green criminology there is surely room for all of these view points and each should be considered in its own space. White (2008) suggests that the most successful way of dealing with this conflict is to see issues as they relate to all three perspectives. A significant amount of environmental issues are harmful to humans, animals, and the environment, and should be considered within their specific context. Figure 1 is "…a model of decision-making in which information in each of the three areas is weighted up in regards to any specific issue" (White, 2008, p. 24).

Weighing Up Harm

Ecocentric Approach to Justice	Animalcentric Approach to Justice	Humancentric Approach to Justice

Figure 1 (White, 2008, p. 24)

This model acknowledges the interconnectedness of the three areas. The actions of humans can have a negative effect on the environment and other species, which in turn can have a negative impact on humans. A recent example of this is the tailing pond spill at Mount Polley mine on August 4, 2014. The tailing pond near Likely, British Columbia spilled an estimated 25 million cubic meters of water, contaminated with mine waste, into surrounding waterways (CBC News, 2014). This disaster effects the ecosystem of the surrounding water ways and the animals that depend on the water but humans are one of the species which depend on it. Humans are therefore effected by their own actions (or of actions by some of their species). The above model allows for the weighing of harm to all those involved and gives context for the assessment of these harms; rather than a rigid predetermined decision on which rights are more worthy (White, 2008). However, "[f]or the model to work, it is essential that objective data be collected, that scientific studies be drawn upon, that various types of experiential and traditional knowledge are tapped into, and that baseline information is provided" (White, 2008, p.26). This model is useful when we are considering the results of this research and the many different ways that the activists view their action.

The social construction of environmental crime

Any analysis of environmental crime must be done while acknowledging that what is defined as harm is ultimately a social construction. Within green criminology there is an acceptance that realist and constructionist views both apply. In that, "yes, there is an objective 'nature', and yes, humans interpret this nature through cultural filters" (White, 2008, p.33). The actual environmental problem may not be contested but the significance of it, and how much attention it is given, is a social construct. In many ways environmental problems need to become social problems to be given real weight within the current social context (White, 2008). This is where the idea of a social movement being the solution to climate change comes into play.

White (2008) engages with Hannigan's (2006) pathway to the social construction of environmental problems. First is the assembling of the problem with supporting research and evidence. Second, is presenting the problem by bringing attention to its significance, usually through the mass media and by attributing moral worth to it. The third aspect is contesting, which involves networking, gaining support and in general mobilizing people around the issue. There are many factors that may interfere with the successful construction of a problem such as lack of scientific authority, media attention, or motivated people. Ambiguity of definition can also be an issue, since what is seen as a problem for one person may not be considered one for someone else. Problems can also be framed in different lenses. For example, a logger may view logging as an issue of job retention over environmental harm (Hannigan, 2006 as cited in White, 2008).

Important to this social construction, as noted above, is the framing of problems as both social and environmental. While there is a desire within green criminology to move towards more of an ecocentric point of view, certain realities place human needs over that of non-humans. The basis for this is that humans have a significant amount of power over the environment and therefore an ability to either help or harm it. While there are certain environmental forces which effect humans, such as flooding and fires, humans have a drastically bigger effect on the environment. The second issue is that equality among living and non-living being on the earth, or complete moral egalitarianism, is neither logical nor practical. There are differences between species and the view of human suffering as natural is unacceptable from a moral standpoint (White, 2008).

Beyond this is the acknowledgment of universal human interests. This means that the survival and prosperity of humans relies on the eco-systems which we effect. Basic needs for survival, such as clean air and water, should be considered of greatest importance. However this is not usually the case. White states that "…the reason why we are not fixing up the planet, even though it is to the advantage of all that we work together in our common interest, is that specific class interests intrude upon the process whereby planetary well-being might be the priority" (p. 47). The social construction of environmental issues is intimately connected with capitalism and state/corporate crime.

Capitalism: the fuel for environmental crime.

Everyone can have an impact on the environment, and can therefore create environmental harm, but the powerful have a significantly greater capacity to do so. Within a capitalist system[4] it is the corporations whom have the most power, and therefore their environmental crimes are the most harmful. However, it is the capitalist system itself which is the greatest culprit for environmental crime, for it is inherently criminogenic (White, 2008). Glasbeek (2004) explains that the system is designed to remove responsibility from those making decisions, in that the corporation is legally a person and responsible for its acts. However, a corporation is not capable of thinking and acting on its own and therefore it lacks criminal intent. Within a criminal justice system which require both an act (actus reas) and intent (mens reas), there are no grounds to convict. There have been new standards created, that state a "corporation [is] 'criminally responsible' when it's acting mind and will exhibit wrongful intention" (Glasbeek, 2004 as cited in White, 2008). However this standard is very problematic within large corporations where it is extremely hard to prove.

Glasbeek (2004) states that corporate crime is the norm rather than the exception. There are rarely criminal sanctions imposed for corporate wrong doing, which results in crime being profitable. Within a capitalist society citizens are divided into the upper (capitalist) class and the lower (working) class. In western countries the capitalist class is filled with predominantly wealthy, white men who own the corporations and/or are heavily invested in them. There is also significant overlap between the capitalist class and those with state power. It is therefore no surprise that the laws reflect their interests. This is the basis of the problem within state/corporate crime, which, as a result of immense environmental transgressions, is also significant within green criminology (Glasbeek, 2004; White 2008 & 2011).

The capitalist system is hugely responsible for environmental crime, and the social construction of it, as a result of its engrained denial of harm (White, 2008). Capitalism is based on the continual increase of consumption, with no regard to for the effects this has on nature. In fact, nature is turned into a commodity that is seen as an exchange value rather than use value, and may even be altered biologically or physically; the genetic engineering of food for example. The system is the problem because of the way it views our relationship with nature, it is harmfully anthropocentric (Glasbeek, 2004; White 2008 & 2011).

This mode of production, based on continued expansion and commodification, is inseparable from the way we consume. Historically people have consumed based on what they need to survive but capitalism is based on consumerism. Consumerism is the fuel for a capitalist society in that it constantly creates new needs, such as through the introduction of new trends or constantly evolving technology (the iPhone for example). In this sense production, or the need of the corporations to sell, is served by the need to consume, rather than the need to consume being served by production (White, 2008). The effect that this has on the environment is huge. There are "…constant escalating pressures on the world's non-renewable resources, huge waste of existing human and natural resources and potentials, major issues of disposal and clean-up, and a

---

[4] It is important to note that it is not just capitalism states that have a history of environmental crimes, Communist countries are also known to have little consideration for the environment. However, within the current context we are primarily concerned with capitalism.

'demonstration effect' which is distorting world production-consumption patterns" (White, 2008, p. 163).The fact that this production and consumption is based on the extraction and burning of fossil fuels, means that capitalism is ultimately the driving force behind climate change.

In essence, capitalism socially constructs environmental destruction to seem normal and not criminal. The creation of "needs" or desires makes corporate destruction of environment seem as if it is unavoidable (White, 2008; Klein, 2014). For example, the tar sands are necessary because we need oil for our car and we NEED our car. It also makes environmentally unfriendly activities pleasurable, such as going for a scenic drive in that car. Consumption is a social phenomenon as it is based on the production of needs and desires, for the purpose of fueling capitalism. However, at its core this philosophy of continual increase in production and consumption is contradictory. Capitalism is based on the continual increase of production through use of raw material but it destroys the material that it relies on. Ecological sustainability is impossible within a capitalist system, so capitalism is inherently environmentally harmful, and therefore destroys its possibility of continual increase in production (White, 2008; Klein, 2014).

Capitalism is also inherently socially unjust, as it puts the need to increase production over natural human needs and ignores social consequences. This is evident in the fact that those with the least money often receive the worst service or quality of product (White, 2008& 2003). It is also often the poor and working class who are exposed to environmental risks, with minority groups bearing the brunt of this harm. Those who live in precarious situations are easily exploited to work in dangerous situations. The capitalist system is structurally criminal, as it is based on the exploitation of the environment and the working class (White, 2008; Klein, 2014; Glasbeek, 2004).

The state is intimately connected with capitalism, as there is significant overlap between the capitalist class and the state. This overlap is evident in who is elected, funding allocated to campaigns by corporations, and a revolving door between regulators and corporate employees. What is defined as criminal is therefore decided by the capitalist class, which explains why street crime has harsh penalties when state/corporate crime does not; regardless of the fact it can cause significantly more harm (White, 2008 & 2011). Canada is a great example of this reality, where "getting tough on crime" has meant significantly harsher punishments for street crime. While at the same time environmental protection has been stripped. This is a situation of the criminals defining the crime (Green, Ward & McConnachie, 2007). Corporations also have the ability to use state resources such as the police and the courts for their own purposes. This is evident in the use of strategic lawsuits against public participation and the use of police officers or military to protect corporate interests (White, 2008 & 2011; Klein, 2014; Hurley & Shogren, 1997).

Green criminology requires a critical analysis of capitalism and the social construction of environmental harm. There is a blurry line between what is criminal and what is not, a line that is constructed by capitalism. Green, Ward and McConnachie (2007) suggest "…that state crimes, for criminological purposes, should be defined as actions by state agencies that not only violate human rights, but also violate norms with which the agency in question was under significant pressure to conform" (p.119). This also transfers to corporations, which should be held to a higher standard than their own definitions of crime. However, not all state/corporate crime is

defined as legal even within their own definitions. Corporations have a long history of environmental crimes, such as the illegal dumping of toxic waste, and states have similar histories, such as illegal logging. Legal loop holes and captured regulators allow many of these crimes to go unpunished or even unacknowledged. While there are certainly state/corporate crimes committed at a local level, many of these crimes transcend state boundaries and are carried to other parts of the world as a result of globalization (White, 2008 & 2011; Green et al, 2007)

The Globalization of Environmental Harm and an Eco-Global Criminology

In today's world we are all connected at some level. What we choose to do in our everyday lives has effects on people living in countries around the world. White (2011) relates this to the "butterfly effect", where even the smallest act can have immense effects somewhere else in the world. He suggests that "the local is indeed global in this worldwide system of networks and flows" (p. 1). At a basic level globalization has led to transnational crime within the traditional sense of crime as something which is illegal. This can also include environmental issues such as illegal pollution. Within a green criminological perspective though transnational environmental crimes involve:

-… some kind of *cross-border transference* and an international or *global dimension…,*

- Transgressions that are *harmful to humans, environments and non-human animals*, regardless of legality per se; and

- environmental-related harms that are facilitated by *the state*, as well as *corporations and other powerful actors,* insofar as these institutions have the capacity to shape official definitions of environmental crime in ways that allow or condone environmentally harmful practices. (White, 2011, p.3 (emphasis in original))

Globalization has led to the creation of superpowers called transnational corporations, and the spread of capitalism across the world. Worldwide emphasis on 'free trade', privatization of nature, and neoliberal states, all enforce the effects of global capitalism. They are also supported by global institutions such as the World Bank (Friedrichs & Friedrichs, 2002). Many people look to globalization as a good thing. However, the effects it has on poorer countries and those who inhabit them, show it is only good for the corporations who now benefit off of the commodification of the environment and people at both a global and local level.

In addition, neoliberalism enforces capitalism because it creates a culture where the market is the ultimate concern. Policies are put in place to allow the corporations to increase their production and profits as much as possible, with little, if any, consideration for the effects. Over the last decade Canada has seen its environmental protections be stripped to pave the way for energy projects such as the Kinder Morgan Pipeline, SLAPP suites are being filed against those who dare stand up to corporations, and the conservative government is intent on keeping the destructive tar sands alive. However, the Canadian economy benefits very minimally from these destructive practices. These ideals are also spread to other sectors, such as education and health care, where the quality is of little concern if the same service can be provided for less

money. In addition, market values are spread to individual lives, where people are left to take care of themselves regardless of their social situation. This has created a society which is primarily concerned with themselves, and possibly their closest family and friends. Neo-liberalism has been a strengthening force behind corporate control. (Giroux, 2013; Brown, 2006; Brown, 2003)

The spread of capitalism has led to a new sub discipline within green criminology called eco-global criminology. Eco-global criminology is attempting to address the global realities of environmental harm and one of the main focuses is on how research is conducted. White (2011) draws on Connell (2007), who "…queries whose knowledge, whose perspectives and whose ideas come to dominate our understandings of the social world" (p.28). We can connect this to Cohens (2001) concept of cultural denial, which looks at the social construction of denial, which can lead to a personal denial of serious realities. To understand global issues we must hear global voices, which is something that is missing within academia today. We must cross both cultural and disciplinary boundaries and be sensitive to the specific situation we are working within, rather than accepting the culture of denial. White (2011) states that "[b]ridging the gap requires dialogue (not monologue), listening (not lecturing) and give-and-take interchange (not just give, or just take)" (p.30). There is a history of exploitation within western academia, which mirrors the exploitation by western capitalism, and this must be addressed for successful and useful research to take place. This connects closely to decolonizing indigenous methods (Kovach, 2010).

There is also a need for the implementation of horizon scanning, where the risk of future harms, or currently unacknowledged harms, are also addressed. Horizon scanning involves identification of perpetrators of harm (causal forces), the use of multidisciplinary methods to uncover these transgressions, and consideration of how to respond. Consideration of the future is of specific importance through intergenerational justice (equity), precautionary principle (measure of prevention), and transference over time (aggregate and amalgamating effects) (White, 2011).

Within eco-global criminology there is a focus on three broad issues: climate change, bio-diversity, and waste and pollution. All of these issues are related and have an immense impact on the present and future state of our world. However, climate change is by far the greatest threat. It is the cause of current harm and it is going to continue to increase in intensity and scope. Capitalism is the pressing force behind climate change and the capitalist class refuses to change its ways, placing economic gain over the continued prosperity and safety of the planet. The effects of climate change will result in widespread chaos, as a result of food shortages, mass migration and increased social conflicts. Even attempts by the capitalist class to mitigate the effects of climate change result in more harm (paradoxical harms) (White, 2011).A discussion of climate change and its implications for the future of our world will be discussed later in this review.

From Research to Action: A Green Public Criminology

It is evident by the above overview of what green criminology encompasses, that there is no simple answer to what green criminologists do. On one hand green criminology can work

within existing legal definitions of crime by analyzing current laws and regulations surrounding environmental crime. From this point there can be conceptualizations of ways to enhance environmental protection through existing legal structures or through the introduction of new ones, such as an international environmental court. However, White (2008) suggests that the real goal of critical green criminology is "…challenging the status quo, and about making the world a better place" (p.274). This involves seeing, judging, and acting. There is a need to be aware of the social construction of environmental harm through capitalism and corporate/state actions. In addition to being aware of how capitalism and globalization allows for immense social inequality and the exploitation of people and the environment (White, 2008 & 2011). Through this awareness there needs to be a call to action on the part of both criminologists and the world at large.

This calls for further consideration of what is criminal, as a result of needing to overcome the powers of capitalism. Activism in many parts of the world is criminalized and the state is active in repressing democratic participation. The criminalization of dissent calls for further investigation by criminologists, who must play an active role in exposing these wrongs. Activism may also involve acts that are legally defined as illegal and may even be harmful, such as acts of ecotage. In these situations there needs to be careful consideration for the realities surrounding these actions. While harm is never good, in some cases it may be necessary. The capitalist elite are powerful and harmful, and in the case of globally detrimental realities such as climate change, there may be a need to fight fire with fire. In some cases illegal and harmful acts may be justified and necessary (White, 2011).

This research expands on this consideration and study of activism, in that it see's activism as a solution to a culture of denial that is inherently criminal. From this point of view, the study of how people come to be active is necessary to "solve" this crime. While traditional lenses of criminology may see laws and prisons as solutions to street crimes, green criminologists should see activism as the ultimate solution for the crime of climate change. From this point we also need to make sure that as criminologists we are actively applying and engaging in these solutions.

In essence green criminology calls for public involvement, or a green public criminology. Uggen and Inderbitzin (2010) state that "[n]owhere is the gap between perception and evidence greater than in the study of crime and punishment" (p. 726). I believe that this statement transfers to environmental crime within its current capitalist social construction, as is demonstrated in the above discussion. While there is currently no literature suggesting a green public criminology, it seems that the aims of the perspective calls for one. Public criminology means taking research and information from the criminology field and disseminating it within the wider public, while also engaging with and working with and for the public. The point of this is to influence both policy and public thought. In regards to this work, I am intending to utilize the findings to strengthen the movement against climate change, from my position as an activist.

Uggen and Inderbitzen (2010) identify four main areas of public criminology, which intersect with professional, critical and policy criminology:

(a) evaluating and reframing cultural images of the criminal, which is perhaps the clearest example of public criminology; (b) reconsidering rule making, which has deep roots in critical criminology; (c) evaluating social interventions, which derives from policy criminology; and (d) assembling social fact and situating crime in disciplinary knowledge, which most clearly maps onto professional criminology (p. 726)

The intersection of public criminology within the other three areas makes it a useful platform for a successful green criminology, which has an emphasis on social change. A reframing of who is criminal is necessary because of the capitalist definition of what is crime. This leads to a need for critical examination of rule-making within a capitalist system, and an evaluation of resulting social interventions. Green criminology has a huge need for the use of interdisciplinary knowledge and social facts to effect social change. Public criminology calls for engagement with the public through media, teaching, and community engagement, something that green criminology will need if it to be successful.

To simply study environmental crime and be critical of the realities surrounding it will not create social change. Green criminology needs to be involved within the wider environmental movement, by providing support and knowledge to those fighting environmental crime. This could be through attempts to change social perceptions, pushing for legal changes surrounding the criminalization of dissent, or joining in at the front lines of the battle through engagement with environmental groups and acts of protest. Cohen (2001) explains that as intellectuals we have a moral obligation "…to try to find out and tell the truth *as best as one can* about *matter of human significance* to the *right audience*- that is, an audience *that can do something about them"* (p.286(emphasis in original)).

Being involved in public green criminology may not be easy or immediately rewarding, and it may even present possible dangers to the criminologist. In public criminology in general it is it acknowledged that engaging with the public can be difficult, since they are navigating through the media and fighting against public perceptions reinforced by the state. It can even present dangers to the criminologist if they are associated with negatively viewed communities such as sex offenders (Uggen & Inderbitzen, 2010). For green criminologists this reality is heightened, since it is the corporations and state that we are speaking out against and challenging. At a relatively unthreatening level corporations control what is let out through the media, as a result of their ownership over most of the main media outlets. At a significantly more threatening level they have control over the state, and through it the criminal justice system and military. Green criminology is at its core deconstructing and challenging capitalism, and threatening the current social order of the world; one that the capitalist elite are unlikely to give up without a fight. This threat should not be a reason for not engaging in a public criminology. For, as Cohen (2001) explains, "[i]ntellectuals who keep silent about what they know, who ignore the crimes that matter by moral standards, are even more morally culpable when their society is free and open. They can speak freely, but choose not to" (p.286).

This overview of green criminology will provide a perspective for the rest of this study. Many of the topics mentioned above will reappear in later sections and the topics of climate change, denial, and activism will be explored within a green criminology context. This research

is expanding beyond what is traditionally thought of to be criminology, and green criminology, especially eco-global criminology, provides a platform for these types of studies. This section has come near the beginning of this study so that the rest of the sections can be read with this perspective in mind. In the next section I will be providing in depth context for the exact problem that we are facing. As criminologists we need to be aware of how our world is changing and continue to evolve with these changes, so that we are investigating problems and implementing strategies that are relevant and useful.

The Problem:

Scientific evidence points to the eventual destruction of our current way of life as a result of climate change. Multiple reports highlight the fact that climate change is happening, humans are the major cause of it, and that it is going to have an immense and irreversible impact on our world (IPCC, 2013; The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d.). From natural disasters to the resulting devastation and social conflict, climate change is already and will continue to affect us unless huge changes take place. This section will look at the history of environmental harm as it relates to colonization and capitalism, the current realities surrounding climate change, what this means for the future of our world, and how our government and nations are dealing with the issue.

The colonization of environment and peoples

The history of the human occupation of earth is relativity short. Our species has only been around for about 4 million years and the building of cities began only 10, 000 years ago. Within the earth's history of 4.6 billion years we have existed for only a moment in time (Seeds & Backman, 2012). Humans had lived in relative harmony with the earth for thousands of years and in most places this was still the case, until about 500 years ago. When the Americas were "discovered" by imperial powers there began a long history of the pillaging of natural resources and the commodification of people and places. Many of the crimes of empire were environmental in nature (Hill, 2010).

The invading empires came to claim land and resources, which had been used for many generations by Indigenous peoples. When the land was not given up freely, Indigenous peoples were slaughtered by the millions across the globe. Stolen goods were sent back to Europe where the ruling class became wealthy at the expense of Indigenous peoples (Hill, 2010). This commodification of nature included not only the environment but the commodification of people as slaves (Mrozowski, 1999). While this was certainly not the beginning of slavery, it was the beginning of a world-wide slave trade, and those that were enslaved were treated in cruel and unusual ways (Hill, 2010). Historically, colonization has been based on environmental crimes by the empire, and continues to be environmental in nature, as will be discussed later in this review.

Iadicola (2010) discusses the power of empires, and their inherent criminality. He believes that the crimes of empire are too often unacknowledged within criminology and even within the study of state crime. Empires "…are organized to conquer and control the resources and markets of other territories and people" (Iadicola, 2010, p.33). Today's society is based on the crimes of an empire, crimes which included wars of aggression, ethic-cleanings, and genocide. Within the environmental context, crimes of empire included the stealing of land and resources, destruction of natural spaces, and the enslavement of peoples.

Today the controlling empire has changed but an empire still exists. The United States of America is an empire which conquers and controls other lands as it sees fit. All under the guise of liberation; regardless of whether the people desire this liberation (Iadicola, 2010). An Empire is"…a major actor in the international system based on the subordination of diverse national elites, who, whether under compulsion or from shared convictions, accept the values of those

who govern the dominant center or the metropole" (Maier, 2005 cited in Iadicola, 2010, p. 32). Within the current context this can be seen in Shells occupation of the Niger Delta. There has been a long history of destruction by empire within Nigeria, starting with the slave trade in 1444 by the Portuguese and then, when slavery was abolished, with the palm oil trade. Today the Niger Delta, and the people who call it home, are exploited by the American oil company Shell for the abundant oil it contains. A lack of consideration for safety has resulted in oil spills and destruction of the environment, causing social disarray, immense health problems, and conflict (Okonta & Douglas, 2003). This mass destruction of environment and peoples continues relatively unhindered, showing the power of capitalism, corporations, and the empire that is the United States of America.

There is a cultural denial surrounding the realities of the empire, both in the fact that they are the successor of the British Empire and that they are the current empire. This denial is necessary within empires to cover up the devastating realities of their actions; "[i]n the case of the United States, it's myth of a non-empire liberating people around the world from the tyranny of evil empires and dictators" (Iadicola, p.32). This connects to Stanley Cohen's (2001) concept of cultural denial, which is used by people living within a state that is based on violence and oppression to avoid the unpleasant reality. While they may be aware on some level, they deny the implications of these realities or choose to not acknowledge them. This may take the form of state suggested denial through media or could be a slow slip into cultural denial without state intervention. This is evident in lack of acknowledgement around the history of, and continual, colonization and destruction of indigenous communities, and the continued intervention into other countries by the United States and its allies.

Environmental crime has its roots within the colonization of Indigenous peoples and continues to be closely tied to them today. Indigenous peoples are in many cases the face of the environmental movement, which will be further discussed later in this study. Today colonization continues across the world, although it has two new faces: capitalism and globalization.

The rise of capitalism and the unbalancing of the human/nature relationship

It was only a few centuries ago, with the beginning of industrialization, when the relationship between humans and nature began to become unbalanced. This unbalancing was even noted in 1798 by Reverend Thomas Malthus who stated that:

The power of population is infinitely greater than the power of the earth to produce subsistence for man. Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. Subsistence only in an arithmetical ratio…by that law of our nature which makes food necessary for the life of man, the effects of these two unequal powers must be kept equal (as cited in Hopkins, 2000, p. 12)

Although it is unlikely that he could predict the grave realities of what lay a few hundred years in the future for humans, it is telling that there was already a realization of the limits of nature. Twenty-two years before Malthus publicly announced these worries, the first commercial steam engine was introduced in 1776. This signified the birth of a new kind of industry.

Up until this point humans were constrained by the will of nature, both in travel and production. Factories were powered by water wheels, therefor limiting where they could be built, and ships were carried by wind, limiting their ability to travel. Water power had many benefits such as being free, clean, and actually more powerful than coal powered steam engines. However, the use of coal allowed humans to have control over nature, by centralizing the production of goods within cities and allowing ships to travel through almost any weather. The domination of earth was to appealing for men to turn down, and soon coal was used widely. (Klein, 2014)

There has been a "…connection between pollution and labor exploitation…since the earliest days of the Industrial Revolution" (Klein, 2014). As Marx and Engels (1848) so famously stated "[t]he history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (p. 3). The struggles enclosed in environmental harm are similarly mirrored in these class struggles. With the forceful removal of the commons and the introduction of factories and mining, it was always the working class that faced the realities of environmental harm. The use of coal allowed colonists to travel across the globe, claiming control of whatever they wanted and destroying those who stood in their way. The labouring class worked in unhealthy conditions, often facing serious health problems as a result of working with coal. (Klein, 2014)

As was discussed at length above, capitalism is based on the continual increase of production and growth of wealth, and therefore, the continual and increasing exploitation of natural resources and the working class (Klein, 2014; White, 2008 & 2011; Marx & Engels, 1846). The desire for continual growth is in itself unattainable. There are limited resources and capitalism has no consideration for its impact on these resources. This continual increase in consumption, and denial of the realities surrounding it, has led to a situation where we are no longer in control; nature is fighting back in the form of climate change. Marx and Engels (1846) may refer to the uncontrollability of the relationship between capitalism and climate change as "… a sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells".

The Battle: Climate Change v. Globalism and Free Trade

Climate change has been acknowledged by scientists as a problem since the 1950's, and President Johnson was warned of the dangers of climate change in 1965 by his Science Advisory Committee. Although it did not appear on the public radar until 1988, at this time it seemed that real change was going to take place. The first emission reduction goals were discussed in June of that year, at the World Conference on Changing Atmosphere in Toronto. The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was also formed. In America awareness of the greenhouse effect rose from 38% in 1981 to 79% in 1989. Discussion had even started to take place around how to reverse the effects of climate change and the consumerist lifestyles of developed nations were brought into the spotlight. (Klein 2014)

However, at the same time that climate change was seemingly acknowledged, major historical events took place across the world: ending with the breaking of the berlin wall and opening up the world to be taken over by capitalism. From Washington "right-wing ideologues… waged a frontal attack on political experimentation, on the idea that there might be viable ways

of organizing societies other than deregulated capitalism" (Klein, 2014, p.75). Over the next decade the western version of extreme, pro-corporation capitalism would spread to every corner of the world, and along with it the consumerist lifestyle of the middle and upper classes. The next few years showed victories for both climate change and capitalism:

In 1992, governments met for the first United Nations Earth Summit in Rio, where they signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the document that formed the basis for all future climate negotiations. The same year, the North American Free Trade Agreement was signed, going into effect two years later. Also in 1994, negotiations establishing the World Trade Organization concluded, and the new global trade body made its debut the next year. In 1997, the Kyoto Protocol was adopted, containing the first binding emission reduction targets. In 2001, China gained full membership in the WTO, the culmination of a trade and investment liberalization process that had begun decades earlier (Klein, 2014, p. 76).

While these events occurred within the same time period they took no consideration of the effects they would have on each other. Global trade is intimately connected with increased emissions and therefore in direct contradiction to fighting climate change. Regardless of the lack of direct negotiations over which goal would be victorious, combating climate change or increasing worldwide trade, there was never any real question of the fact that globalized trade would win. From the beginning climate negotiators resigned to being second in line. The UNFCCC stated that "measures taken to combat climate change, including unilateral ones, should not constitute…a disguised restriction on international trade", and the Kyoto Protocol contained a very similar statement (Klein, 2014).

Robyn Eckersley explained the situation well, when she stated that:

Rather than push for the recalibration of the international trade rules to conform with the requirements of climate protection, or push for the use of trade measures to enforce compliance and ensure fairness to "first movers" in the climate regime, the Parties to the climate regime have ensured that liberalized trade and an expanding global economy have been protected against trade-restrictive climate policies (United Nations Environment Program, 2009, p. 32).

In essence those who were apparently concerned with climate change willingly handed over control to those working towards globalized, borderless, free trade. However, those making the trade agreements refused to acknowledge issues of climate change within their agreements, and they have so far successfully won the battle. Today companies take their production to places where they have the least restrictions, allowing the worst possible exploitation of both the environment and people. These products are then sent around the world, where their consumers use them for a period of time and then throw them in the trash, replacing them with the next desired commodity. These realities have led to an increase rather than a decrease in carbon emissions, skyrocketing past original predictions (Klein, 2014).

What is Climate Change?

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) defines Climate Change "…as a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g., by using statistical tests) by changes

in the mean and/or the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer" (Cubasch, Wuebbles, Facchini, Frame, Mahowald & Winther, 2013, p.8). Carbon dioxide is present in our atmosphere. It blocks out harmful radiation and also traps heat from the sun, which keeps us from being a frozen planet. This is called the greenhouse effect. While a certain amount of greenhouse effect is necessary for the survival of life on earth, too much can result in extreme temperature changes. For example, the planet Venus has a runaway greenhouse effect. It is covered by a dense layer of carbon dioxide clouds, and its temperatures are extremely high. Carbon dioxide is naturally recycled by oceans and plants, and stored in things such as coal and permafrost. Humans cause climate change as a result of continually releasing carbon dioxide into the air through burning of fossil fuels and the destruction of natural areas, such as the Amazon Forest (Seeds & Backman, 2012)

There is a general consensus within the scientific community that climate change is happening, that it is caused by humans, and that it is going to have immense and irreversible effects on our planet. The earth's climate has warmed by an average of 1.4° F in the last 100 years. While this seems small, if we continue on our current path it is estimated that there will be an additional 4 to 8° warming in the next 100 years. The average temperature for the last ice age was only 9° higher than it is today (The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d.).

There are natural causes of climate change, such as volcanic eruptions. However, the IPCC (2013) provides strong scientific evidence that humans are the main cause. Half of the warming from 1951 to 2010 is believed to be caused by human actions. The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) notes that "…the science linking human activities to climate change is analogous to the science linking smoking to lung and cardiovascular diseases" (The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d., p.4).

The effects of climate change are evident around the world. Summer Sea ice in Alaska in 2012 was at half the average of between 1979 and 2000 (National Snow and Ice Data Center, 2012 as cited in The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d.). Oceans are absorbing the extra carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, resulting in their rapid acidification, which is already having negative impacts on crustaceans (Hönisch et al, 2010 as cited in The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d.). Animals are migrating towards the poles to escape the increasing temperatures (The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d.). Sea levels are rising at extremely fast levels and patterns of precipitation are changing. Some places are experiencing extreme rainfall, while others have heat waves, which also increase the occurrences of fires (IPCC, 2013; The AAAS Climate Science Panel, n.d.).

What does climate change mean for the humans?

These realities have implications for humans which extend beyond damages caused by natural forces such as storms, sea levels, and forest fires. While these things will definitely result in extreme suffering and many deaths, they will also cause, and are already causing, secondary results. Social conflict is already occurring as a result of issues surrounding climate change, and these conflicts are only going to increase as our situation worsens. There are four main areas of concern: "conflicts over resources (e.g. water); conflicts linked to global warming (e.g. climate induced migration); conflicts over differential exploitation of resources (e.g. biopiracy); and

conflicts over the transference of harm (e.g. cross-border pollution)" (White, 2011, p. 39). Hendrix and Salehyan (2012) found a positive relationship between conflict in Africa and the amount of rainfall, with significantly more conflict occurring during the driest and wettest periods. This will have severe implications for Africa within the future of climate change, since it will experience more extreme weather patterns.

Increased migration, with the increase of "environment-refugees", will put pressure on first world countries and is "…reinforcing the development of a fortress mentality within particular jurisdictions" (White, 2011). Forced migrations are already occurring in many parts of the world, such as in the south pacific, where islands are disappearing into the sea as a result of rising tides. Increasing instability as a result of climate change will result in a surge of asylum seekers. This means that those in less affected countries will need to decide how to react. Australia provides an example of how this situation may escalate. Starting in 2001, their 'Pacific Solution' placed asylum seekers in a detention camp on the small island of Nauru. The conditions are known to be inhumane and unbearable, with many detainees attempting to take their own lives (Amnesty International, 2012; Klein, 2014). As detainees wait for years to find out their fate, there are hunger strikes (Schetzer, 2014), riots (Farrell, 2014), and rape (Doherty, 2014). Nauru is an unpleasant example of the conflict and inhumanity that may accompany climate change, specifically for those that are forced away from their homes to seek asylum in other countries (Klein, 2014).

Nauru has its own story of being exploited for its natural resources, and then being taken advantage of for its financial desperation. It is now disappearing from rising tides. Within 10 years after the first colonial discovery of a pure phosphate lime rock, Nauru went from a lush, healthy country with amazing social programs, to an empty rock, with its inhabitants suffering from obesity and multiple health conditions (Klein, 2014). Klein (2014) suggests that "…Nauru has spent the last century disappearing from the inside out; now…it is disappearing from the outside in" (p.165). It is a perfect example of how those who are least responsible for climate change are often in the most precarious situations as a result of it. Even more paradoxical is that the inhabitants of an island that is disappearing from climate change, and are likely soon going to be environmental refugees, are charged with running a detainee camp for the refugees of today. (Klein, 2014)

The effects of climate change will not be felt equally across the world, and neither will the resulting conflict and unrest. They will be mixed with socio-economic and political issues, to result in increases in crimes such as human and commodity trafficking, stealing, and other crimes associated with conflict (White, 2011). Smith and Vivekananda (2007) explain that:

Many of the world's poorest countries and communities thus face a double-headed problem: that of climate change and violent conflict. There is a real risk that climate change will compound the propensity for violent conflict, which in turn will leave communities poorer, less resilient and less able to cope with the consequences of climate change. There are 46 countries – home to 2.7 billion people – in which the effects of climate change interacting with economic, social and political problems will create a high risk of violent conflict.

There is a second group of 56 countries where the institutions of government will have great difficulty taking the strain of climate change on top of all their other current challenges. In these countries, though the risk of armed conflict may not be so immediate, the interaction of climate change and other factors creates a high risk of political instability, with potential violent conflict a distinct risk in the longer term. These 56 countries are home to 1.2 billion people (p. 3). Climate change in essence will greatly increase the gap between the rich and the poor. Even within developed countries such as Canada and the United States those living in poverty, people of colour, and women will suffer the most. This is because they often have fewer resources to mitigate these effects.

Superstorm Sandy, which hit the east coast of the United States and Canada in 2012, is a great example of how the suffering from these natural disasters is felt most acutely by the less fortunate. The National Guard patrolled the streets of New York and those living in the wealthier parts of town were given assistance. However, those living in less wealthy places such as housing projects were not as fortunate, Until a group of volunteers formed "Occupy Sandy". They starting going from door to door offering assistance and found many people who had been locked in their homes for days, often without necessary medicine. Some were too sick to leave or in fear of being robbed or harmed. Many of these people were on welfare, elderly, or mentally ill; some of the most vulnerable people within our communities. A similar situation happened in New Orleans's during and after Hurricane Katrina, when the poor were essentially left to fend for themselves; giving the United States a less than satisfactory track record but sadly not a surprising one (Klein, 2014).

From an eco-global criminology perspective, the lack of responsibility for causing climate change by those who are suffering the worst, brings up huge questions around who is responsible. How responsible should the wealthy be for the pain and suffering their lifestyles are inflicting on the poor? Williams (1996) defines an environmental victim as:

> Those of past, present, or future generations who are injured as a consequence of change to the chemical, physical, microbiological, or psychosocial environment, brought about by deliberate or reckless, individual or collective, human act or act of omission (p.21 as cited in White, 2011)

By this definition it would seem that there are many ways to find the wealthy culpable for inflicting harm on others. As was discussed earlier, from a green criminological perspective, it is usually the capitalist elite, corporations, and the state that are considered responsible. This is as a result of the immense power they have to cause harm and the fact that they are more than often not using this power to act against climate change. With the facts seemingly being so clear, and climate related disasters already occurring around the world, one would assume that the leaders of the world would be taking action to stop climate change. If only for their own benefit, since climate disasters also affect them, including their ability to produce and sell. However, this is not the case. Instead they are engaging in what Cohen (2001) calls official denial.

The official denial of climate change

Official denials encompass public statements or actions of people (or groups) that are responsible for an organization, corporation, or state. This includes government officials, NGO representatives, corporate executives, and representatives of international organizations such as the World Trade Organization. These are organized and collective denials. There are classical denials (literal, interpretive, and implicatory), counter offensive denials, and partial acknowledgments (Cohen, 2001). Official denials about climate change and the dangers surrounding it are abundant. As discussed above, capitalism is based on denial of the fact that the earth's resources are finite and therefore continued expansion of production and consumption is not possible. This leads to a culture of denial, which will be discussed later, and also means that any state, NGO, corporation or other kind of organization that works within the ideology of capitalism, is also in denial of this reality (White, 2008).

Most official climate change denial cannot be taken as actual denial of its existence, rather as the denial of its implications or strategic denial for the benefit of capitalism. Klein (2014) suggests that climate change deniers may actually be the most acutely aware of the realities of climate change and the fact that any real change will completely derail their way of life. This knowledge fuels their attempts to deny since successful climate change action is ultimately the death of capitalism. It is important to understand then, that for corporations, or as we will soon see those funded by them, denial is not an actual denial of the science but a frantic attempt to save their lives; most, if not all of these corporations cannot survive without capitalism (Klein, 2014).

The Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute and the Ayn Rand Foundation are all conservative think tanks who were founded to be defenders of neoliberal forms of capitalism, and now adamantly deny the implications of climate change. A significant portion of their funding also happens to come from fossil fuel corporations. Cohen (2001) explains that the increase in "…international visibility and transparency have made the more literal forms of literal denial difficult to sustain" (p.105). Within the context of climate change it has become increasingly harder to say that climate change does not exist at all; as a result of abundant scientific evidence and increasingly unstable weather. Instead these think tanks revert to implicatory denials and counter offensives.

There is a focus on denying the implications of climate change. Such as suggesting that a few extra degrees of warmth would actually be a good thing, and that it would make many places have better crops. There is also a denial of responsibility. While a majority of scientists agree that climate change is fuelled by human actions, this fact is adamantly denied by many people within these think tanks. For example Willie Soon, an astrophysicist and geoscientist, insists that climate change is a result of natural changes in the sun (Klein, 2014). A recent example of denying the implications of climate change is an interview with physicist Freeman Dyson. He explains that while climate change is happening and it is caused by humans, it is not actually a bad thing. In fact he suggests that it is making the earth greener. He says that we cannot be 100% sure that there will be any climate disaster and even if one does occur it will not happen for another 100 years. Therefore his conclusion is that we should not act against it (Vancouver Sun, 2015).

While there are many different interpretations of climate change, some of them coming from people within the same institute that are contradictory, they are all attempts to change the discussion around the issue. Weak attempts to deny the fact that capitalism, which they shamelessly promote, is the cause of a catastrophe. These semi-scientific attempts to deny climate change are actually the nice side of these think tanks. Their implicatory denials also include attempts at righteousness and necessity, both of which are forms of contextualization (Cohen, 2001). Denial on the basis of righteousness can be seen in arguments suggesting that those countries who cannot defend themselves from climate disaster deserve to suffer, regardless of the fact that many of them did not contribute to the problem. This superiority complex is evident by a newspaper article which suggested climate change would secure America's geo-political power. There is also the argument that to act against climate change would be more expensive than to deal with the repercussions. Or that a world without capitalism would be full of suffering and therefore to act against climate change would be wrong. Both are morally repulsive and evidently wrong attempts to make their lack of action seem righteous. Similarly, the strong belief in capitalism as the only possible way to live, is to deny that there are other options. Climate change was therefore inevitable, as is their lack of action (Klein, 2014). These are only a few examples of attempts to place climate change in a different context, however the others are more aligned to counter offensive denials than serious attempts to deny.

Counter offensive denials could be considered the specialty of climate deniers. At some point they realized that they could no longer deny the existence or implications of climate change with facts, so they resorted to personal attacks on their accusers. Allegations are thrown around like bullets, suggesting that environmentalists are terrorists, or socialists and communists. They attack people that are publicly environmentalists, such as Al Gore and David Sazuki, on the basis of their life style. Or the hacking of climate scientists emails, modification of the contents and then the public claim that the scientists were in fact lying (Klein, 2014). A telling question was asked At Heartland Institutes Sixth International Conference on Climate Change, "To what extent is this entire movement simply a green Trojan horse, who belly is full with red Marxist socioeconomic doctrine?" (Klein, 2014, p. 31).

The above attempts at denial are examples of capitalist corporation's frantic attempts to guarantee themselves a future. Action against climate change is a threat to their existence and the only way to fight it is "by claiming that thousands upon thousands of scientists are lying and that climate change is an elaborate hoax" (Klein, 2014, p.43). Regardless of the lack of real scientific, moral or logical reasoning behind these denials, they ultimately have an effect. Articles, news stories, and online media fill with the "facts" and ideas that come out of these think tanks (Klein, 2014). Aided by an already formed culture of denial, the corporations funding these organizations are in some ways winning.

Corporations, or the people speaking for them, do not need to come out and openly deny climate change. Although their actions ultimately speak to their lack of acknowledgement or concern over their effects on the earth, they pay for others to deny for them. It is not only think tanks and scientists however that can be bribed; so can politicians and green groups. For politicians this bribery is legal and called lobbying.

In 2013 in the United States alone, the oil and gas industry spent just under $400, 000 per day lobbying Congress and government officials, and the industry doled out a record $73 million in federal campaign and political donations during the 2012 election cycle, an 87 percent jump from the 2008 elections (Klein, 2014, p.149).

The amount of campaign and political donations given out by the oil and gas industry in Canada is not known, as a result of them not being required to reveal that information. The only thing we know is how often they are in communication with each other. However, the numbers are rather suggestive:

[T]he Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers spoke with federal government officials 536 times between 2008 and 2012, while TransCanada, the company behind the Keystone XL pipeline, had 279 communications. The Climate Action Network, on the other hand, the country's broadest coalition devoted to emission reduction, only logged six communications in the same period (Klein, 2014, p.149).

The fact that the government is in the back pockets of oil and gas companies is evident by their lack of action around climate change. While they are certainly not blatantly denying climate change, since with the current scientific evidence and extreme weather occurrences it is not politically acceptable, they are in no rush to make changes. Global carbon dioxide emissions in 2013 were 61% higher than when negotiations around climate action first began in 1991. At the Copenhagen United Nations Climate Change Conference in 2009 it was agreed that we should attempt to keep the temperature change bellow two degrees. The vague phrasing of this was not accidental, since the lack of binding commitment to this goal made it more of a suggestion. However, even this goal would leave many places in the world in great peril from rising sea levels and ocean acidification. In fact it was referred to as a "death sentence" for people in vulnerable countries. Developed countries would also be at risk since there is a possibility of hitting a climate tipping point and setting off uncontrollable natural reactions. (Klein, 2014)

The suggestion of 2 degrees now seems like an attractive alternative to the predicted 4 degrees of warming we are on track to achieve. Kevin Anderson of the Tyndall Center for Climate Change Research stated that this amount of warming is "incompatible with any reasonable characterization of an organized, equitable and civilized global community" (as cited in Klein, 2014, p. 13). Islands would disappear, cities would drown, and heat waves would kill both people and crops. The possibility of a tipping point, perhaps triggered by Arctic permafrost melting and releasing large quantities of methane, is even higher (Klein, 2014).

This lack of action is an example of climate change denial, perhaps contextually in that they do not believe the effects will be as disastrous. It may also be a denial of responsibility, which is evident in that fact that a lot of climate discussion has centered on placing blame and taking responsibility. Those from developed countries do not feel they should take on a majority of the responsibility, even though they contributed the most overall. While those in developing countries do not want to halt their economic growth since they have not caused as much of the problem. There is also the economic argument that we cannot stop using fossil fuels or it will destroy our economy and our way of life. This is an interpretive denial of necessity, based on the

belief that our economic wellbeing is somehow more important than a habitable earth (Klein, 2014).

The state also uses counter offensive denials against environmental activists by defining them as threats to the nation or as terrorists. Over the last few decades there has been growing concern in Canada about the surveillance of activism, particularly as these kinds of activities have been grouped with terrorism and extremism. Surveillance in this light can be seen as a way to suppress social movements. As Boykoff (2007) explains suppression is "a process through which the preconditions for dissident action, mobilization, and collective organization are inhibited by either raising their costs or minimizing their benefits" (p. 12, as cited in Monoghan & Walby, 2012). Monaghan and Walby (2012) show how surveillance was expanded in preparation for the 2010 Winter Olympics and G20 summit as a way to suppress activism.

An Integrated Safety Unit (ISU) was formed for the purpose of security in preparation for these events, and its Joint Intelligence Group (JIG) was primarily in charge of surveillance. The role of threat assessments was later turned over to a CSIS agency called the Integrated Threat Assessment Center (ITAC). Monaghan and Walby (2012) explain that the ISU and ITAC are examples of fusion centers. These "…involve both centralization and extension of intelligence practices: coordination is concentrated in a few, new agencies, but intelligence gathering responsibilities are extended to local and regional police who never before participated in such networks" (p.136). This concept originates from Anthony Newkirks work on the centralization of intelligence after 9-11 in the United States.

These fusion centers have also expanded their functions beyond the original intention, which is described by a term called "mission creep" (Monahan & Palmer, 2009). The original documents created by these organizations referenced threats to these mass events, and Canada in general, by various terrorist organizations. However, after a few years the label "Multi Issue Extremist (MIE)" appeared and became the main focus of the threat assessments and surveillance. While there is no exact definition of what an MIE is, it includes any group or person that is involved in dissent against the status quo. Greenpeace is one of the groups most often referenced (Monaghan & Palmer, 2009).

This new category, and the surveillance of domestic activist groups, has resulted in the blurring of activism, terrorism and extremism[5]. While traditionally this type of surveillance was focused on preventing violence against civilian populations, it is now focused on preventing physical and financial damage. This damage is often aimed at corporations rather than state property. While none of the MIE groups have ever aimed to harm civilians, the way the ITAC blurs the categories makes it seem as if "…almost any expression of opposition is equated with the threat of violence against civilians" (Monaghan & Walby, p. 145).

The fact that this type of dissent is the main focus of surveillance, leads Monaghan and Walby (2012) to conclude that this is an attempt at social movement suppression. This means that it "…aims to compose a picture in which political opposition is removed from the frame" (p.

---

[5] It should be acknowledged that this is not the first time that activists have been the target of government surveillance or constructed as threats to the country.

135). Some examples of this surveillance is the infiltration of groups by undercover officers and home visits by ISU officers. This can have a chilling effect on dissent and result in the criminalization of activism. While all activist groups are subject to this surveillance, Indigenous groups have been subject to more intense surveillance within Canada. A specific Aboriginal JIG was formed and the military participates in surveillance specifically on Indigenous peoples (Proulx, 2014).

In 2011 the Canadian Government released its "Counter Terrorism Strategy". It identified domestic terrorist threats as often "…based on grievances—real or perceived—revolving around the promotion of various causes such as animal rights, white supremacy, environmentalism and anti-capitalism" (p.9). This statement furthered the blurring of activism, terrorism and extremism by placing activists within the same territory as violent extremists. This coincided with the public release of the fact that the government was already spying on environmental and First Nation groups, who have been identified as threats to national security (Diabo & Pasternak, 2011; Voices Voix, 2013).

All of this was exemplified when an Access to Information Request revealed that government organizations had been sharing this information with companies, such as Enbridge and Shell. Briefings between these organizations had been occurring bi-yearly since 2005, included presentations by the RCMP and CSIS, and was organized by the department of National Resources (Groves, 2012). The spokesperson for Natural Resources Canada stated that the goal of these events is to allow the companies "to plan and develop measures to protect their facilities" (Groves, 2012).

Within the last few years documents gained through Access to Information and Freedom of Information requests have continued to support the fact that the government is both spying on activist groups and sharing this information with corporations. In 2013 it was revealed that the government had been spying on activist groups opposing the oil-sands. The NEB was at the head of coordinating CSIS, the RCMP and private oil companies in conducting surveillance on these groups (Miller, 2013). Another request showed that CSIS was involved in helping the NEB and Enbridge prepare for expected protests in the summer of 2014 (Bronskill, 2015).

All of this surveillance is done under the presumption that activists and their organizations pose some kind of threat to Canada. A document that was leaked in early 2015 shows how negatively activists opposing the tar sands are viewed. The RCMP report, titled "Criminal Threats to the Canadian Petroleum Industry", explains the threat of "anti-petroleum extremists" and "Aboriginal extremists". It poses those who are active against the petroleum industry as threats to Canada. This is especially concerning under the new anti-terrorism law: Bill-C51. The bill lists interference with critical infrastructure as an activity that could threaten the security of Canada and the RCMP document is created as a "Critical Infrastructure Intelligence Assessment". There are concerns around the criminalization of dissent now that Bill-C51 is passed (Stewart, 2015). If people are afraid that they will be arrested, or worse, they are less likely to involve themselves in social movements. This adds to the suppression of social movements, particularly those opposing the Alberta tar sands.

The labelling of activists as terrorists is an attempt to discredit them and what they are fighting for, as well as to try to prevent others from joining the cause. In 2013 Canadian Environmentalists David Suzuki voiced his opinion that the reason Canada is building more prisons at a time when crime is decreasing, is so they can fill them with eco-activists (Humes, 2013). While he has not spoken to the point again, his suggestion seems to have a reasonable point. All of the spying and labeling of activists as terrorists can be seen as an attempt to deny the real issue, which is the impeding consequences of climate change. They use the activists as scapegoats, so that the attention can be focused on the apparent threat of MIE's, rather than the real threat of climate change. The RCMP even refers to climate change in their report as something that is suggested rather than scientifically proven. A denial of the existence of climate change by the biggest law enforcement organization in Canada is an unnerving statement.

The fact that any action against climate change would be in complete contradiction to capitalism, and would mean the end of corporate control, is the big motivating factor behind official denials. This lack of action is a result of "…selfishness and sheer amorality" (Cohen, 2001, p.23). Far from not believing in climate change, the capitalist elite seem to be highly aware of the realities of it. Rather, they are terrified of what their future will look like if real action against climate change happens. They are choosing to value the pursuit of profit over the well-belling of all those who are not elite capitalists. Evident to this lack of literal denial is the fact that there are cases of corporations profiting off of climate disasters (Klein, 2014).

Vulnerable countries, with very little responsibility for this climate crisis, are being sold protection schemes in the form of insurance, resulting in billions of dollars in profit for the insurance companies. Raytheon, the weapons giant, is preparing for a rising need for their services, both response teams and weapons, as a result of the social conflict caused by climate change. The genetically modified food giants, Monsanto and Syngenta, have been pushing through hundreds of patents on seeds that are supposedly resistant to extreme weather (Klein, 2014). All of these are examples of how our current capitalist system is going to respond to climate change. Even when they stop denying, they continue to try and profit off the suffering of others.

What is even more disturbing than the capitalist elites desire to go down with their ship, is the will of many green organizations to go down with them. Rather than continuing to fight against the capitalist system which is causing the harm, some of the green organizations are attempting to work with it. Attempts to work within the capitalist system, by speaking their language, has become popular within some parts of the green movement. Big corporate donations have also fueled the partnership, with many green organizations helping to "green wash" their corporate donors. The promotion of fracking and nuclear energy as clean energy sources also points to either their collusion with corporations or denial of the large scale changes that need to take place. (Klein, 2014)

This also makes us into bystander nations. Where we are aware of the suffering of others, which is ultimately caused by our lifestyle but we do nothing to change (Cohen, 2001). Climate change currently has more of an effect on developing, third world countries, than on developed countries such as the United States and Canada. Even though it will have an effect on our

countries, and in some places already is, our nations have chosen to continue to be bystanders. This is especially true for Canada, where the conservative government has failed to take any action against climate change. Instead it has increased the extraction of oil and the expansion of the Alberta tar sands (Chung, 2014). Cohen (2001) compares "[t]he state's right to remain neutral and uninvolved – even not to notice – [as] a political analogue of the individual's 'right to be an ostrich'" (p.163). While it is the state that is refusing to act, it is the culture of denial which allows the lack of action. These decisions mirror Orwell's statement about nationalism:

> The atrocities of official enemies arouse great anguish and indignation, vast coverage and
> often shameless lying to portray them as even worse than they are; the treatment is
> opposite in all respects when responsibility lies closer to home. Atrocities that do not bear
> on domestic power interests are generally ignored (as cited in Cohen, 2001, p.163).

We can see this reflected in the large amount of money that the United States spends on its military, a $495.6 billion base for 2015 (Office of the Under Secretary of Defense & Chief Financial Officer, 2014). Yet when it comes to climate change very little is ever done to help those who are suffering, even within their own country such as in the aftermaths of Hurricane Sandy and Katrina. While it is impossible at this stage to completely ignore these realities, the bare minimum is done because of the fact that it does not align with the interests of those in power. Even the recent China/United States deal on climate change, although it is definitely a step in the right direction, falls significantly short of what needs to be done (Biello, 2014).

Very often these attempts to cover up or deny the truth come out, which is evident in the publishing of Klein's (2014) book *This Changes Everything*, where she exposes these very realities. Unfortunately the exposure of them does not automatically mean that things will change. There are powerful cultural forces at work which place us within a culture of denial.

A culture of denial

These powerful forces are of course capitalism, neoliberalism, and consumerism. Our culture is based on the denial of many things. At our foundation is the denial that our societies were formed by the destruction of other people and their cultures. Our entire society was built from crimes of genocide and is continually based on the exploitation of people across the world. Cohen (2001) explains how whole "…societies are based on forms of cruelty, discrimination, repression or exclusion which are 'known' about but never openly acknowledged" (p.11). These cultures of denial may start as state suggestions but then become normalized within cultures. Within capitalist neoliberal societies we have normalized these fundamental beliefs. They are evident in our consumerist life styles, the extension of market values to non-market commodities and individuals, and the intense individualism (Klein, 2014; White, 2008; Giroux, 2013). We are aware of the fact that many of the most vulnerable people in the world are suffering to provide us with these luxuries and that it is destroying our environment but we choose not to acknowledge these realities.

The decision to not acknowledge the harm our lifestyles cause comes from two main forces. One is from a culture which promotes these lifestyles as being necessary or normal. These "[c]ultures of denial encourage turning a collective blind eye, leaving horrors unexamined or

normalized as being a part of the rhythms of everyday life" (Cohen, 2001, p.101). This denial originates from the corporations and states that influence our lives, and ultimately capitalism and neoliberalism, which normalize these behaviours. In turn, it creates a society that is willing to accept official denial of climate change and internalize it. Klein (2014) explains that,

> …we are products of our age and a dominant ideological project. One that too often has taught us to see ourselves as little more than singular, gratification-seeking units, out to maximize our narrow advantage, while simultaneously severing so many of us from the broader community whose pooled skills are capable of solving problems big and small. This project also has led our governments to stand by helplessly for more than two decades as the climate crises morphed from a 'grandchildren' problem to a banging-down-the-door problem (p.460).

There are things that we can do to combat climate change. While it is no longer possible to avoid all of its consequences, we can mitigate the worst of it. However, this means a change in lifestyle. It means that wealth needs to be redistributed and that the rest of the fossil fuels need to stay in the ground. It means that there needs to be a different approach to communities and relationships with other countries. It means that capitalism and the continued increase in production and consumption needs to stop. Capitalism and climate action are not possible together, so this means we need to change the way we think: we need to change our culture. (Klein, 2014)

The second force is fear and a desire for self-preservation, as a result of the fact that we have to change. Cohen (2001) states that "[o]ne common thread runs through the many different stories of denial: people, organizations, governments or whole societies are presented with information that is too disturbing, threatening or anomalous to be fully absorbed or openly acknowledged"(p.1). As discussed above the state and corporate elite are aware that these changes need to take place, so they have been putting immense amounts of efforts into preserving their way of life, and convincing the general public that we cannot change.

As a society we are so engulfed by capitalist neoliberal beliefs that we may actually fear what our lives would look like without capitalism. We have been convinced that there is no alternative. Klein (2014) explains that we are constantly bombarded with messages telling us "…that humanity is…hopelessly selfish and greedy" (p.461). Perhaps, she suggests, the reason we are in denial is because we are not able to deal with how much we actually care. Perhaps we are not as selfish and greedy as our culture of denial is trying to convince us but that the reality is just too much to come to terms with. If we believe there are no alternatives and that without capitalism we would be suffering, then accepting our responsibility in contributing to climate change would be terrifying.

This culture of denial tries to convince us that there is no other option; that at our core we are selfish people and that we are not capable of change. So even if we do acknowledge that climate change is happening, we are paralyzed by the reality with seemingly no way forward. Just as Cohen (2001) explained, our culture of denial is a defense mechanism. It is a mechanism created by the state and capitalist elite to try and preserve capitalism. Then, as we are convinced by the ideology, it becomes a defense mechanism for us as individuals. We all know to some

extent that the climate is changing. It is impossible to ignore now that social media allows us to spread a message across the world within seconds. We see the natural disasters in real time. We know the arctic ice is melting. We know the scientists are telling us we need to change. We know all of this but we still do not fully acknowledge what is happening.

Naomi Klein (2014) calls this act of knowing but not fully acknowledging "looking away". She says there are many ways we look away. This may be in the form of telling a joke to disregard the seriousness of the problem. We might suggest that economically, it does not make sense to act against climate change. Even those who are environmentally conscious might decide to not act. She explains that,

> …we tell ourselves that all we can do is focus on ourselves. Meditate and shop at farmers markets and stop driving – but forget trying to actually change the systems that are making the crisis inevitable because that's too much 'bad energy' and it will never work. And at first it may appear as if we are looking, because many of these lifestyle changes are indeed part of the solution, but we still have on eye tightly shut (p. 4).

To Cohen (2001) this is a personal denial enforced by a culture of denial. A majority of the people in our country are choosing to look away. Maybe they accept the realities of climate change. Maybe they even agree that it is caused by humans and that the only way we can mitigate the effects are to change how we live. Maybe they know that what we are doing is not enough, but they do not act. They do not demand change. They do not confront our government about their inaction. To acknowledge something that is as dire as climate change and to not act, is to still be in denial.

The problem then, is this. We are faced with an unprecedented threat to the very existence of humans on earth; climate change. In the face of this threat our leaders have chosen not to act, as a result of the fact that capitalism cannot survive in a climate friendly world. Instead, our leaders and the capitalist elite have put an incredible amount of effort into making sure that no action is taken, by reinforcing the culture of denial which we already live in. As a result of this, a majority of people in first world countries, the countries that have the power to make the change, are continually "looking away" from the problem.

In the past social movements have successfully changed cultures of denial, and forced people to start acting. Our countries have shattered preexisting norms with the abolition of slavery, the woman's liberation movement, the civil liberties movement, and the labor movement. It is possible. The biggest problem we face right now is that we are running out of time. Climate change is not something we can deal with in 10, 20, or 50 years. We need to deal with it now. In 2011 the International Energy Agency reported that if we do not seriously change our relationship with energy by 2017 then we will have set in an irreversible climate change. In an interview Faith Birol, IEA's chief economist, stated that "[t]he door to reach two degrees is about to close. In 2017 it will be closed forever" (Herron, 2011 as cited in Klein, 2014).

The IPCC has explained that from 2014 forward the world cannot emit more than 1000 gigatonnes of CO2 if we are to stay below the 2 degree goal. The IEA has predicted that we will hit this limit by 2040 if we continue on this path. Their report in 2014 explained that "…it is

clear that the 2°C objective requires urgent action to steer the energy system on to a safer path". So the problem is that we *need* to make serious changes within the next two years to avoid irreversible changes to our world's climate, and we do not have the political or social will at this time to make these changes.

The positive side of this problem is that there are things we can do. Klein (2014) and many other have laid out plans for how we could come together and fight climate change. The problem is that any real change would requires a huge change in the way we live and interact with the environment and each other. Historically these huge changes have come as a result of social movements. Klein (2014) explains that "[i]t is slowly dawning on a great many of us that no one is going to step in and fix this crisis; that if change is to take place it will only be because leadership bubbled up form below" (p.465). These leaders are the people that I have chosen to focus on. For the exact reason that they are the only hope we have of averting this crisis.

Methodology

This study consisted of five semi-structured interviews with people who are currently involved in environmental activism within British Columbia. The aim of these interviews was to gain stories of their personal journey to action around these issues. The participants are involved in multiple different avenues of activism, such as protesting, civil disobedience, art, education, advocacy, politics, and Aboriginal justice. While these avenues are certainly not mutually exclusive, all were represented in this study. The sample was both convenient and selective, as it was drawn from my own personal connections and by reaching out through public avenues such as Facebook.

I attempted to make the sample as representative as possible, from what I already knew of the movement. However, the sample cannot be considered formally representative. Inclusionary criteria were: 1) they were over 18, 2) they currently resided in British Columbia, preferably the lower mainland region, 3) they must be publicly involved in the environmental movement or in an environmental organization and their involvement must be recent (i.e. 2013- present) and 4) their contact information (i.e. email, phone number, social media) must be publicly available. The sample consisted of three women and two men. Two of the women and one of the men were Indigenous and the other two participants were Caucasian. There was also a wide range of ages, the youngest being in her twenties and the eldest a grandfather. In addition to their activism they led diverse lives. The sample consisted of people who fell in many different categories: student, professor, artist, politician, government worker, retiree, parent, and grandparent, among other things. This range of participants was important for a number of reasons.

Across the world Indigenous peoples and women are often leading the resistance against environmental destruction, and the same is true within British Columbia (Klein, 2014). It was therefore necessary to interview people who represented this leadership. A further discussion of the importance of Indigenous and female leadership will occur in the analysis. The age range and variety of life paths were also significantly important because of the fact that these issues affect everyone who is alive today and all future generations. The framing and understanding of these issues will vary depending on who a person is. Since the goal is to understand how a person comes to be actively involved, it is necessary to understand and acknowledge the many different avenues that are possible. In his research Cohen (2001) states that there are "…different narratives of transformation: a long, gradual process; a dramatic transforming encounter; a sudden epiphany; a special 'ability'" (p.264).

The participants were originally contacted by email or through Facebook with a letter of introduction (Appendix B). If they showed interest in participating they were then sent a letter of invitation (Appendix C) and the informed consent (Appendix D) form through email. Eight people were contacted with invitations to participate, seven showed interest in participating and five followed through with an interview. The high success rate of invitations to participate can speak to the fact that the participants believed this research to be important. These are all people who lead incredibly busy lives. The fact that they were even willing to find the time to meet with me, shows their dedication to the cause and their position as advocates for it. This also meant that

a few of my interviews were rescheduled and that I had to be very flexible in finding a time that worked within their schedule.

The main research method was a semi-structured interview with five prepared open ended questions (Appendix A). The interviews ranged from 20 minutes to 50 minutes long. The questions were focused on: 1) how a person came to be involved in the environmental movement, 2) why they chose to participate in civil disobedience (or why not), and 3) any ideas they had for getting others involved. However, if the conversation took a turn that was not cohesive to the prepared questions, I did not force it back to them but let the story flow naturally. This enabled the participants to tell their stories as they believe they should be told; as Kovach states, "…the story breathes and the narrator regulates" (p.99). It allowed for an honest and personal telling of their story and also aligns with traditional Aboriginal beliefs of the power of stories (Kovach, 2010). Environmental issues, while they concern everyone, have historically and continue to be led by Aboriginal peoples (Klein, 2014; Brook, 1998). This intimate relationship meant that the research needed to be conducted with this connection in mind.

There is an unpleasant relationship between western modes of obtaining knowledge and traditional Aboriginal forms of knowing. Historically traditional forms of knowledge have been either disregarded or exploited, and research has been extractive in nature. It was important for this research to not perpetuate this colonization. Special care was needed when converting oral stories into written ones, so as to be as representative of the original voice as possible (Kovach, 2010).

However, the power of a story was significant for the research in general, as it allowed for the most insight into a person's experience. The point of this research was to hear subjective stories from participants and to see what knowledge can be gained from them. Cohen (2001) used stories to represent different forms of denial and acknowledgement, as a representation of the subjective nature of these concepts. Within Aboriginal traditions there is a "…inseparable relationship between story and knowing" (Kovach, 2010, p.94) and this is something I wished to embrace in my research.

I needed to be aware that as "…a researcher [I] assume a responsibility that the story shared will be treated with the respect it deserves in acknowledgment of the relationship from which it emerged" (Kovach, 2010, p. 97). This required me to build a rapport, to the extent possible within the study design, with the people I interviewed so that I could gain the necessary trust for the sharing of their stories. I did this through self-location which means I shared my own story, allowing the research participant to assess my motivations and alliances (Kovach, 2010). This was initially done through a letter of introduction and then again in person at the beginning of the interviews. Some of the participants I had a connection with before the research began, which meant that a rapport had already been built.

Through all the interviews I began with a small conversation before the actual interview started. For example, one of them began with a discussion of an event they had just spoken at and a book I had on the table. While I did not place the book there specifically to start a discussion, it allowed for a rapport to form. The conversation also continued to flow in almost all the interviews after the tape recorder was turned off. This conversation ranged from discussion of

masters programs to future activities/involvement. This speaks to the fact that there was at least a baseline relationship and trust formed. My personal involvement within and desire to strengthen the movement seemed to create a common ground, which I hope and believe allowed the participants to feel comfortable sharing their experiences.

The goal was to have the research be conducted in a way that meshed with those involved in the movement. This makes the results more organic and useful. I believe that personal narratives were a comfortable and honest way for participants to tell their stories, and did my best to integrate them in my research in a way that is respectful and representative. It is my hope that, as Kovach (2010) suggests, these "[s]tories of resistance [will] inspire generations about the strength of the culture" (p.103), and in this case also the strength of the movement.

To further encourage the natural telling of stories the participants were asked to provide two questions which they believed were necessary to understand how they came to participate in their activism. This is a method used by Woodilla and Forray (2008) which they developed from Michel Bougon's (1986) self-questioning procedure. The participants were emailed the request to come up with two questions in advance, and then email them to me before the interview. I decided to give them advance notice in writing the questions, so that they were able to give some serious and critical thought to which ones best address their stories. I believed that these would bring up themes and/or important events or issues which I did not consider, and therefore make the results more relevant. However, none of the participants chose to email questions ahead of time. While I think this is partly due to a lack of time on their part, all of them having incredibly full schedules, it also seemed to be as a result of not feeling that anything needed to be added. At the end of each interview I mentioned the option to add the additional questions and a majority of the participants stated that they did not feel it was necessary.

The interviews took place in multiple locations, some in study rooms at the library, one at a small coffee shop, and another on the phone. The main goal when choosing a location was to make sure the participant was comfortable and that their participation was as convenient as possible. The in person interviews were all done in public spaces where we still had an acceptable amount of privacy from people over hearing our conversations. While in the study rooms at KPU the participants were given the option of keeping the door open or closed, based on their comfort level. The location for the coffee shop interview was done at the request of the participant. I took extra care when conducting the phone interview to make sure I was in a private space, where no one could overhear our conversation.

The interviews were voice recorded, after gaining consent from the participants. They were then transcribed within a few days and the recording was deleted. The transcripts were manually coded. First with paper and pencil, and then with highlighters, in an open format. Themes and trends were identified from this open coding and the transcripts were all coded again in a closed format. As a result of my analysis of existing literature and the conducting and transcribing of the interviews, I did have some preconceived notions of what the themes would be. However, I went through the transcripts looking for any themes that arose. I identified nine main themes, with each of them having their own breakdown categories. I separated these

themes into two groups: reason for action and environmentalism. Figure 2 is the coding manual that was used for closed coding.

Figure 2: Coding Manual

Environmentalism:
        Getting others involved
            - Empowerment
            - Youth
            - Education
            - Waking people up/moving past denial and guilt/shame
            - Working together
            - Personal reward/sacrifice
        Framing activism
            - Anti-capitalism – distrust/disappointment in the government/those in positions
            of power.
            - First Nations rights
            - Humanism
            - Everyone is an environmentalist
            - Threat of climate change
            - Connection to Feminism
        Emotion/affect
            - Fear
            -Anger
            -Hope
        Denial
            -Personal
            - Official
            -Cultural
Reason for action
        Urgency – Can't deny
            -Threat of climate change/future of the planet
            -Future for children/grandchildren
            -Who they are
        Childhood
            -Connection to nature/earth
            -Influential people
            -Growing up female
            -Growing up Indigenous
        Feminism
            -Growing up female
            -Connection to First Nation women
        Civil disobedience
            - Lack of confidence in government/those in positions of power
            - Lack of democracy
            - Not viewed as civil disobedience
            - Last straw
        Who they are
            -Responsibility
            - Connection to First Nations
            - Empowering themselves
            - Personal reward/sacrifice

    I chose to code the two groups on different transcripts, to make the themes stand out from each other. The closed coding was done with highlighters, on transcripts printed on large sheets of paper. I chose to leave the quotes in their full context, rather than cutting the transcripts and

grouping together the themes. This was done to make sure that I did not lose the context of what was being said and kept the stories intact. By this point I knew the transcripts incredibly well, so while doing my analysis I was able to collect relevant quotes without them being pre-grouped. Many of the quotes I use are quite lengthy. This was to ensure that their voices were heard in an authentic way. It is important to note that, while I did my best to preserve the stories as they were told, there is a significant difference between hearing someone tell their story and reading it. I do believe that losing the emotion and tone of voice that all of the participants expressed, to some extent reduces the quality of the story. This is to a large extent unavoidable but I did my best to work around it.

When I was putting together my research proposal, I originally positioned working with Indigenous peoples as an ethical concern. As discussed above there are definitely ethical considerations when working with people of Indigenous decent, as a result of continued colonization. However, I want to be careful to not position the people I work with as being in a lower position of power than I am as a researcher. We are not only both involved in the movement but the people I interviewed are almost all public figures, who can be seen as leading a movement. These are people who are powerful in their positions within the movement and while they may have been victimized at times in their life, I want to avoid portraying them as victims. They are strong individuals, who I consider experts on the topics I am interested in.

In addition to working with people of Aboriginal decent there were other ethical considerations. Although all the participants were public about their activism and therefore not worried about others finding out, other personal circumstances could place them in difficult situations. Some of these people may be part of ongoing court cases as a result of their activism. These are also personal narratives, not professional ones, so some of the information I received was regarding experiences that are not, and should not, be public knowledge. To mitigate these ethical concerns all participants are anonymous, they were given pseudonyms, and extra care was taken to make sure that there are no identifying features in this paper.

Analysis

When faced with the realities of climate change, denial is the norm. We live in a capitalist society which enforces the belief that the exploitation of people and the earth for profit is acceptable, and in fact desirable. Any real action against climate change would go against this belief. Every day we make decisions as individuals and as a society about how we are going to live, and typically we do not choose to act against climate change. As outlined above we face a huge problem; one that could mean that the earth will no longer be habitable for our species. Yet a majority of us are still not willing to make the changes that are needed to counter climate change.

What about the minority though? What about those people who are standing up and demanding change? How are they different than the majority of society? Or are they different? Cohen (2011) came to the conclusion that rather than asking why people deny we need to ask why they ever chose to acknowledge and act. Denial is a normal state, as it is a defense mechanism when faced with unappealing realities. There are people who either chose not to or are unable to deny the realities of the world, they have broken through this culture of denial.

From an eco-global or green criminology perspective, I am concerned with social change and therefore how people come to acknowledgment and action. In green criminology there is an awareness of the threat that the continued destruction of the environment poses to the world and a desire to prevent this destruction. While it acknowledges avenues for change through government organizations, it also realizes that extreme pressure is needed from outside sources in the form of activism (White, 2011). To create this change though we need people who are able to break through this culture of denial and, as Cohen suggest, fully absorb and openly acknowledge the realities of climate change. The participants in this study are perfect examples of this. They are all actively fighting against the continued destruction of the earth, so as a criminologist I am interested in the path that led them to break through the culture of denial.

Within this analysis we will explore pathways to activism, with a focus on childhood, education/career, and a moment of action. Then there will be an exploration of the framing of their activism, and of the question, are we all environmentalists? Within this section there will also be a focus on Indigenous rights and the connection to the climate action movement. The analysis will finish off with a consideration of how to get others involved, with a focus on education, dealing with negative emotions, privilege, and avenues to action. While this analysis is composed significantly of original research, it is intertwined with existing literature because it allows for a deeper understanding of the findings.

Pathways to Activism

In the context of this research a pathway simply means a story. It is an acknowledgment that everyone has a history and that looking at a holistic view of a person's life is important to understanding where they are today. We all start on different paths and we have no control over where or what this path is. At different points our paths change, we may not realize that they have or it might be a conscious choice. However, where we are today has everything to do with the road that we have travelled. Chawla (1999) uses a similar concept of paths in her work. She

explains that "[t]he paths [that] lives follow reflect both intention and chance" (p.18). This is built of off Bandura's (1982) work which explains the relationship between determinism and chance encounters. While there are certainly social and psychological forces at work, it is how they interact with chance encounters that determine our path. Again, putting it in the simplest terms, the pathways that these activists have travelled, are the stories of how they arrived where they are today.

The five people I interviewed all have distinct pathways to their activism. While there are some common themes, they all have their unique reasons for being where they are today. Childhood, education/career, and moments of awakening or realization play an important part in all of their stories. Pathways are varying and there is not one reason for why a person becomes who they are. However, there are different parts of their stories that give us some insight into why they have a desire to make an impact. These are, as Cohen states, ordinary people who have come to be active in their own way. He suggests that "[t]hese are like folk-tales of conversion: the slow buildup or sudden epiphany, then a lifetime's selfless dedication" (p.251). While Cohen speaks of "folk tales" or fables, this seems to describe the lives of my participants to a tee.

Childhood

Everyone acknowledged that their childhood had an impact on their involvement in activism. These reasons ranged from growing up as an Indigenous person facing racism, growing up as a female with no expectation of her, and specific influential people who instilled values in them. Some of the participants were outspoken as children but not all of them were. Their placement at the front of a movement is something which they have learned over the years. Cohen speaks of different ways that people become active and he comes to the conclusion that there is no such thing as an "altruistic personality", we are not born activists.

The interviews confirmed this belief, in that none of them showed signs of being "born this way". They all had moments and reasons, stemming from their childhood, as to why they became active. The closest thing to being born an activist was being born with a sense of responsibility. However, it would seem that this responsibility came from the community rather than genetics. Raymond explains that becoming who he is today was a result of a conscious decision because of his sense of responsibility.

> I was a shy kid growing up, you could never get me in front of an audience growing up and I think it's just something that I've just worked hard to develop. Because I've always known that there's a sense of responsibility for people…within our communities that've had the opportunities and who've worked hard to uh become scholars or scholarly and that…we have a responsibility within our communities to look after what's best for our communities

All of the people that I interviewed spoke specifically to how the values of their culture led them to their activism. The Indigenous people were especially focused on this aspect. Sophie speaks to being raised in the Cree and Dene culture:

> …I think there were key players in my life, through my upbringing, who made me understand… values that I don't think most of Canadian society upholds. One being, One being…the right to lead as a woman and to govern my own body uhm and to take leadership positions. My mom was a prime example of raising us this way and I wasn't really understanding that these values were carried by the Cree and Dene. As I grew up and chose to grow…outside of the home, I learned

that these aren't the values that most people have and that a lot of the values that I was taught aren't upheld…

Similarly Hannah speaks to the influence that her father had on her. While he is not Indigenous, he was adamant that her and her siblings grew up with an understanding of their Indigenous history and culture, and the ability to stand up for themselves.

> I would say the number one factor in me…using my voice to speak the truth is…my dad. … m y dad raised my sister and I by himself with my mom's family at Musqeum…I was taught the truth of, of history and taught the fact that the history books don't actually represent the truth….My dad also did a lot of work, again in the most fun way possible, to ensure that my sister and I would be intelligent, articulate and decisive. To be able to speak for ourselves. To not let other people…dictate to us or intimidate us to be who we were, to be subservient, to be tractable to their ideas. Being raised by a man and around men, and being comfortable to use my voice. Being comfortable to speak up. Being comfortable to disagree. Being comfortable to have a different opinion.

While she removed herself from her Musqeum culture for many years, growing up with this family had an impact on her. It was her dad, however, that also impacted who she is. The culture that we are brought up in has a huge impact on who we are today. Kathy and Nicholas also reflect on the impact of their childhood and the culture which they grew up in. Kathy explains that childhood was a time of "benign neglect" as a result of being a female. There were no expectations for her to make anything of herself, so this left her free to become who she wanted. Nicholas grew up in a family of politically active people, which he says "rubbed off" on him. These childhoods have of course intertwined with the culture of denial which every person in Canada is engulfed in. However, it would seem that these sub-cultures created an avenue, or path, away from the norm.

Intertwined with these cultures, were the realities of growing up as either Indigenous and/or female. Nicholas was the only interviewee who did not mention sex or race as prominent feature of who he is today. Being that he is a white male, in a culture which caters to white males (Kimmel & Ferber, 2010), this is not surprising. Sophie and Hannah both noted that they were taught that women can lead and use their voice. However, growing up being an outspoken female did not make things easier, especially being Indigenous. As Hannah explained:

> Growing up knowing that people looked at me with this kind of hard, cold, mean eyes simply based on the way I looked, it changed who I was. And the things that people felt comfortable to say. But because I was raised to be strong and independent and outspoken, I was often those things. So I remember at a young age I've known what it's like to say something, to speak words and truth that are upsetting to other people. To have people come back at you with, with an energetic force and a violent force because how dare I…that little brown girl correct anybody or say something contrary to what it is they're thinking, saying and doing.

While not indigenous, Kathy also connects her experience of growing up as a female to her activism today. However she is able to view her experiences in a positive light, perhaps this speaks to growing up in a society where her skin colour did not negatively affect people's opinions of her. She explains:

> I grew up in a very rural area and at a time when kids were set to run free. So I basically grew up outdoors…so that was a deep connection with nature, so that was one thing. Uhm it was also an era of benign neglect. So I have always been left to find my own way. And as a girl at that time

and that place I also uhm… well not much was expected of me   and so…that gave me, I used to think that it was a handicapped that I wasn't supported and there wasn't expectations for me to make something of myself. But now that I'm older I realize that that was actually a gift because it gave me freedom to follow my own instinct and confidence that I could do whatever I want.

She also benefits from a privilege based on her skin colour (Kimmel & Ferber, 2010). This is a privilege that stems from the realities of colonization and the constructing of western modes of knowing and living as the only legitimate way (Monture, 2006; Saul, 2014). For Indigenous peoples, especially Indigenous women, their lives and pathways are shaped by the realities of being oppressed. Being a woman is not separate from being Indigenous. Race and sex, and other defining factors, are intertwining realities that construct who we are. Patricia Monture (2006) explains:

> By the time I reached law school, I understood that much of my identity was shaped on the recognition that I was oppressed. I was oppressed as an Indian. I was oppressed as a woman. I was oppressed as an Indian Woman. I do not experience categories of "Indian" and "woman" as singular and unrelated. The experience of Indian and Woman is layered. My choice to go to law school was premised on my desire to fight back against the oppression and violence that I had lived with as an Indian woman (p.79).

This leads to a question that Cohen (2011) brings up in his book: "Do survivors and victims, people who have suffered terribly themselves, have a special sensitivity to the suffering of others?" (p. 266). Based on the context of the childhoods experienced by four of the five activists that I interviewed, I am led to consider the possibility that the answer is yes. Perhaps people who have suffered themselves are more likely to speak up in the face of injustice. While Kathy speaks only of "benign neglect", Raymond, Hannah, and Sophie all speak about the racism and/or sexism that they faced growing up. For the women this was also coupled with violence.

Hannah is specifically forward about her experiences of violence and racism. In an emotional conversation she explained her experience of growing up as an indigenous female:

> …I think I was 12 the first time a man hunted me, and ever since uhm…I've been hunted and stalked and preyed upon. I've had men hold me hostage and try to rape me…And I've had uhm… I am the only woman that I know who hasn't been raped. And I am the only woman that I know who…uhm…I made…these are…these are hard issues to talk about and for…for myself and my own experience growing up with a mother who was in residential schools from 4 until 16….So the ongoing torture devastation, the stripping away of dignity and respect, the trampling over of the rights, the elimination of of…of the human being in first nation's people, especially women. We are uhm sexual object. We are uhm token, uhm…uh window displays when needed a lot of the time. And my, this is what my experience has been in this world…

The question is in some ways unsettling, as Cohen suggests, but in other ways it can be seen as empowering. Women and Indigenous peoples are leading the movement against climate change, regardless of where you look in the world (Klein, 2014). This can be seen in the image of a Mi'kmaq mother kneeling in front of the RCMP at a protest near Elsipogtog First Nation in 2013. This photo is a representation of the large number of Indigenous women who were and continue to be a part of protecting the water from proposed fracking (Troian, 2013). Klein (2014) looks at how, while these issues impact everyone, they impact those living in poverty and those of colour first and foremost. Women and Indigenous peoples are two groups who have

historically and in many ways continue to be oppressed (Monture, 2006; Saul, 2014). Yet they have found a way to move past our culture of denial. A further look at the role of Indigenous peoples and women, and specifically Indigenous women, will take place later in this analysis.

I do not intend to imply that activism that does not stem from these kinds of experiences is any less authentic. However, it is important that those who live lives of privilege, whether this stems from their sex, race, sexual orientation, economic class, or any other fact, are aware and reflective of how this privilege impacts their lives (Kimmel & Ferber, 2010). Perhaps there is a connection between suffering and activism. However, there is then the question of why do only certain people who suffer act? And why do people who have seemingly not suffered still act? There are of course other aspects to considered, as life paths are varying and have many factors. It is important to note that a few of the participants did not engage in activism until after their 20's. This means that a lot happened between their childhoods and their activism.

Another theme that kept appearing in my interviews was parental influence. Nicholas and Hannah both speak of their fathers influence and Sophie was greatly influenced by her mother. Raymond speaks generally of people within his family who are a source of inspiration and says that his family has a history of activism:

> There are many examples of people within my own family who…uhm have been active engagers within,…within our society and uh ever since you know…the Indian reserve system was created in British Columbia uh my family members were from, you know, from the mid 1800's when the country was still forming, were at the forefront of protesting and asking, not asking but looking for justice within this construct of society that we are now set with.

Is activism then something that can be passed down generations? Again, this research suggests that it is possible. Of course I do not mean this in terms of genetics, but socialization. Four of the five participants spoke to the fact that their families were active while they were growing up and that they had an impact on who they became. Nicholas's parents could even be described as activists themselves and he seems to have passed this on to his own children who, while they are not publicly active, have both chosen paths that are environmentally conscious. The importance of family influence was also found in Chawla's (1999) work on "Life Paths into Effective Environmental Activism".

One theme that I expected to be more prominent, as it was in Chawla's (1999) research, is a connection to nature that originated in childhood. Kathy does speak to the fact that she was always outside as a child and how this created "…a deep connection to nature". Raymond also speaks of the importance of growing up in a community that was based on fishing and living off the land, which he says "…was really formative in sort of who [he] became…". However, these were the only two interviews where this theme arose, which was surprising. This was surprising for two reasons. The first is that it had appeared in past research (Chawla, 1999) and the second was because of the fact that this is an important factor in my own activism. I soon realized that the environment was not the main focus of their activism, as I will discuss later on in this analysis, which gave an explanation for why this theme was not more prominent.

A fulfilling education and/or career

Education and/or career were the next step on the pathway to environmental activism for all of the participants. This also usually led to their moment of awakening or realization. Education in this sense varies from postsecondary to spiritual and cultural education and is often an extension from their childhood. For Sophie, Nicholas, and Kathy post-secondary education played an influential role. Kathy states, "I'm a scientist so I've been very well aware for a long time about the science behind climate change". In this sense her education gave her knowledge to understand the issue and realize its severity.

In contrast Nicholas and Sophie both changed their educational plans as a result of their need to act. Sophie thought that she should finish her education before becoming involved: "So I actually wanted to get my degree first and then get involved so I could find my place within it". But this was interrupted by her moment of realization, which was the G20 protests in 2010, when she decided she could no longer wait to become involved. As she explains it: "That was the moment when I was like okay, I don't have time to wait, I need to get involved and so I went to my first rally and engaged in symbolic activism". She also uses her education as a way to engage with the movement. She is currently studying conflict resolution and sees this as a way of engaging people with these issues. While she specifically focuses on Indigenous communities, I believe that she has found an important avenue to getting others involved, which I will be delving into later in this analysis.

Nicholas started out his education in the sciences but then decided to move to sociology for his master's program. He explains that "…by that point I realized no, no, there's too much happening in this world I can't foresee myself in a lab". This is also connected to the cultural context of this time, which was the 60's. He explains it as a

> …time of uh…incredible social ferment, I suppose is the way to put it. You had the civil r i g h t s movement in the states. You had the Vietnam War. You had assassination after assassination of US presidents and president hopefuls. Assassinations of black leaders. And in all of this the world began to not make sense to the young and people really began to look for something new and out of that broadly speaking, what's been called the counter culture emerged. So it was, if you had your eyes and ears open it was impossible to be immune to that. You would have to be picking up on it.

This switch led him to complete a masters of sociology and then go into a career which he felt allowed him to make change. He said that his position allowed him to work to make change within a bureaucracy and be a "tempered activist".

Raymond also spoke to his education and career but rather than changing his view he uses his chosen career, art, to express his activism.

> I'm an artist first and foremost. That's my passion that's my profession as well, so uh, a lot of the work that I've done revolves around uh sort of a positive visioning of our community and one way that I'm able to participate and help with that is through my art…. Asserting our presence on the land. That we've had a continued and sustained presence in our territories for uhm, for thousands of years and that one of the things that my art and the work of other artists in my community does is uhm, sort of put a visual stamp on it. Saying yes we are here.

His art is a way of positioning his community and expressing who they are, it is also drenched in his traditional teachings. His education is both postsecondary and traditional. In a similar fashion Hannah's education is a huge part of her activism but she speaks only to her

traditional teachings. She separated herself from her Indigenous heritage for a long time, as a defense mechanism against the racism and negativity she faced growing up as an Indigenous woman. However one day she decided that she no longer wanted to live this way and she chose to re-embrace her traditional teachings and start to learn her culture.

> …and then six years ago I decided that I didn't want to carry that shame anymore. I didn't want to carry that pain. I was letting go, excuse my language, and of all the bullshit that was never mine to be lugging around for, you know, 35, 36 years at the time. And I started to learn my language…

All of the participants had careers which led them or allowed them to express their activism. It is interesting that none of them had the same careers or educations. Rather they had a mixture of different interests, which allowed them to be active in their own way. I see this as an important factor, since activism is often seen as only protesting and acts of civil disobedience. Activism can and should take many forms. This is something that will come up again later in this analysis. As I mentioned before, their careers and education often led to or were intertwined with their moments of awareness. The moment when they could no longer deny that they had to act.

Moment of action: breaking through the culture of denial

Cohen explains that "…there are different narratives of transformation: a long, gradual process; a dramatic, transforming encounter; a sudden epiphany; a special ability" (p.264). For most of the participants their narrative of transformation was gradual but also included a transforming encounter or a sudden epiphany. In many ways there can be connections drawn between the childhood experiences of the participants, their education or careers and their moments of awareness that led them into their activism today. None of them were devoid of a connection to activism or an awareness about the realities of the world, but they were still involved in a process of denial. These moments of awareness or realization can be seen as the moment of breaking through the culture of denial. They may have always acknowledged the problem but they were still able to convince themselves that not being active was okay. Then there was a moment, a breakthrough, when they could no longer choose to not act.

I already explained how Sophie originally wanted to wait until she finished her degree before she became actively involved but in 2010 the G8 protests created a moment where she decided she could no longer wait. All the other participants had a similar moment, or multiple moments, where they simply could not "look away" anymore. After re-embracing her culture and starting to learn her language Hannah learned about a developer that wanted to build at c̓əsnaʔəm or maiden marpole, which is a traditional burial ground. She explains:

> …I personally started to find my voice at c̓əsnaʔəm and when Idle No More started, I started going, started talking, started singing. Uhm this turned into three years later and I haven't stopped.

She also found a sense of empowerment in this moment. So it was more than awareness but a moment of empowerment and connection, as she explains:

> Being at c̓əsnaʔəm and the bridge with my own community members and people that came literally from all over the world and brought their songs and stories and their magic and their healing. And the fact that they cared uhm…something magical happened there. There was…the way I describe it is we tapped into this like universal energy of change and empowerment.

Because what I'm working on is, is empowering myself and reclaiming my dignity and reclaiming my, my, my own respect. I am working on…uhm letting go of shame. I'm working on letting go of constantly having to qualify that I even deserve to exist. Because that is, that is beyond a hard place to live. It's not even living. And uhm… I mean it's…it's such a gross understatement to say it's unhealthy. So the Idle No More uhm even that was here in Vancouver, when I was standing the crown, with all of these drummers and singers. And it was a lot of First Nations people and it still is and a lot of women. But there, but with the men and the women, and some in regalia and with their drums and the songs and feeling that actual unity. Feeling that connection happening from person to person to the hundreds of people who would turn up to each event. And that it was positive and that it wasn't uh, it wasn't uh…take to the streets and trash the windows and knock the garbage cans over and yell at, yell at all the while people. It was about us and it was for us and it was empowering ourselves and reclaiming so much of what was brutally stripped and continues to be stripped from us. And instead of being forced to accept it now, we have a choice. We are at a time and a place, finally, where we're not only able to stand up and uhm…stand up for ourselves but we're able to stand up for protection of the environment. We're able to stand up finally in protection of our women. And uhm in protection of what means too much and is so necessary for every person hat is here. And I knew in that instant that this is where I, this feeling, this is it. I found the work I need to be doing.

Her moment of empowerment was a spiritual awakening but it was also a moment of awareness that she needed to fight for what she loved. As she says, she found where she belonged and the work she needed to do. Raymond experienced similar moments of realizing he needed to protect the things he loved. The first was when he learned about the Northern Gateway pipeline and that Enbridge was not respecting the rights of Indigenous peoples regarding land claims, and that these things would eventually come down the coast. He then took a canoe trip up the coast of BC where he saw the destruction that other industries had left. He explains:

It was after that time that any…anything that I was sitting on the fence with like in regards to the NEB process and Enbridge and Kinder Morgan was really diminished. Once I'd seen, once I saw the damage that was wrought by other industries…. Where we visited communities along the coast that uhm didn't benefit from these exploitative resource extractive industries that once they were done doing what they were doing, they were uhm, there was no uh…uh there was no impetus from them to uh restore these vast resources that were taken and so the question from many citizens that we've talked to across the province is that well if, if these government regulated and government subsidized organizations and industries like logging, mining, and fishing, didn't look after the environment, what's going to be so different about these oil industries?

Not everyone viewed this need to fight for what they love as an empowering endeavour. In fact Nicholas reinforces the fact that this was not part of his plan. He had things he wanted to focus on when he retired and issues of climate change were supposed to be a secondary concern. However, with the announcement of the Kinder Morgan pipeline and the birth of his grandchildren, the issues became impossible to ignore. He chose to place his other goals on the backburner to focus on action against the pipeline. He explains:

But what changed things for me was, the announcement that there would be two, not just one but two, tar sand pipelines through BC. Uh with all the risk that that presented both to the land and to the water. But the major concern in there was this is all about fuelling global warming and then along came our grandchildren…At any rate when the grandkids were born, we found that you know it's great, it's fun, especially for a grandparent, and joining that part of it. But uhm…so there was the joy but also it, it…it sort of recast your awareness in thinking about the future. So now you have a visceral way to look into the future so I think that was another major factor.

He saw the issue to be important and he was emotionally connected to it by looking at the future for his grandchildren. However, he spoke about the issue as if it is something he has to do, rather than something he found great pleasure from.

> So my niece's husband says "O you must really enjoy this", I said in a sense I don't enjoy it but I mean that in a sense Justine that it wasn't part of the plan and I've got other things that I keep wanting to get to. So it's not as if I come into this with the sense of "yes this has really helped fulfill me in some sense". Uhm it does in a sense because I find that the people that are involve are, almost to a person, people you'd like to know. So to come back to your question, of uhm, am I the kind of person to get involved in these kinds of issues? Yeah I guess uh, sprinkled with a little salt.

In this sense he felt compelled to act but did not seem to get the same feeling of empowerment as Hannah. What all of these stories have in common is that they experienced moments where they could no longer be in denial. This is the type of denial that Cohen speaks of where someone is aware of what is happening but does not act. While not denying that there is a problem, they all experienced denial in the form of convincing themselves they did not need to act. Sophie believed that she could finish school before becoming active. Nicholas was convinced he could retire and not focus on climate change. Kathy still thought the government might make the necessary changes. Hannah had chosen to deny her culture, and in essence part of who she was. Raymond had also chosen not to take concrete action until his moments of awareness.

These moments changed their perspectives. I think of them as similar to needing glasses and not realizing it, and then one day putting them on; the world is a lot clearer and in focus. Cohen (2011) explains that "…this ability to see clearly – the move from peripheral to central vision, seeing through the 'gauze' of euphemism- makes all the difference" (p.265). This is the moment where they break through the culture of denial, which can in many ways be uncomfortable but, from the way they speak of it, there really in no choice any more. The curtain has been lifted and we can no longer deny what is behind it.

For many of them this meant making sacrifices in their own lives. Nicholas put his retirement plans on hold because the future of his grandchildren was in jeopardy, regardless of the fact that there are other things he wants to get to. Sophie could no longer focus solely on her education, she needed to act. Kathy says that she "…think[s] we all have to make sacrifices to make change". Hannah speaks freely of being terrified and how she has to continue to act regardless.

> And I'm faltering to find my balance again and its uhm...I'm scared again, I'm terrified. And even having, even knowing that, and even having that knowledge and having that fear, what I know even more than that is, I will never stop speaking the truth and I will never stop protecting. I will not be quiet and I will not go away. …so whatever fear or terror, whatever, you know it's called post-traumatic stress, whatever these things uhm...is happening, I just have to find a way to take care of myself and still keep moving forward with all of these things. Otherwise I should just lie down and die because I will not live in a world where this is okay.

All of the participants speak to the fact that this is who they are. They may not always have been this way, they may not have been born activists but it is who they are now. When I asked Nicholas if his activism is still centered on the humanist approach he stated: "I'm still

concerned with it, it's part of who I am". Hannah, as she expressed above, also views her activism as her place in the world, where she is supposed to be. Sophie explains: "It's my passion, it's my way of life. It's who I am and everything about who I've become is rooted in this long story about colonization". Kathy also speaks of living life true to who she is, which results in her activism. Raymond explains that it is a responsibility he has as a part of his community and he sees his activism as looking after his community.

Cohen's (2011) fables or "folk-tales of conversion: the slow buildup or sudden epiphany, then a lifetime's selfless dedication", is exactly what my participants experienced. There was both a slow build up, as seen in their childhoods and education/career choices, and then there were moments of awareness or sudden epiphanies. While the concept of a lifetime of selfless dedication seems extreme, my participants all show a sense of selflessness and an admirable dedication. They pass up their own plans, such as Nicholas's retirement plans and Sophie's plan to finish school, and keep active regardless of their own fears and hesitations.

Klein (2014) speaks of "[a] shared determination to stay in the fight for the long haul, and to do whatever it takes to win", which she sees in the people in this movement. I certainly see this in all of the participants. They speak with an obvious passion and show a dedication in their actions that speaks for itself. These are people who spend every free moment they have focused on making an impact. While they all realize that they cannot do it on their own, they certainly show a selfless dedication which shows no sign of ending.

An amalgamation of social movements: are we all environmentalists?

This research is titled "Pathways to Environmental Activism within BC" because I wanted to speak with people who were active around issues such as proposed pipelines. I assumed that people who were active on these issues would consider themselves environmentalists, or at least approach the issue from an environmental perspective. What I have learned first and foremost from my discussions with people at the forefront of this movement is that they do not automatically identify as being environmentalists.

Environmentalism is actually treated as a dirty word by some of the participants. There are suggestions that it is associated with hippies and on the fringe of society people. Or it is considered an irrelevant category since everyone who knows the facts should be one. As Kathy explained:

> I personally don't really like the term environmentalism because people use it in a derogatory way and personally I have very strong feelings that any intelligent, thinking, person, is an environmentalist and if they're not uhm then they're not thinking clearly about the issues.

If they consider themselves environmentalists at all it is an afterthought to their main reason for being active. Something, that after consideration, they can see themselves as being associated with. When I asked Hannah if she considered herself an environmentalist, after a pause she responded by saying, "I've never really considered that. That's…it would depend on the definition of an environmentalist. More than anything I'm a protector and I'm a truth speaker. And that's my job and that's why I'm here". However, when I asked her to define environmentalism she said she would define it as being a protector and a truth speaker. She is okay considering herself an environmentalist if it can be defined in her broad terms.

Raymond had a similar reaction. He was reluctant to call himself an environmentalist but after further consideration he decided that he was one. He explains: "…so I think that I'm one of those people that is active so yes I'm an activist and I'm uh a speaker on behalf of the environment as it pertains to my community, and so uh it's very important to me". All of the participants were hesitant or outright denied their being labelled an environmentalist. However, when asked to define what an environmentalist was they all described something similar to their own activism. This speaks to the fact that environmentalism has in some cases obtained a negative or exclusive definition. It also suggests that environmentalism has become a broader term. While perhaps it used to be associated with "fringe of society people", "hippies", or "tree huggers", as some of my interviewees suggested, now it seems to have evolved to include a greater variety of people.

Nicholas explains that core environmentalists are people who "…spend time uh engaged in concerns about flora and fauna and preserving life, those forms of life on earth…". He does not consider himself an environmentalist in these specific terms but sees himself fitting into one of the categories underneath this movement for climate action. For him there are four main groups of people within the movement, which he views as a big tent. He explains:

> Yeah I think the best way, term I'd like to use, that I think applies is the big tent. This is   a   l   l about creating a big tent, in which no end of people can participate and come under one roof and say yeah, this is what we are doing you know, committed to this. We're working on this together. Yes I look around the room, look around the room and see a lot of different kinds of people and in a lot of ways maybe we wouldn't be spending time together, uh if the situation were different but this whole issue of global warming is a uh is uh a hugely binding experience I think and uh folks who are concerned about it, need to constantly be looking for ways to bring in more people, So uhm, in that sense I'd like to think as a broadly speaking, a small e environmental movement, with many different folk involved, many of whom, 5 years ago, two years ago, 6 months ago, wouldn't say, and maybe even right now, wouldn't say they're an environmentalist per say but they see this issue uh as one that threatens the planet and there are so many aspects to what the planet represents.

Nicholas does a wonderful job explaining how environmental issues have become a uniting banner for many different activists. Climate change has specifically allowed different groups to unite under one cause. This also means that, as Nicholas explained, people do not necessarily come at the issue from an environmentalist perspective. This perspective connects to Klein's (2014) discussion of Blockadia; the grassroots world-wide movement that she says has risen up to say "no". All of this is done under the banner of climate change, which is a unifying issue, but peoples reasoning for being involved are broad and varying. This is also reflected in Sophie's explanation:

> Environmentalism is a pretty broad…understanding of protecting of the environment and animals and the earth in general. But there's different paths within environmentalism and different motivations right? So some people become environmental activists because they don't want to lose their house or their land, right? When it directly affects them. Some people be environmentalists because it's cool and there's a bunch of hippies with dreadlocks who just want to smoke weed all day. And then there's the anarchists. And then there's people who actually understand the scientific part of it.

Nicholas identifies four areas in his tent metaphor and they also came up in my research: Core environmentalists, anti-capitalists, humanism, and indigenous rights. In addition my

research brought up concepts of feminism. However, none of these groups are exclusive. Nicholas explains these categories as, "Meaning you can come up with categories that largely make sense but not everyone purely fits into one or the other so… I might be 60% of the humanist category and a mix of others".

While all of the participants could probably be placed primarily in one category, they certainly overlap, since even the categories overlap. The only one that none of them outright identified with was the core environmentalist group, where the preservation of flora and fauna, or our natural spaces, was the main focus. However, the desire to protect natural spaces was present in all of the interviews. For example, Raymond's activism is focused on his community and the colonization that Indigenous peoples have faced but he also speaks to the fact that the natural areas have changed since he was a child. He is concerned for how the industries are treating the natural places in British Columbia.

Similarly, Hannah definitely comes at the issue from the perspective of an Indigenous woman but she also speaks about her desire to protect other living things. However, this is not only because they need to be protected but because as human beings we also need them to survive. This connects to the ecological conceptualization of our relationship with the environment. She explains:

> It's hard because, I get conflicted because on one side of the coin I am doing work against…uhm I'm doing work to speak up against the work, against Kinder Morgan Transmountain Pipeline, the uhm…protecting the sacred headwaters, the tar sands, the fish farming, the continued mining, the uhm resources extraction in south America, everywhere around the world, all of these things are happening. But more importantly I'm working to speak up for, for the actual land, for the trees, for for you know the two legged, the winged, the four legged, and all of our, and all of everything in the water because they don't have a voice. And it's not just because they deserve to be protected but on a more selfish note for a lot of people, not just the kind of hippy dippy tree hugger mentality, we need every one of these species. We need the trees, we need the arable land. I mean it's. It goes…it's beyond ridiculous to say we need clean water to drink, we need clear air to breath, we need arable land, we need non uhm non uh… we need land that hasn't been modified to the point that it's killing people and produce that come from it is killing people. But we are at a point where these things need to be said and they have to be said loudly, consistently.

Her perspective is similar to ecological justice which was discussed in the "Green Criminology" section. From this perspective we need to be concerned for everything on the earth because we are all connected in one large eco-system. While there are certainly some things that present a more severe threat to humans or to specific animal species, at a big picture perspective we are all connected. This is represented in Hannah's view that "…on a more selfish note…we need every one of these species".

Hannah is probably the most diverse in her framing of the activism she does. This last quote identifies her as someone who is trying to protect and speak for the land, for its own sake and for the future of humans. However she also discusses her activism as stemming from her Indigenous and feminist roots. She sees environmental issues as originating in colonization and the desire to gain access to land and resources, which continues today.

> …from this most recent history of the residential schools but also looking at the history of colonization and the whole purpose of of this uh…of Canada and the dominion of Canada and the government of Canada at every level was to eradicate the First Nations people from the land. And

not just for the purpose of eradicating them but for the purpose of gaining full access and control over what are called resources and the simple fact is, they weren't able to eradicate us all. So all the ongoing torture devastation, the stripping away of dignity and respect, the trampling over of the rights, the elimination of of…of the human being in First Nation's people, especially women.

Hannah seems to see the issue that she is active against as encompassing many perspectives. She explains: "I mean there are so many little tiny issues that are connected. And it's this big ball of yarn, you can't pull one string without the rest jangling. It's ALL connected". She simply wants everyone to feel safe and live in a healthy world. She feels that people have a right to this. From a broad perspective this may be humanism, or general social justice, but that would ignore the fact that she is Indigenous and a female, and therefore her actions are driven by her experiences as an Indigenous female.

Her discussion of growing up with the racism and violence that being an Indigenous woman has brought her is steeped with emotion. She goes between anger and hope for the future. It is clear that she never wants anyone else to have to face the things that she has and that no matter how afraid she may be, she must keep acting. She sees a connection between not only colonization and the treatment of the land but the treatment of women and the land.

> I want a world where men have, uhm regained the knowledge and the uhm…the understanding of the value and the power and the respect that women deserve. It is our job to keep ourselves safe but why do we need,… why do we need to teach women to not get raped? This, this is a huge starting point and its cus the rape and the violence go hand in hand and it's the exact same thing that's being done to the earth. The earth is being devastated with bore holes and tar sands and tailings ponds and fish farms and its being deforested. And all the perfect methods of resource extraction…it's the exact same thing.

Sophie connects her activism in a similar way to growing up as an indigenous woman and having to face the violence and discrimination that comes along with that.

> Well because of colonization, this is something that I talk about quite a bit with people, is as an Indigenous woman who faces violence on a regular basis through colonization, my body has become the landscape for violence. And uhm our bodies are a part of the environment, they're a part of the land, and they belong to each other there's a cycle that happens. And… uhm my role is in direct relations to my body being a physical manifestation of the land and so in order to stop the violence that exists on my body I have to stop the violence that exists on the land because the violence on my body is committed in order to gain the land.

When asked to define environmentalism she states:

> So there are multiple understandings I think of environmentalism and multiple motivations that lead people to become active. But I think that basically just the understanding that we can't continue to rape the earth any more than we already have and we're leading to our own demise basically.

Both Hannah and Sophie refer to the way we interact with the earth as rape. They also acknowledge a connection between how our society interacts with the environment and how it interacts with women. This connects to eco-feminism which "…advocates that, in the patriarchal society, we should connect natural domination with sexual domination, combine the ecological movement with the women's movement, and solve the ecological crisis and the social crisis in the process of fighting against patriarchal domination" (Ling, 2014, p.95). Although not all eco-feminists use the uncomfortable connection of rape, it has been discussed. Collard and Contrucci

(1989) made the bold statement that "…nature, animals and women are objectified, hunted, invaded, colonized, owned, consumed and forced to yield and to produce (or not). This violation of the integrity of wild, spontaneous Being is rape" (p.1). Ecofeminism then views the domination of the earth and women as resulting from patriarchy. They are both seen as commodities rather than living beings, which also connects to capitalism. [6]

In a discussion of the integration of criminology and eco-feminism, Lane (1998) notes that ecofeminism may be a dying area of research. This is as result of the fact that many people may not view their gender politics as the most important aspect of their activism. While at some points they may come at their activism from a feminist standpoint, at other times they may be active from other positions. Lane (1998) calls this transient ecofeminism and explains that this forming of new alliances allows for a stronger social movement rather than the end of it.

This acknowledges the fact that we are all unique people who carry multiple identities, yet are faced with many of the same problems. Rather than seen as a weakening of the eco-feminist movement, it should be seen as a strengthening of it and other movements. This alliance can certainly be seen within the interviews that I conducted for this research. All of the participants come at the issue from their own view points, yet they desire the same outcome; a change in culture. At the core is really a desire to remove this culture of denial that is based on capitalism. A culture that colonizes Indigenous peoples, places the pursuit of profit over all other needs, and turns nature and people into commodities.

Hannah and Sophie see the issue from the perspective of Indigenous females. Raymond while Indigenous, is not female, and he did not mention anything regarding the connection between nature and women. He did however speak to the connection between the continued colonization of Indigenous peoples and the destruction of the earth. Kathy and Nicholas on the other hand, did not associate their action with issues of race. This is understandable since they are Caucasian and are unlikely to have faced personalized racism. Nicholas did acknowledge that Indigenous peoples play a huge role in his "big tent" and that they have their own unique perspective. Nicholas sees the issue from the perspective of a grandfather. Kathy primarily speaks of the issue as being one of political ideology. Specifically capitalism and neoliberalism. She is also a woman, and does mention her childhood experiences of growing up a female, but does not speak of the connection between woman and the earth. Yet all of these people are fighting for the same cause and under the same banner. This speaks to the fact that it is an amalgamation of all these different viewpoints.

It is also significantly important to note that none of them denounce the other avenues. There was never a negative comment spoken about anyone who was fighting not on the side of corporations and the state. Rather, they were often supportive of the other facets. For example, Sophie comes at the issues from the perspective of an Indigenous female but she also speaks to the fact that it is not just about Indigenous peoples: "This isn't how we're supposed to live. This isn't how we were meant to live. Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples". Nicholas and

---

[6] It is important to note that there has not always been a positive relationship between Indigenous women and the broader feminist movement (Monture, 2006).

Hannah also mention other perspectives or their consideration for other groups of people multiple times. This is important because of the fact that it is such a diverse group of people and they are all working together. While there are certainly subgroups, as Nicholas explained, they all come together to stand against these issues. It is a unity of movements: feminist, Indigenous, anti-capitalist, environmentalist, and humanist.

 Klein (2014) also speaks of the social movement against the continued use of fossil fuels as a continuation or amalgamation of other social movements. She explains that

> …all of these past movements, in one form or another, are still fighting today – for full human rights and equality regardless of ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation; for real decolonization and reparation; for food security and famers rights; against oligarchic rule; and to defend and expand the public sphere.

> So climate change does not need some shiny new movement that will magically succeed where others failed. Rather, as the furthest reaching crisis created by the extractivist worldview, and one that puts humanity on a firm and unyielding deadline, climate change can be the force- the grand push - that will bring together all of these still living movements. A rushing river fed by countless streams, gathering collective force to finally reach the sea (p.494-495).

This unification of social movements is evident in my own research. It is not just one issue that needs to be dealt with. It is a multitude of issues that come together under the threat we are facing from climate change. Because this threat effects everyone, it is acting as a unifying factor. It is not just an indigenous, feminist, environmental, or humanist perspective. All of these perspectives come together in the realization that the way we interact with the earth and each other is not healthy. And built into this is the realization that capitalism and neoliberalism are not healthy and we cannot move forward and make any effective change under this ideology. Kathy is particularly adamant about this fact. She states that:

> We are living in a time…when uhm…we've really have been asleep at the wheel for 30 years. Uhm I think there's been a big movement by an ideology that's known as neoliberalism that is not conservatism, it's very distinct from conservatism. Uhmw here there's a very strong ideology that the markets, that they should be supported and uhm it's not…less government…it's actually more government that does not value democracy and it does not value the environment and those are two of my very big concerns and over the past few years when I've woken up to the fact both our democracy and our environment are being totally being ran rush shod over. Uhm I had no choice but to act.

This sense of intense urgency is something that is reoccurring in my interviews. Kathy shows this urgency when she states that she had no choice but to act. Sophie, when asked how she became involved in environmental movement, to start with simply said "urgency". After further inquiry she said,

> So there is a sense of urgency uhm in regards to the way that oil impacts the environment, and climate change as well as fracking. When I became educated about, about the environmental impact but also the health impact on the Indigenous communities further downstream from tailing ponds or directly dealing with fracking, then I was very concerned and I go involved.

This urgency comes from the fact that climate action needs to take place now and a realization that those in positions of power are not acting. It also comes from the tar sands oil being sent to our coast, or into our backyards. However, this urgency also mirrors the idea that they lacked the ability to do anything else. None of the participants came at the issue as being something they were incredibly excited to get involved with. Yet none of them felt they could make another choice. This connects to Cohens (2001) concept of banality of virtue in that they see "…the situation as giving them no choice" (p.264). Once they were faced with their moment of awareness, or breaking through the culture of denial, they could no longer look away. However, most of the participants were not excited to get involved, even though they acknowledge that they do get a sense of empowerment and fulfillment from their involvement.

Nicholas explained a few times that this was not his plan. He is retired and had things he wanted to accomplish but then with the announcement of the two pipelines he realized he needed to focus his attention on the threat of climate change. Raymond speaks about the fact that he was always shy growing up but that he has forced himself to become comfortable in the spotlight because he has a responsibility. Kathy explains that she was waiting for the politicians to do their job, she has kids and a life that she was living but then she realized that "…it was up to us" and started acting. Sophie speaks about being apprehensive because there is fear involved and how she had planned to get her degree finished first but then she could no longer wait after witnessing police brutality at a protest. Hannah expresses her fear but determination to keep acting with a strong sense of emotion:

> So…we're leaving the way to this and uhm…despite the fact that the majority of us are terrified. Despite the fact that, that the majority of us have no idea how we're going to pay our bills or rent, or get from one event to the next. We're fierce and we're and and we…[stó:méxen?] I am warrior. And I feel that and it's not…the Hollywood version of warrior uhm…warrior is beautiful. Warrior is powerful. Warrior is protector. Warrior is bland of uhm of uh emotions and logic and action and caring for, for the communities. And uhm… to be to have that instead of a sense of shame, embarrassment, and humiliation. To feel pride and acknowledgement and power. Knowing where I come from and who my people were and how long we've been here and our stories. Uhm our own histories and our own uhm experiences here on this land. We've been on it since the first sunrise. I want every woman to feel the way I feel. And I am still terrified, I still have no clue what I'm...what I'm actually going to be doing tomorrow, in an hour from now and that's not the way I usually live and after […] I've had to take time off because uhm...because it triggered all of the other violent incidents. It triggered every time I have been stalked or preyed or or or hurt by a man. If I'm around men who are tense now. If I'm around a man, if he moves his hands fast. If men have a bad energy or they're angry. I can't be around it. I'm, I'm having to go see counsellors. I'm doing my own healing work with, with friends. Uh....I'm doing my own healing work with my friends in the sense of taking time off and taking time away but I'm seeing spiritual healers, I'm seeing cultural healers as well as I'm working with uhm counsellors who specifically work with women who have uhm experienced violence. And I never thought I'd be back here again. I never thought uh...I never imagined that it would be socially condoned at an incident where I was peaceful for a police man to hit me in the face and other people say that I deserved. And, excuse my language, it's fucked me up. And I'm faltering to find my balance again and its uhm...I'm scared again, I'm terrified. And even having, even knowing that, and even having that knowledge and having that fear, what I know even more than that is, I will never stop speaking the truth and I will never stop protecting. I will not be quiet and I will not go away. And this makes me dangerous to the people who benefit from maintaining the status quo. And these sheeple that become the police and these sheeple who wander around uhm...still believing the propaganda, the lies that have been created to keep them docile and not thinking...I can't really be too concerned

about uhm...their reactions to a lot of things because it's that mentality that got us into the mess we're in. so whatever fear or terror, whatever, you know it's called post-traumatic stress, whatever these things uhm...is happening, I just have to find a way to take care of myself and still keep moving forward with all of these things. Otherwise I should just lie down and die because I will not live in a world where this is okay. I want you to be safe, I want all of the women in your family, and all of the women in your circle to feel safe.

In everyone, regardless of their reasoning or their framing of their action, there is a sense of urgency and that they really could do nothing else in the situation. As is demonstrated in Hannah's discussion of the topic, these issues are steeped in emotion. While not everyone speaks about it in such a forward sense as Hannah, the emotion is evident. Discussions around climate change, colonization, sexism, and inequality, are not easily had without an emotional component.

Klein (2014) believes that the one uniting force behind all the reasons for being involved in, what she calls, Blockadia, is love. She explains,

The power of this ferocious love is what the resource companies and their advocates in government inevitably underestimate, precisely because no amount of money can extinguish it. When what is being fought for is an identity, a culture, a beloved place that people are determined to pass on to their grandchildren, and that their ancestors may have paid for with great sacrifice, there is nothing companies can offer as a bargaining chip. No safety pledge will assuage; no bribe will be big enough. And though this kind of connection to place is surely strongest in Indigenous communities where the ties to land go back thousands of years, it is in fact Blockadia's defining feature (p.342).

I feel confident in stating that based on my interviews, this is true. I believe that people are active because of love. Raymond loves his community and is concerned for his future children. Nicholas loves his grandchildren. Sophie also loves her community and family, which includes her childhood friends. Hannah is intimately clear about her love for the world in general, in fact her love seems to almost overwhelm her. Kathy is not as forward with her professions of love but it is clear when she speaks that she has emotion in her activism. She loves the places she is trying to protect but she comes at the issue from an academic perspective.

This also means that their activism involves concern for the future, with consideration for these loved people or places. Climate change, along with the sexism and racism that some of the participants connect to it, threaten the future for those they love. Ashlee Cunsolo Willox (2012) connects climate change to the work of mourning and I believe that her concepts transfer to my research. She wishes to extend the work of mourning beyond only human bodies and onto non-humans such as animals or ecosystems. She says that although these things are not discussed at a public or political level, we do mourn for loved places or creatures that are lost. This is connected to Cohen's (2001) belief that those who are not able to deny, or be bystanders, have extended their sense of self to encompass people beyond their own social groups. This social group may be a family, community or country.

In this sense then Willox (2012) is saying that we can extend our moral inclusivity to non-humans as well and that there are already many people who do so. She calls on people to share these stories of mourning and believes that this will bring these non-human entities into the political and ethical sphere. This is an eco-centric view of the world. She is trying to call for an

eco-citizenship form of mourning, where all types of mourning are taken seriously. From this point of view, if we acknowledge that we are vulnerable to this type of mourning and speak about it publically and often, then we can create a political discourse around the issues. She also calls for people to take their anger and use it in a productive way. We can use anger to create a social movement, which is really what the people I interviewed and those that Klein speaks about are doing. A social movement that is created by anger, that is as a result of the things that we love being threatened. However, rather than using this anger in a destructive way, people are using it to create new spaces for conversation and to stand up in unity against these destructive forces. Hannah speaks to using her own fear and anger in a positive way to unite others:

> Uhm that even though there may be anger in, in the reality, and uhm...in the statements...the overall feeling is that uhm... I wanna present it in a way that actual opens mind and opens hearts, so we can all start to see things from the same perspective of the truth of the facts. Not the slanted propagandas BS that has been spewed out to people for, for hundreds of years. So setting it up in a way that people can actually take it in and not feel guilt and not feel shamed but instead feel like they can actually make a difference, like they can actually be involved and feel good about it. Uhm coming at it from that perspective instead of pointing the big finger and "shame, shame, shame".

In this way she connects to Willox's (2012) idea that mourning can unite us. However, she is adamant that we need to extend the mournable body to non-human entities. While I agree that there are benefits, and on a moral level it is logical, to acknowledge that we can grieve for these non-human entities, I do not think it is necessary in the context of climate change. All of my participants, while they mention a concern for natural spaces and non-human entities, primarily come at the issue from a point of concern for the future of humanity. They connect climate change to the future for their community, grandchildren, or even unborn children.

However, they also see things from an ecocentric point of view, where we acknowledge that everything is connected and that our future is intertwined with non-human entities. So while grief for non-humans may not be necessary for this movement to be successful, within the frame of ecocentrism even those who are only concerned for the future of humanity need to grieve non-human loses. Willox (2012) also discusses the fact that we can grieve for predicted future loss. While there are certainly already loses occurring as a result of climate change, it is the predicted massive future loss that people are also currently mourning. However, we can take past loss and the grief we felt for them and use this as a way to motivate our desire to prevent the future loss we envision.

Perhaps this is an explanation for why those who have already suffered may be more likely to engage in this movement. All of the Indigenous participants experienced huge loss. This is evident in personal experiences and at a base level this is in the loss of their culture and way of life. However, Hannah also speaks to the loss of their humanity in the eyes of others. She says that people do not see Indigenous peoples, and especially women, as humans. While not the loss of a physical beings or entity, it is loss on a massive scale. Colonization is all about loss and perhaps this means that they are more acutely aware of what there is to be lost.

When I asked Hannah why Indigenous peoples were at the forefront of this movement she explained:

People wonder what's underneath all of this, really, we have nothing left to lose. So we, we need to stand up. Because if we don't stand up now and speak for the environment. We stand up and we are using out voices for the land, because we have to learn to use our voices for ourselves We've been so dehumanized that a lot of us believe that we've not even humans still. So using our voices and in acts using our voices to protect the land. To speak for those who cannot speak for themselves empowers us to use our voices for ourselves, so that we can be more powerful and effective in the actual work of protecting.

Using our voices also connects to the power of stories. I chose to embrace the power of story in this research because I believe it is an organic way to understand a person's life and pathway to activism. What my research has shown is that stories are also a powerful force within the movement. Story allows for a human connection between people, which creates the basis for a social movement. From Willox's (2012) point of view these stories allow us to connect on an emotional level based on our acts of mourning.

It is not surprising that stories play such an important role in this movement. The power of story originates from Indigenous cultures and, as has already been discussed, Indigenous people are in many ways leading this movement. For this reason I have chosen to have a section that specially speaks about the role of Indigenous peoples. While certainly all other pathways and conceptualizations of the problem are important, it is crucial to acknowledge the huge role that the history and continued colonization of Indigenous people plays in this movement.

Indigenous rights and the climate action movement

Four of the five people I interviewed spoke of the connection between Indigenous peoples and the activism they are involved in. All three of the people with Indigenous heritage discussed the connection between colonization and our relationship with the land and each other. This is how they frame their activism. Nicholas also discussed how Indigenous peoples seem to come at the issue from a different perspective. He acknowledges that their culture places them at a different position. I chose to make three of my five participants Indigenous because I was already aware of the huge and critical position they have within the movement. It does not take a lot of investigation to come to this conclusion, all you need to do is attend a rally or demonstration regarding climate action. Even turning on the mainstream news would give you an idea of how prominent they are, although there is no guarantee how accurate the portrayal would be.

Klein (2014) and Saul (2014) are both adamant that there needs to be changes in the way non-Indigenous peoples interact with Indigenous peoples. This is a result of a long history of abuse, dishonesty, and attempts to destroy a people and culture. It also has to do with the fact that we have not honoured the treaties that our country was based on. Settlers in Canada did not always have a colonial relationship with Indigenous people. In fact, when settlers first arrived here they depended on Indigenous peoples and adopted many of their ways of life (Saul, 2014).

Eventually this changed. Laws, such as the Royal Proclamation in 1763, required British settlers to sign treaties with Indigenous peoples to obtain land from them. Treaties were signed almost everywhere in Canada except British Columbia, which even today remains mostly unceded territory. Attempts to open British Columbia up to settlers in 1874, after BC became a part of Canada, were struck down by the Canadian government because no treaties had been

signed. However, after threats from BC to remove itself from Canada, the Indian Act was created in 1876 which gave control over all Indigenous peoples to the government (Hill, 2010).

This began the legacy of the residential schools, where children were taken from their families and placed in church run schools. Over the years information has continued to come out about the atrocities of these schools, from sexual and physical abuse to using the children as lab rats for experiments. The goal was "killing the Indian in the child" and the assimilation of Indigenous children into the white community (Nagy & Sehdev, 2012). Families were torn apart and still suffer from inter-generational trauma that originated at these schools such as: "...alcohol and substance abuse, cycles of violence, suicide, anger, hopelessness, isolation, shame, guilt, and an inability to parent" (Nagy & Sehdev, 2012, p. 67). They were a form of State funded genocide. The government was provided with detailed accounts of everything that occurred and did nothing to stop it.

This colonization and violence continues in our current society. Today almost half of the children in foster care are Indigenous (Woods & Kirkey, 2013). Star light tours are occurring, where police officers drop off apprehended Indigenous peoples in freezing weather, far from shelter with inappropriate clothing, often resulting in them freezing to death (MtPleasant, 2014). The Human Rights Watch (2013) released a report detailing the significant misconduct by police in Northern British Columbia, including sexual assaults and failure to respond to missing women. Since 1980 more than 1,100 Indigenous women have gone missing or been murdered, a rate that is three or four times higher than their portion of the population, and Prime Minister Harper refuses to call for a national inquiry (Chase & Galloway, 2014). These realities are mixed in with high levels of poverty (Hilderbrandt, 2013), substandard living conditions (Cossimmo, 2013), and the continued destruction of the land.

Hannah, Sophie, and Raymond all speak about colonization and its continuation today. How this shaped their lives and their interactions with other people. However, this attempt to annihilate Indigenous cultures and peoples was not successful. While they have never taken the abuse without protest, there has been a renewed energy in Indigenous communities, especially within women and the young. John Ralston Saul (2014) describes this reinvigoration in his book *The Comeback*. He explains how our government continues to perpetuate colonization and how many of their acts are in fact illegal, since they are not upholding the treaties. Idle No More, a movement that originated with the passing of omnibus Bills C-38 and C-45, is calling for the government to take real action for reconciliation with Indigenous peoples.

In many places this reinvigoration is taking the form of renewed rights under treaties agreed upon by colonists and Indigenous peoples, where land rights for these groups are being recognized. There has been great successes in regard to gaining back treaty rights. In 1997 Delgamuukw v. British Columbia "...ruled that in those large parts of B.C. that were not covered by any treaty, Aboriginal title over the land had never been extinguished and still needed to be settled" (Klein, 2014, p.371). In 1999 it was ruled that treaties signed by the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, and Passamaquoddy First Nations in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were not meant to give away land but to share it with settlers. This was a significant case since many North American Treaties had similar provisions for resource-sharing rather than transfer of "ownership".

However, sharing of the land was impossible when one side had the goal of destroying it and making it uninhabitable (Klein, 2014). (Saul, 2014)

Even after these decisions were made the government of Canada continued to live in denial and did not enforce the rights that had been affirmed by these cases. So Indigenous peoples started to use the land that their ancestors had passed down to them without permission from the state. This resulted in often violent conflicts between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples, who were accused of using up all the resources such as fish and wild game. The time was full of tension, violence, and racism (Klein, 2014). This type of reaction is a result of years of official denial and of course a culture of denial which enforces imperial, colonial, and capitalist belief systems. Indigenous peoples have been portrayed as incapable, in the way, and freeloaders. There is a general lack of understanding/education within non-Indigenous communities about the realities that surround this relationship (Saul, 2014).

However, things started to change in 2013 when the Elsipogtog First Nations were fighting against fracking and called to non-Indigenous peoples to join them. This was a turning point in the collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada, specifically to prevent continued fossil fuel extraction. This is as a result of two main realizations by many non-Indigenous people. The first is that treaty rights represent one of the most promising ways to prevent the continued destruction of natural places and the prevention of increased climate crisis. The second is that Indigenous circular models of living[7] provide a different way of viewing the world, one which is much more aligned with our values. In essence the concepts of an ecological view of our relationship with the earth, as described in the green criminology section, mirrors these models. Saul explains that:

> Humans are part of the whole, not elevated above the place and its other inhabitants. And so humans see themselves from within existence. They do not gaze down upon it from above. This changes radically how things are conceived and therefor how things could be done (p. 19). [8]

It is significant to bring to attention that very little of the literature regarding green criminology noted this connection. While there were a few instances where I found a note regarding Indigenous world views (for example Lynch & Stretesky, 2003, p.92) and Indigenous resistance (for example Lynch & Stetesky, 2001), a majority of the literature referred to Indigenous peoples only in the context of victims. Even this connection was limited. From my view point this connection is significant and the lack of current acknowledgement creates an unhealthy and unjust void within green criminology. We cannot continue to view Indigenous peoples as only victims, rather than groups of people with valid points of view and conceptualizations of the world. As academics concerned with environmental issues green criminologists should be initiating this change of perspective

---

[7] It is important to note that there is no one "Indigenous way" since there is *many* different cultures around the world. Saul (2014) is speaking specifically to what he calls the "northern half of North America". However, there are still many different cultures within that.

[8] For a further discussion of this Saul (2014) suggests Richard Atleo's *Principles of Tsawalk*.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (n.d.) has been actively working to gather the truth about the residential schools by collecting stories and research. They also travelled across Canada hosting events and raising awareness, with a goal of reconciliation. The fact is though, that this reconciliation can only happen if we start to acknowledge the realities of our country. We must stop denying and we must demand that our government stop denying and start acting. Saul (2014) says that the Indigenous comeback is the "great issue of our time". Klein (2014) refers to the climate action movement in similar terms. While these could be seen as conflicting statements, I do not see them this way and neither do Saul and Klein.

As discussed above this movement is a compilation of many other movements, one of them being the Indigenous rights movement. From a non-Indigenous perspective though we need to be aware of the huge political, legal, social, cultural, and sheer people, power that Indigenous peoples play in this movement. We need to start the reconciliation process by respecting the rights that Indigenous people hold. For the common sense moral fact that it is the right thing to do but also because we need them. And we need to realize that we need them. Saul (2014) explains that we need to stop viewing Indigenous peoples as part of failing cultures that need to be helped. That they do not need our sympathy but that we need as a country to acknowledge the wrong doings because it would be best for everyone involved. Klein (2014) similarly speaks about how non-Indigenous people need to be conscious of the way they interact with Indigenous communities, so as to not further the existing colonization. We cannot use their land rights and world views for our own advantage without restoring real justice within our society.

From an Indigenous perspective there can also be a specific pathway seen, one which involves removing this "victim" status. Monture (2006) discusses the evolution from victim to warrior. She explains that from victim there is a slow process of being a survivor, and then from there is the reveling of a warrior. Hannah speaks about herself in a similar way as a warrior:

> We're fierce and we're and and we... [stó:méxen?] I am warrior. And I feel that and it's not the...the Hollywood version of warrior uhm...warrior is beautiful, warrior is powerful, warrior is protector, warrior is balance of uhm of uh emotions and logic and action and caring for, for the communities. And uhm...to actually be able to feel that again, to be to have that instead of a sense of shame, embarrassment, and humiliation. To feel pride and acknowledgement and power. Knowing where I come from and who my people were and how long we've been here and our stories. Uhm our own histories and our own uhm experiences here on this land

From warrior Monture says a person then turns into a teacher, where they "…not only speak to the truth but they also offer ways in which we may change the reality we are living in" (p.84). Hannah has identified as a speaker of the truth, and a protector, but I believe she can also be seen as a teacher.

> I...do this work with the full intention of...of waking up...we'll say the embers of respect, dignity, and power in the other women. In the women who read uhm an interview, in the women who are at a rally. In the women who just sit and chat with me, wherever I might be. Uhm because every single woman who is woken up, who is stirred to find her own way to healing and find her own way back to dignity and strength and respect, then empowers how many more. And it is our job to do it for ourselves, with ourselves, but we also need our men. Our male warriors to be able to stand beside us and around us. To protect us and support us. To love us. To care for us.

Monture also speaks to male warriors, in that she sees that they exist but not in the same number that the women. While there are definitely men who encompass what it means to be a warrior, Raymond is a great example of this, those standing up and using their voices are predominantly women.

As I mentioned above, none of the people I interviewed spoke ill of other people within the movement. This includes the Indigenous people about the non-Indigenous peoples, and vice-versa. However, all of the Indigenous people spoke to the fact that there needs to be education within the non-Indigenous communities about these realities. That part of making people "wake up", is making them acknowledge how their country came to be. Raymond explained how he was in protest of what he calls "tokenistic" traditional welcomes:

> …that our communities have to stop doing these obligatory and tokenistic and ceremonial welcoming onto the land of the Indigenous people and uh…you know basically all that does is it negates the real work that needs to be done. That there needs to be authentic engagement, there needs to be authentic collaboration with the indigenous communities in order for this to work, for this society to work. Uhm and uh so…uh I think a lot of the work that I'm doing now is about that, its saying 'you know what I'm not coming here with my drum in hand, I'm not coming here wearing my regalia or my cedar hat. I'm coming to you because I'm telling you that we need to do more work than that'. That there needs to be a new sort of, we need to take the next steps.

What are these next steps? What does authentic collaboration look like? From what I understand, it means that we not only break through this culture of denial but dismantle it. The people I interviewed have stopped denying. They have done what Cohen (2001) explains as "…break[ing] the rules of the game by exposing it as a game" (p. 259). From this "[p]eople discover that it is possible to live inside the truth, to find a repressed alternative to the inauthentic, to expose a 'hidden sphere of life'" (p.258). This hidden sphere of life is the Indigenous circular model of living. A way of life that colonizers attempted to eradicate but it is still there. The next step is to get others involved, to create a collective acknowledgement, an authentic collaboration, a "…transformation that makes previously normalized conditions into social problems" (Cohen, 2001, p. 250). We need to strengthen the movement.

Helping others break through the culture of denial

That is the big question at the centre of this movement: how do we get others involved? We know that there are certain moments that lead a person to action, so how do we create these moments for others. All of the participants show a mixture of frustration and hope when discussing this. When asked if they have any ideas, a common response was to agree that it is a problem and that we definitely need everyone to be on the same side. As Nicholas explained with his big tent metaphor: "Ultimately we want 99% of the people in that big tent and the only 1% that's still out there are the sort of top executives of big oil and some of their key shareholders". Hannah similarly states:

> Ideally I would love to have a working peaceful, relationship, between EVERYBODY whose here. We ALL need to work together. We have a phrase in Halkomelem "nə́ċaʔmat tə šxʷqʷeləwən ct", we are of one heart and one mind, and this is the truth. And when we get back to that, some people are going to have be dragged kicking and screaming to it, when we get back to that one heart and one mind place of thinking, acting and doing, everybody will benefit, not just one percent.

The concept of waking people up is something that came up a lot in the interviews. Everyone spoke about making people wake up and become active. Cohen (2001) explains that we cannot jump from denial to action, there are steps we must take. The problem is: "how to transform ignorance into information, information into knowledge, knowledge into acknowledgement (cognition into recognition, sight into insight), and finally acknowledgement into action" (p.248). The main concepts that come out of my research were similar to the four requirements that Cohen (2001) lays out: cognitive demands, emotional demands, moral sentiments, and cultural channels. The activists that I interviewed all had their own ideas for how to get other involved but they had a similar pathway in mind. This pathway closely resembled their own lives. It starts with breaking through the denial (through education), then connecting on an emotional level, and then empowering them by presenting avenues for action. All of them are currently actively trying to get other people involved.

The first step is of course education. This education needs to span further than just climate change however, into how our culture enforces denial through capitalism, privilege, and a limited scope of our history. Hannah explains that "[p]eople need to educate themselves with the truth, […], just the simple truth" but this spans further than climate change. She explains that people need to understand the history and current relationship between Canada and Indigenous communities:

> …for people to properly unveil themselves of the truth. Of, of the history and what really happened at residential schools because the whole truth isn't even known yet. So we're prescribed one year [Truth and Reconciliation], and that walk was fucking phenomenal, 70, 000 people turned up to show that they care, that I matter, that what happened to my mom wasn't right and to offer their healing. One year doesn't fix hundreds of years of, of what continues to carry on as the wrong doing of the actual evil deeds. People really need to get, they really really need to be able to soften themselves enough to understand the actual experience of the Indigenous peoples from around the word. Because before the British went around conquering. There's no land that doesn't know the horrors of what is called colonization or dominant culture. Right here in our own backyards people really need to learn the history, they need to learn the truth of what happened to this land and to these people and how many people aren't even here anymore. […] So …there's a lot, there's a lot, people need to educate themselves of the truth of the history of this country and how Canada came to be, how Vancouver came to be.

> Sophie explains her own struggles in educating people and how youth are easier to reach:

> This is part of what I like about youth, is that if you explain to them what colonization is, it doesn't matter uhm what nation they come from, whether they're Indigenous or non- Indigenous, if you explain colonization, you explain to them racism, you explain to them sexism; hey get it. But adults don't seem to get it because it's been so pervasively seeped into them.

She points out a huge barrier to true education, the fact that we live in a culture that does not express the truth, as Hannah explains it. Our culture of denial does not acknowledge the wrong doings and the steps that need to be taken. While there are certainly some things being done, such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, there is a general denial that still encompasses us. Why? Because it is uncomfortable and also because it is complicated. We need to really look and try to understand. We need to truly absorb the truth rather than just acknowledging it and turning away again. Sophie explains that:

It's never just one thing, right? And this is part of why people have an issue understanding these issues. It's because they're so overlapping and they're so complex. They're simply too but people need to have things compartmentalized […]. And that's how education is given to us. So to give them complicated answers becomes difficult right?

So then how do we really educate people about the truth of this situation? To start with we need to deal with the guilt that people feel as a result of these issues, Hannah and Nicholas both emphasis this. Hannah explains:

But to my way of thinking, in the way that I work, I want to say these things and present it in a way. Uhm that even though there may be anger in, in the reality, and uhm...in the statements...the overall feeling is that uhm... I wanna present it in a way that actual opens minds and opens hearts, so we can all start to see things from the same perspective of the truth of the facts. Not the slanted propagandas BS, that has been spewed out to people for, for hundreds of years. So setting it up in a way that people can actually take it in and not feel guilt and not feel shamed but instead feel like they can actually make a difference, like they can actually be involved and feel good about it. Uhm coming at it from that perspective instead of pointing the big finger and "shame, shame, shame".

And this is why lots of people weren't aware of it because they got caught up in a system that kept them distracted and....now see there's another word in my language [   ] and it means to wake oneself up. Well I'm awake and also part of my job is to wake other people up but as gently as possible. I don't want people to feel guilt or shame. I want people to feel empowered and motivated and to know that, really, when we work as one we can make this exactly what we want and need it to be.

Nicholas explains:

And I think it's also important to deal with the guilt that the oil sector tries to force upon people. Uhm they repeatedly, in their public comments, in fact it's one of the most frequent refrains is, you know this is all about providing what people want,…not only that it's what they need, people tell us we need our cars, we need our natural gas heating and on and on and on and then that's couple with, so it's coupled with the underlying thought that they want to get into people's minds that you know what, you're the problem, we're not the problem, you are, cus you want these things and that leads to guilt…

This has to do with both the realities of climate change, as Nicholas explains, but also the realities of Canada and our acceptance of the truth of our origin. In her book *Living in Denial* Kari Norgaard (2011) discusses the connection between denial, cognitive dissonance, and privilege. She explains that:

Privilege is a precarious position. People occupying privileged social positions encounter "invisible paradoxes" –awkward, troubling moments that they seek to avoid, pretend not to have experienced (often as a matter of social tact), and forget as quickly as possible once those moments have passed (p. 217).

When people that have privilege are faced with uncomfortable information, information that threatens or questions this privilege they choose to look away. From my research I believe that this concept of privilege is going to be huge in regards to creating a successful movement against climate change, one where we are all working together. Everywhere in the world has its own history, a story of how that place was created. At this point in time we cannot change the fact that our history is unpleasant. We cannot go back and stop residential schools before they were created. We cannot stop the colonization and slaughter of a culture and people that our country is

based on. Regardless of the fact that we may want to. However, this does not mean that we should ignore this reality, especially since the repercussions of this history are continuing to effect people in a massive way today.

If we want to all work together, then we need to heal the relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples. With this, also comes things that need to be healed within male and female relationships and class relationships. Privilege plays a huge part in why we deny, we are uncomfortable with it. We are uncomfortable acknowledging that we have it and that it is at the expense of other people not having it. However, to work together we need to accept that it exists, why it exists, and do our best to repair relationships that have been broken. This starts with education and an acceptance of the truth, while dealing with the uncomfortable feelings that come from it.

Privilege has many levels, such as race, sex, and class, and they are all interconnected. There is also the concept of environmental privilege, which is the next type that needs to be dealt with and is of course connected to the other types. There is an unequal distribution of environmental harm, it effects the poor, women, and people of colour to a higher degree (Klein, 2014). Raoul Lievanos (2010) explains environmental privilege as "the taken-for-granted structures, practices, and ideologies that give a social group [a] disproportionately high level of access to environmental benefits" (p1, as cited in Norgaard, 2010). This privilege allows those living in certain areas, and usually of a certain race and social status, to not be faced with the environmental destruction that our lifestyles create.

This distancing between benefits and realities is closing. Klein (2014) discusses how "sacrifice zones" are now starting to encompass areas with people that usually benefit from this environmental privilege. For example, there was an oil spill from a cargo ship in Vancouver's English Bay (CBC, 2014), and with the proposed pipelines bringing more oil from the tar sands, we are no longer as environmentally privileged as we used to be. This can assist in bringing people together for a specific cause but it does not mean that other forms of privilege do not need to be dealt with. As discussed above, this movement has the possibility of being a unifying movement for many social movements. However, if we are to do this in the most successful way possible, these relationships need to be fixed and those with privilege need to acknowledge it.

Sophie speaks about her work in conflict resolution, as a way to get others involved:

So right now my thing is conflict resolution actually as a way of getting people involved. So I'm looking at ways in which, in Indigenous communities specifically because uh Glen Coulthard talks about politics of recognition and how Indigenous people need to stop looking to the government to validate our existence and to recognize us as nations but that instead we need to validate ourselves and work on the strength of our communities and so that's what I'm doing with conflict resolution and focusing on Indigenous peoples conflict because we were , we've always been able to resolve conflict and through the processes of colonization a lot of things have been interrupted as well as conflict resolution. So what I'm looking at is gaining strength within our Indigenous communities […]. And learning how to strengthen those communities through conflict resolution because we're always going to have conflict, and changing people's perspective on conflict. Conflict is not scary uhm and it shouldn't be scary, it's a normal part of life, it's a natural part of life and it's what makes us human and that we have ways to resolve conflict and to involve our personal narratives. Now make those traditions, or infuse that with traditional practices of resolving conflict to make relevant our understanding of conflict.

I believe that this is a huge part of creating a strong movement. While Sophie specifically works with Indigenous communities, which is of course an invaluable place to start, her concept of applying conflict resolution needs to expand to the rest of our society. The only way to address these larger issues of privilege, which results in strong emotions of guilt and anger, is to have effective conflict resolution. Part of the capitalist and colonialist culture of denial is to make everyone feel as if they are on their own, and that everyone should only look out for their own wellbeing. The first step to breaking through this culture is to start resolving the conflicts that keep us separated. Conflicts also represent the opportunity for action, so that conflict can be resolved (Christie, 1977).

This separation creates a feeling of powerlessness. Kathy explains: "I think people have been disempowered in that way, they don't think that they can a make a difference as individuals, they don't recognize their own power". While we can certainly make impacts individually, it is as a group that we are powerful and that is why all of the activists I interviewed emphasized this need to work together. This also means that along with conflict resolution is the need for a human connection. If we can see the shared humanity in all of us, then we will hopefully find it easier to resolve conflict. To find this shared humanity we need to connect to them on an emotional level or as Hannah describes a human level:

> …my own experience from this pretty small time frame of three years is that connecting with people on a human level. Me being willing to be vulnerable, me being willing to share uhm my experience. Ugly, uh traumatizing, painful, uhm…funny at times uhm. Me being able to, to just let the light of truth shine on what my experience is. Me opening up and allowing myself to be a human being. To connect with the human being in you. That enables you to do that same thing with somebody else. And when we actually have that, even just the tiniest crack of an open mind and an open heart then we actually get to see where, what, where is the heart in this person, what sits in that heart and then we can make the connection between all of these uhm…all of these challenges I guess. All of these realities. So that uhm as gently as possible the person is woken up and finds their own way to act.

Nicholas speaks about connecting to a primal instinct in people that gives them a desire to protect their young:

> I think that uh the card to play, the way that we'll be able to get these folks attention is to, is to connect people to that real primal thing that we have which is to protect the young. I think the same thing should be done with parents but with grandparents its particularly special because grandparents can look 40 or 50 years in terms of the future for those little ones growing up…Well I do strongly believe if you plat the card, if those parents are saying that they're looking out for [their child] by making money let's say in the oil sector, point out to them that the future is not looking bright because of what they do, for that child.

This primal instinct is something that is shown in Nicholas's own reasons for acting (his grandchildren) and is also mentioned by Raymond, who speaks about protecting the earth for his unborn children and grandchildren. This is a theme that Klein (2014) also finds in her research. She explains that "[t]he various toxic threats these communities are up against seem to be awakening impulses that are universal, even primal- whether it's the fierce drive to protect children from harm, or a deep connection to land that has been previously suppressed".

Perhaps the answer is, as Willox (2012) suggests, to use stories of mourning to encourage the connection and unification of others for the cause. The idea of concern for the future of

children means that there is concern over the quality of life these children will have. We are mourning the dismal future that we see them living in. This is something that should be and can be shared to other people. A mourning for an unpleasant future, where we use this mourning as a way to motivate action. This also connects to Hannah's belief that we need to connect to people on a human level, where we acknowledge and share the truth through story. Willox (2012) states that the sharing of our mourning through stories and art is a hugely important part of creating a movement against climate change. She discusses how people are already doing this, which we can see in Hannah's sharing of her stories to others, Raymond's sharing through his artwork, and all of the participants in their sharing their stories with me.

In many ways the movement past denial and into action reflects the 5 stages of grief as identified by Elisabeth Kubler Ross: Denial, Anger, Bargaining, depression, acceptance. The choice to not move past denial is in many ways a defense mechanism against these unpleasant emotions that lay between denial and acceptance. Norgaard found that "the desire to avoid unpleasant emotions and the activities of emotional management can also work against social movement participation" (p. 213). So to get others involved we need to help them deal with these emotions, except from the perspective of climate change the hope would be to move past acceptance and into action. If we get stuck at acceptance and don't consider the fact that we can change, then we resign ourselves to the destruction of the earth. As Cohen (2001) explains "…to live daily with this repugnant truth is neither desirable not possible. Not only is such 'acknowledgment' unhelpful, but it immediately mutates into the feeling that 'nothing can be done about things like this'" (p.250). From this point of view those in denial are actual on the spectrum of grief, so rather than seeing them as opposite to action we can see them at the first step towards acceptance and hopefully action (Jamail, 2015).

Joe Duggen recently started a blog called "Is this how you feel?" where he asks scientists to send in hand written letters describing their feelings about climate change. Not their scientific reasoning but how the realities surrounding these facts affect them on an emotional and personal level. Most of the scientists have gone through some or all of the stages of grief regarding the fact that our world is being effected by human caused climate change and there is not serious action being taken against it. However, rather than dwell in acceptance they seem devoted to implementing change and encouraging others to do the same. Many of them speak of hope. Such as Michael Mann who stated: "How do I feel about climate change? Well that's tough. You see, I feel several conflicting emotions. I feel concern, bemusement, frustration, disgust, anger, and hope. Yes, most of all, I feel hope".

The activists that I interviewed also expressed emotion, sometimes very intense emotion, in regards to these issues but they also expressed hope. This is some ways may be seen as their own sense of self-preservation, for if they accepted that there was no hope then they would have no reason to keep acting. Hannah expresses these emotions in a very honest way when she states:

> …I just have to find a way to take care of myself and still keep moving forward with all of these things. Otherwise I should just lie down and die because I will not live in a world where this is okay.

This is an expression of denial, she does not think that she will be able to live in a world that does not change. However, this is not denial in the same sense as I have been speaking about denial so far. Cohen (2001) explains that in these cases "[d]enial is not a neurotic defense mechanism, but a sane recognition that everyone else around is utterly insane" (p.262). From the perspective of climate change, this is a kind of denial that we need. We need to believe that it is possible to change because the way that we are living is insane. So we continue to have hope that we can get others involved and work towards this goal.

Once we have moved past the stage of denial that makes us feel guilty, and started to really educated ourselves, resolve conflict, and embrace the fact that we are all in this together, we have to find empowerment. As leaders in the movements, we have to make others feel empowered. They have to feel as if they can do something and that their actions matter. Cohen (2001) explains that we need visible cultural channels which "…validate the sense that something *can* be done, inform you *what* this something is and enable you to do it" (p.250). This is significantly important in regards to climate change, and all of the other issues that are combined with it. If we successfully get people to acknowledge what is happening, if people absorb the truth, and then have no outlet to change the way things are, it will not be a positive experience. Of course there will always be negative emotions associated with acknowledging privilege, an unpleasant history, and the fact that we are destroying our world. However, this is also the point where people will want to make a difference and there needs to be things in place to let them do that. Nicholas explains how is can be overwhelming, especially for youth, to face the challenge of climate change:

> I sometimes worry about folks, particularly younger folks, not so much your age but let's say young teens and so forth and their struggling just to kind of figure out who the heck they are and school and they have this undercurrent of concern that they keep hearing about, that the future of the planet could go up in smoke. And uhm one of the concerns I have there is that it could be such an overwhelming concern that you know, they just kind of ignore it or tuck their heads in the sand because they can't kind of bear to think about it. They don't have a sense of what they can do.

To get people involved then we need to help them feel like they can make a difference, like they have the power to make a change and that their actions do matter. Both Nicholas and Hannah speak about showing people that any way they can help is important, no matter what that is or how small their action is.

> …the way to really do it is to help them understand that they can do things and that uhm no matter how small their contribution it's part of the larger whole, and it's not as if they have to personally solve this issue and go to every rally under the sun and uh ditch their schooling in order to do this. No do what you can, in the context of your life, but everybody's got to keep working out their lives. So I think that if that sort of thematic message could be there for the young, so that they don't, they feel that they can plug in but not get overwhelmed and if folks can talk, if we can get to them about how, you know what if we can do these four things it's going to cut carbon emission by that amount and that's going to help us head off this 2 degree emission rise issue.

Raymond explains how he empowers the youth in his community specifically, through canoe journeys. These journeys involve both teachings and showing the youth that they are needed and they are capable.

> We have youth oriented, youth journeys that we do every summer, and part of the reason for that is uhm to get our youth out in, out into these canoes because uh one it teaches leadership, uh youth who are really shy about who they are…uhm are often coming from uhm in situations where their choices are silence, whether that being the secondary or primary uh education systems, or at homes, or on the streets, or wherever. So we bring them, we take them out on these canoes and we say you know what we're…we're in this together, I'm here with you. If we don't work together we're not going to get from a to b. And that it really becomes important for you as a member, an important member of our community to take on the role of a leader. Because…we need you more than ever.

After the empowerment, he also acknowledges that it is necessary to let them find their own path, their own way to be involved. He sees this as a way to build strength because everyone has their own identity and passion. This can be connected to his own passion for his art, a path that has allowed him to connect his work to his activism. Similarly the other participants speak about both allowing others to find their own way to participate but also how their chosen path led them be involved. For Kathy her science led her to understand the threat of climate change and then act. For Nicholas his work in the government made him into a tempered activist which then led him to his work now. For Hannah this was finding her culture again. For Sophie her focus on conflict resolution is integrated into her activism.

I believe that the message from this is that we do not need to change who we are to become active. While there are cases where the people I interviewed stepped out of their comfort zones because they felt they had no choice, their activism originates from something that they are passionate about, somewhere they felt at home. Activism is not just going to protests, laying down in front of bulldozers, and making a fuss. There are many things that go into a movement, and if everyone is involved, then we can all focus on what we are passionate about and together we can make real change. There are times when we need to step out of our comfort zone, and doing this is not a bad thing, but leading lives we enjoy is important.

I am not at all suggesting that the activists I interviewed do not enjoy their lives. However, it is obvious that they are all stretching themselves as far as possible to try and get more people in this cause. Kathy speaks about trying to get her friends involved:

> I think that's a really, really hard problem. I struggle with it all the time. I have a hard time just with good friends even, getting them to be active. Uhm they say "O good for you, glad you're doing that", I just look at them and shake my head [incline in pitch] because I can't do it all myself or the few people that are doing it. We need everybody doing stuff and I don't know what it's going to take to wake people up.

This is not an easy process and it is obviously a struggle for every person that I interviewed. However, it is completely necessary. Once we have helped people break through denial, dealt with the negative emotions, and empowered them by giving avenues towards activism, we should have successfully strengthened the movement. At some point we need acknowledgment of climate change and the realities surrounding it to be the norm. We have the ability to use climate change, as Klein (2014) explains, as a way to repair many of the things that are broken in our world. To do this we need collective acknowledgment and collective action. Klein (2014) explains that when social movements are successful in making huge changes it's a result of "…activism becom[ing] an entirely normal activity throughout society….During extraordinarily historical moments – both world wars, the aftermath of the Great Depression, or

the peak of the civil rights era – the usual categories dividing 'activists' and 'regular people' became meaningless because the project of changing society was so deeply woven into the project of life. Activists were, quite simply, everyone" (p. 459). This is what we need and is also expressed by the activists that I interviewed. Kathy's dislike for the word environmentalism was that "…any intelligent, thinking, person, is an environmentalist and if they're not uhm then they're not thinking clearly about the issues". From the perspective of climate change this is certainly true.

This analysis has provided the basis for a deeper understanding of how a person comes to be active, specifically around environmental issues. It is clear that childhood influences, chosen career or educational paths, and moments of awareness where they could no longer deny, play a role in pathways to activism. The framing of their activism from many different perspectives provides additional emphasis on the fact that this is an amalgamation of social movements, with a leading voice from Indigenous peoples, as Klein (2014) suggests when speaking about Blockadia. While there are certainly avenues for getting others involved, it is not an easy process as it involves education on both the realities of climate change and the historical and social construction of our society. Dealing with emotions connected privilege and climate change means that care needs to be taken to react to these emotions in a constructive way. When a person has acknowledged the unfortunate reality, they need to be presented with a way forward. With positive action they can take, so that they are not overwhelmed. My own journey to awareness and action in many ways mirrors the pathways those I interviewed took and their ideas on how to wake people up.

My own journey down the pathway to activism

Writing this has been, and continues to be, both an uncomfortable and empowering experience for me. I considered myself an informed, engaged, and active person, and I have always been concerned with environmental issues. So when I decided to look at activism around these issues I thought it would be a piece of cake. When I was a kid I used to volunteer at the SPCA, and throughout my teen years, even those unpleasant teen years, I was planting trees. Camping, hiking, and other outdoor activities have always been a huge part of my life. Also, I have always been an activist of sorts. In my elementary school the 7th graders played floor hockey after school on Friday. When I reached 7th grade I was informed that only boys could play, but a petition signed by a lot of parents and students quickly changed that. My relationship with my grandfather, an outspoken and interesting man, shaped who I was as a child and who I became. He and my parents instilled a desire in me to "do the right thing", to always voice my opinion, and stand up for myself. My mother always said that one day I would be hanging off a Greenpeace boat.

I am not saying this to promote myself as some wonderful activist but to build a platform to discuss the extreme discomfort I had when facing my own denial. Writing this has made me face the fact that there is a lot I do not know, even regarding climate change, which I always accepted as real and knew there needed to be action. What I learned is that I was in complete denial about the fact that it needs to be happening now. I engaged in a lot of the methods of denial that Klein (2014) speaks about during her discussion of "looking away". I looked, I even changed some of my actions, but then I did not take real action. I thought that taking care of local parks, buying organic food, not eating meat, and other "environmental" actions were enough.

This has been my moment of awareness; my realization that I can no longer wait to act. I cannot stress enough how uncomfortable it was. When I really looked and absorbed all this information, the impending doom that we are facing as a result of our actions, it was an emotional rollercoaster. I felt guilt at the fact that I had not acted enough. I felt fear at the fact that this is a huge problem and that I am only one person. I felt angry at the fact that we had not done anything yet; anger at myself, my family, my community, my country, my government, and the world in general. I also felt depressed at times. There were moments when I thought that nothing could be done, and where that sent me into an incredibly depressed mood. This was all enhanced by the fact that it seemed like everyone around me was content with continuing to look away.

Then I saw a poster for what I thought was an information session about the Kinder Morgan Transmountain pipeline. This was an issue I had been following very closely. One of my moments of most extreme discomfort was writing a literature review on these issues, while the protests at Burnaby Mountain were happening, and not being on the mountain. I decided to attend, and instead of an information session, I found about six people sitting around a table discussing how to take action against the pipeline: I had walked into my first PIPE-UP meeting. This was where I was presented with avenues to change and I had also found people that shared my desire to create this change. This was the moment when I began to feel empowered. Over the last few months I have been involved in planning events, doing presentations, and in general

trying to educate and get people to be active. While I certainly could have looked for and found ways to act against climate change, PIPE-UP presented me with a clear avenue, at a grass roots level, where I could envision the impact we would have.

My empowerment was enhanced when I began my interviews with these amazingly passionate activists. When they were speaking I found connections between their stories and emotions and my own. This empowerment led me to change the way I interact with the world. I do see my activism as a reason to wake up in the morning, and the people in my life are huge motivations for that. I also found that when I became active and started to talk more openly about these things, the people around me reacted in a positive way. They listen and engage in conversation. We discuss climate change and all the issues that go along with it. My parents, my sister and a couple of my close friends have also come to rallies and events with me. The more I talk to people and connect with them, as Hannah says, on a human level, the more I see their walls coming down. They stop defending themselves against the truth and start thinking of ways to act. This, out of everything, is the most empowering moment, when I see someone start to break through this culture of denial.

My denial encompasses more than just climate change however, as I am still in the process of accepting my settler status. My background/heritage is a mess of different things, including Indigenous. We do not know exactly how much, or where the roots are from, but they are there. However, I did not grow up in the culture, or even as being an Indigenous person, since I did not know about this part of me until the end of elementary school. I was always white, or the more politically correct term "Caucasian". I benefited from the privileges of appearing this way. Over the years, as I learned about the history of Canada, I clung to this part of my heritage because it allowed to deny my settler status. While this has been a journey that has been happening longer than it took me to do this research, it was magnified while acknowledging the huge role that privilege plays in creating a more just and sustainable world. I am learning to embrace both my Indigenous and settler heritage, and the paradoxical problems that come with this identity. This is a long, most likely never ending process, and the question that now needs answering, is what next?

Discussion

In the face of climate change academics need to change the focus and scope of their research. Green criminology is a useful starting point for discussions about environmental issues and their global impact on the environment, people, and the world in general. My research has expanded beyond what is normally looked at within green criminology. There is a general understanding that social change needs to take place and that a lot of the momentum for this change will come from grass roots initiatives. White (2011) discusses the need for transnational activism, and explains that "[c]riminologists among others must insist upon the protection of democratic spaces within which popular struggles can occur" (p.155). I also think that as criminologists we should be concerned with creating a solution, and through this research I am continuing the discussion of solutions to the problem of climate change. That solution being the creation of a strong social movement.

As Cohen (2001) suggests, in our culture denial is the norm. We live in a capitalist society that enforces denial of our effect on the earth and what that means for our future. What I am interested in, is understanding how people break through this culture of denial. I have approached the problem with an interest in knowing personal stories because I believe that there is great power in story, as I discussed throughout this study. What I have learned, as I expected, is that there is not one path to activism. My participants shared some similarities in their paths, their upbringing, education/work, and a moment of awareness played a part in where they are today. All of them came at the issue from a different perspective though, speaking to the fact that this really is a movement that is made up of different movements.

The effects of childhood is important, since we need the next generation to be active. In *The Last Child in the Woods* Louv (2005) discusses the disconnect between children and nature, as a result of the way that we live today. He presents the concern that we may not see as many environmentalists in the next generation. Raising children in a way where they care about the environment is important, however, it was surprising to me that more of the participants did not mention this connection in their own life. What my research suggests is that much of their activism stems from their own suffering. I cannot claim that this is a universal truth but it was the truth for some of my participants. It was not their only reason for acting but for many of them their experience as a woman, Indigenous person, or Indigenous woman, is the platform for their action.

This is dangerous. We do not want people to have to face suffering to become active. We need to find other ways to engage with youth to make them want to be active later in life, and also to engage with adults to be active now. The activists I interviewed had their own ideas for how this could be done, but it is one area that needs further investigation. While we can certainly accept that issues are framed from what we know, we do not want only those who suffer to be active. This of course speaks to privilege and how it connects to denial. Nicholas did not face any adverse situations, and Hannah, while a woman, has not faced the same things as the Indigenous people I spoke to. I have also become truly active and I did not face any suffering as a child. So it is possible, and we need to find ways to do it.

From their childhood these activists then went on to education and careers that lead them to a moment of awareness. Education here is meant in a broader sense than just post-secondary. Before their moment of awareness they were still involved in stages of denial. Similar to myself, they were aware but still convinced they did not have to act. Their moments of awareness varied but they all resulted in an inability to continue to deny, they had to act. Their activism is now who they are. While they sometimes found it frustrating, they always found it empowering and rewarding. This research speaks to the fact that activists really are just "normal" people who have experienced these moments of awareness.

My research also shows that the movement against climate change is an amalgamation of other social movements. Every activist had their own reason for acting. These roots included humanism, environmentalism, feminism, Indigenous rights, and anti-capitalism. As Klein (2014) had suggested, this is a continuation of movements, where climate action can allow us to all gain the justice, equality, and freedom that we desire. To do this though we need to repair and create relationships, built on mutual respect. This means that those with privilege must acknowledge it, which is understandably uncomfortable, and do their best to create change. The truth about the history of Canada and the current realities of our society must be accepted. We must break through the culture of denial created by capitalism, neoliberalism, and colonialism, which ignores the realities of injustice within Canada, and climate change.

Indigenous peoples play a huge role in this movement, through treaty rights, world views, and sheer people power. It is essential that this relationship is done responsibly and respectfully. Klein (2014) calls attention to the fact that relationships need to be mutual. Colonization cannot continue through the movement, instead we need to use this as an opportunity to repair relationships. Not everywhere in the world will face the same issues, but in British Columbia this is a huge hurtle. The first step in creating a healthy and strong movement is to stop denying the effects that colonization has had on Indigenous peoples, and start creating or repairing these relationships.

There is no doubt that this is uncomfortable. Moving past any kind of denial is difficult but resolving conflict is essential. Sophie speaks to her work in conflict resolution within Indigenous communities, and I believe that this is important throughout all communities. We need to work on resolving conflict, in a healthy way, so that we can really start to work together. How do we do this? By connecting on that human level. By engaging in real, emotional conversations, where we admit that we are afraid but use each other to feel empowered. There is power in numbers.

If we can heal relationships, move past this denial, and deal with the uncomfortable feelings, then we can start to empower people by giving them avenues to act. This is where group activities and organizations such as PIPE-UP come in, because people need to see that there is a way forward. This is the point where we start to see others become involved and activism becomes the norm. I am optimistic in thinking that this may be where we are right now. We have a core group of very dedicated people and the conversation is growing every day. People are coming into the movement who perhaps would not have in other circumstances. Klein (2014) discusses how the expanded areas of sacrifice have forced people into acknowledgement and

action, and I believe this is true. However, we need to be careful that we engage with one another in a respectful way. We need to resolve conflict at the same time that we deal with climate change, or else we may not have the type social movement that we hope for.

Social movements are the reason that societies change. They start with a few "radical" people and then slowly everyone joins in, and what was once impossible is seen as the only way (Klein, 2014). The part that frightens me is that none of these movements have happened without violence. Even in situations where the people who were acting were dedicated to non-violence. Often it is not the activists that initiate violence, it is the state. This is somewhat unavoidable because we are threatening the way the state is run; we are threatening capitalism, neoliberalism, and colonialism. While I fear possible violence from the state, I know I can do very little to avoid it if it happens.

However, we are also creating a movement that is built up of many other movements, some who do not always see eye to eye. We want everyone to work together but we cannot ignore the fact that not everyone gets along. This is why we need conflict resolution. We need to make sure that nothing divides the movement, and that those who are working together are doing so in a healthy way, that does not threaten violence. When we are successful there will be many decisions that need to be made about how we are going to change. These opportunities may come suddenly and if we are not united as a group then we will not face them in a constructive and unified way. This is not to say that we have to agree on everything, this is not possible. As Sophie explained conflict is natural, but if we do not deal with underlying causes of anger and guilt, then when these opportunities come to work together to create a better future, they will not result in the society we envision.

So what next? There are plenty of areas where I can see avenues for continued research. The connection between Indigenous culture/people and the environmental/climate movement, the connection between feminism/women and the movement, how to us conflict resolution to strengthen a movement, social movements as the 'solution' to systemic crime, and are people who suffer more likely to act, just to name a few. The problem is that we do not have a significant amount of time to be doing academic research. Climate action needs to happen now and it needs to be a collective action. I can see how this could be done. I see the pathway to getting people involved, but it is not going to be easy. Getting people to truly move past denial and start to act is a long process but one that needs to happen soon. We need to engage with Cohen's (2001 & 2010) concept of denial to create a well-deserved moral panic with in our society around climate change.

For me what is next is hands on, out in the community work, focusing on strengthening the movement. I know this is where I need to put my energy. This feeling has been enhanced by the oil spill in English Bay (Bell, 2015; Kresnyak, 2015), where the government has failed to respond effectively, there is a lack of responsibility being taken, and volunteers have been cleaning the beach instead of professionals; and yet again I am writing instead of being involved. Not to say that more academic work is not in my future, or that it is not important. However, in the face of the climate crisis, if we cannot get more people to break through denial, accept the

truth, and work together to take action against climate change, then as Hannah suggests, what would be the point of getting out of bed?

Works Cited

Alacron, K. (April 11, 2015). Act on Climate March draws 25, 000 to Quebec streets. *Vancouver Observer.* Retrieved April 18. 2015 from http://www.vancouverobserver.com/national-observer/act-climate-march-draws-thousands-quebec-streets

Amnesty International. (November 23, 2012). Nauru camp a human rights catastrophe with no end in sight. Retrieved December 7, 2014 from http://www.amnesty.org.au/news/comments/30533/

Amster, R. (2006). Perspectives on Ecoterrorism: Catalysts, Conflations, and Casualties. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 9(3), 287–301. doi:10.1080/10282580600827991

Bandura, A. (1982). The psychology of chance encounters and life paths. *American Psychologist,* 37, 747-755.

Bell, W. (2015). Harper at fault? English Bay oil crisis took 3 years to build. *Vancouver Observer*. Retrieved April 19, 2015 from http://www.vancouverobserver.com/opinion/harper-fault-english-bay-oil-crisis-took-3-years-build

Biello, D. (November 12, 2014). Everything You Need to Know about the U.S.–China Climate Change Agreement. *Scientific American.* Retrieved November 30, 2014 from http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/everything-you-need-to-know-about-the-u-s-china-climate-change-agreement/

Bougon, M. (1986). *Using the self-Q interview process*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Boykoff, J., 2007. *Beyond bullets: the suppression of dissent in the United States*. Oakland: AK Press.

Brisman, A. (2010). The Indiscriminate criminalization of environmentally beneficial activities. In R. White (ed.), *Global environmental Harm: Criminological Perspectives*, (pp.161-192). Cullompton, Devon ; Portland, Or: Willan.

Bronskill, J. (March 17, 2015). CSIS helped government prepare for expected Northern Gateway protests. CBC News. Retrieved March 7, 2015 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/csis-helped-government-prepare-for-expected-northern-gateway-protests-1.2997913

Brook, D. (1998). Environmental genocide: Native Americans and toxic waste. *American Journal of Evonomics and Sociology*, 57(1), pp. 105-113.Carson, R. (1962). Silent Spring. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Brown, W. (2003). Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy. *Theory and Event*, 7(1), 37-59. doi: 10.1353/tae.2003.0020

Brown, W. (2006). American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism, and De-Democratization. *Political Theory,* 34(6), 690-714.

CBC News. (2014). Mount Polley mine spill 78% larger than 1st estimates. Retrieved December 2, 2014 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/mount-polley-mine-spill-78-larger-than-1st-estimates-1.2755974

CBC News. (April 9, 2015). Toxic fuel spill clean-up underway in Vancouver's English Bay. Retrived April 9, 2015 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/toxic-fuel-spill-clean-up-underway-in-vancouver-s-english-bay-1.3026227

Chase, S. & Galloway, G. (December 17, 2014). Harper continues to resist calls for missing Aboriginal women inquiry. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved December 17, 2014 from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/harper-continues-to-resist-calls-for-missing-aboriginal-women-inquiry/article22133991/

Chawla, L. (1999). Life paths into effective environmental action. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 31(1), 15.

Chung, E. (December 1, 2014). Canada's climate inaction leaves it 'increasingly isolated' ahead of COP 20. *CBC News*. Retrieved December 9, 2014 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/canada-s-climate-inaction-leaves-it-increasingly- isolated-ahead-of-cop-20-1.2853774

Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as Property. *British Journal of Criminology*, 17(1), 1–15.

Connell, R. (2001). *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Cubasch, U., D. Wuebbles, D. Chen, M.C. Facchini, D. Frame, N. Mahowald, and J.-G. Winther. (2013). Introduction. In: Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.) *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA

Cohen, S. (2001). *States of denial: Knowing about atrocities and suffering*. Malden, MA; Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Cohen, S. (2011). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York: Routledge.

Collard, A. & Contrucci, J. (1989). *Rape of the Wild: Man's Violence Against Animals and the Earth*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press

Commisso, C. (October 15, 2013). Canada faces a 'crisis' on Aboriginal reserves: UN investigator. *CTV News*. Retrieved December 17, 2014 from http://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/canada-faces-a-crisis-on-aboriginal-reserves-un-investigator-1.1497612

Critical Infrastructure Team. (2014). Criminal Threat to the Canadian Petroleum Industry. Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Retrieved from http://www.desmog.ca/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/RCMP%20-%20Criminal%20Threats%20to%20Canadian%20Petroleum%20Industry.pdf

Darmarajah, S. (November 24, 2014). David Suzuki's daughter and granddaughter arrested protesting Kinder Morgan. Vancouver Observer. Retrieved from http://www.vancouverobserver.com/news/david-suzuki-s-daughter-and-granddaughter-arrested-protesting-kinder-morgan-burnaby-mountain

Diabo, R. & Pasternak, S. (June 7, 2011). First Nations Under Surveillance. The Media Co-op. Retrieved March 28, 2015 from http://www.mediacoop.ca/story/first-nations-under-surveillance/7434

Doherty, B. (November 28, 2014). Female asylum seeker allegedly fell pregnant after being raped on Nauru. *The Guardian.* Retrieved December 7, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2014/nov/28/female-asylum-seeker-allegedly-fell-pregnant-raped-nauru

Farrell, P. (February 23, 2014). Nauru riot blamed on 'uncertainty' about processing asylum claims. *The Guardian.* Retrieved December 7, 2014 from http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/feb/23/nauru-riot-blamed-uncertainty

Fractured Land. (n.d.). Retrieved December 1, 2014 from http://fracturedland.com/

Friedrichs, D. & Friedrichs, J. (2002). The World Bank and crimes of globalization: a case study. *Social Justice,* 29(1-2), 13-36. In R. White (ed.), *Environmental Crime: A Reader* (pp. 131-150). Devon, UK; Portland: Willan Publishing.

Fumano, D. (2015, June 4). Kinder Morgan says 34 ships a month would visit Vancouver harbour if pipeline expansion is OK'd. *The Province.* Retrieved June 6, 2015 from http://www.theprovince.com/news/Kinder+Morgan+says+ships+month+would+visit+Vancouver+harbour+pipeline+expansion/11109965/story.html

Giroux, H. (2013). The Disimagination Machine and the Pathologies of Power. *Symploke*, 21(1-2), 257-269. Doi: 10.1353/sym.2013.0040

Glasbeek, H. J. (2002). *Wealth by stealth: Corporate crime, corporate law, and the perversion of democracy.* Toronto [Ont.]: Between the Lines.

Government of Canada. (2011). Building Resilience Against terrorism: Canada's Counter Terrorism Strategy. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada. Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/sp-ps/PS4-104-2011-eng.pdf

Greenpeace. (n.d.) History. Retrieved December 16, 2014 from http://www.greenpeace.org/canada/en/About-us/History/

Green, P., Ward, T. & McConnachie, K. (2007). Logging and Legality: environmental crime, civil society, and the state. *Social Justice*, 34(2), 94-110. In R. White (ed.), *Environmental Crime: A Reader* (pp. 116-130). Devon, UK; Portland: Willan Publishing.

Groves, T. (October 10, 2012). Canada's Spy Groups Divulge Secret Intelligence to Energy Companies. The Dominion. Retrieved March 2, 1015 from http://www.dominionpaper.ca/articles/4640

Halsey, M., & White, R. (1998). Crime, ecophilosophy and environmental harm. *Theoretical Criminology*, 2(3), 345-371. doi:10.1177/1362480698002003003. In R. White (ed.), *Environmental Crime: A Reader,* (pp.27-49). Devon, UK; Portland: Willan Publishing.

Hannigan, J. (2006). *Environmental Sociology* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.

Hendrix, C. S., & Salehyan, I. (2012). Climate change, rainfall, and social conflict in Africa. *Journal of Peace Research*, *49*(1), 35–50. doi:10.1177/0022343311426165

Herron, J. (November 10, 2011). Energy Agency Warns Governments to Take Action Against Global Warming. *The Wall Street Journal.* Retrieved April 5, 2015 from http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052970204358004577027542955102790

Hilderbrandt, A. (June 19, 2013). Half of First Nations children live in poverty. *CBC News Canada*. Retrieved December 17, 2014 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/half-of-first-nations-children-live-in-poverty-1.1324232

Hill, G. (2010). *The 500 Years of Resistance Comic Book*. Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press

Hönisch, B., Ridgwell, A., Schmidt, D., Thomas, E., Gibbs, S., Sluijs, A., Zeebe, R., Kump, L., Martindale, R., Greene, S., Kiessling, W., Ries, J., Zachos, J., Royer, D., Barker, S., Marchitto, T., Moyer, R., Pelejero, C., Ziveri, P., Foster, G., & Williams, B. (2012). The geological record of ocean acidification. *Science*, 335 (6072), 1058–63. doi:10.1126/science.1208277

Hopkins, E. (2000). *Industrialization and Society: A Social History, 1830-1951*. London, GBR: Routledge.

Human Rights Watch. (2013). *Those Who Take Us Away: Abusing Policing and Failures in the Protection of Indigenous Women and Girls in Northern British Columbia, Canada*. Retrieved December 17, 2013 from   http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/canada0213webwcover_0.pdf

Humes, J. (September 25, 2013). Suzuki: Harper is building prisons for eco-activists. *Winnipeg Sun.* Retrieved December 9, 2014 from http://www.winnipegsun.com/2013/09/25/suzuki-harper-is-building-prisons-for-eco-activists

Hurley & Shogren. (1997). Environmental Conflicts and the SLAPP. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management,* 33, 253-273.

Iadicola, P. (2010) The centrality of empire in the study of state crime and violence. In W. Chambliss, R. Michalowski, & R. Kramer. (eds). *State Crime in a Global Age.* Cullompton, Devon; Portland, Or: Willan Pub.

IPCC. (2013). Summary for Policymakers. In: T, Stocker, D. Qin, G. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P. Midgley (eds.). *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

International Energy Agency. (2011). World Energy Outlook 2011. Retrieved April 5, 2015 from http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/WEO2011_WEB.pdf

International Energy Agency. (2014). World Energy Outlook 2014: Executive Summary. Retrieved April 5, 2015 from   http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/WEO_2014_ES_English_WEB.pdf

Jamail, D. (2015, January 25). Mourning Our Planet: Climate Scientists Share Their Grieving Process. *Truthout*. Retrieved February 4, 2015, from http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/28702-mourning-our-planet-climate-scientists-share-their-grieving-process

Keller, J. (November 27, 2014). Burnaby Mountain Protest Charges Dropped. *The Huffington Post*. Retreived April 10, 2015 from http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2014/11/27/burnaby-mountain-protest_n_6233274.html

Kimmel, M. S., & Ferber, A. L. (2010). *Privilege: A reader*. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Klein, N. (2014). *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*.

Kovach, M. E. (2010). Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts (Reprint edition.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.

Kresnyak, D. (2015). Former Coast Guard commander casts doubt on 'excellent' spill cleanup claim. *Vancouver Observer*. Retrieved April 19, 2015 from http://www.vancouverobserver.com/national-observer/former-coast-guard-commander-   casts-doubt-claims-excellent-spill-cleanup

Lane, P. (1998). Ecofeminism Meets Criminology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 2(2), 235-248.

Lievanos, R. (2010). A Minority Perspective is Limited: Environmental Privilege and Surface Water Hazards in an Impaired Estuary. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers, April 18, Washington, DC.

Ling, C. (2014). The Manifestations and Symptoms of Ecofeminism. *Studies in Sociology of Science*, 5(3), 95-100. DOI: 10.3968/5229

Louv, R. (2005). *Last child in the woods: Saving our children from nature-deficit disorder*. Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill.

Luba, F. (November 24, 2014).11-year-old Kinder Morgan pipeline protesters escorted off Burnaby Mountain. The Province. Retrieved from http://www.theprovince.com/news/year+Kinder+Morgan+pipeline+protesters+escorted+Burnaby+Mountain+video/10407436/story.html

Lynch, M. & Stretesky, P. (2003). The meaning of green: contrasting criminological perspectives. *Theoretical Criminology,* 7(2), 217-238. In R. White (ed.), *Environmental Crime: A Reader,* (pp. 84-102). Devon, UK; Portland: Willan Publishing.

Lynch, M. & Stretesky. (2010). Global Warming, global crime: a green criminological perspective. In R. White (ed.), Global environmental Harm: Criminological Perspectives, (pp. 62-84). Cullompton, Devon ; Portland, Or: Willan.

McCarthy, S. (February 10, 2012). Ottawa's new anti-terrorism strategy lists eco-extremists as threats. *The Globe and Mail.* Retrieved December 9, 2014 from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/ottawas-new-anti-terrorism-strategy-lists- eco-extremists-as-threats/article533522/

McDiarmid, M. (November 28, 2014). Climate change survey reveals Canadians' fear for future generations. *CBC News.* Retrieved December 9, 2014 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/climate-change-survey-reveals-canadians-fears-for-future-generations-1.2852605

Merchant, C. (1990). Environmental Ethics and Political Conflict: A View from California. *Environmental Ethics*, 12(1), 45-86. In R. White (ed.), *Environmental Crime: A Reader* (pp. 103-115). Devon, UK; Portland: Willan Publishing.

Millar, M. (November 19, 2013). Harper government's extensive spying on anti-oil sands groups revealed in FOI's. Vancouver Observer. Retrieved March 17, 2015 from   http://www.vancouverobserver.com/politics/harper-governments-extensive-spying-anti-oilsands-groups-revealed-fois

Monaghan & Walby. (2012). Making up 'Terror Identities': security intelligence, Canada's Integrated Threat Assessment Centre and social movement suppression. Policing & Society, 22(2), 133-151.

Monahan, T. & Palmer, N. (2009). The emerging politics of DHS fusion centers. Security Dialogue, 40 (6), 617-636.

Moreau, J. (2014). More arrests on Burnaby Mountain as Kinder Morgan moves in. Burnaby Now. Retrieved from http://www.burnabynow.com/news/more-arrests-on-burnaby-mountain-as-kinder-morgan-moves-in-1.1616359

MtPleasant, J. (January 29, 2014). Ernie Louttit and the investigation into "Starlight tours". *Two Row Times.* Retrieved December 17, 2014 from https://www.tworowtimes.com/news/national/ernie-louttit-and-the-investigation-into-starlight-tours/

Nagy, R., & Sehdev, R. K. (2012). Introduction: Residential schools and decolonization. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 27(1), 67-73. doi:10.3138/cjls.27.1.067

National Snow and Ice Data Center (2012). Arctic sea ice extent settles at record seasonal minimum. *Arctic Sea Ice News and Analysis*, September 19, 2012.   http://nsidc.org/arcticseaicenews/2012/09/arctic-sea-ice-extent-settles-at-record-seasonal-   minimum/

McCarthy, T. (2015). California governor tells climate change deniers to wake up. *The Guardian*. Retrieved April 18, 2015 from http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/apr/05/california-governor-drought-climate-change-dianne-feinstein

Monture, P. (2006). Standing Against Canadian Law: Naming Omissions of Race, Culture and Gender. In E. Comack (ed.). *Locating Law,* p. 73-93

Noorgard, K. M. (2011). *Living in Denial: Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense & Chief Financial Officer. (2014). United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request Overview. *Department of Defense United States of America.* Retrieved December 9, 2014 from http://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/fy2015/fy2015_Budget_Request_Overview_Book.pdf

Okonta, I., & Douglas, O. (2003). *Where Vultures Feast: Shell, Human Rights, and Oil in the Niger Delta*. Verso.

Ogilvie, C. (2012). BC's Huge Gamble- short film – Enbridge Northern Gateway Pipeline. *You Tube.* Retrieved December 16, 2014 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UgvY6zBc3q4

Proulx, C. (2014). Colonizing Surveillance: Canada Constructs and Indigenous Terror Threat. Anthropologica. 56(1), 83-100.

Saul, J. R. (2014). *The comeback.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada; New York, New York, U.S.A: Viking.

Schetzer, A. (December 6, 2014). Manus Island detainees on hunger strike, refugee advocates say. *The Age National.* Retrieved December 7, 2014 from http://www.theage.com.au/national/manus-island-detainees-on-hunger-strike-refugee-advocates-say-20141206-121mj3.html

Schwartz, D. & Gollom, M. (October 19, 2013). N.B. fracking protests and the fight for Aboriginal rights. *CBC News*. Retrieved April 10, 2015 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/n-b-fracking-protests-and-the-fight-for-aboriginal-rights-1.2126515

Schwendinger, H. & Schwendinger, J. (1975). Defenders of Order or Guardians of human rights?, in I. Taylor, P. Walton, & J. Young (eds) *Critical Criminology,* 113 – 146. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Seeds, M., & Backman, D. (2012). *The Solar System* (8 edition.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Simon, D. (2000). Corporate environmental crimes and social inequality: new directions for environmental justice research. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 43(4), 633-645.

Smith, D. & Vivekananda. (2007). *A Climate of Conflict: The links Between Climate Change, Peace and Ware.* London: International Alert.

South, N. (2010). The ecocidal tendencies of late modernity: transnational crime, social exclusion, victims and rights. In R. White (ed.), *Global environmental Harm: Criminological Perspectives*, (pp.228-247). Cullompton, Devon ; Portland, Or: Willan.

Stewart, K. (2015). Caring about the climate is not a crime in Canada. Yet. Greenpeace Canada. Retrieved March 28, 2015 from http://www.greenpeace.org/canada/en/Blogentry/caring-about-the-climate-is-not-a-crime-in-ca/blog/52134/

Sutherland, E. (1949). *White Collar Crime*. New York: Dryden Press

Tahirali, J. (May 23, 2015). Changing climate brings ticks, Lyme disease into Canada. *CTV News*. Retrieved June 6, 2015, from http://www.ctvnews.ca/health/changing-climate-brings-ticks-lyme-disease-into-canada-1.2387044

Takemura, N. (2010). The criticality of global environmental crime and the response of chaos criminology. In R. White (ed.), *Global environmental Harm: Criminological Perspectives,* (pp.210-227). Cullompton, Devon ; Portland, Or: Willan.

The AAAS Climate Science Panel (n.d.). What We Know: The Reality, Risks, and Response to Climate Change. The American Association for the Advancement of Science. Retrieved from http://whatweknow.aaas.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/whatweknow_website.pdf

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (n.d.). Our Mandate. Retrieved December 17, 2014 from http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=7

Tindall, D. (August 12, 2013). Twenty years after the protest, what we learned from Clayoquot Sound. The Globe and Mail. Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/twenty-years-after-the-protest-what-we-learned-from-clayoquot-sound/article13709014/?page=all

Troian, M. (November 10, 2013). Mi'kmaq Anti-Fracking Protest Brings Women to the Front Lines to Fight for Water. *Indian Country*. Retrieved March 29, 2015 from   http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2013/11/10/mikmaq-anti-fracking-protest-   brings-women-front-lines-fight-water-152169

Uggen & Inderbitzen. (2010). Public Criminologies. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 9(4), 725-749.

United Nations Environment Program. (2009). *Climate and Trade Policies in a Post-2012 World.* Retrieved from http://environmentportal.in/files/climate-trade-policy.pdf#page=27

United Nations. (2007). *The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

US Global Change Research Program. (2014). *National Climate Assessment*. Retrieved June 6, 2015 from http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/.

Vancouver Sun. (April 4, 2015). Conversations that matter – Earth is actually growing greener. Retrieved April 6, 2015 from http://www.vancouversun.com/technology/Conversations+that+matter+Earth+actually+growing+greener/10944052/story.html

Voices Voix. (March 4, 2013). Aboriginal Communities and Environmental Groups. Retrieved March 28, 2015 from http://voices-voix.ca/en/facts/profile/aboriginal-communities-and-environmental-groups

White, R. (2003). Environmental issues and the criminological imagination. Theoretical Criminology, 7(4), 483-506.

White, R. (2008). *Crimes against nature: environmental criminology and ecological justice.* Cullompton, UK ; Portland, Or.: Willan.

White, R. (2009). Introduction: Environmental crime and eco-global criminology. In R. White (ed.), *Environmental Crime: A Reader* (pp. 1- 8). Devon, UK; Portland: Willan Publishing.

White, R. (2010). Globalization and environmental harm. In R. White (ed.), *Global environmental Harm: Criminological Perspectives,* (pp.3-19)*.* Cullompton, Devon ; Portland, Or: Willan.

White, R. (2011). *Transnational environmental crime: Toward an eco-global criminology*. London; New York, NY: Routledge.

Wilderness Committee. (n.d.). Frequently asked questions regarding the Kinder Morgan pipeline proposal. Retrieved November 29, 2014 from https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/ frequently_asked_questions_regarding_the_kinder_morgan_pipeline_proposal

Williams, C. (1996). An Environmental Victimology. *Social Justice,*23(4), 16-40.

Willox, A. C. (2012). Climate Change as the Work of Mourning. *Ethics and the Environment,* 17(2), 137-164.

Woods, M. & Kirke, S. (May 8, 2013). 'Tragic' number of aboriginal children in foster care stuns even the experts. *Canada.com.* Retrieved December 17, 2014 from http:// www.canada.com/health/Tragic+number+aboriginal+children+foster+care+stuns+e ven +experts/8354098/story.html

Woodilla, J., & Forray, J. M. (2008). Justice and the Political in Organizational Life A Narrative Inquiry. Journal of Management Inquiry, 17(1), 4–19.doi:10.1177/10564926080170010201

Yang, S. (2010). The polluting behavior of the multinational corporations in China. In R. White (ed.), Global environmental Harm: Criminological Perspectives, (pp.150-158). Cullompton, Devon ; Portland, Or: Willan.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

The standard interview questions were as follows:

1. How did you come to be actively involved in the environmental movement?

(a) Are there any significant movements, people, or events that you would attribute your activism to?

2. What does environmentalism mean to you?

(a) Why is it important?

(b) What does the environmental movement mean to you?

3. Do you participate in civil disobedience?

(a) Why or why not?

4. What role, if any, did your childhood and / or upbringing play in shaping your current approach to environmental issues?

5. Based on your experience, how would you suggest that we go about getting others involved in the environmental movement?

(a) How should we foster interest and involvement in youth?

Appendix B: Communication Script

[Date]

Dear [participant],

I hope that this message finds you well. My name is Justine Nelson, and I am an honours student in the Criminology Department at Kwantlen Polytechnic University. I am currently working on a thesis research project that investigates how people come to be involved in the environmental movement (broadly understood). The environment has always been a passion of mine and I currently volunteer with Evergreen and the Lower Mainland Green Team doing invasive plant removal and tree planting. Within these organization we also focus on engaging youth and connecting them to nature in their neighborhoods. I have also participated in demonstrations in Vancouver, including the recent Peoples Climate March.

I am wondering if you would be willing to consider participating in this research project by sitting down with me for a one-on-one interview in Vancouver this February or early March. Your work in […] is exactly the sort of environmental engagement that I am hoping to study.

If this sounds like something that might be of interest, please reply to this message and I will send along a formal invitation and additional information about my research. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions about this.

Sincerely,

Justine Nelson

Justine.nelson@kpu.ca

Note: This research project has been approved by the Kwantlen Polytechnic University Research Ethics Board, and is designated project REB 2015-011

Appendix C: Invitation to Participate

[Date]

Dear (Participant),

First, I would like to thank you for considering participation in this research, as per our earlier discussion.

By way of formal introduction, my name is Justine Nelson, and I am an honours student in the Criminology Department at Kwantlen Polytechnic University. I am currently working on a thesis research project that investigates how people come to be involved with the environmental movement. The environment has always been a passion of mine and I currently volunteer with Evergreen and the Lower Mainland Green Team doing invasive plant removal and tree planting. Within these organization we also focus on engaging youth and connecting them to nature in their neighborhoods. I have also participated in demonstrations in Vancouver, including the recent Peoples Climate March.

As part of the research, you are being invited to participate in a one-one-one interview. The participation in this research study and the interview is voluntary, and there will be no monetary or other compensation offered. Your identity will remain confidential. Your privacy will be protected, unless there is an identified risk of harm to others or self, which must be disclosed to the proper authorities. You have the right to withdraw from the research study and interview at any time without prejudice or consequence.

The results of my research will be disseminated to all research participants, and I anticipate that my findings will help to identify some of the common experiences and ideas that lead people to become actively involved in environmental issues.

I will be conducting all interviews in person, in February and March 2015. Interviews will last for approximately one hour, and take place in meeting rooms located at the Central Branch of the Vancouver Public Library, located at 350 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, B.C. The meeting rooms have glass walls, which limit the potential for a strictly confidential interview, but the rooms have doors and passersby will not be able to overhear an interview.

Please respond via email to [Justine.Nelson@kpu.ca] by [Date], indicating if you wish to participate in the study. Please also include three possible dates and times you are available during the following time period [Date - Date]. Central Branch hours are Mon-Thurs, 10:00 - 21:00, Fri-Sat, 10:00 - 18:00, and Sun 11 - 18:00.

Once we have identified a viable date and time, I will contact you to confirm your availability.

The attached consent form explains the research study that you are being asked to join. Please review this form carefully and contact me with any questions about this study before agree to participate. You may ask questions and / or withdraw from the study at any time. If you agree to participate in the study, I would ask that you send me (via email or post) a signed copy of the consent form. If this is not possible, I can accept an email confirmation of your consent to participate, and you can sign a printed consent form at the time of our interview.

I have also attached a copy of my interview questions. As you can see, these are general questions, and my interview participants are invited to use them as a starting point for discussion and reflection. I am also inviting you to suggest one or two additional question that you think that I, as a researcher, should consider posing. This is entirely optional.

If you have questions or wish to verify the authenticity of this research project, you can contact my honours thesis Supervisor and the principal investigator for the study, Mike Larsen (faculty, Criminology Department) at 604 599 3413, or via email [mike.larsen@kpu.ca], or call the Kwantlen Office of Research and Scholarship at [telephone number].

Sincerely,

Justine Nelson

Criminology Student (Honours), Kwantlen Polytechnic University

Enclosures (Consent Form and Interview Questions)

Note: This research project has been approved by the Kwantlen Polytechnic University Research Ethics Board, and is designated project REB 2015-011

Appendix D: Consent Form

Consent Form

Your participation in this research project and this interview is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw from the research study and interview at any time without prejudice or consequence.

Title of Research Project: Breaking Through a Culture of Denial: Pathways to Environmental Activism in British Columbia

Principal Investigator: Mike Larsen

Honours Student Researcher: Justine Nelson

Research Project # REB 2015-011

Voluntary Participation:

Your participation in this research project and interview is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw from the research study and interview at any time without prejudice or consequence. By consenting to participate in this research project, you do not waive your rights to legal recourse in the event of research related harm. No compensation (monetary or otherwise) will be provided as part of this research project.

The expected duration of the interview is approximately one hour.

Permission to Audio Record Interview:

Your participation in this research project and interview is completely voluntary. I will be asking for your permission to make an audio recording of this interview. You have the right to refuse permission to record this interview, or to withdraw permission at any time. If you do not consent to the audio recording of this interview, I will make handwritten interview notes.

If you do consent to the audio recording of this interview, the resulting audio file will be accessible by me (Justine Nelson) alone, and will be destroyed following the transcription of our interview

Please tick the appropriate box below:

1. I grant you permission to make an audio recording of this interview
2. I do not grant you permission to make an audio recording of this interview

Purpose of Research Project:

This project seeks to understand first how people come to acknowledge climate change and related environmental harms as serious issues, and second, how they move from this acknowledgement into forms of active engagement.

Three secondary (and related) questions inform also inform this study:

How do people who are actively involved in the environmental movement or environmental groups understand and frame environmental harm?

How do people who are actively involved in the environmental movement or environmental groups decide whether or not to engage in civil disobedience?

and finally

How do we foster environmentalism in children/youth?

Procedures:

Each study participant will take part in a single, one-on-one, one-hour semi-structured interview. Participants will be persons who are actively and publicly involved in the environmental movement and / or specific environmental groups. These interviews will allow participants to share their own ideas and experiences with the researcher.

Risks of harm / Discomforts / Inconvenience:

There are minimal risks involved in this study. You are not obligated to answer any research question, and you have the right to withdraw from this study at any time. The identities of all participants will be protected at all times, and all interview data will be anonymized before it is analyzed and / or shared.

Benefits:

The research project has the potential to highlight the common experiences and ideas that lead people to become actively involved in environmental issues, and to suggest possible turning points that can move others from denial through to acknowledgement and action. Research participants will be provided with copies of the finished Honours Thesis describing the findings of this study.

Mandatory Disclosure:

The researcher will protect the participant's privacy, unless there is an identified serious risk of harm to others or self, which must be disclosed to the proper authorities.

Storage and Retention of Data:

If you consent to the audio recording of the interview:

The data will be recorded on a dedicated digital audio recording device owned by the Honours Student researcher. Upon the completion of an interview, the Honours Student researcher will transfer interview audio file from this device to her personal (single-user password-protected) laptop computer and immediately delete the file from the audio recording device. Interview audio files will be retained on the Honours Student researcher's personal laptop computer until she has completed transcription, at which point the audio file will be permanently deleted.

If you do not consent to the audio recording of the interview:

The Honours Student researcher's handwritten interview notes will be transcribed to her personal laptop computer. Following this, the original handwritten notes will be securely shredded.

Regarding interview transcripts:

The Honours Student researcher will remove identifying information (names, organizational affiliations, group membership) during the transcription process, replacing it with non-identifying codes. The Honours Student will keep a document containing the 'key' for these codes on her personal laptop computer. Digital copies of anonymized interview transcripts will be kept on the Honours Student researcher's password-protected personal computer. Copies may be transferred to the Principal Investigator's password-protected office computer via password-protected USB device, for the purpose of printing them. No copies of these files will be retained on the Principal Investigator's personal computer, and the USB files will be deleted after the transfer. Printed copies of the anonymized transcripts will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Principal Investigator's (locked) university office. Printed copies may also be stored at the home of the Honours Student researcher, in a locked room in a locked filing cabinet.

Disposal of Records / Data:

All interview audio files will be permanently deleted upon transcription.

The Honours Student researcher will retain a single digital copy of each transcribed interview file and the 'key' document (following the storage procedures outlined above) for a period of one year following the completion of the project. These files will then be permanently deleted.

Both the Honours Student researcher and the Principal Investigator will retain copies of anonymized interview transcripts for a period of one year following the completion of the project

(following the storage procedures outlined above). These documents will then be securely shredded.

Disposition of Data in Case of Withdrawal:

Should you elect to withdraw from this study during or after the interview and prior to the submission of the written Honours Thesis detailing the research findings, all data related to the study (audio recording, if applicable, notes, and transcripts) will be destroyed as soon as practicable. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Persons to Contact:

If you have questions or wish to verify the authenticity of this research project, or if you wish to speak with someone because you think that you have not been treated fairly or think that you have been harmed by joining the study, you should contact the Principal Investigator, Mike Larsen (faculty, Criminology Department), at 604 599 3413, or call the Kwantlen Office of Research and Scholarship at [telephone number].

Once you have read this document, or the document has been read and explained to you, and you have been given the opportunity to ask any questions, please sign below if you agree to take part in the study.

Name of Participant (first, last):

Signature or Mark of Participant or Legally Authorized Representative   Date

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent   Date