

The Ethics and Effectiveness of Rhetorical Strategies Employed by Environmental Groups and the Palm Oil Crisis

Mason Pellegrini
Writing Studies
May, 2016

Faculty Adviser: Dr. Tom Koontz

Essay completed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with Global Honors,
University of Washington, Tacoma

Approved:

Faculty Adviser

Date

Director, Global Honors

Date

The Ethics and Effectiveness of Rhetorical Strategies Employed by Environmental Groups in the
Palm Oil Crisis

We live in a world where corporate interests in gaining the greatest profits possible are regularly at odds with the long-term survival of the human race, where most of the public accepts that human-made disaster of unheard of proportions is just around the corner as a result of the changing environment, yet scant substantial efforts are made to alter our course. Sadly, we live in a world where the desire for economic success is so powerful that people who speak against this environmental destruction will regularly be murdered, might have their house burned down, or can be raped and beaten with impunity (Clarke, 2014). Today's world is a more dangerous place for environmental activists than most realize. Because of this fierce opposition and the fate of the future hanging in the balance, the work of those who want to preserve the environment is now more critical than it ever has been.

What is the work of those who wish to preserve the environment? I argue that the work of an environmental activist consists primarily of wielding rhetoric (symbolic communication) in as effective a way as possible to sway public opinion. Indeed, the rhetorical strategies employed by environmental groups can be the difference between a victory, like many of Greenpeace's actions in the "Save the Whales" campaign, or an embarrassing defeat like the first "Guide to Greener Electronics" that Greenpeace published (Tyler, 2007). However, effectiveness cannot be the only determining factor when choosing a rhetorical strategy: ethics complicates the matter. Some strategies may work effectively to persuade audiences, but they do so through dubious methods, or have unintended side effects. Because of this delicate balance, information about both the effectiveness and ethics of environmental groups' rhetorical strategies is a critical area of research in all of the manifold ways that environmental groups interact with the public. Ideally,

such information would allow environmental activists, to not only achieve their goals more easily, but to achieve their goals in a manner that does not lower themselves to the ethical degradation that some groups who oppose them clearly exhibit.

To shed light in this important area, this article analyzes the argumentative choices made by environmental groups, looking specifically at how environmental groups communicate with the first world public to rally support and create awareness for environmental issues. I do this by first describing a body of research on the ethics and effectiveness of rhetorical strategies that are employed by radical environmental groups that follow the pattern set by Greenpeace, which is the largest environmental organization in the world (Deluca, 1999). Next, my analysis continues into my case study: the ethics and effectiveness of Greenpeace's online campaigning against Indonesian palm oil, and Greenpeace's general canvassing techniques. I come to the conclusion that Greenpeace employs ethically problematic rhetorical tactics, and that other strategies might prove to be more effective in achieving the organization's long term goals.

Neo-Aristotelian Framework of Environmental Rhetoric

In assessing scholarship regarding the ethics and effectiveness of environmental rhetoric, I organize common argumentative decisions using a neo-Aristotelian framework. However, neo-Aristotelian analysis was developed for oration (Foss, 2008), so parts of the framework were not applicable to my artifacts. I focused solely on the canons of classical rhetoric, and, out of the five canons, I only used the two that are fully applicable to my work: invention and organization. The canons memorization and delivery were almost completely non-applicable to my written artifacts, and the style canon was underrepresented in scholarship.

Canon One: Invention

Invention is “the speaker’s major ideas, lines of argument, or content” (Foss, 2008, p. 26), and the major ideas that I focused on were Aristotle’s three forms of persuasive appeals.

Therefore, I begin my analysis of environmental groups’ campaigning techniques in terms of their use of emotional appeals (pathos) and then their use of ethical appeals (ethos). I was able to find little research on usage of the third persuasive appeal: logic (Aristotle, 1872).

The most prominent of the three persuasive appeals that environmental activism is connected to is pathos, and a storm of debate surrounds the legitimacy of certain pathos-related tactics. One particularly controversial use of pathos is what Lunsford and Ruszkiewicz (2013) would describe as sentimental appeals, which usually are depictions of “heartwarming or heartwrenching” situations (p. 77). The manner in which environmental activists most often utilize sentimental appeals is by rhetorically invoking “charismatic megafauna” (CMF). CMF are usually large vertebrates that possess a number of specific characteristics: a large head, the ability to sit or stand, a flat face, round body shapes, feet reminiscent of human hands, large eyes, and fur that at least appears like it is soft (Sunquist, 1992). Animals regularly considered CMF are big cats, great apes, various kinds of bears, and elephants (Skibins, 2013), and environmental groups invoke CMF verbally, through text, or most commonly, through images.

Utilizing CMF has been revealed to be very effective: experiments have indicated that higher levels of attractiveness make humans significantly more likely to support a species’ conservation (Gunnthorsdottir, 2001). Furthermore, real life interactions with CMF have been shown to impart people with feelings of euphoria, an enhanced connection to nature, and an increased willingness to engage in pro-conservation behaviors (Skibins, 2013). It has been

suggested that the mechanism which causes such effects to take place is that CMF remind humans of their own young and resultantly induce a desire to nurture and protect (Sunquist, 1992). In these ways, CMF succeed in persuading people to accept the content of environmental arguments.

However, Lunsford and Ruszkiewicz (2013) argue that sentimental appeals (like utilizing CMF) can be problematic because they make readers feel guilty if they reject whatever course of action the message is proposing. Furthermore, some argue that utilizing CMF will be done only to generate the most donations possible for environmental groups, and that issues of greater importance will be sidelined to CMF, especially if the more important issues are less attractive or harder to understand (Merry, 2012). Another problem with using CMF to get people to engage in environmental conservation is that other creatures that may be more important to the health of an ecosystem, get little or no attention and funding. An excellent example of this phenomenon is the outcry that erupted in the 1960s over hunting harp seals; different organizations began campaigns to save the seals and close up portraits of baby seals were distributed which urged people to save the extremely cute creatures. These efforts resulted in five million letters of protest being sent to the European Parliament, which caused restrictions on harp seal fur trade by various European countries. This may not seem problematic until one learns that the harp seals, at no point during all the hubbub, were anywhere near becoming endangered. Conversely, a creature lacking in charisma like the Mexican long-nosed bat will receive no public outcry despite actually being endangered and also being a critical pollinator for various desert plants (Sunquist, 1992).

Another controversial appeal to pathos that environmental groups utilize is scare tactics or fear appeals; these tactics manipulate people's emotions in a similar manner as sentimental

appeals, except they leverage different emotions. One researcher defined fear appeals as “persuasive messages designed to scare people by describing terrible things that will happen to them if they do not do what the message recommends” (Han, 2014, para. 6). Greenpeace has been noted to employ such tactics. For example, in the days before the internet, Greenpeace used direct mail in much the same way that political propaganda has been disseminated, employing sensationalism, fear, and negative portrayals of opposing groups. They used pictures like baby seals getting clubbed to death in a similar fashion as how anti-abortion groups would use pictures of dead fetuses (Godwin, 1988). Another researcher described Greenpeace’s direct mailing tactics as tending “to stress an eminent threat to potential member’s very existence,” and also noted that door-to-door canvassers tended to use strategies similar to the direct mail requests (Shaiko, 1993, p.94). Such tactics are not surprising because research does indicate that they work well: a meta-analysis composed of 98 studies illustrated that the more fear an appeal utilizes the more powerfully the message is able to influence and change the behaviors of an individual (Han, 2014).

Despite the effectiveness of fear appeals however, there is dispute as to the legitimacy of such tactics. Lunsford and Ruszkiewicz (2013) argue that fear appeals like these “[close] off thinking because people who are scared often act irrationally” (p. 75). Some scholarship disagrees with this however: Merry (2010) argues instead that “numerous studies have shown that sadness and fear are associated with a systematic style of information processing, characterized by more extensive information search and more careful evaluation of evidence than is typical” (p. 865). Despite Merry’s suggestion that fear helps the decision making process, she could probably agree, as a 2004 laboratory study suggested, that low levels of fear (something one might refer to as anxiety) might increase decision making ability, but too much fear can

result in cognitive abilities not functioning properly (Hastings, Stead, Webb, Rossiter & Jones, 2004). So, even if more fear influences a person's behavior to a larger degree, the people receiving the message are not necessarily going to be influenced in a way that causes them to make thoughtful or rational decisions. Furthermore, the same study argued that excessive appeals to fear can have deleterious side effects like, causing audiences to shut out the message and producing anxiety unnecessarily in the lives of people who are not meant to have the message directed at them (Hastings et al, 2004). Though lower levels of fear may help a person be more vigilant in decision making processes, there is clearly a problematic side to leveraging fear in an effort to persuade, especially when there are greater amounts of fear used.

Appealing to the importance of saving the earth is a common strategy in environmental rhetoric, and I argue it can be defined as use of pathos under some circumstance and use of ethos under other circumstances. If the rhetoric suggests that the receiver of the message needs to act to protect the environment by instilling a sense of responsibility or by articulating potential moral benefits of compliance, then the appeal is to the emotion guilt, and it is therefore an emotional appeal. Kenneth Burke argued that guilt appeals function by creating dissonance between someone's personal conduct and the morally superior set of actions that the rhetoric illustrates (Dannenberg, Hausman, Lawrence, & Powell, 2012). Burke also suggested that such appeals were effective in altering an individual's behavior (Dannenberg et al., 2012). A problem with environmental guilt appeals is that they often succeed in convincing individuals that they need to engage in new pro-environmental behaviors, but they fail in outlining what those behaviors are. The end result is that a person feels bad for not engaging in some unknown task, and no behavioral changes occur (Dannenberg, et al., 2012). If a rhetor is simply displaying a commitment to saving the environment and not suggesting the receiver of the message do

something different, then the appeal is more accurately categorized as a display of moral character and therefore a usage of an ethical appeal.

To sum up, scholarship strongly suggests that environmental activists, especially Greenpeace, tend to rely upon a handful of invention strategies: emotional appeals, particularly in the form of scare tactics or CMF, and ethical or moral appeals that function by leveraging guilt. While there are going to be ethical considerations about the use of any persuasive technique, many of the tactics utilized by Greenpeace fall onto the more controversial side of the persuasive spectrum. Tellingly, in contrast to all the information that I found about Greenpeace using the various forms of emotional appeals, I was able to find no information about Greenpeace, or any other environmental group, using logical appeals to garner support or create awareness.

Canon Two: Organization

Foss describes organization as “the general pattern of arrangement” used by the rhetoric (Foss, 2009, p. 27), and in all the research I conducted on the argumentative decisions made by environmental activists, I was unable to find scholarship dealing directly with the topic of organization. However, in an interview with an individual who was employed as a Greenpeace Senior City Coordinator (SCC) and canvassing organizer, I was able to gather some relevant data on how Greenpeace canvassing pitches are structured across all of the United States (methodology for this interview is contained in the “Methodology” section). I recognized this information as having potential application to arguments made by Greenpeace in different media, so I include it here, in my theoretical framework. The following table (table one) represents that data, the argumentative structure used by canvassers in Greenpeace:

Introduction	1. I am
	2. You Are?
	3. We Are...
Pitch	4. Problem
	5. Solution
	6. Victory
Bridge	7. People Power
Logistics	8. Monthly \$
	9. Contact Info

Table one. An illustration of the canvassing pitch

I spoke with the SCC at length about how this argumentative structure works; the following is a summarization of his explanation. The first three steps of the overall pitch are just as a person would expect from any social interaction: those steps simply serve to initiate the conversation, exchange names, and explain what Greenpeace is. The most important part of the overall arch, the real argument, is the section titled “Pitch,” steps four through six.

In the “Problem” step (step four), the canvasser explains to the person with whom they are speaking an environmental issue that Greenpeace is campaigning for. A canvasser might explain how overfishing and reckless oil drilling is occurring in the arctic and how the ice is also melting there at an alarming rate. Next, in the “Solution” step (step five), the canvasser describes what actions Greenpeace believes need to be taken to stop these damages from happening. For the arctic example, the organizer said the solution is “to make the arctic a global sanctuary, and to ban all drilling and industrial fishing in the north pole.” The final step of the “Pitch” section of the argument is the “Victory” step (step six). Here, the canvasser describes a situation where Greenpeace has been able to achieve a different goal that is similar to the solution they are putting forth for the current problem. Going further with the arctic example, the canvasser may explain how Greenpeace was successful in keeping drilling activities out of Antarctica in 1998.

This gives the impression that Greenpeace is the sort of organization that can succeed in making the proposed solution for the problem into a reality.

Even though step seven is not actually part of the “Pitch,” it seems critically important. The SCC described it by saying, “It’s called the bridge because you are connecting the issue to [the person you are eliciting funds from. A canvasser might say:]... By giving us a monthly donation and contact information you can independently fund the work we do.” So, by the end of the argument, a canvasser will have hopefully made it clear to his interlocutor that, not only is Greenpeace the best candidate to be dealing with some serious environmental problem, but that giving money to Greenpeace is what will enable the organization to be able to complete its work in protecting the planet.

Image Use

Last in my neo-Aristotelian framework, I analyze environmental groups’ use of images, which is not a specific type of invention or form of organization, but is still a vital tactic used by radical environmental groups. When it comes to groups like Greenpeace, images are usually generated through the staging of dramatic moments of protest and action, and these moments are often referred to as image events. As the International Media Analyst for Greenpeace International (2009) noted in an interview that “strong image opportunities are still a key element in our campaign development and messaging,” and much of Greenpeace’s actions are done to create “images [to be] disseminated to the media” (DeLuca, p. 265). In 1999, Deluca went as far as to argue that this staging of image events is the “*primary rhetorical activity*” of Greenpeace (p. 3, my emphasis). In essence, creating these images is key to Greenpeace’s operation, and Greenpeace’s success with using these strategies has led many other environmental groups to do the same (DeLuca, 1999).

Using image events is a trend that Greenpeace established from some of its earliest activities. Greenpeace was founded in 1971, but the event that worked to catapult Greenpeace's existence into the realm of mainstream media was their first protest in their "Save the Whales" campaign of 1975, where Greenpeace activists on small inflatable boats placed themselves in between a Soviet whaling fleet and the fleet's prey; the Greenpeace members thought that the Soviets would not jeopardize the lives of innocent people to kill the whale. However, the Soviets fired their harpoon into the whale heedless of the presence of the protestors. Despite the apparent initial failure through the whale's death, the protest succeeded as an image event: people saw pictures and video of the tiny boats going head to head with the formidable Soviet whaling ships on major networks around the world. Since then, these strategic image gathering tactics have headlined many successful Greenpeace campaigns on a spectrum of environmental issues (Deluca, 1999).

In their article "Image Events," Delicath and Deluca (2003) offer a detailed exploration of how image events constitute a potent and necessary form of argumentation for environmental activists. Firstly, they suggest that the centrality of images is simply the norm of public communication and public argumentation at this point since people have become inundated by so many messages. Andrew Szasz noted that "displays of spectacular images are the only way to break through the indifference of the intended audience" (as cited in Delicath and Deluca, 2003, p.319). Furthermore, Delicath and Deluca argue that such tactics are necessary for marginalized groups as the mainstream mass media purposely excludes such ideas. Greenpeace's International Media Analyst expanded upon this in an interview, noting "the commercial media are in a compromised position, since they require advertising to pay their expenses, and the greatest advertising revenue is generated via energy supplies, automobiles, airlines, fast food, electronics,

cosmetics, and home furnishings” (DeLuca, 2009, p. 265). To conclude on image use, Greenpeace has been known to illustrate dramatic moments of environmental destruction or dramatic moments of protest in image form to create compact arguments, and this allows them to penetrate into media arenas that they would not be able to otherwise.

Background to the Case: An Introduction to Palm Oil

Many have never heard of palm oil, so I provide here a quick overview of what palm oil is, and why palm oil is an ideal area in which to study Greenpeace’s rhetoric. Firstly, palm oil is ideal to study because it is one of the most ubiquitous commodities in the world. Studies estimate that roughly half of all items found in today’s supermarkets contain palm oil, and palm oil makes up 30% of the globe’s total production of vegetable oil (Oosterveer, 2013, para. 4). World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF) claims even higher numbers than this: they asserted in 2006 that palm oil made up to 65% of vegetable oil internationally. Additionally, palm oil’s popularity has increased dramatically over the past decades: from 1990 to 2011 the overall area of palm oil plantations has increased sevenfold from 1.1 million hectares to 7.8 million hectares (Ludin et al., 2014, p. 1177). Oddly, despite being a critical staple of global agriculture and the global diet, few people even know what palm oil is, which probably makes it even more tempting to protest.

Secondly, palm oil cultivation is an ideal topic because of the many human rights violations that go along with it, which, I was told by the SCC, Greenpeace is known to target for activism. For poorer and rural Indonesians, the effects of palm oil cultivation are often quite negative. For example, palm oil cultivation has been known to have harmful effects on human health, create impoverished conditions due to low pay and debts, and damage cultural practices (Rist, Feintrenie & Levang, 2010). Widespread “land grabbing” of space suitable for palm oil cultivation has had damaging effects on villagers who are dependent on the forests for their

livelihood; many villages have been deprived of wood to the point where they have nothing with which to build (Casson et al., n.d). At the same time, studies argue that much of the benefits of palm oil production go only to a select few and not to Indonesian society at large (Ludin et al., 2014). In many ways, palm oil is a stereotypical case of corporations disenfranchising indigenous people and taking their resources for monetary profit, just the sort of situation that Greenpeace likes to protest.

Lastly and most importantly, palm oil is an excellent case study for Greenpeace's rhetoric because of all the ecological damage that goes along with creating the commodity. Palm oil cultivation dramatically reduces mammal biodiversity on land, destroys many thousands of hectares of precious rainforest every year and destroys the habitats of critically endangered animals, including many animals considered CMF like tigers, orangutans and elephants (Casson et al., n.d.). To clear these forests, palm oil companies usually employ slash and burn-tactics that are illegal and regularly lead to uncontrolled forest fires (Balch, 2015). Palm oil has also contributed to carbon emissions increasing in Indonesia over twentyfold, from 21,404 kilotons to 451,782 kilotons between 1960 to 2009 (IndexMundi, 2014, table. 4). These emissions have led to the atmosphere being so polluted for Indonesia's neighbor Singapore that their government had to hand out over four million breathing masks in 2013 (almost enough masks for the entire population of Singapore) and advise people from going outside (Velasco & Rastan, 2015, The Response of Singapore to the smoke-haze section, para. 3). The most important detail to note is that these damages are not solely attributable to palm oil: WWF (2014) asserts the possibility of cultivating and producing palm oil in a sustainable and responsible manner that does not cause so much environmental and social damage.

Methodology

Interview Methodology

In addition to studying the literature to create a theoretical framework, I also created primary research through an interview and through rhetorical analysis. The interview that I conducted was with an SCC for Greenpeace. An SCC is the highest rank that a member of Greenpeace can attain within a city; he described his position as the “top-line manager” for his office, and he said that he reports to a Regional Director “who manages a few different offices.” His duties included managing a canvassing operation composed of approximately 8-10 employees, and he said that he still functioned as a canvasser himself from time to time. He described canvassing as seeking out and having conversations with people who may want to support Greenpeace’s work, either in public places or door to door. His testimony was illuminating since canvassing is a critical part of Greenpeace’s communication with the public, and there is very little scholarship that covers Greenpeace’s canvassing tactics: in my months of research, the only article I was able to find on the subject was a physical copy of a Bachelor of Science thesis written in 1988 (Clayton).

The question set I asked the SCC, therefore, focused on the rhetorical strategies used by Greenpeace canvassers. Our conversation did not always follow the linear progression of the questions I had set out, but the set still generally encompasses the topics that we spoke about. The questions I used can be found in their entirety in appendix one. I conducted the interview using my cell phone as a recording device, and I also took notes as the interviewee spoke. We spoke at Greenpeace’s headquarters in a major American city on March 25th 2016. The interview lasted for approximately 30 minutes.

Neo-Aristotelian Analysis Methodology

Rhetorical analysis was limited to Greenpeace's articles. My overall goal was to isolate patterns in invention and organization. The articles I coded were directly related to the palm oil crisis, and they were all from the "Indonesia" section on Greenpeace International's website. The section is largely focused on the damages that palm oil has inflicted on Indonesia. The website has 100 posts that are composed of collections of images, publications or blog posts; the oldest content posted on the website was from September 19th 2012, and the newest content was posted on April 25th 2016. My analysis was limited to the first five blog post style articles that focused directly on palm oil, or damages inflicted by palm oil. I skipped two longer "publication" style content posts to keep all of my artifacts of a consistent form.

To conduct my analysis, I created keys derived from the findings of my scholarship review to guide my analysis in both invention and organization. These keys composed of categories and definitions, so I could determine whether parts of the artifacts fit into particular categories or not. For organization, I looked for instances of the canvassing structure that I outlined in table one and described in the same section of my literature review. When it came to invention, I used definitions taken from a rhetorical criticism textbook for logos and ethos (Foss, 2009), and I created my own definitions based on information in my literature review for types of emotional appeals specific to environmental rhetoric. The invention key I created is available in its entirety in appendix two.

To code the articles, I created two PDF files which both contained all the articles, one for organization and one for invention. For organization, I went through the PDF file highlighting individual paragraphs specific colors for which part of the pitch I thought they fell into, focusing

on what the SCC described as problem, solution and victory. I tried to assign every paragraph to one of those three categories, but a few paragraphs did not fit any of the specifications. After, I tallied up how many paragraphs fit into each particular category. For invention, I followed a similar pattern. I tried to determine what the primary type of persuasive appeal was in each paragraph, also coding nearly each paragraph in different colors for the different types of appeals, then I tallied up the results by counting and recounting. Finally, I studied my findings and noted any patterns.

In addition to rhetorically analyzing the articles, I applied my invention framework to canvassing procedures the best I could by deeply analyzing the recording of the interview I had with the SCC. That analysis is the focus of the following section.

Case Study: Greenpeace and the Palm Oil Crisis

Invention

Canvassing. The most prominent comment the SCC made about invention is that an experienced canvasser knows how to tailor a unique message to whomever they are speaking with. I briefly explained to him what each of the three persuasive appeals were, and asked him which he thought was most important for convincing someone to support Greenpeace. He answered that “the best canvassers are able to effectively shift gears and use any of those three [persuasive appeals]” and that “it depends on the person, and it depends on their reaction they give you.” Sometimes, he elaborated, people approach a canvasser and immediately have a reaction to a picture of a cute animal, and that person will clearly require some pathos, whereas someone may want to have a logical argument around certain environmental issues before they are willing to donate. He concluded however, by saying “I would say the emotional one is probably the one that is used most often in canvassing.”

When it comes to speaking on pathos directly, there were two main areas we discussed. First, as we talked about the basic canvassing pitch, he described the emotional elements of its organization. He said that with the pitch “ideally you are kinda building what we call an emotional rollercoaster... getting people really bummed out about the problem... by the time you get to your victory you have ‘em all excited because you have given them a solution... and then you kinda take that momentum into signing them up as a member.” Secondly, we spoke about CMF at length. Interestingly, the SCC was already aware of the term “charismatic megafauna.” He said that sometimes while canvassing he would begin discussion with people by asking “do you want to talk about orangutans or narwhals?” He said that he did this “because everybody loves cute animals.” He further elaborated on the emotional impact of such tactics by saying that “on a very primal, level humans want... [CMF] to exist and the idea of... seeing one of those species go extinct, primarily because of human activity, is deeply distressing to folks... The idea of having to explain to your children or grandchildren what a tiger *was* instead of what a tiger *is* is kind of a scary idea” (his emphasis). In the end, he emphasized the importance of CMF and connected CMF not only to sentimental appeals, but to fear appeals too, that people love CMF and that the idea of them disappearing is frightening.

There were a number of ways that the SCC explained usage of ethos. He noted that every canvasser is taught to say only one phrase, the same word for word to each person with whom they speak: “Greenpeace is the world’s largest independent environmental organization.” He suggested that the line was important because it impressed upon the audience exactly how credible Greenpeace was. If the listener still was still unsure about how credible Greenpeace was, the SCC said that the canvasser might continue to explain how Greenpeace is over 45 years old,

has over three million members, operates in over 40 countries, or how the “Save the Whales” campaign, which he said that almost everyone has heard of, was Greenpeace’s doing.

Articles. The following table is the data I collected on how the Greenpeace articles match the invention strategies outlined in appendix two:

Category	Type	Article					Totals
		Taufik	Woolley	Rahma	Indradi	Zamzami	
Pathos	Fear appeal	6		4	1		11
	Sentimental appeal		6		2	11	19
	Guilt appeal						
Ethos	Moral Character	2	3	1	3		9
	Intelligence						
	Good Will			1			1
	Credentials			4	1		5
Logos	Evidence				1		1
	Not identifiable	3	1	2	2		8
	Mixed appeals			1	1	3	5
Totals		11	10	13	11	14	59

Table two: Invention results

Out of the 59 total paragraphs in the five articles, 30 of the paragraphs I coded as eliciting an emotional appeal, either in the form of fear or sentimental appeal. Usually these appeals took the form of descriptions of environmental destruction or descriptions of the hardship experienced by various types of animals, usually CMF, and I had trouble differentiating sentimental appeal from guilt appeal: such pieces of information often seemed to attempt at both feelings in the reader. Sometimes all three emotions were involved. Here is a quote about a baby orangutan that is representative of these heavy pathos appeals: “If there were trees, Otan would be swinging freely from branch to branch, his strong grip lifting him in high arcs through the forest canopy. But there were no more trees left for Otan” (Zamzami, 2015). The appeal is clearly meant to be

sentimental since it is about a baby which is in danger, but it presumably makes the reader feel guilty for being complicit in Otan's fate, and fearful about whether the young primate will survive.

There was a relatively large number of instances of ethical appeals in the five articles too: 15 out of the total 59 paragraphs I coded as such. The majority of these appeals were demonstrations of moral character, situations in which Greenpeace identified its aims as being aligned with virtuous causes like saving forests, animals, or stopping palm oil companies. Often, these declarations were made in general ways that are hard to argue with like "we need to push for real protection of Indonesia's forests!" (Taufik, 2016). Five of these ethos paragraphs used former pro-environmental actions of Greenpeace to boost their own credentials. At no point did Greenpeace quote any experts or widely known authorities to boost their own ethos: there were ostensible appeals to the credentials of others with links to articles, but usually these links were links to other Greenpeace articles, rather than any separate and independent authorities.

I had trouble coding any full paragraph as a logos paragraph: I only coded one paragraph as such. There definitely was use of evidence, but since I coded paragraph by paragraph, I would often end up designating paragraphs that had use of evidence in them as pathos paragraphs if the evidence was used solely to drive home an emotional point of some kind. The following is a paragraph that exhibits this trend:

The double whammy of habitat loss and poaching has reduced rhino numbers to perilously low levels. The latest reports suggest there are little more than 100 left in the wild. These tiny populations living in fragments of forest also become susceptible to chance local events like disease or natural disasters, so it can take just one freak storm to obliterate a small outlying group and nudge the species even closer to extinction. Without

the means to travel about safely under forest cover, these groups can't meet to interbreed and genetic diversity becomes an issue as inbreeding leads to less healthy and less successful rhinos. (Woolley, 2016)

Though there is usage of evidence and logic, the overall implication of the paragraph is the rhino's perilous closeness to extinction, so I categorized it as a fear appeal. Even though I coded this paragraph as fear, it is still one of the most evidence-based paragraphs in all five of the articles.

Article's images. To further analyze invention strategies, I categorized the subject matter of the 25 images that appeared throughout the five articles, taking into account their captions as well. What I found is in the following table:

Subject matter and appeal	Article					
	Taufik	Woolley	Rahma	Indradi	Zamzami	Total
Palm oil plantation (N/A)			1			1
Environmental activism (credentials)	1		1	4		6
Children (sentimental appeal)			1			1
Deforestation (fear appeal)	2	1	2			5
Forest fire (fear appeal)			1			1
CMF (sentimental appeal)		2	1		8	11
Total	3	3	7	4	8	25

Table three: Image content and image appeals

The appeals most common in the images follow a similar pattern as the writing: 18 out of 25 of them were emotional appeals. Common subject matter was burnt wreckage left over after a forest fire or a baby orangutan that the caption informs us has just been orphaned by the palm oil

industry. Second most common were images of environmental activism taking place, which I categorized as primarily ethical appeals since they function mostly to build Greenpeace's credentials by illustrating the virtuous activities that the organization takes part in. There were six instances of images with environmental activism, most of which were in one article. Examples of these activism images include activists taking part in a project in a canal to prevent forest fires, and activists handing over a petition to government officials. Images with ethos and pathos made up 24 of the total 25 images. The only image I was unable to categorize was an image of a palm oil plantation, which had the caption "*A young oil palm plantation on peatland*" (Rahmawati, 2016, her emphasis).

Discussion. Much of what was found in the scholarship was present in the articles, and in the description of canvassing techniques. There was an overwhelming reliance on fear appeals and sentimental appeals (usually in the form of CMF). Even passages that did use evidence (like the quoted rhino paragraph in the previous section), would use alarmist statements like "it can take just one freak storm to obliterate a small outlying group and nudge the species even closer to extinction" and alarmist phrases like "tiny populations" and "perilously low levels" (Woolley, 2016). The articles always concluded on a note of fear, suggesting that something terrible would happen if something (donating money) wasn't done: even the article that was ostensibly about an environmental victory ended by pointing out "Continual global pressure is needed to ensure the fires don't take off again – yet they're being predicted for early next year" (Indradi, 2015). There was also a lack of evidence that a reader might use to come to their own conclusion in supporting Greenpeace. Nowhere was there information like "a donation of \$10 a month can, once a year, fund a home for one orangutan." Nowhere was there even information like "Funding Greenpeace is great way to help make these damages go away." Instead, the readers are shown fear or

sympathy inducing images next to buttons that ask them to donate. My overall impression was that the articles sidelined including objective information in favor of appeals that are highly effective but of questionable ethical value.

Organization

Canvassing. Canvassing organization follows my organizational framework explained above, since I derived my framework from the basic canvassing pitch.

Articles. The following is the data I collected on how the Greenpeace articles match up to the organizational strategy outlined in table one:

Category	Article					Total
	Taufik	Woolley	Rahma	Indradi	Zamzami	
Problem paragraphs (P)	4	6	6	4	14	33
Solution paragraphs (S)	3	2	2	1		8
Victory paragraphs (V)	2		3	5		10
Unassigned paragraphs	1	1		1		3
Mixed paragraphs	1	1	2			5
Total paragraphs	11	10	13	11	14	59
Pattern	PVS	PS	PVS	VPS	PS	

Table four: Organization results

Surprisingly, none of the five articles fit directly into the PSV pattern that the SCC described. Even so, very consistently, the paragraphs fit into one of the three categories: I was only unable to put eight out of the 59 paragraphs into one of the categories. Furthermore, the sections of the articles that corresponded to the different parts of the pitch often hung together in cohesive chunks rather than being spread throughout the articles, meaning that usually paragraphs of a particular type were consecutive and not mixed with each other. The most

common patterns were PVS and PS with two instances of each. In four out of the five articles the problem came first, the same as the canvassing pitch. All of the articles ended with a bridge.

By far, the most common type of paragraph was problem paragraphs. More than half of the paragraphs fit the description of “problem paragraphs”, with 33 of the total 59 fitting that category. There was one article which was almost exclusively illustration of an environmental problem with 14 straight paragraphs in narrative form of how the actions of palm oil companies make life difficult for orangutans. The problem was usually portrayed as forest fires, dangerous circumstances from different animals or the palm oil companies themselves. In all the articles, palm oil cultivation was described as the source of the problem.

All the articles at least touched briefly on what the solution was to the problem: in three of the articles what was defined as a solution was government or company action, including increased transparency with corporations (Zamzami, 2015) or corporations “keeping their promises” (Rahmawati, 2016). One article outright suggested that the solution was palm oil companies “protecting and restoring the forests and peatlands [they have] damaged” (Taufik, 2016). One of the two articles that didn’t suggest government or company action suggested generally that forests needed to be protected (Indradi, 2015). The last article suggested that “What needs to change is human behavior” (Woolley, 2016), but gave no suggestion as to what those changes in human behavior might be.

Three of the five articles contained what can be described as a “victory” section. In two of the articles, the victory was shown to be Greenpeace leveraging mass pressure on companies through petitions, with one example of a victory being members of Greenpeace trying to restore water flow to peatlands in an effort to avoid the dryness that leads to forest fires.

Each of the five articles ended with what the SCC would have referred to as a bridge, a connection to how the reader could support the work that Greenpeace was doing. This was done in all five articles with an exhortation to “Take action,” which was a link to sign a Greenpeace petition to ask companies which use palm oil to do more to stop deforestation. Implicitly, throughout each article it was also suggested that the reader donate money to Greenpeace, with three links to lead the reader to a page to donate on each article, one of the links being very large and emphasized with a picturesque image of the *Rainbow Warrior* (Greenpeace’s flagship) riding on the sea.

Discussion. What interested me the most in my analysis was not what was written, but the suggestions that were not included. The articles seemed to be structured in such a way as to limit any responsibility that the reader might have in environmental destruction: only the one article vaguely suggested that human behavior needed to change. Besides that, the blame was imputed on companies and governments as if the behaviors of the individual human beings who compose and support those organizations had nothing to do with their propagation. Not only did the artifacts suggest that supporting Greenpeace was the only action readers should take to deal with the problem, but there were even suggestions that readers shouldn’t worry about boycotting any products at all to try to stop palm oil, that there was no reason for readers to even try to engage in behaviors that might take power away from the governments or palm oil companies. The following is an example of that trend:

For the average person, being a part of the solution isn't as simple as making a few changes to your shopping habits. From Doritos to Colgate to Johnson & Johnson baby soap, palm oil is in so many products that it's hard to avoid. Even if you could, palm oil

isn't the problem - deforestation is the problem, and that will only stop when corporations take responsibility for the palm oil they buy. (Rahmawati, 2016)

If anything, it seemed to me that rhetoric like this might make individual behaviors that put the environment in danger more likely. A person might decide to support Greenpeace with a monthly donation, then stride through the supermarket buying whatever products that they want, going along with the implied conclusion of the articles, that only the actions of non-human entities can stop environmental destruction. My hypothesis is that Greenpeace abstains from implying any sort of individual responsibility on readers for environmental problems to try to get more donations. It seems that articles which continually suggested that readers should change their own behaviors to protect the environment might make readers feel guilty about what they are not doing and want to discontinue their reading. Conversely, framing articles the way Greenpeace does, suggests that the *only* action that a reader might take to protect the environment is donating or signing a petition, so when the reader does as the rhetoric suggests and donates money or signs a petition, they have held up their entire end of the bargain when it comes to protecting the environment, leading to a sense of closure and satisfaction. This structure is much easier for everyone involved, but of course, it is worse for the environment.

Conclusion

In the end, Greenpeace's rhetoric has much in common with their arch-enemies: corporate interests. The man who made advertising what it is today, David Ogilvy, believed that the best advertisements are ones that employ smoke screens to obscure the fact they are trying to sell you something (Ahern, 2012), and this is exactly what Greenpeace does in its rhetoric. Whether on the street or online, Greenpeace has a tendency to make its arguments in indirect ways. The implicit objective of each of the pieces of rhetoric was to make Greenpeace appear the

only solution to these problems to elicit donations from readers, and, as the SCC would say, this is accomplished by “building... an emotional rollercoaster,” using problematic rhetorical tactics that people have the least amount of defense against. Employing the least problematic forms of argumentation are rarely used; the articles stray away from providing information on how Greenpeace will suit a need, and letting the reader come to a conclusion on their own.

It’s perfectly understandable why Greenpeace would employ such tactics: just as the Greenpeace International Media Analyst explained in his interview with Kevin Deluca (2009), commercial media is a compromised place, and without using the same tactics as the media it is unlikely that Greenpeace would be able to get as much attention as it does. However, I suggest that relying more on logos and direct argumentation could overall have better effects for the organization and the environment overall. Greenpeace boasts about having over three million members, and implies that this means they represent the interests of that many people, but that is not true. What Greenpeace really has is three million people that have been mostly persuaded, largely through fear, into handing over money for fear of their own livelihood and a lack of any other perceived alternatives. If Greenpeace argued directly and logically, the organization might have fewer “members,” that is people who they have persuaded onto their side of the fence, but the members that the organization did have would be members who are intellectually and overtly in support of the campaigns that Greenpeace pursues. I suspect that those people would be far more likely to vocally support Greenpeace, donate larger amounts of money, actually engage in environmentally friendly behaviors, and try to convince their friends to do the same. With that kind of support, Greenpeace might actually serve to make a real difference with environmental problems, rather than mostly functioning to perpetuate its own existence and simultaneously spread negative emotions.

Appendix one

1. Just briefly, what is your position and title, and what projects have you worked on within Greenpeace?
2. In your official role as a Greenpeace employee, what kind of circumstances do you find yourself where you are trying to convince people to join Greenpeace's cause? [ask him how long he has done those positions]
3. Feel free to answer this question briefly as well. There is a surprising lack of research concerning Greenpeace's canvassing operations. Can you give me some general information on what a canvasser's job looks like? How much money a canvasser may gather in one night, how many hours they work, etc.
4. Think of a situation where you persuaded a particularly hostile person to join Greenpeace's cause. What was it in your tactics that allowed you to do this? What tactics generally will you adopt in talking to a person you guess may not be onboard with Greenpeace's cause?
5. Opposite question. What kind of strategy may you adopt with a person you guess is already onboard with Greenpeace's cause?
6. [Explain to him persuasive appeals.] Which one of those is most effective for convincing someone to join Greenpeace's cause? Why? How might you use each of these three individual persuasive appeals?
7. This is a general question. In your opinion, which of those persuasive appeals does Greenpeace itself most regularly use?
8. Do non-argumentative elements influence how successful a person may be in convincing a person to join Greenpeace's cause, such as appearance, tone of voice?

9. What kind of training are canvassers given to be able to convince people to join Greenpeace's cause more effectively?
10. What types of traits are looked for in people that indicate they would make an effective canvasser? E.g. friendly, young, passionate?
11. Besides past support of Greenpeace, what do you think is the most important factor in a conversation that will lead towards a person deciding to donate to Greenpeace?

Appendix two**Invention key**

Category	Type	Definition
Pathos	Fear appeal	Threatens the wellbeing of the reader directly or indirectly
	Sentimental appeal	“heartwarming or heartwrenching situations” (Lunsford and Ruskiewicz, 2013, p. 77)
	Guilt appeal	Leading the reader to believing that they are not doing something virtuous, which they should be doing
Ethos	Moral Character	“linking the message and the rhetor with what the audience considers virtuous” (Foss, 2009, p. 26)
	Intelligence	“display[s] of common sense, good taste, and familiarity with current topics and interest” (Foss, 2009, p.26).
	Good Will	“establishment of rapport with the audience through means such as identifying with the audience members or praising them” (Foss, 2009, p.26)
	Credentials	Giving Greenpeace’s credentials or giving the credentials of another reputable source
Logos	Evidence	“Whether the evidence is the quoting of experts, statistical summaries, personal experience, or some other form, a critic examines it to see whether it is relevant to the thesis being developed, whether the evidence is consistent, and whether sufficient evidence has been supplied to make the point.” Furthermore, “something must be done with the evidence to encourage the audience to come to some conclusion based on it” (Foss, 2009, p.26)

References

- Ahern, L. (2012). Evaluating the ethicality of green advertising: Toward an extended analytical framework. In L. Ahern & D. S. Bortree, (Eds.), *Talking green: Exploring contemporary issues in environmental communications* (171- 194). New York: Peter Lang.
- Aristotle. (1872). *Aristotle's treatise on rhetoric*. (T. Hobbes & T. A. Buckley, Theodore, Trans) Bell & Daldy. (Original published in 4th century BC). Retrieved from <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uva.x000308795;view=1up;seq=9>
- Balch, O. (2015, November 11). Indonesia's forest fires: Everything you need to know. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2015/nov/11/indonesia-forest-fires-explained-haze-palm-oil-timber-burning>
- Casson, A., Gaskell, J., Kanninen, M., Van Noordwijk, M., Sheil, D., Sunderlands-Groves, J., & Wertz, K. (2009). The impacts and opportunities of palm oil in southeast asia. *What Do We Know and What Do We Need to Know?* Retrieved from http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/occpapers/op-51.pdf
- Clarke, C. (2014, April, 16). Hundreds of environmental activists killed worldwide over past decade. KCET. Retrieved from <https://www.kcet.org/redefine/hundreds-of-environmental-activists-killed-worldwide-over-past-decade>
- Clayton, L. (1988). *Grassroots politicking: Canvassing with Greenpeace* (Problem series (Huxley College of Environmental Studies). Bellingham, Wash.: Huxley College of Environmental Studies.
- Dannenberg, C., Hausman, B., Lawrence, H., & Powell, K. (2012). The Moral Appeal of Environmental Discourses: The Implication of Ethical Rhetorics. *Environmental*

Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, 6(2), 212-232. doi:
10.1080/17524032.2012.668856

Delicath, J., & DeLuca, W. (2003). Image events, the public sphere, and argumentative practice: The case of radical environmental groups. *Argumentation*, 17(3), 315-333.

DeLuca, K. (1999). *Image politics: The new rhetoric of environmental activism* (Revisioning rhetoric). New York: Guilford Press.

DeLuca, K. (2009). Greenpeace international media analyst reflects on communicating climate change. *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture*, 3(2), 263-269.

Retrieved from

<http://www.tandfonline.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/abs/10.1080/17524030902972734>

Foss, S. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice* (4th ed.). Long Grove, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Godwin, R. K. (1988). The structure, content, and use of political direct mail. *Polity*, 20(3), 527-538. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3234875>

Gunnthorsdottir, Anna. (2001). Physical Attractiveness of an Animal Species as a Decision Factor for its Preservation. *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of The Interactions of People & Animals*, 14(4), 204-215. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/abs/10.2752/089279301786999355>

Hastings, G., Stead, M., Webb, J., Rossiter, J. R., & Jones, S. (2004). Fear appeals in social marketing: Strategic and ethical reasons for concern. *Psychology and Marketing*, 21(11), 961-986. Retrieved from

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/10.1002/mar.20043/epd>
e

Han, C. (2014). Demarketing fear: Bring the nuclear issue back to rational discourse. *Energy Policy*, 64, 183-192. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2013.09.028

Huddy, L., & Gunnthorsdottir, A. (2000). The persuasive effects of emotive visual imagery: Superficial manipulation or the product of passionate reason? *Political Psychology*, 21(4), 745-778. Retrieved from
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/10.1111/0162-895X.00215/epdf>

IndexMundi. (2014). Co2 emissions. CO2 emissions (kt). Retrieved from
<http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/indonesia/co2-emissions>

Indradi, Y. (2016, March 3). Meet the Indonesians taking climate action into their own hands. *Greenpeace International*. Retrieved from
<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/indonesia-climate-action-forests-peatland/blog/54939/>

Ludin, N. A., Bakri, M. A. M., Kamaruddin, N., Sopian, K., Deraman, M. S., Hamid, N. H., et al. (2014). Malaysian oil palm plantation sector: Exploiting renewable energy toward sustainability production. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 65(0), 9-15.
<http://dx.doi.org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.11.063>

Lunsford, A., & Ruskiewicz, J. J. (2013). *Everything's an argument*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

- Merry, M. (2010). Emotional appeals in environmental group communications. *American Politics Research*, 38(5), 862-889. Retrieved from <http://apr.sagepub.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/content/38/5/862.full.pdf+html>
- Merry, M. (2012). Environmental groups' communication strategies in multiple media. *Environmental Politics*, 21(1), 49-69. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/abs/10.1080/09644016.2011.643368>
- Oosterveer, P. (2015). Promoting sustainable palm oil: Viewed from a global networks and flows perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, (0). <http://dx.doi.org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.01.019>
- Rahmawati, A. (2016, March 3). Palm oil: Who's still trashing forests? *Greenpeace International*. Retrieved from <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/palm-oil-whos-still-trashing-forests/blog/55724/>
- Rist, L., Feintrenie, L., & Levang, P. (2010). The livelihood impacts of oil palm: Smallholders in indonesia. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 19(4), 1009-1024. doi:10.1007/s10531-010-9815-z
- Shaiko, R. G.. (1993). Greenpeace U. S. A.: Something Old, New, Borrowed. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 528, 88-100. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1047793>
- Skibins, J., Powell, C., & Hallo, R. (2013). Charisma and conservation: Charismatic megafauna's influence on safari and zoo tourists' pro-conservation behaviors. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 22(4), 959-982. Retrieved from

<http://link.springer.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/article/10.1007/s10531-013-0462-z>

Sunquist, F. (1992). Who's Cute, Cuddly and Charismatic? *International Wildlife*, 22(6), 4-11.

Retrieved from

<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=e78a8641-46c9-4754-bf64-d4d80f9dc75b%40sessionmgr198&vid=1&hid=111&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=9302141871&db=a9h>

Taufik, K. (2016, April 25) When palm oil companies get banned, are they willing to change?

Greenpeace International. Retrieved from

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/indonesia-palm-oil-companies-banned-customers/blog/56280/>

Tyler, M., E. (2007, January 6). EPA information should make greenpeace red-faced over apple targeting. *arstechnica*. Retrieved from <http://arstechnica.com/apple/2007/01/6507/>

Velasco, E., & Rastan, S. (2015). Air quality in Singapore during the 2013 smoke-haze episode over the strait of Malacca: Lessons learned. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 17, 122-131.

Retrieved from

<http://www.sciencedirect.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/science/article/pii/S2210670715000463>

Woolley, J. (2016, April 1). Sumatran rhino found while forest habitat is lost. *Greenpeace*

International. Retrieved from

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/sumatran-rhino-found-deforestation-habitat/blog/56037/>

Zamzami. (2015, November 13). Sad, scared, alone. The baby orangutan orphaned by the plantation industry. *Greenpeace International*. Retrieved from <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/Blogs/makingwaves/sad-scared-alone-the-baby-orangutan-orphaned-/blog/54755/>