4

Green as a Shade of Blue

Political Rhetoric, the Democratic Party, and the Early Environmental Movement in the Upper Midwest

CAMDEN BURD

In 1963, Gaylord Nelson arrived in Washington, DC, with a goal to make environmental concerns a cornerstone of the Democratic Party. The young senator had made environmental legislation a key feature of his political career in Wisconsin and intended to turn his local successes into national ones. So when President John F. Kennedy prepared to embark on a nationwide conservation tour in 1963, Nelson urged him to emphasize the environmental issues that faced the nation. He believed the president needed to "make a nation-wide appeal for the preservation of our vital resources," because as Nelson saw it, this was "America's last chance." He urged Kennedy to stress the need to protect waterways, conserve resources, and legislate against hazardous pollutions that affected wildlife and human health. The Wisconsin senator considered these issues both incredibly important and politically popular. "Americans in all walks of life are interested in natural resources," he wrote to the president. "It cuts across political party lines, economic classes and geographical barriers." "This is a political issue to be settled at the political level." The Midwestern politician's message to the president was simple: it was time for the Democratic Party to embrace the modern environmental movement.[1]

Nelson's insistence to the president signaled the rising concern for environmental issues in the early 1960s. The modern environmental movement developed slowly during the 1940s and 1950s, a period of postwar

industrialization and economic development that dramatically changed the American landscape. The effects of suburban sprawl and unprecedented material consumption inspired a wave of disparate communities to advocate for the creation of suburban and urban parks, the regulation of pollution, the preservation of particular landscapes, and increased conservation practices. The publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962 served as a catalyzing force for the movement as it brought attention to the harmful effects of pesticides, in particular dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), on larger ecological systems. Removing the veneer of scientific jargon from her text, Carson presented a clear moral argument against the indiscriminate use of DDT, which had boomed in post-WWII America. The book resonated with Americans, and onlookers began to question the use of a variety of chemicals—not just DDT. The threat appeared to be everywhere. Exhaust from cars and power plants, oil spills, laundry detergents, hazardous working environments—the hallmarks of industrial society—all represented a potential threat to human health and cherished landscapes. By the mid-1960s, environmental concerns began to shape national politics.[2]

Though environmentalism was a national movement, its presence was especially pronounced in the Upper Midwest—a region defined by large industrial centers, sprawling suburban communities, and vast agricultural landscapes. The visible and chemical evidence of the postwar economic boom were evident in the exhaustive iron mines of the Upper Midwest, the polluted waters of the St. Clair River near Detroit, the burning waters of the Cuyahoga River in 1969, the collapsing of the Great Lakes fisheries, agricultural pollution, algae blooms throughout the Great Lakes, and the toxic contamination of dairy cows with polybrominated biphenyls (PBB). In the decades after World War II residents of the Midwest witnessed or directly experienced some of the harshest realities of environmental pollution. Though concern for the environment was wide-ranging, citizens who took up environmental causes did so for a variety of reasons. The political energies that grew from the postwar era were diverse and loosely aligned. The environmental movement brought together a coalition of activists including housewives, conservationists, students, labor unions, civil rights advocates, and intellectuals. Politicians from both parties tried to respond to, and channel, those energies. Though the early environmental movement was largely bipartisan, the ways in which members of either party framed their environmental rhetoric varied. Across the region, Democrats framed their environmental agenda in familiar terms that often fit into preexisting political ideologies that grew from the New Deal era. As a result, Democrats in the Upper Midwest

argued for environmental legislation in a language that demonstrated a distrust of industrial power, a concern for American workers, a strong commitment to the notion of a public commons, and the need for a strong government to ensure the movement's success.[3]

Though the modern environmental movement developed over the course of the 1960s, concerns about the natural world had been central to the Democratic Party since the New Deal. The massive economic program contained several components that explicitly focused on the environment, including the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Soil Conservation Service. New Dealers saw a direct connection between economic scarcity and environmental degradation. By building dams, planting forests, and restoring exhausted soil, New Deal Democrats harnessed the power of the government to raise incomes and conserve resources. Economic stability, social uplift, and environmental conservation were all connected under the banner of New Deal liberalism. So, when Democrats encountered 1960s environmentalism, they channeled a language and political vision that had been established during preceding decades.[4]

Conservation rhetoric was hardly new to Midwesterners when the New Dealers' political descendants began discussing the environmental harm of the postwar period. The region has long been home to prominent conservationists interested in exploring the connection between humans and the natural world. Writers such as Aldo Leopold and the lesser-known Paul Lester Herrington brought ecological writing and Midwest landscapes to mainstream audiences. Leopold's *Sand County Almanac* (1949), published shortly after his death, and Herrington's *Of Men and Marshes* (1957) challenged readers to question their own relationship with the natural world by arguing for a land ethic that placed humans within ecological settings.[5] Their writings spoke to a particular moment when audiences found themselves in a whirlwind of economic development, unprecedented consumption, and the resulting environmental change of those factors. Channeling those sentiments, regional politicians spoke a language that was cultivated from and directed toward the Midwest.

Take, for instance, the political rhetoric of Adlai E. Stevenson, who regularly spoke on industrial greed, corporate overreach, the destruction of the commons, and a concern for the health and financial security of American workers. In speeches while governor of Illinois, from 1949 to 1953, Stevenson supported the conservationist principles established during the New Deal, including a call "to cooperate with the Federal Government in control of floods and erosion" as a means to protect the livelihood of Illinois farmers. Such rhetoric is unsurprising for a politician whose

career began working as a lawyer for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration during the early years of FDR's administration. As a New Dealer, Stevenson maintained a healthy skepticism toward industry's role in society, arguing that "the plain, hard fact is that the industrial age has created problems of health, housing, education, transportation and employment." As such, he believed it was the role of government to improve the material well-being of the nation's citizens, articulating a connection between economic and environmental health. This sentiment was clear in his 1956 presidential nomination speech. "With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can conserve our resources of land and forest and water. We can develop them for the benefit of all of our citizens."[6] The speeches, though not specifically focused on the environment, demonstrate a political ideology that could embrace a movement giving preference to workers' and farmers' economic and physical well-being.[7]

Stevenson's tone more closely aligned with that of the environmental movement in the later years of his political career. By 1960, while seeking a third bid for the Democratic Party's nomination for president, Stevenson again harnessed language that would later be echoed more forcefully by environmental advocates. He stressed the common good as well as public spaces and resources while criticizing the unprecedented consumerism that had come to define the postwar period. "This year we will be making a choice between two approaches," he argued in the early days of his campaign. "We shall have to decide whether to go on putting private consumption first or shift the priority to our public needs." Stevenson even targeted what would eventually be a key issue of the early environmental movement—phosphate-rich detergents. "We can no longer pretend that the challenge of the twentieth century can be met with better detergents and more toothpaste—with private opulence and public squalor. It can only be met with better education and more attention to our public needs." It is important not to overstate Stevenson's environmental agenda. During his brief 1960 campaign Stevenson did not articulate harsh regulations on pollution or strict environmental legislation. However, it is clear that he was familiar with the rising social and political tensions that would foment into a larger environmental movement just a few years later.[8]

In Michigan, Senator Philip Hart won his 1958 election with a platform that focused on a range of social and economic platforms: establishing a more active integration plan for desegregated schools, securing protections for organized labor, expanding social security to cover hospitalization, increasing federal medical aid, and providing greater assistance for lower-income and disabled Americans. It was not until he served on the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources that he began to

take a more proactive stance on environmental issues. In speeches and meetings Hart advocated for more efficient management of water resources and an increase in federal planning and conservation of resources. The senator saw these issues to be of particular importance "in Michigan, as in most of the Middle West," where "industrial waste and municipal sewage, resulting from our heavily populated and highly industrialized communities, have reached a stage where they are a real threat to our use of water." At a 1960 interstate conference on water resources held in Chicago, Hart argued that the "United States is shockingly in arrears in the prudent management of its water resources." He expressed concern about wasteful practices, lack of sewage treatment, industrial dumping, and a decline in recreational opportunities. For Hart, water touched all aspects of society. Proper water-resource management, he argued, "critically affects national security, public health, interstate commerce, and opportunities for full employment and economic prosperity."[9]

The Michigan senator made sure to note that water pollution was a local problem with national consequences. After all, lakes, rivers, and streams do not concern themselves with political boundaries. For this reason, Hart embraced a federal approach to water management. "Sewage poured into a stream travels down that stream and has no conscious awareness of where the township or city or state boundary begins or ends," he outlined to constituents as the Senate debated the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961. "No township is an island unto itself in this matter of water pollution." The bill, eventually signed into law, provided the federal government more power to coordinate and oversee water treatment plant construction across the country.[10]

In addition to his early work on water pollution, Hart became a loud advocate for the protection of land for public use. In 1961 he proposed legislation to create two National Recreation Areas: spaces that would eventually become the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore and the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore. His arguments expressed a concern for a rapidly industrializing society as well as a need to preserve natural spaces for the larger public. "There is handwriting on the wall for all to see who will but open their eyes," he noted while introducing the bills. Due to foreseeable increases in the American population, Hart argued, "more people will have more leisure and more money to spend than has been available for previous generations." While Hart envisioned this future as sign of the economic progress of the region, it was still concerning. "Simultaneous with this greater demand will be—and indeed already there has been—a rapid and permanent destruction of our remaining outdoor recreation sites through private development and acquisition for

industrial purposes." Hart argued for the preservation of these spaces so that every American had access to a "vanishing shoreline." In the face of privatization and industrialization, Hart's proposal stemmed from an ideological commitment to protecting a recreational and environmental commons for public use.[11]

Perhaps no Midwestern politician embodied the environmental movement quite like Wisconsin Democrat Gaylord Nelson. Prior to his arrival on the national political scene, he made conservation a central component of his governorship. In Wisconsin, market-oriented politicians hoped to end a program where state funds supported county governments that placed forests into a broader system of conservation management. Opponents of the program wanted county governments to manage their own forests and sell the land for private development. If successful, their proposal would have placed nearly two million acres of public land onto the marketplace. In 1961, Nelson vetoed the bill and spent the remaining two years of his term strengthening the original program by passing legislation making the county system permanent. Nelson learned that conservation and environmental legislation could be a winning political issue on the local level.[12]

Though many national Democrats were slow to adopt environmentalism as a political priority, Nelson continued to make it a cornerstone of his legislative agenda. In his very first year in the Senate, Nelson began to craft legislation that would require that detergents be made with biodegradable products after it was discovered that phosphate-rich detergents were contaminating water and causing algae blooms. He continued his fight against harmful chemicals by taking direct aim at DDT. In 1966 he introduced legislation that banned the sale of the chemical. After a long legal battle with manufacturers, Nelson's political movement proved successful when a federal appeals court finally banned the use of the chemical in 1973. He also supported the creation of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore on the northern tip of Wisconsin, arguing that iconic landscapes belong to all Americans, especially those caught in the "cradle of problems called the industrial Midwest." In the midst of blight, pollution, and landscapes scarred by industrialization, Nelson saw the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore as public commons fit to meet the unique needs of the Midwesterner. "This area must be saved for them and their children and their children's children."[13]

In 1969, Nelson began to envision a broader grassroots movement around issues of environmentalism. Inspired by the 1969 oil spill near Santa Barbara, California, he hoped to combine the style of antiwar teach-ins with the political imperatives of environmentalism. By April

1970, Nelson had established an office, staff, and bipartisan collaboration to sponsor and support more than ten thousand Earth Day events across the country. During appearances at rallies, he spoke to audiences with a rhetoric that blended antiwar sentiments, Great Society promises, and a criticism of citizens and industries that openly polluted the commons. "Our goal is not just an environment of clean air and water and scenic beauty," he argued while giving a speech in Ann Arbor, Michigan. "Our goal is an environment of decency, quality, and mutual respect for all other human beings and all other living creatures—an environment without ugliness, without ghettoes, without discrimination, without hunger, poverty or war." The task was large and would require "a long, sustained, political, moral, ethical, and financial commitment far beyond any effort ever made." But he was optimistic. With such a large signal of support, Nelson hoped that the popularity of his environmental message might encourage deeper societal change.[14]

The rhetoric used by Midwestern Democrats was not lost on those voters who had traditionally supported the party. One example was the support that Hart and Nelson received from labor unions. Flyers and pamphlets produced by the United Auto Workers (UAW) regularly called for environmental action over the course of the 1960s and early 1970s. The UAW had been a proponent for environmental issues since the mid-1950s and even established a Department of Conservation and Resource Development in 1966. Organized and run by Olga Madar, the department rallied support around environmental issues that directly touched the lives and communities of industrial workers. One 1970 flyer blended a concern for the environment with a traditional pro-worker position. "The G.M. worker must be assured that the environment in which he works is as free of hazards to life and limb," it read. "Moreover, he has a right to expect—and insist—that the environment of the community is kept healthful and pleasant to the extent that the company he works for can help make it so." The pamphlet called for strict federal guidelines for water and air pollution, civilian action groups, and an active campaign of letter-writing to politicians. The pamphlet also made sure to celebrate the Midwestern politicians who championed this environmental ethic, including Nelson and Hart. As the UAW leadership saw it, environmental and labor concerns were two sides of the same coin.[15]

As the 1960s progressed, many Democrats attached environmental rhetoric to the larger Great Society programs. "I want to talk to you about the Great Society," Hubert Humphrey proclaimed in one 1965 speech. "You know here the pressing need of our cities and of the need for better mass transit. You know the problems of the elder citizen who needs

housing, medical care, hospitals, and you know the problem that can least of all be postponed: the need for better educational facilities and better teaching." Included in a long list of legislative priorities, Humphrey emphasized "how important it is that we maintain our heritage of natural beauty." Environmental issues, Humphrey argued, were one component of a larger political project to improve the lives of all Americans—particularly those at the bottom of the economic spectrum.[16]

By 1970, after Humphrey failed to win the 1968 election, his environmental rhetoric had become more pointed. At a symposium in Cloquet, Minnesota, Humphrey laid out an ambitious agenda. He hoped to declare "the decade of the 1970's as the decade of people, environment and peace [PEP]," believing, "they're all tied together." This was to be the "PEP decade"—a period "set aside to concentrate on the battle of physical pollution and the environment . . . and dedicated to peace." At the international level, Humphrey called for the creation of a United Nations Board of Environmental Control "to establish enforceable standards for clean air and clean water . . . to prevent contamination of international rivers and oceans." Humphrey believed state and local communities could establish advisory boards where "industry, lay public, labor, young people and interested citizens" would monitor pollution, coordinate efforts to clean up the environment, and promote conservation and recreational activities. His proposal included national standards for all forms of pollution so states did not have to compete against one another. This was essential for the then Senate-candidate from Minnesota. He believed in strong federal oversight and pollution standards that "would prevent economic blackmail where a major employer could cast aside the public's interests and put a gun to the community's head by threatening to close a plant and put thousands of people of out of work." He was resolute that "no business has the right to say that to a community." Like many Midwestern Democrats, Humphrey maintained a tradition of skepticism toward industries that used economic threats to dissuade local dissent or regulation.[17]

Humphrey further combined his vision for economic justice and environmental restoration when he, along with Augustus Hawkins, crafted the Humphrey-Hawkins Act—a bill that sought to lower inflation, ease the economic concerns of the early 1970s, and provide well-paid jobs for out-of-work Americans. The Minnesota senator argued that every American had "the right to productive and gainful employment" as well as "the right to a clean and wholesome environment" and "the right to a clean and decent neighborhood." The authors of the bill sought to expand civil rights, building on the 1960s movement while addressing the new economic and environmental realities of the early 1970s.[18]

Though these political movements were ambitious, many Midwestern Democrats saw them stall as the 1970s progressed. As scholars have noted, early environmentalism was a bipartisan project. Both Democrats and Republicans supported a variety of legislation that sought to reform wasteful practices, protect human health, and regulate industrial activities. But as the 1960s closed, Republicans shifted their legislative priorities. Consider, for instance, a GOP pamphlet from 1970 that sought to remind voters about the difference between the two parties. The document was not inherently anti-environmental, acknowledging that "we have allowed a serious imbalance between man and nature." "Republicans believe that the most important element in renewal of our environment is people," it began. "There must be creative interplay between government at all levels, private industry, individual citizens. Acting together, we can gain control of our environment." The pamphlet was vague as to what a GOP environmental agenda might actually look like at the dawn of the 1970s. President Nixon established the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1970—a point of contention for many conservatives within the Republican Party who sought to limit the reach of federal agencies, not expand them. What was clearer, however, were the ways in which the Republican Party sought to critique the Democratic agenda. Its leadership condemned the growth of the federal agencies, the regulatory state, and the diminished power of local government—a criticism that held double meaning on the tail-end of the 1960s. Most significantly, the Republican Party pamphlet criticized how their political rivals conceived of the American population. "They assume that society is collectively responsible for each of its members"—a philosophy at odds with free enterprise and individualism. The pamphlet criticized how Democratic politicians framed many of its political priorities, including environmentalism. By 1970, Republicans had not fully embraced anti-environmentalism, just the rhetorical tools that Democrats had used to support environmental reforms.[19]

Conservative critiques of environmentalism became more pointed over the course of the decade. Advisers within Gerald R. Ford's presidential administration worked to fit an anti-environmental agenda into the political principles of New Federalism. They took aim at the Environmental Protection Agency, which, as they saw it, gave preference to environmental concerns over "energy, economic, or social goals." Believing that the EPA was too strict in its enforcement of the Clean Air Act and actions against other pollutants, advisers hoped to diminish the power of the agency that had been established by Ford's predecessor. Such issues, the advisers noted, should be left to the states and local governments—a political philosophy that prioritized ideology over ecological realities.[20]

As conservativism developed into a more realized anti-environmental political movement, the New Deal coalition that had enabled Midwestern Democrats to propose their ambitious plans for environmental reforms also began to fracture. A stagnant economy, inflation, rising unemployment rates, and energy crises, as well as political backlash against the Vietnam War, the civil rights movement, and the Watergate scandal, rocked the political landscape. In extractive communities in the Upper Midwest, environmentalism was soon seen as a burden that threatened the economic livelihood of miners—often union members. In Michigan's Upper Peninsula, for example, a coalition of miners, antigovernment voters, and Democratic political leaders led a secession movement throughout the 1970s in the hopes of combatting and repealing the environmental legislation of the 1960s. Supporters of the new "State of Superior" explicitly denounced the Clean Air Act, the National Wilderness Preservation System, and the anti-economic development rhetoric of the more radical wings of the environmental movement. In other parts of the region, a new public-interest movement embraced environmentalism but criticized the role of government. Believing the government was impeding environmental reforms, leftwing critics led by Ralph Nader undermined faith in public institutions. As the 1970s progressed, an increasing number of Americans lacked trust in the ability of the government to tackle pressing environmental problems. The fractured New Deal order would give rise to a neoliberal one in which free markets, free movement of people and goods, and cosmopolitan ideas could improve the material lives of American citizens. For many liberals and conservatives, there was no place for the pro-government environmentalism that politicians like Hart, Nelson, and Humphrey had promoted throughout the 1960s and early 1970s.[21]

Revisiting the rhetoric of these Midwestern Democrats provides a lens to understand the broader trajectory of the environmental movement since its arrival in the 1960s. Though the proposals and rhetoric that politicians like Hart, Humphrey, and Nelson brought forward throughout the 1960s ultimately faded through the 1970s and 1980s, their encompassing environmental vision seems remarkably relevant today. The most devastating effects of climate change have shifted the political dialogue regarding the role of government in solving the most pressing environmental issue in human history. For many, climate change cannot alone be solved with individual responsibility, corporate benevolence, or nonprofit advocacy. An example is the rhetoric and vision embodied in the Green New Deal. The proponents of the resolution call on the power of the federal government to enforce carbon emission standards while ensuring well-paying jobs, investing in infrastructure, addressing poverty, and guaranteeing clean and

healthy environments—all while promoting justice and equity. The broad vision of the resolution, a point of controversy among conservatives and many centrist Democrats, would have been familiar rhetoric alongside the speeches and proposals of these Midwestern Democrats, who also believed that environmental legislation required a strong government to enforce rules, corral unchecked capitalism, protect workers, and advance economic equity.[22]

NOTES

1. Letter from Gaylord Nelson to John F. Kennedy, August 29, 1963, Box 231, Folder 16, Nelson Collection mss1020, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Madison.

2. Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962).

3. For a sampling of the environmental changes in the post-WWII era, see Christopher W. Wells, *Car Country: An Environmental History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014); Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Spawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Dan Egan, *The Death and Life of the Great Lakes* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2017); David Stradling and Richard Stradling, *Where the River Burned: Carl Stokes and the Struggle to Save Cleveland* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015); Joseph S. Cialdella, *Motor City Green: A Century of Landscapes of Environmentalism in Detroit* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2020); Jeffery T. Manuel, *Taconite Dreams: The Struggle to Sustain Mining on Minnesota's Iron Range, 1915–2000* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Nancy Langston, *Sustaining Lake Superior: An Extraordinary Lake in a Changing World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019); Edward C. Lorenz, "Containing the Michigan PBB Crisis, 1973–1992: Testing the Environmental Policy Process," *Environmental History Review* 17, no. 2 (1993): 49–68; Adam Rome, *The Genius of Earth Day: How a 1970 Teach-In Unexpectedly Made the First Green Generation* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2013). For more on environmental politics, see Samuel P. Hays, *A History of Environmental Politics since 1945* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg Press, 2000).

4. For environmental histories of the New Deal, see Sarah T. Phillips, *This Land, This Nation: Conservation, Rural America, and the New Deal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Neil M. Maher, *Nature's New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

5. Aldo Leopold, *Sand County Almanac* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949); Paul Lester Errington, *Of Men and Marshes* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1957).

6. Adlai Stevenson, "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago," American Presidency Project, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/node/275477, accessed November 10, 2022.

7. Adlai E. Stevenson, "Inaugural Address, January 10, 1949," in Walter Johnson and Carol Evans, eds., *The Papers of Adlai E. Stevenson, Volume III: Governor of Illinois, 1949–1953* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1977), 24; Adlai E. Stevenson, "Address to Inland Daily Press Association, October 19, 1949," in ibid., 170.

8. Adlai E. Stevenson, "Jefferson and Our National Leadership," *Virginia Quarterly Review* 36, no. 3 (1960): 348.

9. For more on Philip Hart, see Michael O'Brien, *Philip Hart: The Conscience of the Senate* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1995); "Senator Philip A. Hart's Report from Washington, for Release in Michigan Papers Beginning Monday, January 30, 1961," Box 97, Folder 61–9, Philip A. Hart Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (hereafter, Hart Papers); "Remarks by Senator Philip A. Hart (D-Mich) before the Inter-State Conference on Water Problems of Council of State Govts, Tuesday, December 6, 10:00am, Chicago, Ill.," Box 97, Folder 60–81, Hart Papers.

10. "Philip A. Hart Radio Blurb—Water Pollution (1:06min.)," Box 97, Folder 61–88, Hart Papers.

11. "Remarks of Senator Philip A. Hart (D-Mich) on Introducing Bills to Establish in Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Recreation Area and the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area, June 27, 1961," Box 97, Folder 61–88, Hart Papers.

12. Bill Christofferson, *The Man from Clear Lake: Earth Day Founder Senator Gaylord Nelson* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), 156.

13. Christofferson, *The Man from Clear Lake*, 214–215, 273–279, 239–250, 302–312; "Revised Script for Apostle Islands Region TV film," Box 123, Folder 27, Nelson Collection mss1020, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Madison.

14. Christofferson, *The Man from Clear Lake*, 302–312; Rome, *The Genius of Earth Day*, ix–xi; "Nelson's Notes for a Speech in Ann Arbor on the First Earth Day, April 22, 1970," Box 231, Folder 57, Nelson Collection mss1020, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Madison.

15. "United Auto Workers Pamphlet about Environmental Activities of the Union," Box 47, Folder 26, Nelson Collection mss1020, Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Madison; the relationship between the UAW and the environmental movement can be found in a variety of works. See Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*, rev. and updated ed. (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2005); Andrew Hurley, *Environmental Inequalities: Class, Race, and Industrial Pollution in Gary, Indiana, 1945–1980* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Brandon M. Ward, *Living Detroit: Environmental Activism in an Age of Urban Crisis* (London: Routledge, 2022).

16. "Remarks by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator Dodd Dinner, March 6, 1965," Speech Text Files, Hubert H. Humphrey Papers, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul.

17. "Excerpts from Speech by Hubert H. Humphrey, Environmental Symposium—April 6, 1970, Cloquet, Minnesota," Speech Text Files, Hubert H. Humphrey Papers, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul.

18. "Civil Rights Speech at LBJ School of Public Affairs Symposium, Austin, Texas, December 10–11, 1972," Speech Text Files, Hubert H. Humphrey Papers, Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul; Arnold A. Offner, *Hubert Humphrey: The Conscience of the Country* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018), 371–373.

19. Gregg Coodley and David Sarasohn, *The Green Years, 1964–1976: When Democrats and Republicans United to Repair the Earth* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2021); James Morton Turner and Andrew C. Isenberg, *The Republican Reversal: Conservatives and the Environment from Nixon to Trump* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018); "There Is a Difference," MSS-076, Box 1, Folder 47, Charles H. Varnum Papers,

Central Upper Peninsula and Northern Michigan University Archives, Northern Michigan University, Marquette.

20. "Memo, Examples of EPA Activities and Actions that Reflect Philosophies Different from Those of the Administration, July 5, 1974," Folder: Environmental Protection Agency New Federalism Review, Box 7, Michael Raoul-Duval Files, Gerald R. Ford Library, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

21. "A New 'State of Superior': Political Fracture and Anti-environmentalism in the Upper Midwest," in Jon Lauck and Catherine McNicol Stock, eds., *The Conservative Heartland: A Political History of the Postwar American Midwest* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2020), 153–170; Paul Sabin, *Public Citizens: The Attack on Big Government and the Remaking of American Liberalism* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2021); Gary Gerstle, *The Rise and Fall of the Neoliberal Order: American and the World in the Free Market Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2022).

22. "H.Res.109—116th Congress (2019–2020): Recognizing the Duty of the Federal Government to Create a Green New Deal," February 7, 2019.