Meeting in a Redwood: Wilderness on the Public Screen

Kevin Michael DeLuca

A spectre haunts the environmental movement. It usually manifests itself in the mantra of jobs and has been effectively deployed by various industries to smear environmentalism as an elitist movement unconcerned about people, especially the working class and minorities. In the industrial juggernaut's incessant plundering of the earth's resources, the tropes of jobs and human welfare consistently trump other values. In the United States, this process was clearly at play in the 1980-1990's debate over the United States' ancient forests in the Pacific Northwest. It is being replayed in the campaign to drill for oil in wilderness areas, especially in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This campaign has been so effective that to protect wilderness, to fight for an endangered species, to "speak for the trees,"[1] is now often construed as a misanthropic act and taken as a sign of callous disregard for people. The credit for the success of this haunting surely goes to industry and their PR flaks, as well as to humans and their infinite self-absorption, but some credit is due to the rhetorical failings of environmental groups. Wherever credit may be due, the key concern is surely the debilitating effects this has had on environmentalism, particularly with regards to splintering progressive groups. For example, although both environmental and labour groups face antagonisms produced by global corporate capitalism, they have had difficulty making a common cause against their shared adversary.

In the past two decades there have been two significant attempts within environmentalism to defuse the jobs versus environment, or people versus

nature dilemma: environmental justice activism, and market environmentalism. Focusing on people and their environment, the environmental justice movement has had notable success in diverting the stream of toxic wastes from minority and working-class neighbourhoods. Lois Gibbs, former leader of the Love Canal Homeowner's Association and founder of Citizen's Clearinghouse for Hazardous Wastes (CCHW), accurately summarizes the goal and effect of environmental justice activism:

> Over the past ten years the Movement for Environmental Justice has redefined the word environment. No longer does the media, the general public or our opponents see the environmental movement as one that is focused on open spaces, trees and endangered species alone. They have finally got it! The Environmental Justice Movement is about people and the places they live, work and play (1993, p. 2).

This transformation of environmentalism comes at a very high price for wilderness concerns. In environmental justice rhetoric and actions, the wilderness is eclipsed and "environment" now means "human environment." In general, environmental justice groups evince no concern for wilderness or endangered species except when in instrumental relation to human welfare. They are, in short, not advocates for wilderness or any nonhuman species - they do not "speak for the trees." Instead, they speak for humans from an anthropocentric perspective and concern themselves solely with issues that impinge on human welfare.

Market environmentalism produces a similar dynamic, in this case transforming environmentalism into a variant of capitalism. With quantitative risk assessment, the pollution credits/cancer bonds institutionalised in the 1990 Clean Air Act (on the initiative of the Environmental Defence Fund), and the recently formed Chicago Climate Exchange, market environmentalism aligns itself with the goals of economic "progress." From such a perspective, environmental groups become partners with polluting corporations and market incentives replace government regulations. As president of the National Wildlife Federation, Jay Hair asserted, "Our arguments must translate into profits, earnings, productivity, and economic incentives for industry" (quoted in Dowie, 1995, p. 107). In the discourse of market environmentalism, the environment is reduced to economic calculations and wilderness does not even figure.

In summary, the response of environmental movements that focus on justice and the market is to give up the ghost and abandon wilderness issues. Both reduce wilderness to standing-reserve for human needs (Heidegger, 1977). Yet the finest moments of environmentalism often involve humans exceeding self-concern and caring for the intrinsic being of the wilderness and other species. Sure, wilderness was often sold as a balm for harried urban souls and a boon for railroad profits, but one cannot read John Muir or Ed Abbey, among others, and not be struck by the love of wilderness for its

own sake – the love of something outside of human design. More than love, though, the encounter with wilderness is an encounter with a non-human other. I am not decrying the loss of the pristine wilderness of the Romantic tradition with its unfortunate race and class consequences (DeLuca and Demo, 2001). Instead, what I am suggesting is at risk with the abandonment of the concept of wilderness is the loss of what Derrida (1974) terms "monstrosity," the other that exceeds human sense and economic calculation, the excess that is a constitutive outside, the unlimit.[2]

Another response to the incessant privileging of the issue of jobs that seems to so easily defeat environmentalism, one that does not abandon wilderness, is possible. It is a response that does not ignore human issues but also does not turn the environment into another subset of the human domain. It respects the nonhuman and humbles humanity in relation to the rest of creation and honours Thoreau's dictum, "in wildness is the preservation of the world" in its most fundamental senses. A woman in a tree in California, in "speaking for the trees," enacted such a response.

In December 1997, Julia "Butterfly" Hill, an ex-waitress and car accident victim, climbed Luna, a 1000 year-old redwood and potential victim of a chainsaw massacre. So began the longest tree-sit in United States environmental protest history. Butterfly lived in the tree for over two years. During that time she overcame El Niño winds and rains, harassment by Pacific Lumber (the company that "owns" the tree and hopes to turn it into cash via the medium of picnic tables and hot tubs) that included fly-bys by helicopter and an attempt to starve her out through a security guard blockade, the atrophying of her legs, and the general travails of living on an 8x6 platform 180 feet up a tree.

The actions of Butterfly occupy a potentially crucial pivot in environmentalism and the battle over resources. In enacting a link between wilderness and environmental justice grounded in the former, Butterfly performs an alternative politics. Butterfly had perforce to "perform" on a world stage structured by corporate globalisation. As such, she provides a vision for political resistance and action in a hostile media landscape. In engaging with her "performance", I will explore how Butterfly in the form and content of her messages consistently articulates the link between wilderness and justice for people. In order to transform her act from an anomaly to a practice for our time of images, I will first describe and conceptualise the media stage on which Butterfly acts.

Charting the Terrain: Hope in a Forbidding Land

It is axiomatic that the children of industrialism live in a technological world. Indeed, from before birth until death, we are bathed in technology and

its products – not too unlike the humans in *The Matrix*. While Americans spend half their day engaged with media, most hardly step outside in any sense of that word – they spend barely five minutes a day outdoors. Gitlin's observation two decades ago that "the media specialize in orchestrating everyday consciousness.... they name the world's parts, they certify reality as reality" (1980, pp. 1-2) is even more apt today.

This mediated state of affairs has not failed to raise considerable alarm, especially among those concerned with the status of democracy and the possibilities for social change. If Habermas' concept of the public sphere has become the de facto metaphor for democracy, concerns are evident in the continuous chorus of lament over the decline of the public sphere. Sociologist Boggs' judgment is typical: "As the twenty-first century dawns, American politics is in an increasingly pathetic condition.... the deterioration of the public sphere has potentially devastating consequences for citizen empowerment and social change, not to mention the more general health of the political domain itself" (2000, pp. 1, vii). Though sharing a general sense of dismay, there are two distinct discourses on the decline of the public sphere: one centres on technology, the other on political economy.

Ideally the public sphere denotes a social space wherein private citizens gather as a public body with the rights of assembly, association, and expression in order to form public opinion.[3] The public sphere mediates between civil society and the state, with the expression of public opinion working to both legitimate and check the power of the state. This public opinion is decidedly rational: "the critical judgment of a public making use of its reason" (Habermas, 1989, p. 24). The public sphere assumes open access, the bracketing of social inequalities, rational discussion, focus on common issues, face-to-face conversation as the privileged medium, and the ability to achieve consensus.

It is important to remember that Habermas' book was an historical study of the rise of the bourgeois public sphere and its decline in late capitalist society. Habermas laments the passing of the bourgeois public sphere and the rise of mass media spectacles, a turn of events he sees as the disintegration or refeudalisation of the public sphere – a return to the spectacle of the Middle Ages. He argues that the activity of the public sphere has been replaced with consumerism: "Rational-critical debate had a tendency to be replaced by consumption, and the web of public communication unravelled into acts of individuated reception, however uniform in mode" (1989, p. 163). In these observations Habermas presages the two narratives of decline: the technological critique tied to the rise of mass media, and the political economy critique that laments the dominance of corporations.

From Plato through Heidegger to contemporary media theorists, an important tradition in social theory understands new communication

technologies to change epistemologies and then condemns them in a conservative reflex that deploys morality to privilege orality and older technologies.[4]   The work of Neil Postman is exemplary of this paralysing response.   He describes the decline of print and the rise of the Age of Television as "an inquiry into and a lamentation about" (1985, p. 8), arguing that, "each new medium, like language itself, makes possible a unique mode of discourse by providing a new orientation for thought, for expression, for sensibility" (1985, p. 10).   In other words, each new communication technology changes a culture's "cognitive habits, its social relations, its notions of community, history, and religion.... you make a cultural revolution. Without a vote. Without polemics. Without guerrilla resistance" (1985, p. 157).

After making a strong argument for new media producing epistemological change, for television having "dramatically and irreversibly shifted the content and meaning of public discourse (1985, p. 8), Postman reverts to the academic equivalent of spitting into the wind and attempts to thwart the Age of Television with adjectives (shrivelled, absurd) and the asking of questions (1985, pp. 16, 161). This is a contradictory stance. If new technologies truly shape epistemologies and transform the ground of becoming for humans, then neither conservative nostalgia nor moral condemnation will have any impact. A more productive critical stance would explore the possibilities produced through the new technoscape.

A similar dynamic of incisive analysis and moralistic response based on assuming a prior golden age is at work in political economy critiques of mass media. It is twenty years since Ben Bagdikian's seminal work *Media Monopoly* warned that "centralized control over information, whether governmental or private, is incompatible with freedom. Modern democracies need a choice of politics and ideas, and that choice requires access to truly diverse and competing sources" (1987/1983, p. 3). Since then, critiques of the concentration of media ownership have consistently posited Bagdikian's idea (explicitly or implicitly) that an idealized public sphere that is open and diverse is the model for democracy; and that the current concentration of media ownership is dangerous because it is antithetical to a vision of democracy as a public sphere of diverse and equal voices.   Robert McChesney's recent retelling of the concentration tale, *Rich Media, Poor Democracy*, echoes Bagdikian's warning: "the media have become a significant *anti-democratic* force.... The wealthier and more powerful the corporate media giants have become, the poorer the prospects for participatory democracy" (2000, p. 2).   Indeed, for McChesney, media concentration "is a poison pill for democracy" (2000, p. 2). Both Bagdikian and McChesney propose structural reform, with the latter concluding that such reform is dependent on "the emergence of a strong left political movement" (2000, p. 282). What is striking is that both authors suggest that

their solutions are Quixotic calls swimming against the tide of history. Bagdikian calls his remedies "politically impossible" and "politically unrealistic," yet concludes, "what is logical and good ought to be expressed even if it appears unachievable at the moment" (1987/1983, p. 225). McChesney describes "the overall mood on the democratic left" as "mostly one of despair", and suggests the public is both "handcuffed" by myths and "blindfolded" by the media system (2000, pp. 318-19). Although their critique of the concentration of ownership is compelling, hopeless utopianism is an inadequate response.

The dream of the public sphere as the engagement of embodied voices, democracy via dialogue, cloisters us, for its vision compels us to see the contemporary landscape of mass communication as a nightmare. Although an historically and culturally understandable desire, the fondness for bodily presence and face-to-face conversations ignores the social and technological transformations of the 20th century that have constructed an altogether different cultural context, a techno-epistemic break. Foucault's "face drawn in sand" has been washed away, replaced by a corporate logo. The public sphere as a guiding metaphor for social theory is limiting because it holds static notions of the public arena, subjectivity/agency, appropriate political activity, and democratic citizenship, thus ignoring current social and technological conditions. The public screen is a more apt metaphor for thinking about the places of politics and the possibilities of citizenship in our present moment.

For a social theorist, then, the key response to the structural transformations of our moment is neither to adopt a moral pose nor to express yearnings for a mythical past, but to explore what is happening and what is possible under current conditions. In this stance, I am taking a cue from Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri:

> The Empire we are faced with wields enormous powers of oppression and destruction, but that fact should not make us nostalgic in any way for the old forms of domination. The passage to Empire and its processes of globalisation offer new possibilities of liberation.... Our political task, we will argue, is not simply to resist these processes but to reorganize them and redirect them toward new ends.... The struggles to contest and subvert Empire, as well as those to construct a real alternative, will thus take place on the imperial terrain itself (2000, p. xv).

If embodied gatherings of culturally homogenous, equal citizens engaged in rational dialogue with the goal of consensus is no longer a dominant mode of political activity, what is the place of politics today? One answer is the public screen. Groups perform image events (DeLuca, 1999) for dissemination via corporate-owned mass media that display an unceasing flow of images and entertainment. Although today's public screen is not the liberal public sphere of which Habermas dreams, wherein a rational public

through deliberative discussion achieves public opinion, neither is it the medieval public sphere of representative publicity that Habermas fears, a site where rulers stage their status in the form of spectacles before the ruled. Rather, on today's public screen, corporations and states stage spectacles (advertising and photo ops) certifying their status before the people/public *and* activists participate through the performance of image events, employing the consequent publicity as a social medium for forming public opinion and holding corporations and states accountable. Critique through spectacle, not critique versus spectacle.[5]

The Public Screen

The concept of the public screen recognises that most public discourse today takes place via "screens" - televisual and computer. Further, it suggests that we cannot simply adopt the term "public sphere" and all it entails, a term indebted to orality and print, for the current screen age. The starting premise, then, is that television and the Internet in concert have fundamentally transformed the media matrix that constitutes our social milieu, producing new forms of social organization and new modes of perception. The public screen is a constant current of images and words, a ceaseless circulation abetted by the technologies of video, film, photography, and the Internet. TV's speed, stream of images, and global reach create an ahistorical, contextless flow of jarring juxtapositions. While the public sphere, in privileging rational argument, assumed a mode of perception characterized by concentration, attention, and focus, the public screen promotes a mode of perception that could best be characterized as "distraction". Although distraction and the glance are antithetical to the public sphere and were read negatively by theorists such as Horkheimer and Adorno (1972) and Kracauer (1998) as signs of the decline of civilization, I suggest that they be read not morally but analytically as signs of the emergence of a new space for discourse, the public screen, that entails different forms of intelligence and knowledge. The public screen conceptualises distraction not as a lack of attention but as a necessary form of perception when immersed in the technologically induced torrent of images and information that constitutes public discourse in the 20th and 21st centuries. Speed and images, singly and in concert, annihilate contemplation.

The public screen places a premium on images over words, emotions over rationality, speed over reflection, distraction over deliberation, slogans over arguments, the glance over the gaze, appearance over truth, the present over the past. Susan Sontag and Jean Baudrillard's observations on photography are also illuminating with respect to the public screen in general: "Industrial societies turn their citizens into image-junkies.... turn experience

itself into a way of seeing.... an event has come to mean, precisely, something worth photographing," something that has appeared on the public screen (Sontag, 1977, pp. 24, 18-19). Baudrillard proposes: "Photography brings the world into action (acts out the world, is the world's act) and the world steps into the photographic act (acts out photography, is photography's act)" (2000, p. 3). The political world comes into being via images on the public screen. The question becomes, then, not whether images are good or bad but what are the possibilities for social change politics in a mass-mediated society? A woman sitting in a tree for two years provides one answer. Like Italo Calvino's *The Baron in the Trees*, Butterfly's act is a fantastic fable, but this fable resonated as an image event on the world's public screens.

Speaking for Trees and People

Tree-sitting is a tactic made popular by the radical environmental group Earth First! as a way of saving ancient forests. During her two years in the tree, Butterfly managed to become the public face of Earth First! and to successfully articulate the inextricable twining of wilderness and social issues. She managed to do this through the sitting of her protest, her bodily presence in the tree, and her rhetoric.

The particular tree-sit that Hill joined had started in October 1997, and was significant for its location. It was not in pristine wilderness but on a hillside above the town of Stafford, California. The Earth First!ers chose this location after a mudslide caused by clear-cutting destroyed seven homes in Stafford. Significantly, Stafford is a lumber town. Belying the stereotype, then, this Earth First! tree-sit links wilderness and social concerns and continues a philosophical and political shift initiated by Earth First! activists Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney with Redwood Summer in 1991.

Butterfly's use of her body and the redwood Luna suggests her awareness of the image landscape she is operating in. A former model, Butterfly realizes that a pretty face and a striking image are irresistible to the media, the daily staple of the public screen. In her self-presentation on her website, two types of images predominate. First, there are close-ups of Butterfly, barefoot and hugging Luna, her traditionally pretty white face framed by her windswept long, black hair. It is a face that is both pleasing and comforting, a cliché of small-town America. Second, there are long-range shots that give more of a sense of the grandeur of Luna. Among the most spectacular are those of Butterfly standing on the very pinnacle of the ancient Redwood, hundreds of feet in the air, arms outstretched toward the sky, hair flowing in the wind, tenuously tethered to the tree by her feet. In thus deploying her body, Butterfly turns her protest into an image event worthy of the public screen.

The longer Butterfly dwelled in Luna, the more of an international image event she became. Though neither well educated nor a veteran environmentalist, Butterfly proved to be a savvy student of media politics and a remarkably disciplined rhetorician. A steady pilgrimage of print and television journalists travelled to Luna, many ascending the tree, to interview Butterfly. In addition, Butterfly's solar-powered radiophone was her umbilical cord to the media worlds of radio and the internet. As the following selection from a variety of sources demonstrates, Butterfly deftly weaves together wilderness issues, human concerns, and a critique of corporate practices that manages to displace the jobs versus environmental debate. Instead of letting jobs be the test of all wilderness or making justice the measure of environmental and social issues, Butterfly places wilderness as the ground for environmental and social concerns. Further, she does this while reducing herself to synecdoche, consistently claiming that she herself and her actions are merely symbols for larger struggles against environmental devastation and corporate avarice.

Butterfly interacted with media from the United States, Europe and Asia. In the United States, she appeared on all the major television networks (NBC, ABC, CBS, and CNN), was interviewed on all the major news organizations' web programs, participated in debates with Pacific Lumber executives, addressed conventions and conferences, and was the subject of stories in *The New York Times*, *Rolling Stone*, *Time*, and many others. Butterfly also started two elaborate web sites: www.lunatree.org and www.circleoflifefoundation.org. The following quotations are designed to give a sense of the substance and form of Butterfly's arguments. They are somewhat repetitive, but repetition is an important skill, especially when addressing diverse audiences in different media: newspapers, television, radio, and the internet. The repetition is also a sign of Butterfly's ability to stay on message. Speaking to *Time Magazine Online*, Butterfly said:

> After being up here a few days, I realized that what was happening here was not only destroying the environment, but people's lives as well. I gave my word to this tree, the forest, and to all the people whose lives are being destroyed by the lumber companies, that my feet would not touch the ground until I had done everything in my power to make the world aware of this problem and to stop the destruction.

> Many of us believe that the rights of all life are being violated - in disrespect of the land and the people who care about the land. I, too, want a solution. But that solution must be based on love and respect for all life and not on the amount of money that a corporate power, based in Texas, can pull from the land and its people.

On *ABC News Online*, Butterfly commented:

> We must make our government uphold laws that are already in existence and stop corporate dominance over the environment and the common person's life.

For the first 100 years of this company's existence it was locally and family run and operated. Charles Hurwitz used money financed illegally to hostilely take over Pacific Lumber. When his corporation took over, they increased the rate of cut by three times the amount previous. What they are doing here will leave this area not only without any of our original ancient Redwood trees but will also leave this area with no jobs. I am standing up for these people and these forests whose voices are not being heard.

In an interview with Monica Mehta on *MOJO Wire*, Butterfly repeated many of these points:

I feel pretty good. It's been really, really hard, but as hard as it's been on me physically, all I have to do is think about the seven families in the town of Stafford who no longer have a home. And all I have to do is think about the animals whose homes are these forests that are being destroyed. I felt raising public worldwide awareness is very important. And right now this sit has gained a much-needed spotlight that we can shine on the forests and on the issues, […] and love and respect. I look at *Earth First!* more as a movement than as an organization, in that when we put ourselves first we suffer, but when we put the Earth first then everyone is helped.

Butterfly also told *CNN*:

Well, first and foremost I'd like to say that's it's not just about this singular tree. It's about all of the old grove redwood trees here on the coast that are being threatened. So this one was chosen because December 31, 1996 through the first of '97, a massive mudslide as a result of the logging practices of Pacific Lumber under Maxam Corporation completely destroyed seven homes in the town of Stafford, directly below me.

In an interview with *Reuters*, Butterfly was quoted, "The destruction that's happening here doesn't know any bounds and my being here is putting a face to that and something for people to connect to."

In her comments Butterfly presents an engaging and sophisticated analysis of justice that encompasses environmental and social dimensions through a grounding in wilderness. Instead of people first, it is wilderness first but with a recognition that caring for wilderness *is* caring for people. For Butterfly adding people is not merely a polite gesture, but a recognition of the essential connection between wilderness and people. Consistently, Butterfly links the tree *and* forest *and* people. She is a tree-hugger and people-hugger. In this position Butterfly is reaffirming the fundamental insight of the Frankfurt School's analysis of the domination of nature: in the domination of nature people are inevitably dominated. Clear-cutting the redwoods destroys people's homes. Butterfly is also proffering a complicated notion of wilderness. It is not out there, far away. It is in many places and it is intimately connected to human lives. Indeed, wilderness is

the ground of our being. We do not so much live in an environment as dwell in wilderness.

In revealing the fundamental relation between wilderness and people, Butterfly challenges the triangulation strategy that linked corporate jobs and people against wilderness. Instead, Butterfly consistently connects corporate practices and greed to the destruction of both wilderness and jobs. Clear-cutting at excessive rates destroys both trees and jobs, forests and communities.

Butterfly offers and enacts a wilderness environmentalism that grounds caring for people in caring for wilderness.   William Cronon recently delivered a lecture titled "Humanist Environmentalism: A Manifesto" (1999) wherein he declared:

> A humanist environmentalism strives to protect nature but also other, equally important values: responsible (wise?) use, social justice, democracy, fairness, tolerance, community, generosity (forgiveness of the other), love, humane living, beauty, good humour, joy. Wilderness is a crucial measure of our success in building a more just and humane environmentalism, because wilderness will only survive if our culture, our political economy, our ideas and values, honour and sustain the space in which it survives--a space that is not just ecological but moral, political, cultural. But that will only happen if we abandon the dualistic illusion that it is separate from ourselves. It could hardly be more connected, and our every act affects it.

The position Cronon advocates is one Butterfly both supports and pushes in an important way by moving the emphasis from "humanist" to "wilderness," so that wilderness is not merely an important value and a crucial measure of our success but the ground that makes possible our existence. Wilderness environmentalism holds out hope for shifting away from the multiple anthropocentric worldviews that have done enough harm. It shows a way of forging political alliances among disparate groups that share a common critique of global corporate industrial capitalism.   Finally, wilderness environmentalism suggests a path of humility that may enable humans to survive.

In enacting her wilderness environmentalism through the image event of a tree-sit, Butterfly models one way of negotiating the hazardous terrain of our mass-mediated, image-saturated, corporate-dominated public screen. Longing for a bygone golden era is understandably human, and suggesting political reform/revolution is potentially useful, but neither response is adequate for making sense of and acting in the present cultural-historical moment. We must exploit the conditions of possibility for rhetoric, politics, and activism on the public screen. One woman (with a small volunteer support group) confronted and defeated the corporate behemoth Maxxam/Pacific Lumber by deploying the possibilities of the public screen.

Butterfly's victory was both immediate and more general: she descended Luna only after Pacific Lumber agreed not to log Luna and a buffer zone; on a general plane, she contributed to raising global awareness of the issue of logging ancient forests. Besides the many television appearances, internet interviews, newspaper articles, and an award-winning film, Butterfly received numerous recognitions that suggest her presence on the public screen: one of *People's* "25 Most Intriguing People of the Year," *Good Housekeeping's* "Most Admired Women of 1998," *George's* "20 Most Interesting Women in Politics." In an episode of *The Simpson's*, Lisa resorts to a tree-sit. In ironic tribute, OmniSky used an image of a woman in a tree to advertise a wireless internet device.

Butterfly's success does not mean that social change is easy. Clearly, a corporate-dominated public screen presents formidable constraints. Still her success does suggest that the public screen also presents meaningful opportunities. The corporate world is not homogenous, and the interests of Maxxam/Pacific Lumber are not the same as those of Walt Disney/ABC News. Journalistic practices are not yet identical to economic practices, so news can still include events that challenge economic "progress." Mass media can amplify the voice of a person to astonishing proportions, so one person or a small group can confront corporate giants and governments. Corporate image is a vital currency on the public screen, so even the most powerful of corporations is vulnerable to imagefare. Butterfly's lessons are not reason for comfort, but they are reason for action.

Notes

1. With a bow to the *Lorax* and Dr. Seuss.
2. Derrida is referring to the future as a monstrosity, but I think wilderness must be conceptualized in similar terms: "The future can only be anticipated in the form of an absolute danger. It is that which breaks absolutely with constituted normality and can only be proclaimed, *presented*, as a sort of monstrosity.... which will have put into question the values of sign, word, and writing" (1976, p. 5).
3. Although Habermas is credited with the term public sphere, concern over the public has a long history that can be traced at least to Aristotle. The 1st Amendment of the United States can be read as a theory of the role of the public in a democracy (Jhally, 1989). In the first half of the 20th Century, John Dewey, Walter Lippmann, and Hannah Arendt were important theorists of the public in a mass-mediated democracy.
4. See Plato's critique of writing and praise of orality in *Phaedrus* (1956). Heidegger condemns the replacement of the hand by typewriter: "This 'history' of the kinds of writing is one of the main reasons for the increasing destruction of the word. The latter no longer comes and goes by means of the writing hand, the properly acting hand, but by

means of the mechanical forces it releases. The typewriter tears writing from the essential realm of the hand, i.e., the realm of the word" (1992, pp. 81).

5. For a comprehensive account of image events, see DeLuca 1999. For the original formulation of the concept of the public screen, see DeLuca and Peeples, 2002.

Works Cited

Bagdikian, B. (1987/1983). *The Media Monopoly*. Boston: Beacon.

Baudrillard, J. (2000). Photography, or the writing of light. *Ctheory.Net* (pp. 1-6).

Boggs, C. (2000). The *End of Politics: Corporate Power and the Decline of the Public Sphere*. New York: Guilford.

DeLuca, K. (1999). *Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism.* New York: The Guilford Press.

DeLuca, K. and A. Demo. (2001, October) Imagining Nature and Erasing Class and Race: Carleton Watkins, John Muir, and the Construction of Wilderness**.** *Environmental History* 6:4, pp. 541-560.

DeLuca, K. and J. Peeples. (2002, June). From public sphere to public screen: Democracy. Activism, and the 'violence' of Seattle. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19:2, pp. 125-151.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Dowie, M. (1995). *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the close of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gibbs, L. (1993). Celebrating ten years of triumph. *Everyone's Backyard*, 11, 2.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching*. Berkeley: University of California.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT.

Hardt, M & A. Negri (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Heidegger, M. (1977). *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. New York: Harper and Row.

Heidegger, M. (1992). *Parmenides*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP.

Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Herder.

Jhally, S. (1989). The political economy of culture. In I. Angus & S. Jhally (Eds), *Cultural Politics in Contemporary America*. New York: Routledge.

Kracauer, S. (1998). *The Salaried Masses: Duty and Distraction in Weimar Germany*. New York: Verso.

McChesney, R. (1999). *Rich Media, Poor Democracy*. New York: New Press.

Plato. (1956). *Phaedrus*. In *The works of Plato*. New York: Random House.

Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Viking.

Sontag, S. (1977). *On Photography*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.