### Part 1 – a Haunted Landscape

#### Welcome to the 6th great extinction event you’re all invited, take a seat, and enjoy the ride as species die, forests collapse, and the ice melts. Marvel at the human race’s magnum opus our greatest achievement the culmination of millennia of progress and uncapped growth. But don’t stare for too long, for if you gaze into the abyss something will stare back the ghosts haunting this baren landscape; human and non-human alike their cries echo inside this room and their shimmer is felt to anyone who listens.

Tsing et all 17, Anna Lowenhaupt, et al. *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

--The winds of the Anthropocene carry ghosts—the vestiges and signs of past ways of life still charged in the present. This book offers stories of those winds as they blow over haunted landscapes. Our ghosts are the traces of more-than-human histories through which ecologies are made and unmade. "Anthropocene" is the proposed name for a geologic epoch in which humans have become the major force determining the continuing liv-ability of the earth. The word tells a big story: living arrangements that took millions of years to put into place are being undone in the blink of an eye. The hubris of conquerors and corporations makes it uncertain what we can bequeath to our next generations, human and not human. The enormity of our dilemma leaves scientists, writers, artists, and scholars in shock. How can we best use our research to stem the tide of ruination? In this half of our volume, we approach this problem by showing readers how to pay better attention to over-laid arrangements of human and nonhuman living spaces, which we call "landscapes!' Our hope is that such attention will allow us to stand up to the constant barrage of messages asking us to forget—that is, to allow a few private owners and public officials with their eyes focused on short-term gains to pretend that environmental devastation does not exist. We also face a barrage of messages that tell us to keep moving for-ward, to get the newer model, to have more babies, to get bigger. There is a lot of pressure to grow. We do not think this work is simple. It requires moving beyond the disciplinary prejudices into which each scholar is trained, to instead take a generous view of what varied knowledge practices might offer. In this spirit, we begin with a literary essay that offers the fine description necessary to pay attention to ruins, but later move to a scientific report on the very long history of human-caused extinctions and an anthropological guide on how to read landscape history in the shapes of trees. These and much more open up the curiosity about life on earth that we will need to limit the destruc-tion we call Anthropocene and protect the Holocene entanglements that we need to survive. Our era of human destruction has trained our eyes only on the immediate promises of power and profits. This refusal of the past, and even the present, will condemn us to continue fouling our own nests. How can we get back to the pasts we need to see the present more clearly? We call this return to multiple pasts, human and not human, "ghosts." Every landscape is haunted by past ways of life. We see this clearly in the presence of plants whose animal seed-dispersers are no longer with us. Some plants have seeds so big that only big ani-mals can carry them to new places to germinate. When these animals became extinct, their plants could continue without them, but they have been unable to disperse their seeds very well. Their distribution is curtailed; their population dwindles. This is an example of what we are calling haunting. Anthropogenic landscapes are also haunted by imagined futures. We are willing to turn things into rubble, destroy atmospheres, es, sell out com-panion species in exchange for dreamworlds of progress. Haunting is quite properly eerie: the presence of the past often can be felt only indirectly, and so we extend our senses beyond their comfort zones. Human-made radiocesium has this uncanny quality: it travels in water and soil; it gets inside plants and animals; we cannot see it even as we learn to find its traces. It disturbs us in its indetermi-nacy; this is a quality of ghosts. As anthropologists, we imagine our talk of ghosts in kinship with corn-',amities around the world, Western and non-Western, who offer nonsec-ular descriptions of the landscape and its hauntings. Rather than an a priori distinction between modern and nonmodern, however, we open our analysis to practical ways of kerning what is out there: the past and the present around us. This book is not about cosmologies but rather about on-the-ground observations, and from varied historical diffiactions and points ofview. Snake spirits and radioactive clouds share our attention as each draws us closer to the haunted quality of ruined landscapes. Our use of the term "Anthropocene" does not imagine a homo-geneous human race. We write in dialogue with those who remind readers of unequal relations among humans, industrial ecologies, and human insignificance in the web of life by writing instead of Capita-locene, Plantationocene, or Chthulucene (see Haraway, this volume). Our use of "Anthropocene" intends to join the conversation—but not to accept the worst uses of the term, from green capitalism to techno-positivist hubris. As we introduce the chapters, we want to show you both their prac-tical gifts for reading landscapes and their work in grasping that which is hard to grasp—the spookiness of the past in the present. In this introduction we offer the wind as a figure for this uncanniness. Winds are hard to pin down, and yet material; they might convey some of our sense of haunting. Each paragraph in grey italics introduces an article from our volume through its haunting qualities. (Bold phrases are key themes in direct quotation from the essays.) We have included pieces from the "Monsters" half of the book along with "Ghosts" since the sections tell intertwined stories. Although our analytic frames deserve some separation, monsters and ghosts cannot be segregated. Mean-while, we also use sentences in italics to index crosscurrents among our multiple authorial voices. The Santa Ana winds pour into Los Lameks Canyon along the Tijuana-San Diego border. The wind is hot and dry, and it tanks ghosts. Tires are everywhere in this canyon, writes Lesley Stern. Garbage dumps, bulldozed mesas, and steel fenced borders mix with invasive plants and native gardens in weedy shantytowns. Here is the debris of capitalist waste, the unspectacular afterlives of discarded things. Some tires are repurposed as building materials. Others lie around, dumped by careless dealers. Traffic from the United States flows southbound into Mexico unchecked; not so for reverse traffic. The canyon remembers the movement of things, including unlikely tomatoes growing through tax• is sewers and cracked cement. Traces of past, present, and future mix in gardens that sprout from the graves of a violently uneven modernity. Like every landscape, Los Lattreles Canyon is haunted by its human and nonhuman histories. The transformation of the formerly biodiverse estuaries and can-yons of the U.S.-Mexico border illustrates the predicament of indus-trial modernity: condominiums line one side, while waste piles on the other. Directives to close the border ask us to shut our eyes to continu-ing transfers of wealth and waste. Ghosts accumulate on both sides of the border from the residues of violence. As life-enhancing entanglements disappear from our landscapes, ghosts take their place. Some scientists argue that the rate of biological extinction is now several hundred times beyond its historical levels. We might lose a majority of all species by the end of the twenty-first century.' The problem is not just the loss of individual species but of assemblages, some of which we may not even know about, some of which will not recover. Mass extinction could ensue from cascading effects. In an entangled world where bodies are tumbled into bodies (see our Monsters), extinction is a multispecies event. The extinc-tion of a critical number of species would mean the destruction of long-evolving coordinations and interdependencies. While we gain plastic gyres and parking lots, we lose rainforests and coral reefs. How much longer will we agree to step aside in silence as masters of the universe turn us into property, write our contracts, rape our bodies, sell our histories? How much longer will you and 1 choose extinction? We live at the cusp of an extinction event comparable in scale to the Cretaceous-Paleogene (K-Pg) extinction event 65 million years ago that killed off the dinosaurs along with some 75 percent of all life forms on the planet.2 The difference is that the current event, the "sixth extinction;' will not be caused by an asteroid from outer space crashing into earth. The extinction event currently taking shape on the horizon of our shared future is the product of modern industry. How shall we retain the productive horror of our civilization—and yet refuse its inevitability? One method is to notice that the "we" is not homogeneous: some have been considered more disposable than others. More than fourteen thousand kilometers lie between the Arctic tun-dra and the tip of South America. American red knots make that great migration each spring on the belly of the wind. They make a critical stop at Delaware Bay, where theyfeast on the eggs of horseshoe crabs that are emerging from the ocean on a single day in synchronized reproduction. Human overharvesting of horseshoe crabs, however, has threatened the food supply of these migrating birds. As a result, a multispecies coordina-Hon that has taken place over millions of years is suddenly in danger of extinction. Will they leave only ghosts? asks biologist Peter Punch. How many kinds of time—from longue dune evolutionary rap-prochements to the quick boom and bust of investment capital—are wrapped up in these encounters? Minor forms of space and time merge with great ones. An extinction is a local event as well as a global one. Extinction is a breakdown of coordinations that has unintended and reverberating effects. Some earth systems scientists describe the Anthropocene as the "Great Acceleration: the sharp rise in the destructive environmental effects of human industry since the second half of the twentieth cen-tury? The massive increase in carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrate emissions into the atmosphere from industrialized agriculture, min-eral extraction, petroleum-driven production, and globalized ship-. ping/transportation networks has outpaced all other rhythms of life. Yet the Great Acceleration is best understood through immer-sion in many small and situated rhythms. Big stories take their form from seemingly minor contingencies, asymmetrical encounters, and moments of indeterminacy. Landscapes show us. Imagine walking through Monti Pisani in Italy, where pines and abandoned chestnut orchards mingle. Andrew Mathews offers tactics for • noticing the longue dark of human disturbance as he shows us form, texture, color, a process of constant speculation as pattern. Ghosts become tangible through the firm of ancient chestnut stools. Centuries of grafting, cultivation, trade, taxation, and disease are inscribed onto their structure and shape. The landscape emerges from ghostly entanglements: the many histories of life and death that have made these trees, this place.

#### As we continue to remake the world, we continue to create new baselines that forget the species that were they’re before us, these landscapes are made up of assemblages of the dead gathered to remind us of the species we have already made extinct. This means your extinction scenarios are non-unique its already happened we just haven’t been listening.

Tsing et all 17, Anna Lowenhaupt, et al. *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Extinction Leaves Traces To track the histories that make multispecies livability possible, it is not enough to watch lively bodies. Instead, we must wander through landscapes, where assemblages of the dead gather together with the living. In their juxtapositions, we see livability anew. Many great animals that roamed the world in the Ice Age, for example, are now extinct. Their traces are still with us. Northern trees that grow back when cut down, such as oaks, may have evolved that ability in times when elephants trampled them. The ghosts of lost animals haunt these plants, even as the plants live on as our companions in the present. Giant cave bears, straight-tusked elephants, and spotted hyenas once made their lives in Europe. The ground sloth, the mastodon, the shrub. ox: these were animals of North America. Unprecedented numbers of ntegafanna species became extinct during the late Quaternary period. Their disappearance from Eurasia, Australia, and the Americas is closely linked to the arrival of modern humans in these continents. As biologist Jens-Christian Svenning argues, their loss is almost certainly anthropogenic. As humans reshape the landscape, we forget what was there before. Ecologists call this forgetting the "shifting baseline syndrome?' Our newly shaped and ruined landscapes become the new reality. Admir-ing one landscape and its biological entanglements often entails for-getting many others. Forgetting, in itself, remakes landscapes, as we privilege some assemblages over others. Yet ghosts remind us. Ghosts point to our forgetting, showing us how living landscapes are imbued with earlier tracks and traces. The native American flowers that are now missing from the Great Meadows of the University of California campus in Santa Cruz are ghosts to ecologist Ingrid Parker. Remembering missing flowers alerts her to the amnesia that distorts our perception of landscapes. Today, the Great Meadows are places of beauty and leisure, protected by law as natural havens. But the meadows are recent products of human distur-bance. Almost devoid of the native plants that used to grow there, they are grasslands of colonially introduced species. The life worlds of indigenous flowers and the Native Americans that lived with them are specters in these grasslands. Ghosts remind us that we live in an impossible present—a time of rupture, a world haunted with the threat of extinction. Deep histories tumble in unruly graves that are bulldozed into gardens of Progress. Yet Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet is also a book of weeds—the small, partial, and wild stories of more-than-human attempts to stay alive. Ghosts, too, are weeds that whisper tales of the many pasts and yet-to-comes that surround us. Considered through ghosts and weeds, worlds have ended many times before. Endings come with the death of a leaf, the death of a city, the death of a friendship, the death of small promises and small stories. The landscapes grown from such endings are our disaster as well as our weedy hope.

#### We do not exist as sovereign subjects but rather a multiplicity of relations to others. The subject is fractured through time and is constantly evolving and changing based off our lived experiences and personal relation to identity.

#### Hardt 14 “The Power to be Affected”

The first step of this process is to take stock realistically and recognize that we are not sovereign subjects. Berlant is rightly suspicious of the standard ethical injunctions that assume our individual sovereignty, as well as those that aim at constructing or supporting sovereign political powers. Consider the sovereign individual, in correspondence with Carl Schmitt’s political formula, as the one who decides (2007). Berlant questions both elements of this statement: the one and the decision. Sovereign decision, she claims, resides on an illusion of self-control, “a fantasy misrecognized as an objective state” (2011, p. 97). People are not always engaged in projects of selfextension, she says, and in fact, they seldom have significant control over their decision-making. Spinoza expresses the same idea in quantitative terms. The power of all individual or limited subjects to think and act autonomously corresponds proportionally to the relation between their powers and the power of nature as a whole. “The force by which a man perseveres in existing is limited, and infinitely surpassed by the power of external causes” (1985 Ethics IV P3). Only God (or nature as a whole) is self-caused because it has no outside. The fact that the power of the world outside of us so far surpasses our own power means that we are affected by others much more than we affect the world or even autonomously affect ourselves, and thus, our capacity for sovereign decision-making is minimal too. The other half of Schmitt’s dictum is equally unfounded: “the one” never decides or acts or is acted on. The subject is never one. Agency and causality, Berlant suggests, should be understood not in terms of unities but instead “as dispersed environmental mechanisms at the personal as well as the institutional level” (2011, p. 114). Spinoza expresses this too in mathematical and geometrical form. A body or an individual, he explains, is formed when a great number of parts agree with each other and thus communicate in a consistent way (1985 Ethics II P13 definition). Essential to a body is the relation: the body lives as long as that relation is maintained. Instead of thinking in terms of unities, then, we need to think the relation among multiplicities and recognize the consistency of dispersed landscapes. To identify the locus of decision or acting or being acted upon, we need to look to not the one but the consistent relation among the many. There is no point in lamenting our relative lack of power or unity or ability to rule ourselves autonomously. Spinoza, in fact, ridicules those wise men who, maintaining a fantasy of the sovereign subject, chastise us for being ruled by passions. “Philosophers look upon the passions by which we are assailed as vices, into which men fall by their own fault. So it is their custom to deride, bewail, berate them, or, if their purpose is to appear more zealous than others, to execrate them. They believe that they are thus performing a sacred duty, and that they are attaining the summit of wisdom when they have learnt how to shower extravagant praise on a human nature that nowhere exists and the revile that which exists in actuality. The fact is that they conceive men not as they are, but as they would like them to be. As a result, for the most part it is not ethics they have written, but satire; and they have never worked out a political theory that can have practical application” (2002 Political Treatise, Chapter 1, Introduction, 680). A practical political theory instead must begin where people are, and really existing people are primarily filled, so to speak, by passions. Berlant poses the terrain of the nonsovereign in terms of the “interruptions” or “intermissions” that break the imagined efforts of self Hardt extension of sovereign subjects. (Be careful, though, not to be misled by these terms because, as Berlant makes clear, they are the norm not the exception: we live in the interruption and the intermission the vast majority of the time.)

#### The multiplicity of the environment is demonstrated through its shimmer, affective relations between ecosystems, species, and even humanity. Temporal patterns that represent the pulses of the world and its inhabitants. Humanity doesn’t exist sperate to the environment but rather within it. Thus, the ROTB is to vote for the debater that best creates landscapes to connect humanity to the environment. The goal is not to solve individual instances of environmental destruction or crisis but rather to create a framework of knowledge that allows humanity to stay in tune with the pulse of the environment only then can we listen to the ghosts and follow their paths.

Tsing et all 17, Anna Lowenhaupt, et al. *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Shimmer Still Beckons Smothered by bad death ghosts, it seems easy to give in to inevitability or to climb belligerently up and forward. But there are other ghostly matters shimmering just below our notice. This book argues that,

to survive, we need to relearn multiple forms of curiosity. Curiosity is an attunement to multispecies entanglement, complexity, and the shim-mer all around us. "Shimmer" is a gift, too, of the Yolngu people of Australia, as passed to us by Deborah Bird Rose. Shimmer is the seasonal kiss of mutually thrilling encounters among flying foxes and flowering eucalyptus trees, flying fox people, rain, and rainbows. Flying foxes spread eucalyptus pollen and seeds, allowing the trees to reproduce; they are an animal wind in the trees. Rose describes their coordinations through the Yolngu term bir'yun-a shimmering into brilliance. Bir'yun attends to temporal patterns that emerge from more-than-human shimmerings and dreamings—pulses of ancestral power, of life riding a wave that is always coming: "bir'yun shows us that the world is not composed of gears and cogs but of multifaceted, multispecies relations and pulses? Landscapes shimmer when they gather rhythms shared across var-ied forms of life. Shimmer describes the coming in and out of focus of multispecies knots, with their cascading effects. Yolngu cosmolo-gies inform us; juxtaposed with the stories made available from many arts and sciences, vernacular and academic, we learn the liveliness of landscapes. Landscapes enact more-than-human rhythms. To follow these rhythms, we need new histories and descriptions, crossing the sciences and humanities. As artists, we conjure magical figures, weave speculative fictions, animate feral and partial connections. We necessarily stumble. And try again. With every mark, difference haunts and struggles to appear anew. Postcolonial historian Dipesh Chakrabarty points out that con-sideration of humanity as a geological force troubles the distinction between natural and human history, forcing us into a new kind of historicity.6 The deep time of geology, climate, and natural science is collapsing into the historical time of human technology. Anthropos has become an overwhelming force that can build and destroy, birth and kill all others on the planet In the new histories and politics that we must form—and as the contributions to Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet demonstrate—we must share space with the ghostly contours of a stone, the radioactivity of a fingerprint, the eggs of a horseshoe crab, a wild bat pollinator, an absent wildflower in a meadow, a lichen on a tombstone, a tomato growing in an abandoned car tire. It is these shared spaces, or what we call haunted landscapes, that relentlessly trouble the narratives of Progress, and urge us to radically imagine worlds that are possible because they are already here. Anthropocene: a time when survival teeters on a question stirring in the marrow of the Earth's bones. What kinds of human disturbances can life on Earth bear? By showing us Progress and Extinction—life's historical entanglement with death in ruined landscapes—ghosts point the way in this half of Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet. Turn the book over and follow monsters.

### Part 2 – Environmental Journalism

#### Objectivity has been redefined through environmental journalism to be focused on the interpretation of facts through specialized knowledge this objectivity is key for effective environmental journalism

Fahy 18 Declan Fahy (2018): Objectivity as Trained Judgment: How Environmental Reporters Pioneered Journalism for a “Post-truth” Era, Environmental Communication, DOI: 10.1080/17524032.2018.1495093

Objectivity can be viewed as the application of “trained judgment” A particular conception of objectivity migrated from science to journalism in the US in the 1920s. Historians of science Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison in Objectivity (2010, p. 185) identified this concept as “mechanical objectivity.” The concept referred to a set of noninterventionist procedures that scientists followed to identify and represent natural phenomena. But from the middle of the last century, that idea changed, as scientists realized evidence had no meaning unless it was interpreted by specialized scientists who could link new evidence to existing facts and ideas. A new conception of objectivity consequently emerged to capture this process of expert interpretation, one Daston and Galison (2010, p. 314) defined as “trained judgment.” Their definition codified an idea put forward in 2003 in Columbia Journalism Review that expertise should be a constituent feature of a rethought notion of objectivity. Reporters, the magazine argued (Cunningham, 2003, p. 31), should be encouraged to “develop expertise and to use it to sort through competing claims, identify and explain the underlying assumptions of those claims, and make judgments about what readers and viewers need to know to understand what is happening.” Moreover, expertise is foundational to what journalism scholar Patterson (2013, p. 7) called “knowledge-based journalism.” He argued that contemporary journalists should excel in the application of relevant expertise to public affairs coverage, using that knowledge to evaluate, select, and emphasize the most valid and important 4 D. FAHY evidence or perspectives to report. There is evidence that, driven by their experience and expertise, environmental reporters in the US have made this conceptual shift to viewing objectivity as trained judgment. The shift occurred from the year 2000 after reporters felt “duped” by the communication tactics of the fossil-fuel industry in the 1990s that presented climate change as a controversy in an effort to stall policy responses that would harm their commercial interests (Gelbspan, 1998; Hiles & Hinnant, 2014, p. 448). The shift also occurred as a result of the expertise reporters developed around climate change, allowing them to report the issue in greater depth. As Hiles and Hinnant (2014, p. 442, italics in original), noted: “Several used the term writing with authority to describe what they do now.” Their experience and expertise caused the experienced reporters to redefine objectivity. They agreed, for the most part, that “interpretation borne out of journalistic experience and extensive research is an acceptable form of objectivity” (Hiles & Hinnant, 2014, p. 446). Their revised view – in effect, seeing objectivity as trained judgment – sets a useful precedent and example for other reporters to follow and develop, as they apply advanced analytic and interpretative skills in their journalism. Objectivity can be viewed as the implementation of a transparent method Environmental reporters have always been immersed in specialized knowledge, but the general move to weight-of-evidence reporting has meant they have become more self-reflexive and transparent in how they communicate that knowledge. Reporters have moved from employing objectivity as understood by journalists to applying objectivity as understood by scholars. Journalists traditionally saw objectivity as the unbiased presentation of verified facts, leaving readers to evaluate those facts. Academics, by contrast, have had to state clearly, in the communication of their work, the methods they deployed to systematically gather evidence and the criteria and frameworks they used to interpret and evaluate that evidence (Post, 2015). This scholarly definition aligns closely with a contemporary conception of objectivity offered by two journalism critics, Kovach and Rosenstiel (2014, p. 103), who defined it as “a disciplined unity of method transparently conveyed.” They argued that, to be objective, journalists should convey clearly in their reports how they gathered, verified, and presented evidence, so readers could see for themselves the often-obscured methodology of journalism. A further way environmental journalists have been transparent is to make explicit in their reports the motivations of their sources. Revkin (2007, p. 153) endeavored to spell out for his readers a a source’s background, credentials, affiliations, and likely agenda in a reporting technique he called “truth in labeling.” Experienced environmental reporters believed in the transparent disclosure of information about their sources and methods of gathering information (Hiles & Hinnant, 2014). And such transparency is vital for contemporary environmental journalism, which takes place in a largely online environment that is pluralistic, participatory, collaborative, and social (Fahy & Nisbet, 2011). Objectivity can be viewed as the pluralistic search for consensus A major function of journalism, argued communications scholar Donsbach (2014, p. 665), is to depict a shared reality in which citizens have “a reservoir of common knowledge, experiences, and values.” But creating such a shared reality, necessary for society to function, is increasingly difficult, he argued, because of declining interest among younger citizens in the public sphere and the fragmentation of audiences, with news consumers seeking out information that conformed to their existing interests and beliefs. As a countermove to this trend, he argued (2014, p. 674), journalists can act as brokers to create spaces where different parts of society could come together to create this reservoir of shared understanding. One pioneering example of an environmental journalist taking on this brokering role was Revkin’s work at his New York Times “Dot Earth” blog, published between 2007 and 2016 (Nisbet & Fahy, 2015). At the site, Revkin deliberately convened various ideological perspectives and disciplinary specialists as part of an ongoing, pluralistic, consensus-seeking discussion about climate change. By enlisting communities of readers as active participants in the ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATION 5 production of his journalism, Revkin at “Dot Earth” practiced a form of environmental journalism that has been variously conceptualized as public journalism, or civic journalism or, most recently, engagement journalism (Blatchford, 2018; Rosen, 1999). For Revkin, convening a wide-ranging discussion was essential because, after reporting on climate for decades, he came to believe that the social responses to climate change needed a broad dialogue among interested parts of society, including scientists, policymakers, sociologists, economists, planners, journalists, and citizens, many of whom have disagreed about how to respond to climate impacts, a disagreement grounded in different political and social values (Revkin, 2016). At the blog, Revkin aimed to focus on areas of deep consensus, seeking what Priest (2015, p. 308) called “‘middle ground’ solutions” to environmental problems that can benefit, or be acceptable to, environment and industry, avoiding extreme views, and thereby reducing, as a result, the potential for polarization. Building a dialogue-based consensus about what constitutes a shared reality can also have social impact, as a focus on negotiation and consensus can address and resolve science controversies and drive social change (Lewenstein, 2017). These reconfigured definitions of objectivity grew out of environmental journalism, but can serve as reliable guideposts for the rest of contemporary journalism. Other journalists can learn from environmental reporters who reassessed objectivity as they moved to weight-of-evidence reporting, broke the binary between objective and advocacy journalism, and reported on public controversies that involved evolving scientific evidence, deep political division, and fractious public debate. Other journalists seeking to rethink objectivity can adapt, for their own ends, the way environmental reporters came to see the concept as the application of trained judgment, the implementation of a transparent method, and the pluralistic search for consensus around areas of shared understanding. Of the three reconfigured views of objectivity, trained judgment is the most important, as it infuses all of a journalist’s work. But it is also the most difficult way of thinking for journalists to develop because it can only be gained through a combination of experience and expertise. Nevertheless, trained judgment is crucial if contemporary journalism is to undertake one of its foundational roles – helping readers make sense of a reality that, as McNair (2017) noted, grows ever more complex. As the journalistic profession struggles to adapt to the complexity of the current information culture, environmental reporters, by engaging deeply with the nature and impact of knowledge, have reconfigured the concept of objectivity, providing a conceptual model and guide to action for their peers. They are pioneers for contemporary “post-truth” journalism

#### Thus, we defend Resolved: In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy**.**

#### Environmental journalism is key to connecting humanity to the landscape of our environment it is impossible to develop a framework of shimmer with the environment if we are not even aware of it in the first place.

Platt 17 <https://therevelator.org/environmental-journalism/>

What is the role of environmental journalism in a world of science denialism, partisan politics, “fake news” and ever-increasing environmental threats? I gave [Bobby Magill](http://bobbymagill.com/), the president of the [Society of Environmental Journalists](http://www.sej.org/) and senior science writer at [Climate Central](http://www.climatecentral.org/), a call to discuss the nature of covering these tough issues during these difficult times. A lightly edited transcript of our conversation follows. John Platt: I’m really interested, as SEJ president and someone with a lot of experience in the field yourself, what you feel the role in environmental journalism is these days, and if you think it’s changing as a result of the political climate? Bobby Magill: Well, I think clearly the role of environmental journalism is to inform the public about their environment, the regulations that affect their environment, the air they breathe, the public lands they enjoy, the quality of their water, their changing climate. Without journalists and environmental journalism, the public would have a very difficult time trying to parse out the facts versus misinformation regarding the environment in which they live. So, environmental journalism plays a critical role in public understanding of that, and the political process. Platt: So one of the things that I like about environmental journalism is that it combines so many topics. It’s got science and politics. It’s got crime, lifestyle choices, just about everything under the sun. In your vision, is this kind of like a field that enwraps everything else? Magill: I like to think about it this way. Maybe not every story, but many stories that we write as journalists can have an environmental angle. You know, the SEJ board just held its board meeting in Fort Collins, Colorado, and Colorado State University recently built a new stadium right on campus. That required land use change on campus, and that had a variety of issues associated with it. That’s an environmental story because it affects land use. It affects traffic patterns. It affects how people use electricity and water, and how they park their car, it affects transportation and all kinds of things that have environmental consequences. So, that’s a sports story. It’s a business story. It’s an education story, and it’s an environmental story.