

American Studies and Environmental History: Provoking Thought and Practice

Kendra D. Smith

In a 2002 article titled “Conceptualizing the Real,” Hal Rothman skillfully details the development of the field of environmental history and its intersections with American studies. He laments that “American studies has become theory and identity; in the process it has lost something valuable, the grounding that environmental history can provide.”¹ Rothman is right to assert that the fields of American studies and environmental history benefit from common intellectual engagement, yet his comments suggest that despite some exceptions, a nearly irreconcilable rift has developed between the fields. In fact, scholars within the fields of environmental history and American studies continue to have as many similarities as differences in content, methods, and mission. As scholars of both fields have refined the definitions of “culture” and “nature” and rearticulated the relationship between the two, they tread on similar academic terrain. Despite Rothman’s distinction between theoretical American studies and materialist environmental history, practitioners of American studies and environmental history alike have sought avenues to link theoretical insights with material realities and to illustrate how identities are embodied and reflected in the natural world. Moreover, scholars in both fields have had a sense of mission about their intellectual work and have embraced opportunities to take their knowledge outside of the academy. As a result, both fields face a similar challenge of how to address the role of human agency in cultivating ecological and cultural change.²

Rothman's review offers vague guidelines for how American studies and environmental history scholars might renew their partnership with one another, but an invigorated dialogue between American studies and environmental history must also address the relationship between thought and practice.

American studies and environmental history scholars provoke readers to reconsider the relationship between thought and practice because their works echo the assertions of early American pragmatists like John Dewey for whom, according to Nicholas Brommel, "thinking is seen not as a distinction from, but as an extension of, experience."³ Perhaps more than any other fields, environmental history and American studies illustrate the processes through which thinking is actualized in space, embodied in environments, and put to work in the world. Because American studies and environmental history illustrate the relationship between ideas and their consequences in the larger world so keenly, scholars in both fields need to be mindful of the ways in which their own thinking may be actualized and experienced. In other words, while part of American studies and environmental history's common work is to "conceptualize the real," the fields are also uniquely positioned to ask readers to "realize the concept." How do environmental history and American studies scholars and their narratives inform and inspire readers to act in the world? This essay highlights three approaches that will promote continued dialogue between American studies and environmental history scholars and also addresses the fields' responsibilities to engage their readers thoughtfully and experientially: tracing the cultural and natural processes of consumption and production; exploring the importance of places in the formation of ideas; and using the model of "co-production" to investigate the simultaneous global and local manifestations of ecological and cultural change.

Although American studies scholars and environmental historians alike have produced scholarship about the relationship between nature and culture, it would be disingenuous to deny that anxiety still exists among practitioners of both fields about what an environmentally conscious cultural studies or culturally-attentive environmental history might look like. Scholars voice concern about whether nature or culture should be central to the narratives they create. Some environmental historians express unease about studies that emphasize the cultural construction of nature because they believe that such studies will discount nature's materiality and agency. One of the great innovations of environmental history is recognizing that humans exist as only one species within a larger natural world. Therefore, some environmental history scholars fear that putting culture—rather than nature—at the center of environmental history would invalidate its contribution to historical scholarship.⁴ Some American studies scholars, on the other hand, fear that environmental history narratives that stress nature's transformative effects on human culture slight the plurality of individual human experiences with the environment—and especially the cultural influences of race, gender, and class. A number of American studies researchers also feel that

environmental historians could better integrate issues of power into their narratives.⁵

Perceived differences about the fields' methodology also raise concerns. Many American studies scholars guard against environmental history's tendency towards materialism, while numerous environmental historians are wary of American studies' proclivity for abstract theory. But these generalized statements mask the variety of works in both fields. Environmental historians might be surprised to learn that the field of American studies has a long history of studying *material* culture as well as theory. In fact, it was within American studies that environmental historians who have the most materialist slant—Donald Worster and Alfred Crosby—found a home for their early works.⁶ By the same token, despite the importance of materiality to many environmental history narratives, environmental historians have used the insights of some of cultural studies' key figures—like E.P. Thompson, Raymond Williams, and Leo Marx—to articulate the cultural and historical construction of the idea of nature and identify how particular cultural groups related to the natural world.⁷

Finally, some American studies and environmental history scholars perceive that their own commitments to different ethical and political projects—environmentalism vs. social justice—prevent common intellectual engagement.⁸ In fact, environmental history and American studies scholars' moral and ethical concerns have as much in common as not, because both sets of scholars face a similar problem: determinism. Determinist narratives are a persistent thorn in the side of both sets of scholars who consider their intellectual work to be a public or political act, because determinism belies the notion that individual or collective action can make a difference. When American studies and environmental history scholars write deterministic histories, they fail to create a place for human agency in shaping natural systems and social change. To reconcile the differences between American studies and environmental history, scholars must not only look for ways in which environmental and social problems are related, but also to look for theoretical frameworks that acknowledge the role of individuals in creating change in cultural, economic, and environmental systems. Rather than dwell on the differences in political agenda, scholars from both fields would benefit from a shared effort to figure out ways to recognize the possibilities for action within systems of nature and culture.

Three approaches seem suited to bridging the material and ideal elements of the nature-culture relationship, promoting the exchange of ideas between American studies and environmental history, and, most important, addressing the issue of human agency in narratives: an approach that traces the cultural and natural processes of consumption and production; one that explores the importance of places in the formation of ideas; and one that simultaneously investigates the global and local manifestations of ecological and cultural change. By considering the material and ideal elements of human-environment interactions as one process and by being attentive to human agency in their

narratives, American studies scholars and environmental historians could provide narratives about people and the environment that inspire both thought and practice.

The Culture and Nature of Production and Consumption

Environmental historians and American studies scholars have already identified the juncture between production and consumption as a fruitful one for exploration of human-environment interactions. In 2002, the American Society for Environmental History titled its annual conference “Producing and Consuming Natures.” Interest in consumer practices among environmental historians has arisen as the field has shifted in the last twenty years from studying nature as a place apart towards uncovering the history of the landscapes of everyday life.⁹ Works such as William Cronon’s *Nature’s Metropolis*, Richard Tucker’s *Insatiable Appetite*, and Adam Rome’s *The Bulldozer in the Countryside*, link the environmental and social impacts of commodity production to the ordinary household goods Americans purchase. In so doing, these works expose the environmental impacts of mass consumption. These histories open up the field, because commodified nature reaches into almost every reader’s experience of everyday life. Sometimes these histories of turning nature into commodities lack much detail about how individuals engaged market systems, because they identify “the economy” as the key actor in changing ideas towards nature. Nevertheless, they have helped establish the groundwork to move environmental history beyond a set of histories of extractive industries (mining, logging, fishing) and towards an exploration of the innumerable relationships between nature and culture forged through consumption and modern work.¹⁰

Expanding the scope of environmental history to include consumption and modern work has moral implications. The recent scholarship in environmental history has made it impossible for urban or suburban consumers to consider themselves disentangled from the web of resource extraction and to implicate only the extractive industries for environmental degradation. Humans use nature—as producers and consumers—whether they live in country or city, work with a backhoe or a laptop, or play with video games or Peterson’s field guides.¹¹ Environmental historians have made great strides towards including a wider variety of human-environment interactions in their histories, but opportunities abound for continued intellectual engagement.

American studies scholarship has also turned towards consumerism in recent years, using objects of material culture to analyze cultural values as well as material exchanges. American studies, especially its branch of material culture, has long provided an environment for cross-disciplinary investigations of the role of objects in the formation of culture.¹² These material culture scholars shared the assumption that objects were more than merely raw materials that met human needs for subsistence. Rather, they believed that goods “are needed for making visible and stable the categories of culture.”¹³

To this end, American studies scholars have revealed the ways in which objects have helped to mediate relationships, provided a means for individual expression, and been incorporated into shared rituals. Philip Deloria's *Playing Indian* explains that by donning a disguise or trading Indian artifacts, white middle-class Americans confronted and communicated ideas about authenticity and the American nation.¹⁴ Works such as Lizabeth Cohen's *Making a New Deal* and George Lipsitz's *Rainbow at Midnight*, suggest that particular consumer practices of workers provided a common language from which they constructed class identity.¹⁵ But if consumerism forged worker unity, it could also create division. Nayan Shah explains in *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown* that when California labor leaders affixed union labels on cigars and clothing, they identified unlabeled clothing with Chinese workers whom they excluded from labor protection. Hence, by buying union-labeled products, consumers affirmed a foundational ideology of racial exclusion.¹⁶ Often, consumerism provided the materials for individuals to negotiate multi-faceted identities. George Sanchez's *Becoming Mexican American* explains that Mexican-Americans' purchases of consumer goods enabled them to adapt and amalgamate cultures of the United States and Mexico, while Nan Enstad's *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure*, reveals how New York City garment workers' purchases of fiction and fashion enabled them to affirm their identities as workers and as women.¹⁷ By examining consumerism within its social and cultural context, these works have helped clarify the role of goods in constituting cultural categories of race, class, and gender.

As mass commodities have come to the center of both environmental history and American studies analyses, most scholars have either traced the stories of the goods' transformative effects on the environment or their cultural meanings. But a few exemplary works have integrated commodities into both their natural and cultural context. Jennifer Price's *Flight Maps: Adventures with Nature in Modern America*, for example, employs the concrete materials of pigeon pies, shopping malls, and pink flamingos to construct a cultural history about ideas of nature, authenticity, and taste. Price's book revisits familiar stories of environmental history—such as the extinction of the passenger pigeon and the development of the Audubon Society. But her history sheds new light on these well-known tales, because the analysis consistently searches to uncover the cultural ideals that motivated individuals to act in the environment. Rather than deride pigeon hunters or scorn plastic-flamingo purchasers, Price's history digs into the primary documents to uncover what shooting a pigeon or planting a plastic flamingo *meant* to late nineteenth or mid-twentieth century Americans. Her analysis thereby helps us to understand the people who consumed these objects, not just the materials or ideas transformed by production and consumption.¹⁸ Price's work also points towards important questions yet to be fully answered by environmental historians and American studies scholars, such as: What human values guided uses and abuses of nature? How did uses of

nature vary among different groups of people, in specific places, at particular points of time? In what ways were these practices learned, cultivated, carried out?

As environmental historians and American studies scholars uncover the material impacts of consumer goods, they also need to situate the processes of production within their cultural contexts, because the same processes of industrialization that obscure the ecological pasts of consumer goods also conceal the cultural values underlying production systems. American studies and environmental history scholars have already provided multiple models for this kind of scholarship. Frieda Knobloch's *The Culture of Wilderness: Agriculture as Colonization in the American West* bares the cultural roots of agriculture, showing that agriculture is a social enterprise, not just a material one.¹⁹ In *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture*, Deborah Fitzgerald similarly traces the important role of the ideals of agricultural engineering and economics as drivers of the industrialization of farming in the mid twentieth-century.²⁰

By identifying the unnoticed assumptions that lie beneath production systems, these works suggest that economic systems exist in a cultural context. Economies depend on a set of choices that individuals and communities make about how to allocate tasks, distribute products, use goods, and compensate one another for labor.²¹ When "the economy" is understood on cultural terms, it can be seen not as a deterministic force against which individuals are powerless, but as a system created by individuals and communities through their actions and ideals. Histories attentive to the cultural and material elements of economies thereby assure readers that they can and do indeed live out their values.

Places Create Knowledge and Ideas Shape Spaces

A second way in which American studies and environmental history scholars have forged connections between the ideal and material elements of the nature-culture relationship is by building on the theoretical contention that people come to know by living in place. The works of Michel Foucault and Donna Haraway provide some of the theoretical underpinnings for this body of scholarship. American studies scholars and environmental historians have creatively refined the theorists' key insights and could continue to develop theories and practices about thinking and doing in nature.²²

Michel Foucault's works provide one example of how ideologies construct spaces and spaces communicate ideals. He contends that medical and state agents wield power that is dispersed through physical spaces such as asylums, prisons, schools, hospitals, and bodies, thereby silencing and constraining alternatives to normality.²³ Foucault's attention to places as sites of power offers an important insight to scholars studying space.²⁴ And yet, as the sphere of normalizing power widens to encompass almost all spaces in Foucault's analyses, his explanation

for how power operates becomes as diffuse and vague as the power he describes. Moreover, by asserting that normalizing power penetrates all places, Foucault's framework stifles the possibility that individuals or communities could construct spaces to become sites of liberation, resistance, empowerment, or inspiration. He thereby leaves much room for environmental historians and American studies scholars to describe the multiple ways in which places communicate power and knowledge to those who inhabit them.

A number of scholars have identified the ways in which particular sites communicate cultural messages. Like myths or symbols, spaces convey collective representations of culture, but spaces enable cultural ideals not only to be represented, but also to be performed. Marguerite Shaffer's *See America First: Tourism and National Identity, 1880-1940* suggests that landscapes such as national parks and auto-touring routes enshrined national traditions and provided sites for travelers to legitimize their national identity.²⁵ Janet Davis' *The Circus Age: Culture and Society under the American Big Top*, similarly reveals how the physical sites of the circus upheld cultural values of individualism, feminine respectability, and Anglo-American superiority.²⁶ Mart Stewart's "Rice, Water, and Power: Landscapes of Domination and Resistance in the Low-Country, 1790-1880," explains that when antebellum rice planters directed the transformation of tidewater swamps into a hydraulic grid of rice fields, they displayed not only their power over the environment, but simultaneously reinforced their control over African-American slaves. Although the landscape was a symbol of planters' domination, it also provided resources with which slaves could create their own livelihoods through gardening, fishing, and trading resources.²⁷ These works identify some of the many ways in which culture is woven into our experiences of living in place, but they could go further to explain how individuals translate, comprehend, or transform the cultural meanings of particular places. If individuals interpret the cultural message of a particular site in a new way, does it alter the dominant power or meaning of that place? How do a multitude of understandings and experiences of a place come together to construct common cultural meaning? The *process* of how individuals attribute meaning to places deserves as much attention as the identification of particular cultural meanings in specific places.

Donna Haraway provides another theoretical touchstone for works of environmental history and American studies. Haraway, like Foucault, exposes the cultural contingency and historical specificity of ostensibly universal knowledge. But she also believes that her scholarship should provide ways to better understand and engage in the world, and she remains unconvinced that Foucaultian analyses of power and incessant deconstructions of texts will suffice as guides for these practical aims.²⁸ Haraway comes to balance her commitment to historic and cultural specificity and action through the doctrine of "situated knowledge." By asserting that all knowledge claims comes from specific positions, Haraway argues against knowledge that is "unlocatable" and unable

to be called to account. Haraway maintains that to claim that all knowledge is “situated” is not to concede to relativism, because relativism claims “to be everywhere equally” whereas situated knowledge recognizes its partiality.²⁹ However, Haraway offers little explanation of the shared systems (nature, economy, culture) in which individuals create common identities, communities, and dreams. Although Haraway maintains that objectivity can only be realized through “the joining of partial views and halting voices into a collective subject position,” she gives few indications of what common project might meld the partial views and situated knowledges together.³⁰

Haraway’s call for situated knowledge stems primarily from her consideration of how gender shapes epistemology, but her term “situated knowledge” resonates with place-based and regionalist works in environmental history and American studies. Environmental historian Christopher Sellers’ analysis of Henry David Thoreau, for example, notes that, “Thoreau’s natural knowledge veiled neither its geographical ties to a particular place nor its dependence on individual perspective and experience; rather, his bodily situatedness facilitated his knowledge-making.”³¹ American studies scholar Simon Bronner writes in *Grasping Things: Folk Material Culture and Mass Society in America*, “we grasp mind through behavior.”³² Regionalist scholars claim that our thoughts and actions in place are not separate; rather, we come to think and believe through the things we do.

American studies scholars have been among the leaders in documenting the effect of place on the production of knowledge and of region in the shaping of culture. The works of Paul Venable Turner and Thomas Schlereth, for instance, analyze the influence of physical sites that facilitate formal education, such as college campuses and arboretums.³³ Other American studies scholars have documented regionalist influences in formal art and literature.³⁴ *The Handbook of American Folklore*, edited by Richard Dorson, identifies how a variety of places—schools, neighborhoods, and office buildings—function as sites for interchange and exchange of rituals, customs, traditions, and sayings that make up a local culture.³⁵ George Lipsitz argues that social activists of the 1960’s sought to gain control over physical spaces, “using space as a source of solidarity and as impetus to action.”³⁶ By investigating the shared traditions, art forms, and environments of particular places, regionalists within the field of American studies have argued for a conception of collective identity (and collective memory) based on experiences in place and experiences of displacement.³⁷

Environmental writers have also called for more conscious engagement with the concept of place. Writers like David Orr and Paul Gruchow contend that knowing one’s place also engenders a sense of belonging and responsibility, because it enables a person to understand one’s dependence on the natural landscape and on other members of a shared community. But they note that as people have fewer opportunities to directly observe nature and to engage with one another, they know less and less about the natural and cultural history of the places they live.³⁸ Orr and Gruchow find this trend unsettling, because as students

learn to depend on specialized expertise and abstract technological solutions to environmental problems, they have neither the skills nor interest to take care of their local land, water, and community. Therefore, the authors advocate active learning about place—through direct observation of nature and cultivation of community life. By changing how people come to know place, they believe that they can transform how they live in it.³⁹ Like Haraway, these environmental writers recognize a necessary relationship between epistemology and ontology, but their emphasis on the power of place offers a site or common project through which many “situated knowledges” can interact with one another.

Environmental historians employ the concept of place as a site for further historical inquiry. In a 1994 article titled “Place: An Argument for Bioregional History,” historian Dan Flores calls for scholars to consider region as a unit of analysis in their narratives. He writes that bioregionalism’s “emphasis on the close linkage between ecological locale and human culture, its implication that in a variety of ways humans not only alter environments but also adapt to them. . . ties it to some central questions of environmental history inquiry.”⁴⁰ Many of the most successful works in environmental history use a particular site or region to explain how changes in the land, new ways of producing and consuming nature, or evolving concepts of nature alter how people experience place.⁴¹ Richard White’s *The Organic Machine*, for instance, employs the history of one particular site—the Columbia River watershed—to survey shifting relationships between people and the river. His work deftly depicts the beliefs, hopes, and ideals through which people understood their work as fishermen and women, gillnetters, planners, nuclear plant workers, and fisheries managers.⁴²

Narrowing the scope of analysis to a particular region gives historians a refined lens to narrate the turning points in human-environment interactions. Moreover, by focusing on particular places, environmental historians have been able to identify the conflicting and cooperating interests in struggles over how natural and cultural resources of a region should be managed. By using the localized case study of Gary, Indiana, for instance, Andrew Hurley’s *Environmental Inequalities* explains how white suburban housewives, labor union activists, and black political leaders alternatively built coalitions and broke them as they mediated the city’s environmental politics.⁴³ Pairing the skills of bioregional historians and folklorists might help to illuminate the collective knowledge and cultural conflicts that come out of particular human-environment interactions.

Although emphasis on place lends important tools for American studies and environmental history scholars, there are risks to regionally-placed case studies of environmental and cultural change. Knowing particular places and cultures helps cultivate responsibility towards nature and cultures, but such responsibility also depends on the recognition of connections between places and peoples. In fact, trends of national incorporation, cultural hegemony, and global interdependence often spark the impulse towards regionalism.⁴⁴ All localities are tied to other ones through systems of state, economy, culture, and

environment. The practices of environmentalism and social justice must be carried out in particular places, but guidelines for action must come from both assessing local needs and environments in the context of a larger perspective. We are all at once both local and extra-local. Our bodies and minds are part of local communities, but they also constitute individuals and communities within a nation, nodes within a global world and beings within an ecosystem. Local studies provide us with concrete starting points for engaging and protecting culture and nature of place, but we must evaluate our individual and local actions precisely because of our responsibility and our larger ecological and cultural community.

To focus widely and abstractly on systems of environmental change, cultural hegemony, or global capitalism diminishes the notion that individuals acting in place can make a difference. Abstract national and international agendas for environmental and social change often fail to be attentive to how such grand imperatives are carried out on a local level, and these agendas risk being irrelevant, arrogant, or even harmful to the knowledge and practices of local communities. As Louis Warren's *The Hunter's Game* explains, the transformation of local hunting commons into state and nationally-managed wild lands waged social costs, especially for the rural poor.⁴⁵ But environmental and American studies based on a local scale tend either to ignore the relationship between local and global networks of power or to romanticize all local action as resistant without acknowledging tension among local groups or friction between localities.⁴⁶ Many social and environmental problems transcend regional and national boundaries—issues like global warming, AIDS, and inequities in the distribution of natural resources and toxic wastes. Local practice is important, but a narrow, insular NIMBY-ism cannot suffice as a model for more equitable and humble relations to the natural world.

Producing, Consuming, and Co-Producing Space and Place

American studies scholars and environmental historians, then, must continue to find ways to illuminate the complex tensions and “intricate interdependencies” between individual and community, person and environment, local and global.⁴⁷ Only theories that acknowledge the simultaneity and interplay between local and global or individual and community can provide an adequate framework for guiding appropriate local actions that can address large-scale environmental and social problems. What theories or existing histories might help engender such insights? Exemplars that seem to straddle these scales and provide imaginative models for future work include Henri Lefebvre's *Production of Space*, Victoria de Grazia's idea of “consumption regimes” and Anthony Bebbington's theory of “coproduction.”

Lefebvre asserts that all spaces are social products, not merely physical sites or mental representations. Building on this assertion, Lefebvre contends that through coming to know spaces, one also comes to understand and engender

social values and practices. In Lefebvre's terms, "If space is a product, knowledge of it must be expected to reproduce and expound the process of production."⁴⁸ Like Foucault, Lefebvre critiques the dominance of *conceived* spaces—abstract ways of describing space such as maps, city plans, or language—because these conceptions of space, generated through formal institutions and with scientific knowledge, disguise the power of the state and of capitalism.⁴⁹ Like Haraway, Lefebvre values the knowledge generated through local and peripheral relations to particular spaces. He writes that *lived* spaces generate less formal, local forms of knowing that are geographically and historically contingent and are the result of specific spatial practices.⁵⁰ Yet Lefebvre also recognizes that scales of space do not operate separately. As he contends, "The worldwide does not abolish the local."⁵¹ Whereas Haraway fails to resolve conflicts between multiple subject positions, Lefebvre acknowledges that lived space is the space of social struggle—where relations of dominance, subordination, and resistance are played out.⁵² However, Lefebvre's abstract scale obfuscates exactly how the processes of social struggle operate, and his emphasis on production and producers of space offers little explanation of how spaces are interpreted and consumed.⁵³

Geographer Anthony Bebbington provides a more concrete model of how people combine local practices and values within extra-local systems as they produce and consume material and ideal elements of space. In "Reencountering Development: Livelihood Transitions and Place Transformations in the Andes," Bebbington explains that in Colta, Ecuador, many rural migrants come to the city for jobs, but use their earnings to accumulate enough capital to buy lands and build houses in the rural areas.⁵⁴ The migrants do not fit the pattern of the resistant peasant, because they willingly engage in wage labor, but neither do they fit the Western model of capital accumulation and modernization, because they choose to return to their rural homes. Bebbington concludes, "'Modernizing development' is not necessarily resisted but is more often taken, transformed, and used; and similarly, modernizing institutions are worked with, used, transformed, and turned, as far as possible, to people's own purposes. As a consequence, almost everything about development is 'coproduced.'"⁵⁵ Understanding development as "coproduction" puts individual people back into the narrative of capitalist development, and lessens tendencies of the economy to appear as a "black box" or totalizing force. It also has the potential to replace the idea of the romanticized resistant local for a more realistic portrayal of peoples who engage with larger structures and also assert their political and cultural identities. Bebbington's notion of co-production creates a place for individual agency and contextualizes this action within systems of ecology, economy, and culture.

Recent works in the history of consumption, similarly, suggest a kind of co-consumption because they embed stories of how individuals create identities through consumerism within frameworks of state power. Historian Victoria de Grazia notes that the significance of consumer practices to empower or disempower depends largely on the political system in which these actions take

place. Different political systems, she argues, create and support varying “consumption regimes.” She writes, “processes of forming identities through acts of consumption need to be related to definitions of the rights and obligations of citizenship under particular regimes of power.”⁵⁶ James J. Farrell’s *One Nation Under Goods* and Lizabeth Cohen’s *A Consumer’s Republic*, give readers clear examples of ways in which the state and citizens channel consumer culture—from tax-increment financing to minimum wages, trademark laws to protective legislation.⁵⁷ De Grazia’s conception of “consumer regimes” provides a heuristic tool for comparative American studies, because it emphasizes that the influences of American capital and culture abroad are always affected by the structures and places of the nation. To call attention to the influence of state structures on consumption is not to deny the importance of identities forged through consumer practices, but rather to recognize the dialogue between cultural identities and the political economy and ecology of particular places.

An emphasis on co-production and/or co-consumption in American studies and environmental history is not novel; existing works in American studies that have used similar ideas—such as bilingualism, hybridity, or heteroglossia—to describe the processes of adaptation of cultural forms.⁵⁸ Environmental histories also lend evidence of intermediaries who moved ideas, practices, or materials between rural and urban or national and local places, adapting them to fit local contexts and purposes.⁵⁹ My concern is not with the novelty of the idea of “coproduction,” but rather with the implications that it presents for the ways environmental history and American studies incorporate human agency into their narratives. Paying attention to the role of bilingual mediators in cultural and economic exchanges adds faces to an often faceless history in which the looming forces of “capitalism,” “state,” or “power” seem to be the only compelling characters. When combined with stories of how intermediaries were at once coldly received, enthusiastically welcomed, and skeptically cooperated with by local communities, these histories begin to approximate the rich and complicated truths of what the processes of change and exchange might have looked like on a human scale.

Engaging Histories and Histories That Engage

Despite differences in theme, approach, or ethical commitments, American studies and environmental history share a basic and important similarity: practitioners in both fields want to put their knowledge to work in the world. American studies and environmental history scholars pursue knowledge, but they also search for ways to enrich the public good and seek ways to deepen respect for nature. These are not trivial pursuits, but essential to their disciplinary traditions.⁶⁰ As James J. Farrell explains in, “What are American Studies For? Some Practical Perspectives,” the best American studies, “involve theory, but theory applied . . . to bridging the past and the present, the text and its readers, the language and its meanings.”⁶¹ Through American studies, he writes, students

gain tools—empathy, understanding, critical consciousness, thoughtfulness, and imagination—to apply to life’s situations. Similarly, William Cronon’s “The Uses of Environmental History” suggests that environmental histories have a purpose, a lasting usefulness in the world. He writes, “By telling parables that trace the often obscure connections between human history and ecological change, environmental history suggests where we ought to go looking if we wish to reflect on the ethical implications of our own lives.”⁶² The disciplines of American studies and environmental history ask their practitioners to learn theory *and* praxis. Equipped with the tools of American studies and environmental history, students and scholars can act willfully, live mindfully, and behave selectively. Praxis pairs the ideal and material in a transformative way.

Finding ways to better address human agency within the frameworks of economy, state, and culture, then, is not merely an intellectual task; it is imperative to helping American studies and environmental history fulfill their missions as disciplines committed to engaging theory and practice. The ways that environmental historians and American studies scholars tell their stories, and especially the roles they assign to humans in their narratives, have great implications for how readers put this thoughtful work to use in the world. When scholars tell top-down deterministic stories about environmental and cultural change in which “biology,” “state,” “cultural hegemony,” or “capitalism” are the key actors, readers are left feeling that their actions matter little in the grand scale of world events. Readers may be left saddened by stories of extinctions or disturbed by the grasp of normalizing power, but cannot imagine how people could have acted in alternative ways.

Localized histories of resistance, however, give readers the sense that they can only act by bucking “the system.” Like Thoreau, they need to retreat from the village and build themselves a life in the woods. But most readers are deeply embedded within systems of culture, family, polity, environment, and economy, and these systems shape the possibilities for individual action within the world. Although a few readers might admire Thoreau, most readers say to the historian: “Get Real.” They have children to feed, mortgages to pay, and do not feel that they can become the town crank. It’s not that the readers don’t care about nature or their communities; rather, many of the stories that historians and environmentalists tell them about human engagement in the natural world leave them with little hope that they can make a difference in the real places in which they live. Moreover, localized histories of resistance often leave unexplored the ramifying and unintended consequences that extend beyond the local context. For example, a history of local resistance to the construction of a waste incinerator might inspire students, but it may not explain the ecological and social consequences of its relocation to another neighborhood or address the systems of waste generation that made the incinerator necessary in the first place.

Histories of co-production, I think, might help readers to bridge these alternatives, by showing them human exemplars who are real people who are

neither shamelessly complicit in large-scale environmental and cultural changes, nor avowedly resistant to them. Co-production is also a great template for encouraging the active, engaged learning that American studies and environmental history can cultivate. At their best, the disciplines require students to consider their own lives within the larger contexts and institutions that shape systems of culture, economy, politics, law, ecology, family, race, gender, sexuality, and power. An American studies and environmental history education should provide students with the skills to employ and critique these structures effectively and critically. Within the co-production model, individuals are not passive receptors of these systems, destined to act as the systems decide, but neither do they act without awareness or recognition of the larger structures. Hence, co-production provides us a framework that might engender active and participatory American studies and environmental history.⁶³

While the ever-expanding body of works by American studies scholars and environmental historians of the last thirty years shows much sophistication and imagination, scholars of both fields must continue to consider the public contexts, readers, and students whom their works serve.⁶⁴ In particular, American studies and environmental history could do more collective work to consider a question central to both fields: how do human agents act within larger cultural, economic, and ecological systems? Indeed, opportunities for complementary co-production and cooperation between American studies and environmental history abound. Although the institutional systems inhabited by individual scholars may discourage exchanges between practitioners of American studies and environmental history, as scholars, we too, can work with, transform, and turn these systems to our own purposes—a richer body of literature, renewed academic dialogue, and engaging scholarship in the classroom and the field.

Notes

The author wishes to thank the three anonymous reviewers whose comments were especially instructive in improving this essay and to thank the editors of *American Studies* for their assistance. She also wishes to recognize the colleagues who aided in its transformation from a seminar paper to its current form—Ikuko Asaka, Will Barnett, Jim Feldman, Sam Graber, Hong Jiang, Scott Moranda, Mike Rawson, Tom Robertson, Keith Woodhouse, and the University of Wisconsin Environmental History Colloquium. Most of all, she'd like to thank Jim Farrell and Frieda Knobloch for launching her journey into American studies and environmental history at St. Olaf College and to thank William Cronon for patiently and gracefully shepherding along her studies at University of Wisconsin-Madison. Each of these wonderful mentors provides a model of invigorating scholarship that reaches beyond the classroom. Any errors or oversights are the author's own.

1. Hal Rothman, "Conceptualizing the Real: Environmental History and American Studies." *American Quarterly* 54 (September 2002): 456; see also Hal Rothman, "A Decade in the Saddle: Confessions of a Recalcitrant Editor," *Environmental History* 7 (January 2002), 9-21.

2. For the public mission of American studies and environmental history, see Gene Wise, "Some Elementary Axioms for an American Culture Studies," in *Prospects: An Annual of American Cultural Studies*, 4, ed. Jack Salzman (New York: Burt Franklin and Company, 1979), 531. Wise asserts that, "Despite massive institutional pressures to see it otherwise, the first and final base of American culture studies must be not in the departments of academe, but in ongoing experiences outside." Many environmental historians, meanwhile, seek to reach public audiences and to inspire

them to reconsider their own relationship with the natural world. As Donald Worster states, "Environmental history ought to have a few *ideas* to offer the public, and those ideas ought to have a little conviction in them as well as reason and evidence. The historian should let people know what he cares about and encourage them to care about it too." Worster, *The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), vii-ix.

3. Nicholas Bromell, "What Next? Thought and Action in Intellectual Work," *American Quarterly* 47 (March 1995): 105; James T. Kloppenberg, "Pragmatism: An Old Name for Some New Ways of Thinking?" *Journal of American History* 83 (June 1996): 101.

4. Donald Worster, "Seeing Beyond Culture," *Journal of American History* 76 (March 1990): 1144; Kevin Dann and Gregg Mitman, "Essay Review: Exploring the Borders of Environmental History and the History of Ecology." *Journal of the History of Biology* 30 (Summer 1997): 296.

5. For examples of environmental history that diminish individual human experiences, for a larger scale on the species, see Alfred Crosby, *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986) or Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997). For calls for cultural influences in environmental history, see William Cronon, "Modes of Prophecy and Production: Placing Nature in History," *Journal of American History* 76 (March 1990): 1129; Carolyn Merchant, "Gender and Environmental History," *Journal of American History* 76 (March 1990): 1117-21; Carolyn Merchant, "Shades of Darkness: Race and Environmental History," *Environmental History* 8 (July 2003): 380-394. On power, Jennifer Price, e-mail message to author, September 17, 2003.

6. Henry Nash Smith identified social and material explanations as part of culture as early as 1956. Smith, "Can 'American Studies' Develop a Method?" *American Quarterly* 9 (Summer 1957): 203-4; Barry Shank, "The Continuing Embarrassment of Culture: From the Culture Concept to Cultural Studies," *American Studies* 38 (Summer 1997): 97-99. Both Worster and Crosby found their first institutional homes in American studies departments—at Yale University and the University of Texas respectively. See Rothman, "Conceptualizing the Real," 485.

7. Raymond Williams, "Ideas of Nature," in *Problems in Materialism and Culture* (London: Verso, 1980), 67; E.P. Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class* (London: V. Gollanez, 1963); Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act* (London: Allen Lane, 1975); Leo Marx, *The Machine and the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). Both Richard White and William Cronon reference Williams. White, "Discovering Nature in North America" *Journal of American History* 79 (December 1992): 874; William Cronon, *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996), 25. E.P. Thompson's work informs Louis Warren, *The Hunter's Game: Poachers and Conservationists in Twentieth-Century America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997) and Karl Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, and Thieves and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). Environmental histories have also long traced the intellectual history of ideas of nature, wilderness, and ecology. See Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 3rd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982); Donald Worster, *Nature's Economy: The Roots of Ecology* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1977); Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983).

8. In recent years, environmental history's new-found attention to environmental justice and gendered histories of the environment has begun to break down these boundaries. Among the works that deal with class, race, and gender vis-à-vis the environment are Andrew Hurley, *Environmental Inequalities: Class, Race, and Industrial Pollution in Gary, Indiana, 1945-1980* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1995); Carolyn Merchant, *Ecological Revolutions: Nature, Gender, and Science in New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1989); Vera Norwood, *Made from This Earth: American Women and Nature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1993); Amy Green, "Two Women Naturalists and the Search for Autonomy: Anna Botsford Comstock and the Producer Ethic; Gene Stratton Porter and the Gospel of Wealth." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 29 (Spring 2001): 145-154.

9. Histories of nature as a resource and as a site for recreation dominated early environmental history scholarship, because so many of these histories traced the origins of Progressive-era conservation and preservation movements. See, for instance Samuel P. Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959). Robert Gottlieb noted this trend in *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1993), 15-46.

10. William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: Norton, 1990); Richard Tucker, *Insatiable Appetite: The United States and the Ecological Degradation of the Tropic World* (Berkeley: University of California, 2000); Jennifer Price, *Flight Maps: Adventures with Nature in Modern America* (New York: Basic Books, 1999); Susan Strasser,

Waste and Want: A Social History of Trash (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1999); Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

11. Richard White, "Are You an Environmentalist, or Do You Work for a Living?: Work and Nature" in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, William Cronon, ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995), 181-2.

12. Two works provide especially useful analyses of the history of material culture studies and the multiple disciplines represented in the field. They are: Thomas Schlereth, "Material Culture Studies in America, 1876-1976," in *Material Culture Studies in America*, compiled by Thomas Schlereth, (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1982), 1-78 and Ann Smart Martin and J. Ritchie Garrison, "Shaping the Field: The Multidisciplinary Perspectives of Material Culture," in *American Material Culture: The Shape of the Field*. Ann Smart Martin and J. Ritchie Garrison, eds. (Winterthur: Winterthur Museum, 1993), 1-21. Cary Carson, "Material Culture History: The Scholarship Nobody Knows," in *American Material Culture*, 401-428 identifies material culture as an off-shoot of American studies. See also E. McClung Fleming, "Artifact Study: A Proposed Model," *Winterthur Portfolio* 9 (June 1974): 153-61; Kenneth Ames, "Meaning in Artifacts: Hall Furnishings in Victorian America." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 9 (Summer 1978): 19-46; John Kouwenhoven, "American Studies: Words or Things?" in *American Studies in Transition*, Marshall Fishwick, ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964), 15-35; Thomas Schlereth, *Cultural History and Material Culture* (Ann Arbor: UMI Press, 1990); Ian M.G. Quimby, ed. *Material Culture and the Study of American Life*. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1978); Ruth Schwarz Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*. (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Ruth Schwarz Cowan, "The Consumption Junction: A Proposal of Research Strategies in the Sociology of Consumption," in Wiebe Bijker, Thomas P. Hughes, Trevor Pinch, eds. *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987), 261-280.

13. Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood, *The World of Goods* (New York: Basic Books, 1979), 59; Arjun Appadurai, ed. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986). Chandra Mukerji, *From Graven Images: Patterns of Modern Materialism*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983); Grant McCracken, *Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988); Daniel Miller, *Material Culture and Mass Consumption* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987).

14. Philip Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 120, 149.

15. Elizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990); George Lipsitz, *Rainbow at Midnight: Labor and Culture in the 1940's* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1994). Rural historians have also identified consumption as a key process in establishing rural identity. Hal S. Barron, *Mixed Harvest: The Second Great Transformation in the Rural North, 1870-1930* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1997); Ronald Kline, *Consumers in the Country: Technology and Social Change in Rural America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000). See also Peter K. Lunt and Sonia M. Livingstone, *Mass Consumption and Personal Identity: Everyday Economic Experience* (Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press, 1992).

16. Nayan Shah, *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown* (Berkeley: University of California, 2001), 158-9.

17. George Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican-American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 201-205; Nan Enstad, *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

18. Price, *Flight Maps*. Also see Ann Smart Martin, "Makers, Buyers, and Users: Consumerism as a Material Culture Framework." *Winterthur Portfolio*. 28 (Summer/Autumn 1993): 157. James J. Farrell also explores the interface between the environmental and cultural contexts of commodities in Farrell, *One Nation Under Goods: Malls and the Seductions of American Shopping* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2003).

19. Frieda Knobloch, *The Culture of Wilderness: Agriculture as Colonization in the American West* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1996), 3.

20. Deborah Fitzgerald, *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 4, 8.

21. Stephen Gudeman, *Economics as Culture: Models and Metaphors of Livelihood* (London: Routledge, 1986), 28, 35.

22. This section of the paper has been aided immensely by Christopher Sellers, "Thoreau's Body: Towards an Embodied Environmental History," *Environmental History* 4 (October 1999): 486-514; and Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, *Culture Power Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 1-29.

23. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (New York: Random House, 1979); Idem., *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*,

ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980); Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1973).

24. For Foucault's influence on environmental history, see Sellers, "Thoreau's Body," 488. For his influence on American studies, see George Lipsitz, "Listening to Learn and Learning to Listen: Popular Culture, Cultural Theory, and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 42 (December 1990): 619.

25. Marguerite Shaffer, *See America First: Tourism and National Identity, 1880-1940* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian, 2000), 3-6.

26. Janet Davis, *The Circus Age: Culture and Society under the American Big Top* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2002), 83, 210-11.

27. Mart Stewart, "Rice, Water, and Power: Landscapes of Domination and Resistance in the Low-Country, 1790-1880," *Environmental History Review* 15 (Fall 1991): 48-49.

28. Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism as a Site of Discourse on the Privilege of Partial Perspective," *Feminist Studies* 14 (1988): 579.

29. Haraway, "Situated Knowledges," 584.

30. *Ibid.*, 590.

31. Sellers, "Thoreau's Body," 491.

32. Simon Bronner, *Grasping Things: Folk Material Culture and Mass Society* (Louisville: University Press of Kentucky, 1986), 21.

33. Paul Venable Turner, *Campus: An American Planning Tradition* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987); Thomas Schlereth, "Keepers of Trees: A Cultural History of North American Arboreta and Arboreal Sites," Notre Dame University American Studies Department website, <http://americanstudies.nd.edu/mainpage.html> (Accessed September 15, 2003).

34. For examples of literary and artistic regionalism in American Studies, see Carey Williams, *The New Regionalism in American Literature* (Seattle: University of Washington Bookstore, 1930); Matthew Baigell, *The American Scene: American Painting in the 1930s* (New York: F.A. Praeger, 1974); American Studies Association: Eighth Biennial Convention, "Region in American Culture," (abstracts, Rivermont Hotel, Memphis, TN, October 29-November 1, 1982); Thomas Schlereth and Barbara Allen, eds, *Sense of Place: American Regional Cultures* (Louisville: University Press of Kentucky, 1990); Diane Dufva Quantic, *The Nature of the Place: A Study of Great Plains Fiction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); Elizabeth Ammons and Valerie Rohy, eds, *American Local Color Writing, 1880-1920* (New York: Penguin, 1998); Lisa Botshon and Meredith Goldsmith, eds, *Middlebrow Moderns: Popular American Women Writers of the 1920s* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2003).

35. Richard Dorson, ed., *Handbook of American Folklore* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), 86-87.

36. George Lipsitz, "No Shining city on a Hill: American Studies and the Problem of Place," *American Studies* 40 (Summer 1999): 59.

37. On displacement, see Gupta and Ferguson, eds., *Culture Power Place*, 118-135; 203-232.

38. Paul Gruchow, *Grass Roots: The Universe of Home* (Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 1995), 126, 130; David Orr, *Ecological Literacy: Education and the Transition to a Postmodern World* (Albany: State University of New York, 1992), 89, 130-31.

39. Gruchow, *Grass Roots*, 124-5, 130; Orr, *Ecological Literacy*, 103.

40. Dan Flores, "Place: An Argument for Bioregional History," *Environmental History Review* 18 (Winter 1994), 5.

41. Richard White, *The Organic Machine The Remaking of the Columbia River* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995); Donald Worster, *Dust Bowl: The Southern Plains in the 1930's* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); Richard Judd, *Common Lands, Common People: The Origins of Conservation in Northern New England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997).

42. White, *The Organic Machine*.

43. Hurlley, *Environmental Inequalities*.

44. As Elizabeth Ammons and Valerie Rohy note, local turn-of the century writers addressed broader social issues such as immigration and national identity. Ammons and Rohy, *American Local Color Writing, 1880-1920*, xvii; Lipsitz, "No Shining City on a Hill," 59, 65.

45. Warren, *The Hunter's Game*, 15-17; 181-2.

46. For example, Adam Rome's *Bulldozer in the Countryside* explains that as suburbanites witnessed the detrimental environmental impact of their neighborhoods' construction, they became inspired to protect the environment. But Rome's analysis fails to consider the racial and class markers of suburban environments. Therefore, he prides local initiative without acknowledging the larger power structures in which these activists operated. Studies that emphasize how consumerism helped engender class and gendered identities, however, often fail to recognize the cumulative environmental impacts of increased consumerism.

47. Janice Radway, "What's in a Name: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, 20 November 1998," *American Quarterly* 51 (March 1999): 10.

48. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Trans. Donald Nicholson Smith (Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1991), 26.
49. *Ibid.*, 37-38.
50. Lynn Stewart, "Bodies, Visions, and Spatial Politics: A Review Essay on Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 13 (October 1995), 610-611.
51. Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 86.
52. Edward Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to LA and Other Real-And-Imagined Places* (Cambridge: Blackwell Press, 1996), 68-70.
53. For more on the *consumption* of place, see John Urry, *Consuming Places* (London: Routledge, 1995).
54. Anthony Bebbington, "Reencountering Development: Livelihood Transitions and Place Transformations in the Andes," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (September 2000), 503-504. For a similar model, see Akhil Gupta, *Postcolonial Developments: The Making of Modern Agriculture in India* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).
55. *Ibid.*, 513-514.
56. Victoria de Grazia, ed. with Ellen Furlough, *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective* (Berkeley: University of California, 1996), 279.
57. Farrell, *One Nation Under Goods*, 215-232; Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Knopf, 2003).
58. For example, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese explains that feminist, African-American and Jewish writers expressed gendered, ethnic, racial, and religious identities in relation to the dominant groups. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "Between Individualism and Fragmentation: American Culture and the New Literary Studies of Race and Gender," *American Quarterly* 42 (March 1990): 12; On heteroglossia, see Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson, eds. Michael Holquist, trans. (Austin: University of Texas, 1981); Terry Eagleton, ed. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1996), 99-102.
59. Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); One of the liveliest passages of William Cronon's *Nature's Metropolis*, for instance, tells how the merchant John McDowell Burrows finessed trade in farmers' potatoes and frozen hogs as well as exchanges with dry goods wholesalers in the city. Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis*, 319.
60. For examples and analysis of the activist strain in American Studies, see Wise, "Some Elementary Axioms for an American Culture Studies," 531; Gene Wise, "Paradigm Dramas in American Studies: A Cultural and Institutional History of the Movement," *American Quarterly* 31 (Fall 1979): 312, 327; Guenter Lenz, "American Studies and the Radical Tradition," *Prospects* 12 (1987), 20-58. In environmental history, see Worster, *Nature's Economy: The Roots of Ecology*, Worster, *Wealth of Nature*, Carolyn Merchant, *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World* (New York: Routledge, 1992).
61. James J. Farrell, "What Are American Studies For? Some Practical Perspectives," *American Studies* 40 (Summer 1999): 195.
62. William Cronon, "The Uses of Environmental History," *Environmental History Review* 17 (Fall 1993): 20.
63. Farrell, "What are American Studies For?" 195.
64. For more on the expansion of environmental history scholarship, see Richard White, "Afterword: Environmental History: Watching a Historical Field Mature" *Pacific Historical Review*, 70 (February 2001): 110-111.