ENVIRONMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY: SPATIAL ANALYSIS AND REGIONAL ISSUES

ADVANCES IN SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Previously ADVANCES IN ECOPOLITICS
Series Editor: Liam Leonard

PUBLISHED UNDER SERIES TITLE '**ADVANCES IN ECOPOLITICS**'

Transnational Migration, Gender and Rights Volume 10
Volume Editor: Ragnhild Sollund
Series Editor: Liam Leonard

PUBLISHED UNDER SERIES TITLE '**ADVANCES IN SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**'

International Business, Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility Volume 11
Edited by Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez and Liam Leonard

Principles and Strategies to Balance Ethical, Social and Environmental Concerns with Corporate Requirements Volume 12
Edited by Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez and Liam Leonard

Environmental Philosophy: The Art of Life in a World of Limits Volume 13
Edited by Liam Leonard, John Barry, Marius De Geus, Peter Doran and Graham Parkes

The Sustainability of Restorative Justice Volume 14
Edited by Paula Kenny and Liam Leonard

Occupy the Earth: Global Environmental Movements Volume 15
Edited by Liam Leonard and Sya Buryn Kedzior

The UN Global Compact: Fair Competition and Environmental and Labour Justice in International Markets Volume 16
Edited by Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez and Liam Leonard

Beyond the UN Global Compact: Institutions and Regulations Volume 17
Edited by Liam Leonard and Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez

Lessons from the Great Recession: At the Crossroads of Sustainability and Recovery Volume 18
Edited by Constantin Gurdgiev, Liam Leonard and Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez

Climate Change and the 2030 Corporate Agenda for Sustainable Development Volume 19
Edited by Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez and Liam Leonard

ENVIRONMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY: SPATIAL ANALYSIS AND REGIONAL ISSUES

BY

LIAM LEONARD

California State University, Fullerton, CA, USA

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

ISOQAR REGISTERED

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Hugo Aguas	California State University, Los Angeles, CA, USA
Dinur Blum	University of California, Riverside, CA, USA
Kevin Bucciero	California State University, Los Angeles, CA, USA
Christian Gonzalez Jaworski	University of California, Riverside, CA, USA
Anthony Keating	Edge Hill University, Faculty of Health and Social Care, Lancashire, UK
Liam Leonard	California State University, Fullerton, CA, USA
Shane Leonard	National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland; Atlantic International Institute, Galway, Ireland
Darren McCauley	Arctic Research Centre, School of Geography and Sustainable Development at St. Andrews University, St. Andrews, Scotland
Brian McKenna	College of Arts, Sciences and Letters at the University of Michigan-Dearborn, Michigan, MI, USA

This page intentionally left blank

SERIES EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Having founded the Ecopolitics website in 2004, and then working with Emerald Publishing to produce both the *Advances in Ecopolitics* and *Advances in Sustainability and Environmental Justice* book series since 2007, I am pleased to present this, the 20th volume in this series. This collection focuses on research which combines a spatial analysis with environmental criminology, mapping crime, and deviance across different locations globally.

In the chapter "Framing Injustice in Green Criminology: Activism, Social Movements and Geography," Darren McCauley examines the manner in which a geographical perspective can assist with understandings of injustice. This spatial analysis looks at the social movements which emerge, and is framed in a green criminological context. The chapter "Anthropology at the Red-Green Crossroads" is located in an anthropological paradigm, as Brian McKenna opens up the debate between Green and Red ideologies. With progressive politics at a crossroads, these debates become all the more crucial for our society.

The chapter "The Ferguson Shooting, 2014: A Spatial and Media Analysis" is my own analysis of the shooting of African-American youth Michael Brown by police in Ferguson, St. Louis in 2014. This chapter incorporates both spatial and media analysis in order to open up the accounts of what happened in this tragic incident. This is followed by Dinur Blum's and Christian Gonzalez Jaworski's study of Spatial Patterns of Mass Shootings in the United States, between 2013 and 2014 in the chapter "Spatial Patterns of Mass Shootings in the United States, 2013−2014."

The chapter "Homeless Demography in Los Angeles County" sees Hugo Aguas present his Homeless Demography of Los Angeles County. Aguas contextualizes the issue of homelessness in Los Angeles, where those marginalized by homelessness are labeled as deviants by mainstream society. In the next chapter Anthony Keating looks at Police Culture, Gender and Crime in the Irish Free State in 1929. This historical account outlines the problems of deviant policing in the emerging Irish state, providing a regional analysis of sex crimes by those charged with upholding the law.

In the chapter "A Spatial Analysis of Crime: 'The Wire' and Depictions of Urban Crime," Shane Leonard provides an analysis of urban criminology through an analysis of the cult television series "*The Wire*." This spatial analysis is located in Baltimore, where local ethnic communities are outlined within the frameworks of the overlapping challenges which they face. In the book's final chapter, the issue of illicit drug use is examined by Kevin Bucciero's

spatial analysis of methamphetamine use in North America. Ultimately, I am pleased to see such a collection of research from both experienced and early career academics. This bodes well for the future of research in this field, and I look forward to many more volumes in the Advances in Sustainability and Environmental Justice Series in the coming years.

Liam Leonard
Series Editor

FRAMING INJUSTICE IN GREEN CRIMINOLOGY: ACTIVISM, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND GEOGRAPHY

Darren McCauley

ABSTRACT

Injustice is perceived, experienced and articulated. Social movements, and their constitutive parts, frame and re-frame these senses of injustice. Two often-overlapping accounts of social movements are in focus in this chapter. Human geography has been flooded with movement-based analyses of environmental justice (EJ). Sociology (more appropriately political sociology) has provided insight into social movements in the form of 'contentious politics' (CP). Building on both sets of literature, this chapter seeks to advance thought in human geography through a detailed exploration of master and collective action framing. It argues, firstly, that framing analysis challenges activist researchers to retain 'spatial constructs' as their central focus, rather than discourse. It calls, secondly, for us to unbind injustice as much as justice in our analysis of framing. And lastly, it demands a multi-spatial perspective on framing beyond simply scalar accounts.

Keywords: Social movements; environmental justice; contentious politics; framing; scale; injustice

GEOGRAPHY, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND FRAMING

> We believe it makes a difference not just where our studies and stories go, but also from whence they come. (Reed & George, 2011, p. 840)

The notion of framing has emerged in geographical thought set within environmental justice (EJ) scholarship (Harrison, 2006; Heynen, 2003; Kurtz, 2003; Lieshout, Dewulf, Aarts, & Termeer, 2011; Sze et al., 2009; Towers, 2000) from a well-established body of political sociology or 'contentious politics' (CP) literature (Baud, 2005; Benford & Snow, 2000; Boykoff & Laschever, 2011; Della Porta & Mosca, 2007; Diani, 2000; Gerrards & Rucht, 1992; Goffman, 1974; Leitner, Sheppard, & Sziarto, 2008; McGammon, Muse, Newman, & Terrel, 2007; Powell, 2011; Zald, 2000). Both sets of authors set out to understand, from a notably social psychological perspective, the role of social movements. In so doing, they have developed, expanded and tested the collective framing of discourses. The development of 'scale frames' has allowed us to more effectively deal with a complicated set of multi-scalar relationships of contradictions and dependencies (Kurtz, 2003). Framing challenges, moreover, geographers to 'foreground spatial constructs — that is human and non-human agents — rather than discourses' (Bickerstaff & Agyeman, 2009, p. 783). This chapter seeks, in part, to enable an inter-disciplinary social movement response to the call for 'imaginative' EJ research (Holifield, Porter, & Walker, 2009, p. 601). It brings together state-of-the-art research and thought on EJ and social movements through a deeper elaboration of framing processes and a focus on injustice, rather than justice.

At the heart of this chapter, a critical disagreement must be placed upfront. For practice-based insight to flourish we should not always accept the dominant understanding of the idea of praxis — that is that theory and practice must inform each other (Sze & London, 2008; Sze et al., 2009). In its place, we should be willing to adopt an understanding whereby movement experience informs theory, but not necessarily the other way around. In such a conceptualization, theory does have a role in exploring normative-based consequences and implications. It should not, however, drive our assessments of movement experiences. This chapter does not quite go as far as Debanne and Keil in arguing that 'movements linked to justice struggles are highly diverse and cannot be measured or expressed in universal terms' (2004, p. 209). In line with Schlosberg's comments, '(t)he point is that different discourses of justice, and the various experiences and articulations of injustice, inform how the concept is used, understood, articulated and demanded in practice; the engagement with what is articulated on the ground is of crucial value to our understanding and development of the concepts we study' (2013, p. 50).

There are two observable trends in social movement literature in geography that this chapter seeks to reflect upon. The theorization and application of justice concepts has moved our attention away from 'activism' towards normative-based 'analysis'. To build a little on this rather simplistic distinction, there has

been a shift from assessing and understanding the viewpoints of activists (and as argued below 'non-activists') towards the analysis of regimes as normatively just (Holifield, 2004; Walker & Day, 2012) due to, what Lievianos refers to as, the increasing 'state resonance of environmental justice'[1] (2012, p. 491). This 'analytical' (or rather normative) turn threatens to severely limit research in social movements to confirming or disproving the application of theoretically developed and selected frames. It is argued here that a focus on understanding injustice, rather than applying normative models of justice, offers a way out of this straightjacket. The often-coined phrase comes to mind: 'whose justice?' − or more appropriately here 'injustice in whose eyes?' Framing is (only) one attempt to bring the conceptualization of justice back to the protagonists of environmental activism.

The second trend in this literature, in light of the 'multiple spatialities' justice research (Walker, 2009a, 2009b, 2012), is the move from vertical to horizontal accounts of space. This has, firstly, amounted to critiques on the usefulness of scale in human geography, most notably from Marston, Jones, and Woodward (2005). They comment, 'we are convinced that the local-to-global conceptual architecture intrinsic to hierarchical scale carries with it presuppositions that can delimit entry points into politics' (2005, p. 427). Inspired by CP scholarship, it is argued below that scale is rarely the entry point for social movement scholars. In reality, individuals, organizations, states and even non-human agents or more appropriately 'spatial constructs' (Bickerstaff & Agyeman, 2009) represent the starting point in our understanding. In so doing, social movement action is no longer confined to scalar entry points. In support of Moore (2008), scale in this context is a category of practice rather than an analytical category in itself. As explored below, the real concern with the politics of scale is not the starting point, but rather the end. This turn to 'all things horizontal' is, therefore, equally refuted as an attempt to 'throw the baby out' of a warm bath into a rather choppy sea. In other words, research on social movements must retain (and develop further) scale frames − but as only one type of frame.

The concept of framing as used in CP scholarship is derived from the work of Goffman (1974).[2] A frame denotes 'schemata of interpretation' that allow individuals to 'locate, perceive, identify and label' occurrences within their 'life space' (Goffman, 1974, p. 21). This entails agency in the sense that what is evolving is the work of social movement activists or movement activists. 'Master' frames designate, firstly, the overall signifier for mobilization in and across movements. They are often adopted early on in the cycle of protest and, as a result, set up a durable inclusive and excluding framework for social mobilization (Snow & Benford, 1992). It is argued below that master frames of 'injustice' should replace the normative and theoretically laden frame of 'environmental justice'. Collective action frames are, secondly, 'action-oriented' sets of beliefs and meanings that are designed by activists to inspire and legitimize types of action. The geographical literature in this area remains constrained by

the construction of 'scale frames'. This chapter suggests an equal need to explore 'place' and 'network' frames.

We must, therefore, place the agents of such claims at the forefront of social movement research. Geographical scholarship on EJ has tended to prioritize the discourse and the meanings it produces (Agyeman, 2002; Davies, 2006). In contrast, CP research on activism prioritizes the individuals and organizations involved (Boykoff & Laschever, 2011; Powell, 2011). From this perspective, it considers movements or movement actors (organizations and activists) as signifying agents engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning for protagonists, antagonists and bystanders. Framing demands, therefore, the foregrounding of spatial constructs in framing practices, rather than the discourses themselves. The continuous reformation, contestation and re-production of frames remind us that they are not static reified entities. They are, in fact, deployed to legitimate movement goals and campaigns (Benford & Snow, 2000; Heynen, 2003; Kurtz, 2003; Sze et al., 2009; Towers, 2000). Framing allows us to question more effectively the key agents, or more precisely the active role of spatial constructs in framing practices.

Social movements by their very nature are entities that aim to remedy a perceived injustice. Benford and Snow (2000) refer to three key components that are always present in framing processes. Attributional framing accords blame and responsibility, while prognostic framing involves the articulation of a proposed solution. Motivational framing refers, thirdly, to the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive (Benford, 1993). Gamson (1992) and Gamson, Fireman, and Rytina (1982) consider that injustice is always at the centre of these framing processes − a conclusion tempered by Benford and Snow (2000). Beckwith comments, 'collective action frames, in organizing and making sense of lived experience and perceptions, serve to identify social injustices, to focus and to summarize grievances, to organize disruptive action and to express disruption, and to posit opposition and solutions' (2001, p. 301).

Environmental problems are, after all, socially constructed claims defined through collective processes (O'Brien, 2011; Taylor, 2000). Di Chiro comments, '(d)efining what counts as an environmental problem and what doesn't … delegates different issues as either inside or outside the environmental "frame"' (2008, p. 279). Claims for justice are often broad and diverse (Fan, 2006). Framing analysis needs to reflect these multiple understandings, rather than any pre-set theories or assumptions. The vast majority of EJ literature concentrates on (and often limited to) 'master' frames for collective action such as 'just sustainability' (Agyeman, 2005) or the 'environmental justice paradigm' (Taylor, 2000). A master frame can expound a series of normative and practical solutions. It is, nonetheless, at its very heart, the mobilizing 'call to arms' for communities in the face of a perceived injustice. The fluidity of master frames of injustice offers a way out from justice-based conceptualizations.

*IN*JUSTICE 'UNBOUND'

Injustice − rather than justice − should be the focal point for EJ research through a more explicit assessment of master frames of 'injustice'. Master frames are collective action frames that have expanded in scope and influence. Put simply, a master frame encompasses the contextual boundaries, interaction and normative claims of more than one organization or one movement. Such frames can indeed vary dramatically in terms of restrictiveness or exclusion. Gerhard and Rucht (1992) found that two distinct master frames (with different protagonists, antagonists, organizations, etc.) worked together to encourage social mobilization in Germany. They can, therefore, often serve as a 'kind of master algorithm that colors and constrains the orientations and activities of other movements' (Snow, 2004). It is argued below that geographical scholarship in EJ research remains theoretically, conceptually and contextually bound. This section concludes with a reflection on not only unbinding EJ research from pre-set notions of justice, but also its conceptualization of 'environment'.

Theoretical accounts of EJ threaten, *firstly*, to bind social movement researchers into pre-determined logics of justice (Barnett, 2010). For Caney (2010), justice-based activism research has hitherto focused on exposing and proposing archetypal normative frameworks. In support of Agyeman, Cole, Haluza-DeLay, and O'Riley (2010), Reed and George comment, 'researchers are cautioned that the long-observed disconnect between theory and practice in the field of environmental justice may be exacerbated should academics become more concerned with theoretical refinement over progressive, practical, and possible change' (2011, p. 839). The theorization of justice seeks to expose ideal end points (and more recently processes) from various philosophical traditions. For example, Okereke (2006) finds that any notions or principles of justice originate from five distinct incarnations: utilitarianism, communitarianism, liberal equality, justice as meeting needs and libertarianism − later refined to include 'market justice' (Okereke & Dooley, 2010). In a similar vein, Schlosberg (2004, 2013) argues that justice theorists need to be pluralist in accepting a range of understandings of 'good'. It is argued here that we need to instead explore the plurality of injustice.

The first step in this direction is indeed the acknowledgement that the study of justice is pluralist. Martin, Gross-Camp, Kebede, McGuire, and Munyarukaza acknowledge, 'that justice poses considerable conceptual challenges, not least because of the practical (if not intellectual) impossibility of reaching consensus' (2013, p. 2). This is borne out by a valiant theoretical sortie through the myriad of approaches to conclude that justice is both plural and multi-dimensional. Their conclusion bears a self-reflective unease; 'we clearly have much to learn about the limitations of our own framing and methods, including our inevitable starting point in logics of justice' (2013, p. 10). The second move involves an acknowledgement that justice is contextualist whereby

some principles may apply in certain situations. Walker comments, 'as we move from concern to concern *and* from context to context, we can expect shifts in both the spatial relations that are seen to be significant and in the nature of justice claims being made' (2009a, p. 622).

Ideal justice theorists seek to effectively eliminate the potential for conflict. Schlosberg comments however, 'such theorists are mistaken … (c)onflicts of justice arise … problem solving entails the negotiation of different conceptions of (in)justice in and across participants, from community or stakeholder groups to corporation or states' (2013, p. 45). Schlosberg claims that the idea of environmental justice has 'examined multiple reasons for the construction of *injustice*' (2013, p. 37). This chapter calls, however, for an exploration of the construction of multiple injustices. The expansion in the theorization of environmental justice as a concept must be answered with a similar response in our understanding of environmental activism. As Barnett comments in support of Sen (2009),

> Rather than thinking of philosophy as a place to visit in order to find idealised models of justice or radically new ontologies, we would do well to notice that there is an identifiable shift among moral and political philosophers towards starting from more worldly, intuitive understandings of injustice, indignation, and harm, and building up from there. (2010, p. 252)

The recent development of normative concepts of justice looms, *secondly*, in a similar manner. There is a sense (to some extent correctly) that such concepts are worldly, emerging from situated conflict. They are, however, more often emergent from philosophical debate. A set of normative-based testable assumptions materialize based upon achieving equity and fairness in the distributional, post-distributional − referred to as 'recognition' largely attributed to Nancy Fraser (1997)[3] and developed by Schlosberg (2004, 2007, 2013) − and procedural burdens of environmental risk. Distributional justice suggests that people of colour and/or low income should not bear a disproportionate burden of pollution (Harvey, 1996). On 'post-distributional' justice, Gibson-Wood and Wakefield comment, '(a) lack of recognition is unjust because it denies an equal voice or "place at the table" to those whose understanding or experiences of "the environment" or "environmentalism" is outside of dominant understandings or experiences' (2013, p. 645). McCauley, Heffron, Stephan, and Jenkins (2013) refer to this framework as the 'triumvirate of justice tenets' (distributional, procedural and recognition).

Gibson-Wood and Wakefield (2013) employ this triumvirate as frames, and demonstrate how it can act as one insightful 'master' frame for understanding environmentalism among Hispanics in Toronto. In other words, each tenet provides a set of expectations for what should be achieved against what actually happened. The 'weakest link' is then identified (in this case recognition). The analytical objective identification of injustice can be blind to the experiential perception of spatial constructs. The more recent attempt to uncover a third form of EJ tenets as the 'post-distributive justice of recognition' (Bulkeley,

Carmin, Castan Broto, Edwards, & Fuller, 2013) threatens, for example, to unintentionally disrobe those who are unrecognized of any meaningful agency. Even though Fraser (2008) firmly identifies social movements as key agents of change, the emphasis is on the call for 'authorities' and 'policy-makers' to recognize under-represented groups − such as in Walker and Day (2012). Framing research emphasizes, in contrast, the need to explore such processes among those who are 'under-recognized' in order to gain insight into the success or not in mobilizing injustices. They are referred to below, not as 'victims', but rather 'non-activists' as a new challenge for social movement and justice research.

Our approach to EJ remains, *thirdly*, contextually bound. In this vein, the EJ 'master' frame is derived from specific empirical contexts. The origins of EJ research are accepted to be race and poverty-based campaigns involving multiple organizations and individuals across the US merging into a veritable EJ movement − often cited as beginning in Warren County, North Carolina (Bullard, 1999; Szasz, 1994; Urkidi & Walter, 2011). And thus, the EJ master frame in the United States is formed around race, class, gender and the environment. Taylor (2000) talks explicitly about the 'environmental justice paradigm' as a master frame which links together 'environment, race, class, gender and social justice' issues. In the United Kingdom (especially among NGOs), the master frame has been termed as 'just sustainability' (Agyeman, 2005; Agyeman, Bullard, & Evans, 2003; Agyeman & Evans, 2004) despite the earlier observation that there exist 'at least three different constructions of environmental justice' (Agyeman, 2002, p. 37). This refers to a frame that links together issues of sustainability, social inclusion and procedural equity (Bikerstaff & Agyeman, 2009, p. 782).

Dawson (2000) demonstrates, however, the potential fluidity of EJ master frames in linking it explicitly to eco-nationalism. She identifies sub-group identity, social justice and environmentalism as the core tenets in the US EJ frame. The US environmental movement is, in her view, built on the foundation of sub-group identity and the desire for social justice. As a result, groups defined by religion, gender, national identity or class could offer a basis for EJ movements and their master frame. In this way, the EJ frame covers, for example, the protection of indigenous peoples across the Americas (Cantzler, 2007; Holifield, 2012; Schlosberg & Carruthers, 2010; Urkidi & Walter, 2011) or Taiwan (Chi, 2001) or tribal groups from environmental hazards in Africa (McDonald, 2002; Visser, 2003). In such a conception, the EJ frame can actually be ultimately divisive and exacerbate violent conflict. Dawson traces the environmentalist roots of nationalist movements in the former USSR leading directly to social tensions and fragmentation. She observes, 'the intertwining of environmental causes and sub-group identities can be seen to both enhance environmental mobilisation among previously immobilized groups and deepen a pre-existing sentiment of "us" versus "them" within the population' (2000, p. 36).

   Empirical-based conceptions of justice are, therefore, as problematic as theoretical and conceptual incarnations. Pellow and Brulle argue, indeed, that '(s) cholars cannot understand … environmental injustices through a singularly focused framework that emphasizes one form of inequality to the exclusion of others' (Pellow & Brulle, 2005, p. 298). Our attention should be drawn to where and when injustice is felt and experienced. Hobson (2006) argues indeed that EJ research must diversify its understanding of where injustice can be found. In her assessment of an environmental organization in Singapore, she demonstrates how environmental injustice is felt in everyday practices of individuals and organizations, even where expressions of public concern on the environment are infrequent or at least highly managed. More recently, substantial research has focused our attention on injustices within climate activism (Barrett, 2012; Bulkeley et al., 2013). The fluidity of master frames on EJ offers one potential solution to unbinding how we approach justice and injustice. We now turn our attention to unlocking further how we can explore master frames of injustice through a better understanding of collective action framing.

MOVING *WITH* SCALE FRAMING

Framing is, above all, a strategic practice (Kurtz, 2003; Leitner, 2003; Leitner et al., 2008; Sze et al., 2009). In other words, collective action frames are deliberative, utilitarian and goal directed. Collective action frames originate from the notion of 'repertoires of contention'. In his book, *The Contentious French*, Charles Tilly refers to such repertoires as a 'set of routines that are learned, shared, and acted out through a relatively deliberate process of choice … where people know the general rules of performance more or less well and vary the performance to meet the purpose at hand' (1986, pp. 390, 392). These repertoires are developed through a process of learning and practice, importation of experiences from other social movements and the mobilization of new constituencies. Change is achieved, therefore, through deliberate innovation and strenuous bargaining where 'people create, adapt, apply and deploy shared understandings' (Tilly, 1995, p. 44). Changes in collective action repertoires, therefore, depend upon the frames of meaning used by strategic actors. In other words, movement activists undertake active signifying work that implies agency and contention at the level of reality construction (Snow & Benford, 1992).
   Collective action frames are essentially the properties of organizations or groups of individuals (Benford & Snow, 2000).[4] In short, NGOs, interest groups, pressure groups, environmental groups, etc., 'frame, or assign meaning to and interpret relevant events and conditions in ways that are intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists' (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 198). Firstly, they set the contextual boundaries in so far as what is effectively 'in' and 'outside' the

collective action frame in terms of perceived antagonists, events, core issues and a timeline. This frame is, secondly, articulated by a restricted set of individuals set within and alongside the organization in question (Baud, 2005; Goffman, 1974; Powell, 2011). Collective action frames involve, thirdly, normative claims on how problems should be approached. The Tea Party movement in the United States involved a wide range of organizations prioritizing different collective action frames that made central normative claims on abortion, the economy, appealing to the 'everyday American', avoiding 'flash in the pan', etc. (Boykoff & Laschever, 2011).

This often leads to competing frames between organizations, and more often contentiously challenging existing authoritative views and framings of reality (Cantzler, 2007; Diani, 1996). In this way, social movement actors are involved in a politics of signification internally between activists as well as with opponents (referred to by Kurtz, 2003 and Cantzler, 2007 as 'counter-frames'). Within this context of framing processes, CP researchers consider political opportunity structures as determinants of social action (Giugni, 2011). In a sea of definitional contestation, we summon Koopmans' tellingly simplistic designation as 'factors outside the mobilizing groups' (2004, p. 63). As Meyer comments, 'the key recognition in the political opportunity perspective is that activists' prospects for advancing particular claims, mobilizing supporters and affecting influence are context-dependent' (2004, p. 126). Both CP and EJ scholars have, in this regard, sought to expunge the primacy of the state[5] in social movement research in revealing multi-scalar, place-specific and networked (Tarrow & della Porta, 2005) action that transcend the state apparatus.

The origin of the scalar perspective as one response to state-centric opportunity structures indicates, for CP scholars, a lasting durability in this research area (Tarrow & McAdam, 2004). For EJ research, Williams (1999) identifies a first wave of EJ literature that focuses on reified representations of scale. A second wave of scholarship is characterized by a more pronounced ability to accommodate the social construction of scale (Bickerstaff & Agyeman, 2009; Kurtz, 2003; Paasi, 2004). Many scholars have demonstrated thus that actors employ scales in various beneficial ways within the context of multiple interactions taking place at different scales (Delaney & Leitner, 1997; Harrison, 2006; Kurtz, 2003; Lieshout et al., 2011; Marston, 2000; Sze et al., 2009; Towers, 2000). Leitner (1997) demonstrates how nationalist right-wing parties manage to employ different scale frames in opposition to the concentration of immigration policy at the supra-national scale. Such research finds that movements attempt to maximize the local scale whilst tapping into the supranational or global. Harvey reminds us further, 'the choice of spatial scale is not "either/or" but "both/and" even though the latter means confronting serious contradictions' (2000, p. 51).

Kurtz (2003), Harrison (2006) and Sze et al. (2009) use the notion of scale frames to encapsulate the discursive practices that construct links between the scale at which a social problem is experienced and the scale(s) at which it could

be solved. Williams reminds us that '(a) dynamic of scale politics centres on an antagonistic relationship between a societal problem and its political resolution … (t)he scale at which a social problem is generated may not coincide with the scale(s) at which the problem might be resolved' (1999, p. 56). In so doing, such authors recall the attributional (i.e. blame and problem construction) and prognostic (solution) framing processes outlined above (Benford, 1993; Gamson, 1992; Gamson et al., 1982). They fail, however, to substantially comment on the third process of motivational[6] (i.e. identifying vocabularies of motive) framing, with the notable exception of Martin (2003) with regards to 'place-framing' (explored below).

Advances in this area of geographical research have sought to escape the upscaling argument. Kurtz (2003) shed light on the role of counter-scale frames that seek to constrain upscaling. In a similar fashion, Harrison (2006) demonstrates, for example, how regulators succeeded in 'downscaling' the framing of pesticide drifts as isolated accidents. Haarstad and Floysand (2007) demonstrate that constructing legitimate discourses on several scales plays a key role in successfully opposing mining in Peru. More notably, scholars have moved beyond scales of regulation to theorize scales of meaning (Towers, 2000) or inclusion/exclusion (Sze et al., 2009). In their exploration of agricultural practices in the Netherlands, Lieshout et al. (2011) break the notion of scale down into four distinct categories: spatial, administrative, agricultural and time. Beyond the expansion of scale, there remain important questions to be explored on transcalar issues from climate change to the genetic scale, as suggested by Bickerstaff and Agyeman (2009), or on hitherto under-explored 'motivational' framing process as revealed here.

MOVING *BEYOND* SCALE FRAMING

The second trend in social movement research is the prioritization of horizontal or flat understandings of space. Scale (albeit one 'vision' of space − as explored above) has been central in geographical approaches to movements. This section does not aim to reflect on the rights or wrongs of the politics of scale. Scale has been, and will remain, a pertinent frame for social movement activists. From this perspective, we refute the suggestion made by Marston et al. (2005) to replace scale with a flat ontology. For frame, and more broadly social movement analysts, scale does and will continue to matter. However, O'Brien warns, 'a narrow focus on scale can also lead to misinterpretations of cause and effect' (2011, p. 545). Above all, this chapter refutes the suggestion by Kurtz that 'the very concept of environmental injustice precipitates a politics of scale' (2003, p. 891). We should accept that, in some instances, the politics of scale may be replaced by alternative spatialities. Put differently, does a movement have to jump scales to succeed? In following, scale, and counter-scale, frames only represent one type of frame.

A 'third' wave of EJ scholarship based upon rejecting the primacy of vertical conceptions of space is observable on the back of a now increased ability to accommodate multiplicity, change and the social construction of scale. The move away from scales of regulation has allowed researchers to accept that scale frames are constructed across horizontal space. In support of Leitner et al. (2008), this observation underlines, firstly, the enduring but under-valued nature of place in framing. Contemporary scale theorists share with those who focus on place a common emphasis on the territorial nature of societal organization. At first sight, places that are separated at one scale become connected through their common association with a higher scale (Sheppard, 2002). However, place theorists deny the claim that scales connect territorially bounded entities. For them, place is in fact open and heterogeneously constituted (Massey, 2005; Verstraete & Cresswell, 2002). With this in mind, we need to respect 'place-framing' as a separate form of collective action framing from 'scale-framing'.

Places have a distinct materiality that mediates and regulates social relations and daily routines. This materiality of space forms the nature and possibility of contention and social action. Beckwith demonstrates (2001) how place constrained attempts of the United Mine Workers of America to achieve a shift in frame from traditionally violent to nonviolent forms of protest. The historical development of the mines in question was deeply embedded in place-specific constructions of masculinity and violence. Places are embued with meaning as well as power. In this vein, social movements attempt to strategically manipulate, subvert and resignify places in beneficial ways. Franquemanque (2007) and McCauley (2011, 2013) demonstrate how French anti-GMO activists reframed a proposed military base in 1971, Larzac, as both a physical site and emblem for a wide range of anti-globalization protests ever since. Heaney and Rojas (2006) explore how different organizations in the anti-Iraq War movement in North Carolina fought over the multiple meanings of place in competing strategic efforts to frame social movement activity.

Place can provide an important mobilizing discourse and identity for collective action. For place-framing, we should, therefore, examine *how* place appears in the discourses of organizations, and *why*. Martin (2003) demonstrates how movement organizations in Minnesota repeatedly cited 'neighbourhood' as a sphere of action with problems that residents could identify and understand. A similarly 'meso-level' approach (Reid, Sutton, & Hunter, 2010) could identify new research questions around not only neighbourhood as a signifying place for activists, but also the household (Barr & Gilg, 2006; Cress & Snow, 2000). Such an approach could, alternatively, be easily applied to recent advances in climate justice activism (Bulkeley et al., 2013) to investigate how activists frame and re-frame the 'city' as a place full of meaning and power. Such research does, indeed, remind social movement scholars that place matters as much as space.

So what of multiple spatialities? After all, for Gieryn, 'place is not space' (2000, p. 465). Leitner et al. (2008) suggests that the politics of mobility offers much in this regard. Tim Creswell comments, '(i)f movement is the dynamic equivalent of location, then mobility is the dynamic equivalent of place' (2006, p. 3). The new mobilities paradigm seeks to capture the meaning, power, practice and embodiment in the displacement of people. Appearing in unexpected places, social movements use mass demonstrations and rallies as well as bike and bus rides to their tactical advantage (Caren, Ghoshal, & Ribas, 2011). This experience of mobility shapes, moreover, the identities of activists. A less nascent conceptual sortie into explicitly horizontal spatialities is found in the politics of networking. Leitner and Miller consider networking as the most effective way for 'advocates of scale framing to deny the simplistic hierarchical power assumptions in dealing with scales' (2007, p. 119). In exploring the human rights group *Madres de Plaza de Mayo* in Argentina, Bosco (2001) observes that the network approach reveals how social relations are embedded in webs of meaning and practice in a way that better emphasizes the spatial relationship between place and space for social movement scholars.

The concept of networking in social movement research is positioned as a challenge to states (particularly for CP scholars). Sewell (2001), for example, points to the construction of activists' face-to-face and virtual communication networks as a means to navigating away from state and business-controlled incarnations. Trans-local networks have emerged to prevent movements from being limited spatially (Routledge, 2003). Wang and Soule (2012) demonstrate through a longitudinal study of protest activities that networking among movement organizations has resulted in broader tactical repertoires and increased repertoire usage through a process of 'tactical diffusion'. Della Porta and Mosca (2007) reveal in their study of the Italian global justice movement how networking develops our understanding of framing through emphasizing 'bridging' processes. In following, networking is considered as an 'antidote to single issue claims … where participation in protest campaigns is reflected in the bridging of several issues and frames' (2007, p. 19). Inspired by the works of Bruno Latour, a recent expansion in the actor network theory (ANT) literature has sought to include non-human agency in justice research (Bickerstaff & Agyeman, 2009; Holifield, 2009, 2012).

Framing allows us, from this perspective, to question more effectively the key agents in network-centred explanations of the spatiality of scale for example spaces of dependence and engagement (Cox, 1998) or assemblages (Bickerstaff & Agyeman, 2009). After all, 'some sort of organization is at the centre of attempts to … pursue the goal of constructing a network of associations' (Cox, 1998, p. 15). Leitner et al. support such work in calling for 'attention to how agency is distributed across the more-than-human world, and not solely located with humans' (2008, p. 158). Schlosberg (2013), especially through the capabilities approach (Schlosberg & Carruthers, 2010), considers the horizontal relationship between humans and non-humans as critical for EJ

scholarship. For him, it effectively represents how we perceive human−environment interaction. It reminds us that environmental injustices are as much in the treatment of the non-human realm as in relations between human beings.

Our overall exploration of injustice must, therefore, seek to delve deeper into how movements frame the non-human world. Leitner et al. (2008) raises the issue of socio-positionality in an attempt to encourage social movement researchers to consider the role of non-human agency. The continual re-production of positionality should be considered alongside the role of non-human agents. Technology has, from this perspective, the ability to empower certain actors whilst disempowering others. Sheppard (2002) evokes the use of the term 'socio-spatial positionality' as a response to the downplay of power hierarchies in networking. Positionality often refers to the social situatedness of subjects in terms of gender, race, class, sexuality and other axes of social difference. At the same time, the co-constitutive nature of the social and space are implicated in the production and re-production of identity. As a result, a social movement's agenda is shaped by its socio-spatial positionality − the type of participants, where or who participates in various ways, their social values or even the geographical situatedness of the organization itself.

CONCLUSION

We have examined above the two dominant conceptualizations − master and collective action − of framing processes in social movement literature from both an EJ and CP perspective. This chapter suggests that we should turn our attention in master framing towards exploring injustice, rather than pre-set theoretical, conceptual or even contextual understandings of justice. The concept of master framing provides, in this way, an opportunity to explore the geographies of injustice. Collective action framing must, secondly, accommodate a wider agenda than scale framing in geographical thought, encompassing advances in place and network framing. In so doing, it needs to embrace new agendas such as mobilities, socio-spatial positioning and non-human agency. The overall approach to the notion of praxis (outlined above) is, indeed, rather simplistic. One could argue that framing is, itself, a pre-set theory. It does, however, challenge us with an important question: how can we listen better?

Houston (2013) challenges human geographers to explore the imaginative practices of how stories are performed in environmental justice struggles in shaping alternative imaginations of place. Her perception of injustice is firmly rooted in sites of pollution. For frame analysis, storytelling can be a powerful tool. It produces different environmental imaginaries about the kinds of worlds they want (or not) to live in. In so doing, such stories can act as a sort of mobile repertoire for combating environmental injustices in other places. They can effectively inspire the construction of frames based on success elsewhere. In

referring to Aboriginal storytelling, Reed and George (2011) remind us, more-over, that readers needed to adopt new ways of listening in order to understand not only senses of justice but also injustice. This chapter challenges academics to similarly adopt, or as in several instances continue, an approach predicated on 'listening' to how injustices are experienced in relation to environmental concerns (for EJ) and the state in its various forms (for CP researchers). Schlosberg comments;

> Environmental justice movements have been challenging the discourse of development in the streets, in the media, and in the halls of the institutions of the global economy. But they also challenge our own discourse of justice in academia as well, and we would do well to listen in. (2004, p. 537)

We should not assume the origins of injustice. Both master and collective action framing illuminate the roots, ideas, values, identities and actions of organizations and various groupings of individuals. They allow us to investigate how the 'owners' of such frames perceive, experience and imagine the world. With this in mind, a framing agenda offers significant potential to investigate two emerging sets of agents in the EJ literature inspired by recognition justice and assemblage — 'non-activists'[7] and 'non-humans'. How do social movement researchers deal with those who do not speak or act? This chapter suggests that the bedrock of collective action frame may be misplaced — such a frame could belong to a set of performances/practices and assemblages as much as an organization. As demonstrated by Houston and Pullido (2002), performative justice allows 'insights into … individuals and groups not able or willing to engage in overt environmental struggles' (Hobson, 2006, p. 674). Bickerstaff and Agyeman (2009) reveal, moreover, the potential of a dual framing and assemblage approach. How performance and assemblages frame such individuals' and groups' perceptions of injustice is a matter for future framing studies.

The multiple spatialities of justice represents more than the now well-trodden observation that 'we need to move beyond the Cartesian view of distributive justice'. This chapter alludes to the multiple spatial framing of social movements. Such framing processes must continue to exude the key attributive, prognostic and motivational traits as found in collective action framing literature. Scale-based framing is only one albeit important account of movement behaviour in this area, arousing new spatial accounts whilst respecting the continuing and overlooked validity of place-framing. In order to move debates forward, EJ and CP scholarship must equally advance how geographical thought deals with the notion of political opportunity structures. EJ research maintains an awkward relationship with CP scholars such as Diani (2005) and Tarrow (2005) who firmly believe social movements remain embedded in national and state-centric contexts. In doing so, this chapter calls for future work on 'multiple spatial opportunities', grappling with the spatialities of Walker and Schlosberg, the political opportunities imagination of Giugni and Meyer as

well as emerging innovations such as discursive opportunity structures (McGammon et al., 2007). Barnett comments,

> The emphasis on the situations that generate political action requires us to supplement the focus upon processes of spatial extension that underwrites the work of Fraser, Dryzek, and Bohman, with a consideration of contexts which generate the modes of transnational agency they focus upon. (2012, p. 684)

NOTES

1. Lievianos (2012) claims that EJ movements' concerns have become captured and institutionalized by the state apparatus due to their increasing 'resonance'. In following, EJ-based research has been attracted to examining how appropriately (or not) the various guises of the state are dealing with and implementing conceptualizations of EJ.

2. Please see Shmueli (2008) for a much wider discussion on framing processes beyond social movement literature.

3. Please see also Fraser and Honneth (2003).

4. This statement is challenged in the conclusion with reference to performative justice.

5. Williams and Mawdsley (2006) acknowledge, however, that EJ studies in geography must take better account of the state's role (albeit with reference to specifically developing states), even if its influence has diminished somewhat in explanations of social mobilization.

6. Please see Wright and Boudet (2012) for a detailed exploration of motivation and social movements.

7. EJ literature on recognition has tended to see a victimised inactive community as one or several homogeneous and united group(s) of people. In support of Ishiyama (2003), the term 'non-activists' challenges us to define more clearly agency in 'under-recognised' groups.

REFERENCES

Agyeman, J. (2002). Constructing environmental (in)justice: Transatlantic tales. *Environmental Politics*, *11*(3), 31−53.

Agyeman, J. (2005). *Sustainable communities and the challenge of environmental justice*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., & Evans, R. (2003). *Just sustainabilities: Development in an unequal world*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Agyeman, J., Cole, P., Haluza-DeLay, R., & O'Riley, P. (2010). *Speaking for ourselves: Environmental justice in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Agyeman, J., & Evans, B. (2004). Just sustainability: The emerging discourse of environmental justice in Britain? *Geographical Journal*, *2*, 155−164.

Barnett, C. (2010). Geography and ethics: Justice unbound. *Progress in Human Geography*, *35*(2), 246−255.

Barnett, C. (2012). Situating the geographies of injustice in democratic theory. *Geoforum*, *43*, 677−686.

Barr, S., & Gilg, A. (2006). Sustainable lifestyles: Framing environmental action in and around the home. *Geoforum*, *37*, 906−920.

Barrett, S. (2012). The necessity of a multiscalar analysis of climate justice. *Progress in Human Geography*, *37*(2), 215−233.

Baud, M. (2005). *Popular intellectuals and social movements: Framing protest in Asia, Africa and Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beckwith, K. (2001). Gender frames and collective action: Configurations of masculinity in the Pittson Coal strike. *Politics & Society*, *29*(2), 297−330.

Benford, R. (1993). 'You could be the hundredth monkey': Collective action frames and vocabularies of motive within the nuclear disarmament movement. *Sociological Quarterly*, *34*, 195−216.

Benford, R., & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 611−639.

Bickerstaff, K., & Agyeman, J. (2009). Assembling justice spaces: The scalar politics of environmental justice in north-east England. *Antipode*, *41*(4), 781−806.

Bosco, F. (2001). Place, space, networks and the sustainability of collective action. *Global Networks*, *1*(4), 307−329.

Boykoff, J., & Laschever, E. (2011). The Tea Party Movement, framing and the US media. *Social Movement Studies*, *10*(4), 341−366.

Bulkeley, H., Carmin, J., Castan Broto, V., Edwards, G., & Fuller, S. (2013). Climate justice and global cities: Mapping emerging discourses. *Global Environmental Change*, *23*(5), 914−925

Bullard, R. (1999). Dismantling environmental racism in the USA. *Local Environment*, *4*(1), 5−19.

Caney, S. (2010). Climate change and the duties of the advantaged. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, *13*, 203−228.

Cantzler, J. (2007). Environmental justice and social power rhetoric in the moral battle over whaling. *Sociological Inquiry*, *77*(3), 483−512.

Caren, N., Ghoshal, R., & Ribas, V. (2011). A social movement generation: Cohort and period trends in protest attendance and petition signing. *American Sociological Review*, *76*(1), 125−151.

Chi, C. (2001). Capitalist expansion and indigenous land rights: Emerging environmental justice issues in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, *2*(2), 135−153.

Cox, K. (1998). Spaces of dependence, spaces of engagement and the politics of scale. *Political Geography*, *17*(1), 1−23.

Cress, D., & Snow, D. (2000). The outcomes of homeless mobilization: The influence of organization, disruption, political mediation and framing. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*(4), 1063−1104.

Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move*. London: Routledge.

Davies, A. (2006). Environmental justice as subtext or omission: Examining discourses of anti-incineration campaigning in Ireland. *Geoforum*, *37*, 708−724.

Dawson, J. (2000). The two faces of environmental justice: Lessons from the eco-nationalist phenomenon. *Environmental Politics*, *9*(2), 22−60.

Debbane, A., & Keil, R. (2004). Multiple disconnections: Environmental justice and urban water in Canada and South Africa. *Space and Polity*, *8*, 209−225.

Delaney, D., & Leitner, H. (1997). The political construction of scale. *Political Geography*, *16*, 93−97.

Della Porta, D., & Mosca, L. (2007). *In movimento*: 'Contamination' in action and the Italian Global Justice Movement. *Global Networks*, *7*(1), 1−27.

Di Chiro, G. (2008). Living environmentalisms: Coalition politics, social reproduction, and environmental justice. *Environmental Politics*, *17*(2), 276−298.

Diani, M. (1996). Linking mobilization frames and political opportunities: Insights from regional populism in Italy. *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 1053−1069.

Diani, M. (2000). The relational deficit of ideologically structured action. *Mobilization: an International Journal*, *5*, 17−24.

Diani, M. (2005). Cities in the world: Local civil society and global issues in Britain. In D. Della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational protest and global activism: People, passions, and power* (pp. 45−67). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Fan, M.-F. (2006). Environmental justice and nuclear waste conflicts in Taiwan. *Environmental Politics*, *15*(3), 417−434.

Franquemanque, G. (2007). From Larzac to the altermondialist mobilisation: Space in environmental movements. *Environmental Politics*, *16*(5), 826−843.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interrupts: Critical reflections on the postsocialist conditions*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of justice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition? A political−philosophical exchange*. London: Verso.

Gamson, W. (1992). *Talking politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gamson, W., Fireman, B., & Rytina, S. (1982). *Encounters with an unjust authority*. Dorsey, IL: Homewood.

Gerhards, J., & Rucht, D. (1992). Mesomobilization: Organizing and framing in two protest campaigns in West Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, *98*, 555−595.

Gibson-Wood, H., & Wakefield, S. (2013). Participation, white privilege and environmental justice. *Antipode*, *45*(3), 641−662.

Gieryn, T. (2000). A space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 463−496.

Giugni, M. (2011). Political opportunity: Still a useful concept? In M. Hanagan & C. Tilly (Eds.), *Contention and trust in cities and states* (pp. 271−283). Dordrecht: Springer.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of the experience*. New York, NY: Harper Publishers.

Haarstad, H., & Floysand, A. (2007). Globalization and the power of rescaled narratives: A case of opposition to mining in Tambogrande. *Political Geography*, *26*, 289−308.

Harrison, J. (2006). 'Accidents' and invisibilities: Scaled discourse and the naturalization of regulatory neglect in California's pesticide drift conflict. *Political Geography*, *25*(5), 506−529.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature and the geography of difference*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of hope*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Heaney, M., & Rojas, F. (2006). The place of framing: Multiple audiences and anti-war protests near Fort Bragg. *Qualitative Sociology*, *29*, 485−505.

Heynen, N. (2003). The scalar production of injustice within the urban forest. *Antipode*, *35*, 980−998.

Hobson, K. (2006). Enacting environmental justice in Singapore: Performative justice and the Green Volunteer Network. *Geoforum*, *37*, 671−681.

Holifield, R. (2004). Neoliberalism and environmental justice in the United States environmental protection agency. *Geoforum*, *35*, 285−297.

Holifield, R. (2009). Actor-network theory as a critical approach to environmental justice. *Antipode*, *41*(4), 637−658.

Holifield, R. (2012). Environmental justice as recognition and participation in risk assessment: Negotiating and translating health risk at a superfund site in Indian country. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *102*(3), 591−613.

Holifield, R., Porter, P., & Walker, G. (2009). Spaces of environmental justice: Frameworks for critical engagement. *Antipode*, *41*(4), 591−612.

Houston, D. (2013). Environmental justice storytelling: Angels and isotopes at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. *Antipode*, *45*(2), 417−435.

Houston, D., & Pullido, L. (2002). The work of performativity: Staging social justice at the University of Southern California. *Environmental and Planning D*, *20*(4), 401−424.

Ishiyama, N. (2003). Environmental justice and American Indian tribal sovereignty: Case study of a land-use conflict in Skull Valley, Utah. *Antipode*, *35*(1), 119−139.

Koopmans, R. (2004). Political opportunity structure: Some splitting to balance the lumping. In J. Goodwin & J. Jasper (Eds.), *Rethinking social movements* (pp. 61−73). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kurtz, H. (2003). Scale frames and counter-scale frames: Constructing the problem of environmental justice. *Political Geography*, *22*, 887−916.

Leitner, H. (1997). Reconfiguring the spatiality of power: The construction of a supranational migration framework for the European Union. *Political Geography*, *15*, 123−143.

Leitner, H. (2003). The politics of scale and networks of spatial connectivity: Transnational inter-urban networks and the rescaling of political governance in Europe. In S. Sheppard & B. McMaster (Eds.), *Scale and geographic inquiry: Nature, society and method.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Leitner, H., & Miller, B. (2007). Scale and the limitations of ontological debate: A commentary on Marston, Jones and Woodward. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *32*, 116−125.

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E., & Sziarto, K. (2008). The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *33*, 157−172.

Lieshout, M., Dewulf, A., Aarts, N., & Termeer, C. (2011). Do scale frames matter? Scale frame mis-matches in the decision-making process about a "mega farm" in a small Dutch village. *Ecology and Society*, *16*(1), 38−50.

Lievianos, R. (2012). Certainty, fairness and balance: State resonance and environmental justice pol-icy implementation. *Sociological Forum*, *27*(2), 481−503.

Marston, S. (2000). The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography*, *24*, 219−242.

Marston, S., Jones, J., & Woodward, K. (2005). Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *30*, 416−432.

Martin, A., Gross-Camp, N., Kebede, B., McGuire, S., & Munyarukaza, J. (2013). Whose environ-mental justice? Exploring local and global perspectives in a payments for ecosystem services scheme in Rwanda. *Geoforum*, *54*(1), 167−177.

Martin, D. (2003). Place-framing as place-making: Constituting a neighborhood for organizing and activism. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *93*(3), 730−750.

Massey, D. (2005). *For space.* London: Sage.

McCauley, D. (2011). Bottom-up Europeanization exposed: Social movement theory and non-state actors in France. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *49*(5), 1019−1042.

McCauley, D. (2013). Protest, politics and produce: A resource account of anti-GMO activism. *Local Environment*, *15*(1), 171−193.

McCauley, D., Heffron, R., Stephan, H., & Jenkins, K. (2013). Advancing energy justice: The trium-virate of justice tenets. *International Energy Law Review*, *107*(1), 1−9.

McDonald, D. (2002). *Environmental justice in South Africa.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

McGammon, H., Muse, D., Newman, H., & Terrel, T. (2007). Movement framing and discursive opportunity structures. *American Sociological Review*, *72*, 723−749.

Moore, A. (2008). Rethinking scale as a geographical category: From analysis to practice. *Progress in Human Geography*, *32*(2), 203−225.

O'Brien, K. (2011). Responding to environmental change: A new age for human geography? *Progress in Human Geography*, *35*(4), 542−549.

Okereke, C. (2006). Global environmental sustainability: Intergenerational equity and conceptions of justice in multi-lateral environmental regimes. *Geoforum*, *37*, 725−738.

Okereke, C., & Dooley, K. (2010). Principles of justice in proposals and policy approaches to avoided deforestation. *Global Environmental Change*, *20*, 82−95.

Paasi, A. (2004). Place and region: Looking through the prism of scale. *Progress in Human Geography*, *28*, 536−546.

Pellow, N., & Brulle, R. (2005). *Power, justice, and the environment: A critical appraisal of the envi-ronmental justice movement.* London: MIT Press.

Powell, R. (2011). Frames and narratives as tools for recruiting and sustaining group members. *Sociological Inquiry*, *81*(4), 454−476.

Reed, M., & George, C. (2011). Where in the world is environmental justice? *Progress in Human Geography*, *35*(6), 835−842.

Reid, L., Sutton, P., & Hunter, C. (2010). Theorizing the meso level: The household as a crucible of pro-environmental behaviour. *Progress in Human Geography*, *34*(3), 309−327.

Routledge, P. (2003). Convergence space: Process geographies of grassroots globalisation networks. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *28*, 333−349.

Schlosberg, D. (2004). Reconceiving environmental justice: Global movements and political theories. *Environmental Politics*, *13*(3), 517−540.

Schlosberg, D. (2007). *Defining environmental justice: Theories, movements and nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schlosberg, D. (2013). Theorizing environmental justice: The expanding sphere of a discourse. *Environmental Politics*, *22*(1), 37−55.

Schlosberg, D., & Carruthers, D. (2010). Indigenous struggles, environmental justice and community capabilities. *Global Environmental Politics*, *10*(4), 12−35.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. London: Allen Lane.

Sewell, W. (2001). Space in contentious politics. In R. Aminzade, J. Goldstone, D. McAdam, E. Perry, W. Sewell, S. Tarrow, & C. Tilly (Eds.), *Silence and voice in contentious politics* (pp. 51−88). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sheppard, E. (2002). The spaces and times of globalization: Place, scale, networks, and positionality. *Economic Geography*, *78*(3), 307−330.

Shmueli, D. (2008). Framing in geographical analysis of environmental conflicts: Theory, methodology and three case studies. *Geoforum*, *39*, 2048−2061.

Snow, D. (2004). Framing processes, ideology and discursive fields. In D. Snow, S. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 380−412). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Snow, D., & Benford, R. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, *1*, 197−217.

Snow, D., & Benford, R. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. Morris & C. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 132−151). New Haven, CT: Yale Press.

Szasz, A. (1994). *Ecopopulism: Toxic waste and the movement for environmental justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sze, J., & London, J. (2008). Environmental justice at the crossroads. *Sociological Compass*, *2*(4), 1331−1354.

Sze, J., London, J., Stirling, F., Gambirazzio, G., Filan, T., & Cardenasso, M. (2009). Defining and contesting environmental justice. *Antipode*, *41*(4), 807−843.

Tarrow, S. (2005). The dualities of transnational contention. *Mobilizations*, *10*, 53−72.

Tarrow, S., & della Porta, D. (2005). Globalization, complex internationalism, and transnational contention. In D. della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational protest and global activism* (pp. 227−246). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Tarrow, S., & McAdam, A. (2004). Scale shift in transnational contention. In D. della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational movements and global activism* (pp. 121−150). Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.

Taylor, D. (2000). The rise of the environmental justice paradigm: Injustice framing and the social construction of environmental discourses. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *43*(4), 508−580.

Tilly, C. (1986). *The contentious French*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tilly, C. (1995). *Popular contention in Great Britain*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Towers, G. (2000). Applying the political geography of scale: Grassroots strategies and environmental justice. *Professional Geographer*, *52*, 23−36.

Urkidi, L., & Walter, M. (2011). Dimensions of environmental justice in anti-gold mining movements in Latin America. *Geoforum*, *42*, 683−695.

Verstraete, G., & Cresswell, T. (2002). *Theorizing place, placing mobility: The politics of representation in a globalized world*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Visser, G. (2003). Spatialities of social justice and local government transition: Notes on and for a South African social justice discourse. *South African Geographical Journal*, *85*(2), 99−111.

Walker, G. (2009a). Beyond distribution and proximity: Exploring the multiple spatialities of environmental justice. *Antipode*, *41*(4), 614−636.

Walker, G. (2009b). Globalizing environmental justice. *Global Social Policy*, *9*(3), 355−382.

Walker, G. (2012). *Environmental justice: Concepts, evidence and politics*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Walker, G., & Day, R. (2012). Fuel poverty as injustice: Integrating distribution, recognition and procedure in the struggle for affordable warmth. *Energy Policy*, *49*, 69−75.

Wang, D., & Soule, S. (2012). Social movement organizational collaboration: Networks of learning and the diffusion of protest tactics. *American Journal of Sociology*, *117*(6), 1674−1722.

Williams, G., & Mawdsley, E. (2006). Postcolonial environmental justice: Government and governance in India. *Geoforum*, *37*, 660−670.

Williams, R. (1999). Environmental injustice in America and its politics of scale. *Political Geography*, *18*(1), 49−73.

Wright, R., & Boudet, H. (2012). To act or not to act: Context, capability, and community response to environmental risk. *American Journal of Sociology*, *118*(3), 728−777.

Zald, M. (2000). Ideologically structured action: An enlarged agenda for social movement research. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, *5*(1), 1−16.