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Abstract

The legislative arm of the United States’ government, Congress, is more polarised than it ever has been in US political history, often hampering President Obama’s attempts to introduce climate legislation. Indeed, attitudes towards climate change have become a marker of political party identity in the US. Yet despite strong Republican opposition to climate and energy initiatives in Congress, there has been significant action at the subnational level, in two states with Republican governors. Governor Schwarzenegger implemented a cap-and-trade system in California, and Governor Perry oversaw legislation that has made Texas the largest producer of wind energy in the US (California and Texas are also the two largest emitters of greenhouse gases in the US). This thesis conducts a discourse analysis in order to examine this anomaly in Republican leadership on the issue of climate change, and investigates how, in light of their Republicanism and the backdrop of intense political polarisation, each of these governors have legitimised their respective climate and renewable energy policies.
Declaration Page

This thesis comprises only my original work towards the Masters of Arts (Research) degree.

Due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used.

This thesis is fewer than the maximum word limit in length, exclusive of tables, maps, bibliographies and appendices.

Rachael Robson
Acknowledgements

First and foremost thanks must absolutely go to my principal supervisor, Robyn Eckersley, for helping me turn my initial research idea into a thesis with more depth and insight than it would have without her support. Thanks must also go to the rest of my supervisory panel, to Raymond Orr and to Sally Young for their suggestions that helped to really tighten my work, and for their positive feedback.

And as always, thanks must also go to my Uncle, Steve, and Grandpa, Max, for their help in proofreading, and to my Mum for her feedback and emotional support.
Contents

Introduction 7

Chapter 1: Theoretical framework and methodology 12

Chapter 2: Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger: California leading the charge 40

Chapter 3: Governor Rick Perry: Energy Security and Texas Forever 55

Chapter 4: Discussion: Beyond Ideology 69

Conclusion 81

Bibliography 83

Appendix A 90

List of all texts used in the case studies of this thesis

Appendix B 94

Example screenshot of note taking using Evernote software
List of Figures

Table 2.1: Databases of the Governors’ texts

Figure 4.1: Governor Schwarzenegger’s discursive strategies

Figure 4.2: Governor Perry’s discursive strategies
Introduction

In 2012, the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere reached 393.1 parts per million. This rate is 141% of the amount of carbon dioxide that existed in the atmosphere in ‘pre-industrial’ times. In April 2014, this amount had risen to 400 parts per million across the northern hemisphere (World Meteorological Organization 2014). The British government’s former chief scientist, Sir David King, has stated that ‘climate change is the most serious problem we are facing today, more serious than the threat of terrorism’ (Brown & Held 2010, p. 293).

The Fifth Assessment Report was published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) in 2014, providing the latest comprehensive assessment on the state of the earth’s climate and the effects of climate change. The report declared that ‘human influence on the climate system is clear, and recent anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases are the highest in history. Recent climate changes have had widespread impacts on human and natural systems.’ (IPCC 2014, p. 1). However, it has become increasingly clear over the past decade that action taken to combat climate change on the international and national level is not as ambitious or concerted as it needs to be in order to avoid or reduce the risks of dangerous climate change.

As the world’s second largest emitter of greenhouse gases, the US has a crucial role to play in the global mitigation of climate change. At the national level, legislative efforts to address climate change have failed to pass Congress. The most notable of these efforts, the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009, also known as the Waxman-Markey Bill after its two authors, was a bill that, if successful, would have seen the US implement a national cap-and-trade system. Though it passed the House of Representatives in 2009, it did not pass the Senate (Center for Climate and Energy Solutions n.d.). President Obama has since used his Executive Powers to pursue his climate agenda, discussed in more detail in Chapter 1. However, this is very much a second-best response. By comparison, if Congress were to pass cap-and-trade or carbon tax legislation, such laws would carry much more broad legitimacy than an Executive Order, and would also be much harder to reverse.

President Obama has worked hard to reverse the long-held international perceptions that the US is not an international leader in climate negotiations. However, he has had to grapple
with a powerful legacy, which began with Congressional resistance to the Kyoto Protocol. Indeed, several months prior to the Kyoto conference in 1997, the Senate unanimously passed Resolution 98, the Byrd-Hagel resolution. It declared that the Senate would not pass any treaty if developing countries did not also take on emission reductions obligations in the same commitment period, or if ratifying the treaty would result in harm to the US economy (Congress.gov 1998).

One major factor that has led to Federal inaction has been ever-increasing levels of political polarisation in Congress, exacerbated by the rise of climate scepticism and denialism that has been largely concentrated among conservatives. In 2010 (President Obama’s second year in office), the Republican Party gained control of the House of Representatives at the midterm elections, and won 66 seats. Moreover, many of the newly elected Republicans were not middle-of-the-road conservatives, but rather sat at the far right of the American political spectrum. With moderate Democrats being replaced by hard-line conservative Republicans, the political ideological gap between the two major parties was suddenly wider than it ever had been in US political history (Layman, Carsey & Horowitz 2006). Furthermore, the phenomena of climate scepticism and denialism, fed by conservative pseudoscience think tanks, have contributed to this state of affairs. Climate scepticism, the doubt in humanity’s role in changes to the earth’s climate, and climate denialism, the outright rejection of any link between human activity and climate change, or of the existence of climate change over all, are positions held by many conservative politicians. According to Climate Progress (2015), 131 members of the Republican caucus in the House of Representatives (53%) and 38 members of the Senate (70%) are either climate sceptics or deniers (Germain, Ellingboe & Kroh 2015, pp., paras. 1-2). Clearly, the increasing presence of sceptics and deniers in Congress has made it impossible for the Obama administration to pursue a proactive climate agenda in the legislature.

Subnational US climate politics: the core research question

Notwithstanding the lack of legislative action in the federal legislature, a number of governors of states within the US have taken it upon themselves to introduce legislative measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change within their own borders. Significantly, it is not only liberal, Democratic governors who are taking up the challenge. A number of states with Republicans at their helm have introduced a range of climate change and
renewable energy policies, all of which have successfully reduced, or reduced the rate of growth of, their respective states’ greenhouse gas emissions. The core research questioned examined in this thesis is: how, despite their politically conservative nature, and despite the historically unprecedented divisions between the two major political parties on climate change, have Republican governors justified their climate change and energy policies?

Central to the question of how Republican governors have justified their policies is the matter of political ideology. Given the general Republican scepticism towards climate science and climate policy, there arises the question of how have Republican governors maintained and defended their climate and renewable energy policies without losing face as Republicans? Moreover, what lessons can be learned from their climate and energy narratives? There may be some that will be useful in the future for other conservative politicians who are concerned with climate change. In particular, this inquiry seeks to understand to what extent Republican governors have drawn upon Republican ideology in legitimising their policies to their various audiences. From an analytical perspective there are three distinct discursive strategies that could be employed. The technique of categorising the discursive techniques of each of the case studies in this thesis is a means of analysis that I have specifically crafted for this thesis. First, governors might draw upon the less partisan components of their ideology in order to connect with bipartisan audiences. Second, they might play on the highly polarised political landscape of the US and attempt to divide their audiences based on the most distinctive features of their ideologies. Or third, they might seek to transcend political ideology by drawing upon other values (be it local or national) to legitimise their policies. As I show in the more in-depth discussion of these discursive strategies in the next chapter, these options are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

**Hunting the discursive trail: Discourse methodology**

In order to answer the question of how Republican governors have legitimised their climate and energy policies, this thesis employs a discourse analysis method. Two Republican governors were selected as the case studies of this thesis, one from California and the other from Texas, which represent the second largest and largest emitters respectively in the US. Governor Schwarzenegger held office in California from 2003 until 2011. Governor Perry held office in Texas for a not dissimilar stretch of time, from 2000 until 2015. Despite having
held opposing views on the issue of climate change – Governor Schwarzenegger readily accepted the science behind climate change while Governor Perry was a climate sceptic – both governors oversaw the implementation of significant climate and/or renewable energy measures in their states. Conducting analyses of these two governors’ discourses first involved constructing databases of their speeches on relevant climate and energy topics. After amassing these databases, each of the governors’ texts were examined, and the findings were then compiled using Evernote note-taking software. From there, findings regarding overarching frames and themes, and smaller-scale stories and ideas were then synthesised. The focus of the analysis was in order to determine how they presented their ideas about climate change and energy matters, with regards to their political ideology, rather than why. A short exploration of the relevant climate and energy policies implemented by both governors prefaced the discourse analyses to provide general context for the analysis.

Overview of this thesis

Chapter 1 will introduce and explain in more detail the context, theoretical framework and methodology of this thesis. This will include a deeper discussion of the currently-polarised US political landscape, and of climate denialism and scepticism. This will be followed by an examination of political ideology and climate change in the US, as well as the range of possible discursive strategies that are open to the governors. The remained of Chapter 1 will explain the discourse analysis methodology in more detail.

Chapter 2 will detail my case study of Governor Schwarzenegger’s climate and energy discourse. This will begin with a brief background on the significant climate and energy policies that were overseen by Governor Schwarzenegger, followed by an analysis of his discourses on climate-and energy-related topics.

Chapter 3 will follow a similar structure to the previous chapter by providing a brief outline of energy policies implemented in Texas by Governor Perry, followed by an analysis of his energy discourses.

Chapter 4 will compare the findings of both case studies by examining similarities and differences between the two Governors’ discourses, how they have in fact employed (or
not) their political ideologies in order to legitimise their policies, and what this means for the broader picture of political responses to climate change in the US.

The conclusion will reflect on the broader insights emerging from the comparative discourse and the implications for the future of climate and energy policy in the US.
Chapter 1: Theoretical framework and methodology

Introducing and overseeing new climate and energy legislation created a number of discursive hurdles for both Governors Schwarzenegger and Perry. For Governor Schwarzenegger, this included justifying why he wanted his state, more than any other in the US, to become a global leader in the fight against climate change. For Governor Perry, this included articulating why he approved such a large expansion of Texas’ wind energy production capabilities, when producing renewable energy is commonly acknowledged to be a natural ally to climate change mitigation, and typically favoured by Democrats. In the broader political context, both governors had to find ways of justifying their policies in terms that were not inconsistent with their political identities against the backdrop of a highly polarised political arena.

This chapter will therefore begin with the general problem of political polarisation over climate change in the US to provide crucial context for the research presented in this thesis. This will focus on how political polarisation in the US has affected climate-related policies, both on the national and state level, and how this is linked to the phenomena of climate scepticism and climate denialism among many Republicans. Against this background, I will explore a range of discursive strategies that each of the Republican governors examined in this thesis might have conceivably employed to legitimise their climate change and renewable energy policies. These range from frames that either draw directly on their political ideology or instead transcend it, by appealing to more general frames.

The second half of this chapter will provide a detailed explanation of the methodology of this thesis. This will include the choice of case studies, how texts produced by each governor were located, and how the resulting data was analysed.

President Obama’s climate efforts and the problem of political polarisation

In 2009, the same year when the Waxman-Markey Bill did not pass the Senate, President Obama announced that the US’s national target for greenhouse gas emissions would be 17 per cent below 2005 levels by 2020 (US Department of Energy 2009). The consensus is that President Obama has always been a climate change champion, but was stymied in his first term by Congress. Nonetheless it is clear that he has made climate change a priority in his second term. In November 2014, in the lead up to the climate negotiations in Lima in
December of the same year, he put out a joint statement with China on each country’s climate policies, which acknowledged the ‘critical role’ both countries had in the mitigation of climate change, and increased the US’s target to 26-28 per cent below 2005 levels by 2025 (White House Office of the Press Secretary 2014, para. 1). In August 2015, the Clean Power Plan, a program co-designed by the President and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), was finalised after a lengthy process of public engagement. The program included an emissions standard on existing power plants, and aimed to reduce the US’s emissions from the utility power sector by 32 per cent by 2030. The plan also includes a larger national investment in renewable energy, with the aim of increasing the US’s production of renewable energy by 30 percent by 2030 (WhiteHouse.gov 2015).

The road to the 114th Republican dominated Congress and the intensification of polarisation began in 2010 (President Obama’s second year in office), when the Republican Party gained control of the House of Representatives at the midterm elections, winning 66 seats. This win for the Republican Party would have deeper ramifications than simply a swapping of the majority legislators from blue to red (that is Democratic to Republican): where many of the Democrats who lost their seats were from the moderate wing of the party, many of the newly elected Republicans were highly conservative. This meant that when the 112th Congress began, ‘the ideological distance between the median Democratic representative and the median Republican representative [would] increase dramatically’ (Abramowitz 2011, p. 294). This divide between a Republican House of Representatives and Democratic Senate reached a peak in 2013, when Congress failed to pass a budget before the deadline of the 1st of October, resulting in a government shutdown. For 16 days, 800,000 people were sent home without pay, and a further million were asked to work without pay (FactCheck 2014).

The hostility in Congress has not lessened to any significant degree since the shutdown, with both parties blaming the other for the problem of polarisation. And this hostility extends beyond the Capitol Building, to the White House. On numerous occasions Congress has blocked bills that have had Presidential support, to the point that in July 2014, President Obama, a Democrat, argued that ‘So far this year, Republicans in Congress have blocked every serious idea to strengthen the middle class’ (Kessler 2014, para. 1).
Climate change is an issue that is heavily impacted by this political polarisation in Congress. With many Republicans (and occasionally some Democrats) in both the House of Representatives and Senate denying the link between human activity and climate change outright, it has become virtually impossible for Congress even to agree on the existence of the problem of climate change, let alone take steps to mitigate and/or adapt to it (Valentine 2014). It is this political polarisation that forms the major concern and prompt of my research: as successive reports by the IPCC have indicated, climate change already is and will continue to have lasting impacts on both the natural world and human society, unless concerted action is taken to stop it. As the world’s largest historical greenhouse gas emitter and the world’s largest economy, the US’ participation in this effort is crucial to the success of the international climate regime. Political polarisation shares a large portion of the blame for why the US has been so slow to take any major legislative (as distinct from executive) initiative on climate change since the failed climate negotiations in Copenhagen in 2009. If this polarisation can be better understood within the context of climate change, including how it might be addressed or circumvented, particularly by Republican representatives, the US may be in a better position to deal with the risks of climate change. In particular, if Republican governors and members of Congress can find face-saving ways of working around the divide between their conservative political identity and action on climate change, then the chances of a major political breakthrough in other states and at the national level are increased.

Fiorina and Abrams (2008) define political polarisation as ‘the simultaneous presence of opposing or conflicting principles, tendencies, or points of view.’ (p. 566). The US has always had a history of political polarisation, going back to arguments over ‘state and citizen power in the 1790s’, and slavery in the 1850s (Layman, Carsey & Horowitz 2006, p. 85). However, whereas in the past American political parties have typically only been polarised on a small number of issues (for example, foreign policy and defence issues such as the Vietnam War in the 1960s), now political parties clash over a much wider range. In short, ‘new partisan conflicts have not displaced old ones; party conflict has extended from older issues to newer issues’ (Layman, Carsey & Horowitz 2006, p. 87). In fact, the level of political polarisation has increased over the decades, particularly with regards to environmental and climate-related issues. As ideological ideas about how to deal with and protect the environment in
particular became increasingly divided amongst members of Congress (though not always amongst the general public), so too did Congress itself, slowing the development of cohesive, climate-related legislation (McCright & Dunlap 2010).

Sunstein (2009) has shown how when individuals come together in like-minded groups to discuss issues including climate change, their opinions are more likely not to move to the centre, but instead to an extreme position. This movement is based on the self-reinforcing information and ideas to which members of like-minded groups are exposed. As McCright and Dunlap (2011) show, media outlets have also become more polarised, and so people increasingly tend to obtain news that reinforces their own political views, hence perpetuating this cycle of polarisation. It is widely recognised that climate change is one such issue that polarises both political parties and the general public in the US. Indeed, a politician’s stance on the issue of climate change has become a marker of political party identity. In turn, such divisive views on the issue have caused it to be framed in a number of different ways by so called ‘red’ (Republican) and ‘blue’ (Democratic) subnational governments.

The phenomenon of political polarisation has produced a paralysis. With members of Congress at loggerheads with each other and the White House on virtually every political issue, the US Federal government is essentially paralysed and unable enact any substantive legislation on climate change. This has prompted President Obama to turn to his executive powers to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under existing legislation, such as through the Clean Air Act. However, when he leaves office in 2016, there would be no barriers to stop the next President from reversing these executive initiatives. This paralysis at the Federal level has prompted a number of climate policy scholars to turn their attention to the subnational level, where a number of state governments within the US, many with extremely varied ideologies and ideas about issues including climate change, have begun to take steps to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, and/or promote the use of renewable energy. Indeed, one of the notable and puzzling features of these subnational climate and energy initiatives is that they do not always emerge in the predictable states, or fall along predictable party lines. My research seeks to determine how, amongst this patchwork of climate and energy initiatives, two states and their Republican leaders are attempting to legitimise their actions.
Climate scepticism and denialism

The rise of climate scepticism and denialism – the former referring to the lack of confidence in the link between human activity and changes in the Earth’s climate, and the latter referring to an outright rejection to any such link – has played a large role in the US’s inability to produce cohesive climate policy at the Federal level. Academics such as Antonio and Brulle (2011) argue that climate scepticism is a symptom of the previously discussed wider polarised political landscape, most notably, the highly contrasting ideas about the way the economy should be run. With the rise of neoliberalism in the 1970s and its consolidation under Reagan and Thatcher, conservatives began to link economic freedom with political freedom; this meant that ideas such as the welfare state (and, later, climate policy that might expand the regulatory role of government and impose costs on the economy) were seen as threats to liberty, and that if the US were to take part in international environmental agreements, its economic power and national sovereignty would be threatened (Jacques, Dunlap & Freeman 2008). Then, in the 1980s under the Reagan administration, when conservative politicians attempted to reduce the level of environmental regulation that existed in the US (for example, by stripping the Environmental Protection Agency of its ‘enforcement’ capabilities), they were met with considerable public backlash (McCright and Dunlap 2010, p. 107). As such, conservative politicians changed their tactics, and instead of attacking environmental programs directly, they learned to use other political techniques to continue their fight against what they perceived as attacks on their political values. Climate scepticism, the act of questioning and challenging the science of climate change, has emerged as one such technique.

McCright and Dunlap (2010) argue that there are different dimensions of political power in interest group politics, each encompassing a different set of techniques an individual or group may use to protect their interests in the face of conflict. After failing to protect their interests in the 1980s through using overt, direct techniques (ie. by outwardly questioning and criticising environmental regulations) right-wing conservatives began to use more subtle techniques to attack the political left’s environmental agenda. By ‘confining the scope of decision-making to only those issues that do not seriously challenge their subjective interests’, they shifted their target, from the environmental regulations themselves to the science they derive their authority from, and so continued to sow doubt around the science
of climate change (McCright & Dunlap 2010, p. 106). As previously discussed, heavily hampered the US’ ability to pass cohesive climate or energy legislation through Congress.

There is also a darker side to climate scepticism. One way the political right has sowed doubt surrounding the science of climate change is through the work of conservative think tanks. Though it is true that most think tanks are established with the aim of serving particular political purposes, some conservative think tanks have prosecuted their agenda by spreading misinformation about climate change. And, in part thanks to their being exceptionally well resourced, and their campaigns being run very systematically, these think tanks have played a pivotal role in the continued presence of climate scepticism and denialism. In an article published in 2011, Jacques, Dunlap, and Freeman analysed 141 books which were sceptical of climate change and other environmental issues from between 1972 and 2005. They found that ‘92 per cent of these books, most published in the US since 1992, [were] linked to conservative think tanks’ (2011 p. 349). Moreover, these think tanks receive funding not just from the general public, but also from corporations, in whose best interest it is for climate change and other environmental issues to be unregulated or only minimally regulated. For example, ExxonMobil, the oil and gas multinational corporation, provides hundreds of thousands of dollars to famous conservative think tanks including the Cato Institute, the Heartland Institute and the Heritage Foundation (Greenpeace 2013). The money trail runs even further than funding organisation and think tanks that are separate to the US government. A number of prominent politicians have received indirect funding and donations (eg. through leadership Political Action Committees – PACs – or through individuals wishing to donate) which contribute to their campaigns. For example, Senator James Inhofe, an outspoken climate denier, received $454,500 from the US oil and gas industry between 2009 and 2014 (OpenSecrets.org 2014). The rise of climate scepticism in the US, in tandem with political polarisation, has certainly been a major contributor to the US’s inability to take concerted action on climate change and other environment-related issues. However, the more important issue for the purposes of this inquiry is how climate scepticism has been linked to Republican ideology.

The research of this thesis contributes to a web of work completed by other scholars on the politics of climate change (particularly at the subnational level), and on how climate change
as an issue is framed by politicians as well as sectors of society such as the media and the scientific community. A number of scholars have turned their attention to the efforts being made at the subnational level, both in the US and in other states. Authors such as Schreurs (2008) have conducted comparative research into different projects undertaken in a variety of international locations, such as California within the US and Germany within the European Union. This research has examined the circumstances that have enabled substantive action on climate change to occur. For example, California has a history of environmentalism, in part due to the necessity of a response to smog and pollution problems, going back to the 1940s. Closer to the vein of this research is the scholarly literature that focuses on not just various subnational climate change policies, but also the way in which the issue of climate change is *framed* and articulated.

**Understanding Climate Change Discourses**

Framing and articulation are very specific to time, place, and community. For example, Weingart, Engels and Pansegrau (2000) have conducted a discourse analysis of the way the issue of climate change is portrayed in three sectors of German society, namely, in the scientific community, by politicians, and in the mass media. They showed how each of the three discourses moved through various phases in the ways in which the topic of climate change was characterised in the period between 1975 and 1995. They showed that while scientists frequently attempted to turn the issue into a political one, both the media and politicians approached the issue in a somewhat reductive manner. By avoiding a discussion about the uncertainties surrounding the issue, and instead focusing on specific facets of climate change, such as greenhouse gas emissions, or specific ‘sequence[s] of events leading to catastrophe and requiring immediate action’ (Weingart, Engels & Pansegrau 2000, p. 280). Spence and Pidgeon (2010) in their research examined the action of framing an issue itself. As they explain,: 

‘The way in which… information is ‘framed’ is paramount. ... A frame allows complex issues to be pared down and for some aspects of that issue to be given greater emphasis than others in order that particular audiences can rapidly identify why an issue may be relevant to them’ (p. 675).
And, of even great significance to this research, the fact that ‘frames can also serve ideological and governance purposes, and as a consequence different social actors within the climate change policy domain... constantly compete in order to present and legitimise their own interpretations of the salient issues’ [emphasis added] (Spence & Pidgeon 2010, p. 675).

Spence and Pidgeon (2010), De Boer, Wardekker and Van der Sluijs (2010), and Nisbet (2009) have sought to categorise various frames that are used to articulate the issue of climate change, often with other, less visible end goals in sight. For example, both Spence and Pidgeon and De Boer, Wardekker and Van der Sluijs referred to ‘attribute framing’, in which a particular aspect of the overall issue is highlighted as a means to determine whether climate change is a likely cause of some particular problem (Spence & Pidgeon 2010, p. 657). Spence and Pidgeon (2010) also discussed ‘outcome framing’, in which a particular behaviour is presented with regards to the gains and losses which may result from such behaviour (p. 657). Interestingly, Spence & Pidgeon (2010) discovered that a “loss frame”, that is, a portrayal of climate change that emphasised the danger of inaction, resulted in better recall of the information on the issue by research participants. However, they were also less effective at garnering positive attitudes and support for climate mitigation efforts than more positive ways of framing climate change (ie a “gain frame”). In a similar vein, De Boer, Wardekker and Van der Sluijs (2010) recounted various ‘science-related frames’, and identify their characteristics – for example, whether a frame’s ‘goal orientation and focus’ is on ‘promotion’ (the emphasis is on positive outcomes of dealing with climate change) or on ‘prevention’ (the dangers of inaction are emphasised, similar to the above mentioned “loss frames”) (p. 506). Nisbet (2009), while noting the Obama Administration’s commitment to taking action on climate change, but (at the time of writing) nonetheless argued that there was a lack of public engagement which hampered the President’s efforts. Within this discussion he presented a ‘typology of frames applicable to climate change’, which are various ways of framing the science-related issues as described above by De Boer, Wardekker and Van der Sluijs (2010). Examples of these frames include the ‘economic development’ frame, which positions action on climate change likely to have a positive effect on the national (US) and the global economy, allowing for an increase in competitiveness, and the ‘morality and ethics’ frame, which puts forward the
question of what is the right thing to do in terms of dealing with climate change (Nisbet 2009, p. 18). Nisbet also made an important distinction, particularly to the research in this thesis; that ‘frames as general organising devices should not be confused with specific policy positions’ (2009 p. 18).

Also pertinent to this research is Fletcher’s (2009) analysis of various frames used at the Federal level of politics in the US in order to articulate the government’s position on climate change. Drawing on Foucauldian ideas about the lack of correspondence between reality and language, she noted that ‘language builds – rather than mirrors – social reality’ (p. 802). This perspective rejects the idea that ‘political language is a stable and accurate reflection of an immutable reality’, and instead examines ‘not only... how actors use language to delineate boundaries and enforce a set of beliefs and social norms but also how they use language within particular institutional and cultural settings [say, the ideologically polarised landscape of US politics] to advance their interests’ (Fletcher 2009, p. 802). Pushing this point further, Chilton and Schäffner (2002) who drew on Aristotle’s ideas about language and speech, observed that ‘political activity does not exist without the use of language’ (p. 3).

**Locating this research within the spectrum of ideological analysis**

The research of this thesis resides in a specific position within the spectrum of ideological analysis, located on the discursive rather than the conceptual end of this spectrum. Maynard (2013) examined the overall ‘field of ideological analysis’, and between ‘conceptual’ and ‘quantitative approaches’ lie the ‘discursive approaches’, which view and analyse ideology through particular lenses, different to those used by conceptual and quantitative ideological analysis (p. 313). For example, where conceptual ideological analysis may examine data such as ‘historical works’, discursive analysis instead examines the ‘discourse of major political actors’ (Maynard 2013, p. 314). Similarly, where quantitative ideological analysis ascribes the source of an ideology’s power to the ‘personal commitments’ made by people like politicians, discursive analysts argue that ideology’s power may instead come from the ‘capture of political language’ (Maynard 2013, p. 314). In a similar vein, McDonald (2012) argued that when a discourse becomes dominant is the point at which it seems to be a ‘natural or inevitable expression... of a community’s core values’, even when it may instead actually be serving the particular interests of a small few
These ideas about the construction of discourse (and also identity) and the discursive power of producing meaning are examined in more depth below.

The two most distinctive theories of discourse analysis are critical discourse analysis, with its roots in Marxist ideology critique, and analysis conducted in the post-structuralist tradition (Maynard 2013). These two streams share a number of similarities, including a number of guiding principles. These include the ideas that ‘discourse is [both] constitutive [and]... conditioned by society’, and with regards to ideology, the fact that it is ‘typically conceived of as produced by power and relations of domination, and as serving to sustain (though sometimes also challenge) those relations’ (Maynard 2013, p. 305). However, there are also differences between the two traditions. Post-structuralist analysis is wary of the idea of an external, objective reality or ‘truth’ outside of discourse and ideology, and therefore it is not possible to refer to truths as a means of ‘unmasking’ of an ideology that is constructed through discourse (Maynard 2013, p. 305). By contrast, critical discourse analysis argues there is an external reality/truth separate from discourse, and so it is possible to conduct such an unmasking by showing the ways in which other realities or truths are concealed or distorted. Critical discourse analysis also goes beyond the text in other ways. Fairclough (2013), for example, has written extensively on critical discourse analysis, and argues that it is a ‘relational form of research’ in that it does not just focus on ‘entities or individuals’ as the producers of discourse, but also takes into consideration ‘social relations’ that may influence them (p. 3). Connected to this, Wodak & Meyer (2009) have argued that the heart of critical discourse analysis is likely to be the analysis of the discourse surrounding a ‘social problem’ (p. 125). Moreover, they also note that critical discourse analysis as a methodology is concerned with ‘discourse,... power and ideology’ and the relations between them (Wodak & Meyer 2009, p. 1). This thesis follows the tradition of critical discourse analysis insofar as it is focused on political discourses that bear upon a major social problem, and is concerned with the connections between discourse, power, and ideology. Moreover, the policy context and background of the discourses was presented so that they could be located in time and place, and a small amount of ‘unmasking’ took place. Nonetheless, the central analysis of this thesis was focused primarily on the text and talk of the discourse, since the main concern was to analyse how the policies in question are legitimised, and that is a discursive activity.
The importance of rhetoric

For the purposes of this thesis, rhetoric refers to the art of persuasion; indeed, Dryzek (2010) stated succinctly that ‘effective rhetoric persuades rather than proves’ (p. 322). A number of scholars (Dryzek 2010; Uhr & Walter 2014) have argued against the claims that rhetoric is nothing more than a tool used by ‘slippery politicians’ to manipulate and conceal the truth (Uhr & Walter 2014, p. 3) Instead they argued for the continued importance of rhetoric in democratic politics for a number of reasons, including the fact that ‘rhetoric facilitates the making and hearing of representation claims spanning subjects and audiences divided in their commitments and dispositions’ (Dryzek 2010, p. 319). Indeed, Dryzek (2010) has distinguished between two different ways of using rhetoric that are especially pertinent to this thesis. That is, rhetoric may be used either to bond with particular audience or to build bridges between different audiences. These may allow a politician to convey not only their ideas on a topic, but also to ‘persuade an always doubting populace of one’s general competence and legitimacy, as well as the wisdom of one’s own policies, while calling into doubt the wisdom and competence of the opposition’ (Uhr & Walter 2014, p. 8). These views on persuading an audience about the quality of a politician’s policies also has crucial links to the social construction of identity, to which we now turn.

Frames to storylines to identity

In justifying their climate and energy policies, the two governors employ rhetoric to demonstrate to their audiences that they are competent leaders and that their policies are not only sound but also more so than their competitors (Uhr & Walter 2014). For Republican governors, this means legitimising their climate and energy policies without losing face as a Republican, or losing office as a Governor. This requires a form of political communication that can connect with the targeted audience through persuasive frames and storylines that are familiar and meaningful to the audience. The result of this process, apart from the justification of policy and the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, is the construction of identity. Both McDonald (2012) and Hansen (2006) highlight the fact that before a government can take any sort of legislative action, be it in the form of foreign or domestic policy, they must first define their values relative to others, and therefore their identity, in the course of justifying their proposed action. McDonald builds on Pierre Bourdieu’s ideas about discourse, arguing that ‘dominant discourses [in his case, of security]
serve particular sets of interests but are accepted and institutionalised as natural or inevitable expressions of a community’s core values’: this is not self-evident so the meaning and importance of these values have to be constructed (2012, p. 12). Lene Hansen (2006) argues a similar point, that ‘identity [and the construction thereof], is... at work in the constitution of... any significant political decision’ (p. xvii). This construction of identity (which distinguishes self/other or us/them) through the use of frames and storylines, along with rhetorical devices like analogy, metaphor, repetition, exaggeration, etc is crucial in the process of legitimising policy.

The successful construction of identity and discourse presupposes fulfilment of a number of criteria that must be met. One such criterion is that a politician must in fact have a rhetorical strategy to serve their discursive strategy, and they must be able to convey it well. According to Uhr and Walter (2014) having a successful rhetorical strategy means understanding that ‘speech is an essential tool’ to rhetoric, and that words used in speeches must be ‘carefully judged and... crafted’ (p. 9). They cite the Gillard government in Australia as an example of a government that did not have an effective rhetorical strategy, and so were voted out. Moreover, it is essential for a politician or government to be able to successfully judge ‘the character of [their] audience’ (Uhr & Walter 2014, p. 3). Having a secure understanding of an audience may include knowing what sort of rhetoric to use; for example, bridging or bonding rhetoric as described by Dryzek (2010). If a politician is unable to do so, then they may fail to connect with, and persuade, their audience.

McDonald (2012) also notes that though a government may be responsible for constructing a discourse in this manner, they do not have free reign to make up new identities. Instead, their discourse must connect with the values and culture of the wider community. Governments are required to have ‘societal support’ throughout the process of defining a particular issue, determining what threatens it, and the action they may take in order to respond (p. 17). So they must find ways of tapping in to the existing political culture. Moreover, the construction of identity and discourse in this manner can result in a catch 22. If a politician does not construct these discourses and identities to justify their policies, they will be unable to argue for the superiority of their leadership and policies. However, the same discourses and identities can set precedents and become constraints in the future. For example, Governor Perry is certainly a climate sceptic, and occasionally also uses climate
denialist rhetoric. To suddenly come out in favour of climate mitigation policies could have a detrimental effect on his claims to leadership, if he has previously built an identity and discourse that is sceptic of the existence of climate change. It then becomes necessary to construct discourses that avoid the appearance of inconsistency.

**Discursive strategies: ways of legitimising climate and energy policy**

Governors may employ a range of discursive strategies to justify their policies on climate change and renewable energy. In this section I explore in more detail the analytical possibilities, and how these might connect with different frames that are already in widespread political circulation around the word.

Of these frames, I am most interested in whether and how each governor draws upon party ideology. In particular, this thesis seeks to determine to what extent each governor employs, refashions, or avoids using their political ideology all together. There are undoubtedly an infinite number of ways they may do so, but for the purposes of this thesis I will separate discursive strategies into three analytical categories. These are:

- **Connecting**: using their ideology to *connect* with a variety of different audiences in order to encourage bipartisanship, by focusing on elements of Republican ideology that might connect with Democrat ideology. This strategy may employ bridging rhetoric.

- **Dividing**: using their ideology to *divide* audiences, in order to emphasise an “us versus them” mentality, by focusing on what is most distinctive, fundamental, or special about being a Republican. This strategy would likely employ binding rhetoric.

- **Transcending**: moving beyond relying on their party ideology in their discourse, or avoiding using it all together. For example, by drawing on American rather than Republican values, or drawing on subnational or other local identities. This strategy would also employ bridging rhetoric that would connect with a wider set of audiences at the national or local level.

Of course, it is possible that each governor will employ more than one of these discursive strategies, and also employ more than one set of frames or storylines. Strategic cross-overs are also possible. For example, locally-oriented stories and colloquialisms might be used to fill out any or all of the above discursive strategies. Nonetheless, these analytical categories
will guide the discourse analysis in ways that will produce clear answers to the core question of this thesis: how have Republican governors sought to justify their climate and energy policies?

The first discursive strategy is one informed by their political ideology; in both cases this is a Republican ideology. The next strategy draws on frames that transcend political ideology, and touch on larger-scale political goals. Examples of these frames include security, and environmental frames, such as ecological modernisation. Lastly, I will explore the potential use of local and national frames, ones that may appeal to the values of the two governors’ constituencies, including, for example, frames and stories that touch on the Texan way of life, or centre of the road American values.

The concept of political ideology

As this thesis examines how both governors have employed ideology in order to justify their policies, an understanding of the concept of political ideology is imperative. Authors such as Jost, Federico and Napier (2009) have presented a succinct working definition that serves present purposes. For example, an ideology is a ‘shared framework of mental models that groups of individuals possess that provide both an interpretation of the environment and a prescription as to how that environment should be structured’ (p. 309) For example, a person’s ideology may tell us about how they view and understand power structures, and how they view “the Other”, that is, people who they believe are different from them.

As the above definition indicates, a political ideology is like a web. For Freeden it is a system of ‘complex ideas that inject order and meaning to observed or anticipated sets of political phenomena and hold together an assortment of related notions’ (Freeden 1996, p. 52). Other academics such as Skinner build on this idea and argue that ideology is made up of not only concepts, but also ‘conventions’ (Maynard 2013, p. 303). These include ‘assumptions, principles, epistemic criteria and terminologies’, all of which ‘collectively define... the intellectual environments of particular contexts and political struggles’ (Maynard 2013, p. 303). Often these complex ideas or conventions, within their assortment of related notions do not have anything in common but are nonetheless stitched together in ways that are made to appear coherent. For example, the issues of climate change, abortion, and marriage equality themselves do not have any connection, yet all three are
litmus issues that help sort Republicans from Democrats on the basis of different sets of political convictions about the proper order of things. Moreover, various political ideologies do not exist in a vacuum but rather are relational insofar as they define themselves against other ideologies. At the same time, ‘they are built from concepts which are ‘essentially contested’’, and indeed, as ‘rival ideologies rarely disregard each other’s core concepts entirely’ it is possible that if it weren’t for the competition over how to structure the aforementioned particular environments, it is possible political ideologies would cease to exist since there would be no identity and difference to tell them apart (Maynard 2013, p. 302).

Beyond these theoretical ideas about what a political ideology is and how they exist in relation to each other, a number of authors put forward ideas about the ways they are shaped in response to various external phenomena, with significant practical political consequences. Carvalho (2007) in particular argues that political ideologies are shaped by their ‘given social and political order’ (p. 223). Indeed, if climate change did not exist it is unlikely various political parties would have a stance on how best to deal with it. With regards to political ideology’s influence on external phenomena, Freeden (1996) states that though ‘actions and thoughts exist “out there”’, they are meaningless unless they are interpreted (p. 43). Political ideology fulfils this role, and gives meaning to otherwise meaningless and unconnected thought and action. One such way to inject meaning into thoughts and actions is through the use of rhetoric, which Freeden (1996) describes as ‘the weaving of narrative tale deliberately employed as a persuasive device’ (p. 36). In short, political ideology is tied up with the contestation of power, and is ‘invoked principally for the process of legitimation in local political struggles’ or, in the legitimation of policy (Maynard 2013, p. 303). Of even more significance than ideology’s role in the production of meaning is the fact that it is a form of power insofar as it seeks to enable some meanings and rule out others. Against this background, we can now turn to Republican ideology.

**Republican ideology**

As the Democratic Party was originally the right-wing party in the US, the Republican Party held the left-wing by default (Rubino 2013). When the party was originally founded in 1856, it stood for policies including increased spending on public education, a more liberal immigration policy, and was anti-slavery. The Republican Party shifted towards
conservatism in 1896, in retaliation to the Democratic Party selecting a liberal candidate. Indeed, Republican ideology grew into a much more conservative doctrine, and now upholds the philosophy that ‘that societal health is rooted in personal responsibility and actions.’ (Conservapedia 2015b, Ideology section). Indeed, the rise of websites such as Conservapedia is in part due to a perceived liberal bias on websites such as Wikipedia, prompting the political right in America to put forward their own take on the world, and again demonstrating the problem of polarisation.

Fast forward to modern US politics, and in 2012 (the year of the most recent Federal election), the 2012 Republican Party Platform provides an encapsulation of contemporary Republican ideology and policy. This includes ideas about everything from the economy (that a free market is the pathway to a stronger economy and higher employment numbers), to the concept of family (that a legitimate marriage is between a man and a woman, and that abortion is bad practice), to ideas about energy and natural resources (that America should adopt an ‘all of the above’ energy policy, including the use of traditional and alternative energy sources) (Republican National Committee 2015, Domestic Energy Independence section).

As previously discussed, the divide between the Democratic and Republican Parties is wider than it has ever been in US history. Until recently, there had always been conservative Democrats and liberal Republicans. However, as Rubino (2013) demonstrated, this has changed over the past decade. Liberal Republicans including Connie Morella of Maryland, and conservative Democrats such as Bobby Bright of Alabama have all been voted out of office. And, as previously discussed, in recent years when moderate Democrats have lost their seats, they are frequently replaced by highly conservative Republicans, all amounting to never before seen levels of polarisation in the US political system. It is this polarisation that causes so many problems when the US government attempts to address climate change. As the political partisanship on various issues has become increasingly entrenched, it has become virtually impossible for members of either major party to have views that contradict their home party. This is especially marked of the issue of climate change. If a Republican governor or politician were to make explicit connections between strong climate and renewable energy policies and Republican ideology, they would suffer a massive loss of face that could have the very real consequence of their being voted out of office.
Having introduced the key elements of the theoretical framework of this thesis, we now turn to explore the range of potential discursive strategies available to each governor and provide examples of how each might be fleshed out in terms of master frames and storylines.

**Enlisting Ideology I: ‘Bonding rhetoric’**

As noted above, Dryzek (2010) discusses two ways of using rhetoric in order to connect with various audiences. The first is by using bonding rhetoric. By using bonding rhetoric, the speaker is able to reinforce and intensify the divides between politically opposed groups (not unlike how Sunstein (2009) has observed the movement of groups of like-minded people from middle of the road views on issues to more extreme ones). Dryzek (2010) noted the fact that members of the Democratic party often fear the use of bonding rhetoric, as it has the power to further ‘deepen divisions with out-groups, ... invoke dangerous emotions, to mobilise passions [and] to move groups to extremes’ (p. 328). However, this problem does not appear to detain Republicans. In the case of climate change, Republicans have sought to divide audiences by playing up an “us versus them” mentality, and enlisting parts of their political ideology that are unique and are not compatible with that of other political parties. In short, Republican politicians who use bonding rhetoric are using the first discursive strategy (i.e. attempting to divide their audiences). They are employing their Republican ideology in ways that connect only with Republican supporters in ways that accentuate differences with Democrats. We see this on a routine basis on a number of political issues. For example, Republican politicians reject the (tighter) regulation of business and the idea of big government, and argue instead that Big Government interferes with individual liberty.

**Enlisting Ideology II: ‘Bridging rhetoric’**

In contrast to the use of bonding rhetoric, an alternative discursive strategy is to enlist Republican ideology through the technique of bridging rhetoric. Bridging rhetoric that reaches across political boundaries (the same ones that binding rhetoric aims to deepen) in order to connect with an audience people with more varied social characteristics (Dryzek 2010). In the case of bridging rhetoric, a speaker’s ability to know their audience is more important than ever. In contrast, bonding rhetoric comes more naturally for the Republican
politician, who can fall back on their own political ideology and narratives from their own ‘social background’ (Dryzek 2010, p. 328). However, when using bridging rhetoric, the aim is to ‘represent a discourse on one’s own side that has some compatibility with a discourse on the other side’ (Dryzek 2010, p. 328). To be able to do this successfully, the speaker has to in fact be aware and understand what discourses exist on the other side of politics, as well as still holding true to the values of their own political ideology.

The use of bonding and bridging rhetoric are not entirely mutually exclusive. Obviously it would be difficult for a politician to employ both techniques within a single speech. However, over their entire discourse, it is not unusual to find a politician enlisting their political ideology in a number of different ways since it is essential for a politician to know their audience in order to successfully construct identities and legitimise policy. So too is it likely that sometimes a politician will build their justifications for policy using frames that both enlist and transcend their political ideology. This is most graphically seen in the switch from the primaries to the Presidential election, when the two Presidential candidates shift from addressing their own party to addressing Americans. Next I will examine some of these transcending frames that may be used instead at the state level.

Transcending Ideology I: ‘Security and identity’

The success of discursive efforts to transcend ideology depend on the speaker finding a frame that cuts across political divisions and united a public. One of the most popular and fundamental concepts with these characteristics is security. Security as a concept is traditionally viewed in terms of the security of a state, and the protection of territory from the invasion of foreign armed forces. However, over the decades and particularly in the wake of the end of the Cold War, the term’s use has expanded to incorporate all manner of direct and indirect threats to an expanding range of security referents (states, individuals, communities, the environment, democracy, etc.) to produce new security discourses ranging from human security, to food security, and energy and climate security. McDonald (2012) recounts this path, in particular the way in which environmental issues have been reinterpreted as security issues. He proposes a definition of security, namely, that it is ‘a site of contestation over the definition of a group’s core values, threats to those values, and the means through which they are to be defended or advanced.’ (McDonald 2012, p. 5). He elaborates on this, noting that such values are not ‘static’ or ‘universal’ (p. 3), and to assume
they are would be problematic. For example, to define the environment as a security issue implies that all people have the same understanding of the environment and value it in the same manner and for the same reasons. Instead, he affirms that ‘security is ultimately understood in different ways by different political communities at different times.’ (McDonald 2012, p. 3). Finally, he notes that ‘we define what needs to be secured by designating what threatens it’; that is, in order to determine what has been made a security issue by a government, we first have to determine what it is they value, ‘who or what needs to be protected, and from whom or what it needs protecting’ (McDonald 2012, p. 27). This understanding of security will guide my discourse analysis in the following chapters.

Building on the above discussion of the simultaneous nature of the construction of identity and that of discourse, it becomes clear that defining a group’s core values is intrinsically linked to defining a group’s identity. McDonald (2012) argues that the protection of a group’s core values, or the securitisation of a particular issue are deliberately, discursively produced by governments rather than objectively given. Indeed, if a government is able to undertake this construction of securitisation, then it raises the political status of the issue and helps to legitimise stronger, and in some cases, exceptional measures.

Language is the ‘principle means through which meaning is given to security’, and issues that have been securitised (McDonald 2012, p. 25). This is true for a number of reasons. For one, language, including the use of images, is the most direct way of securitising an issue. This is undertaken by constructing ‘social categories’ (for example, whose security is being protected, what are the threats, etc), which then, as previously discussed, become accepted and institutionalised as natural by a particular community. Employing a security frame to the topic of climate change or energy provides one of the easiest discursive strategies for a speaker to connect in a more bipartisan manner with his or her audiences.

**Transcending Ideology II: ‘Ecological modernisation’**

Alongside security, one of the most deeply embedded ideas in the modern world that spans many modern ideologies is that of modernisation, and the prosperity that it is expected to deliver. It follows that ecological modernisation can serve as an appealing master frame that is able to make environmental protection and economic development appear compatible. Ecological modernisation emerged in the 1980s as a new way of framing and considering
environmental issues. It was a shift in thinking from the 1970s, when radical environmentalists employed a more hostile view of the relationship between nature and the role of society and industry, believing that environmental protection and economic development were perceived as a zero sum game. Ecological modernisation brought about the idea that safer environmental practice did not have to mean an increase in cost to the economy, and that rather than using reactive methods to environmental problems, such as ‘end-of-pipe’ or downstream solutions to pollution, environmental problems could be addressed in a more fundamental and proactive manner by using a method of prevention rather than a cure, so to speak. According to Hajer (1995), ecological modernisation ‘suggests that environmental problems can be solved in accordance with the workings of the main institutional arrangements of society,’ and, even more succinctly, ‘environmental management is seen as a positive sum game: pollution prevention pays’ (p. 4). There are multiple discourses of ecological modernisation, which are briefly noted below, however, for the purposes of this thesis, ecological modernisation is understood as a general discourse that suggests there is no tension between environmental regulation and economic growth, and that stricter environmental regulation can in fact act as a catalyst for more technological innovation, leading to stronger economies.

Nonetheless, this general understanding of ecological modernisation can be fleshed out in different ways. Christoff (1996) explores a number of different interpretations of the concept. One such interpretation is that ecological modernisation is technological, and is linked with the increased efficiency of industry; Christoff argues, it is ‘fundamentally a technical cost-minimisation strategy for industry and an alternative to labour-saving investment’ (1996, p. 480). Such strategies may include projects to reduce greenhouse gases, or building cars that are more fuel efficient. Another interpretation is that ecological modernisation is a policy discourse. It is a broader shift in the understanding of nature and society’s relationship with it, which includes a ‘reconceptualisation of nature as a public good rather than a free good’ (Christoff 1996, p. 482).

At a more theoretical level, ecological modernisation can be divided up into weak and strong forms. Weak ecological modernisation is more concerned with preserving the strength of the economy, may search for technological solutions to environmental problems, and at its foundation may have nationalistic or state-centric policies. Strong
ecological modernisation ideas and practices, in contrast, are often ecologically centric. Politicians governments who seek to use it may try to cause ‘institutional [or] systemic’ change, and its underlying ideas are likely to come from an international discourse on environmental problems (1996, p. 490). While Christoff does note that the characteristics of weak and strong ecological modernisation are not completely mutually exclusive, they are nonetheless helpful in identifying the stances of particular politicians.

Christoff also makes a significant observation on the way environmental issues are perceived, understood, and acted upon by governments:

‘The new policy culture [of ecological modernisation] and its trends are not always simply or primarily intended to resolve environmental problems. They are also shaped by a contest over political control of the environmental agenda, and, separately, over the legitimacy of state regulation’ (1996, p. 477).

Ecological modernisation clearly provides a very appealing way of framing the issue of climate and energy policy in a manner aimed at connecting with a bipartisan audience. It does not depend upon an us/them binary, and instead puts forward the idea of a positive sum game in relation to the health of the economy and the health of the environment. It is also capable of transcending ideological divisions between Republicans and Democrats, depending on the strand of ecological modernisation being used.

**Transcending Ideology III: ‘Local and American narratives’**

A final discursive strategy that both governors may employ in order to legitimise their climate and energy policies is to tap into locally or nationally oriented narratives and identities. Energy policies, and even more so climate change policies, are potentially large-scale issues with national and even international ramifications. For example, a state such as California’s decision to implement an emissions trading scheme may have national ramifications as other states decide (or not) to implement similar legislation. This in turn may affect the US’ overall carbon emissions, and hence affect their standing on the global stage at international conferences such as the annual Conferences of the Parties, and with regards to international agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol. For the average individual, it can be difficult to connect the dots between their way of life and large-scale international agreements (and disagreements) on greenhouse gas emissions. In order to counteract this
problem, political leaders may use local narratives, anecdotes, or colloquialisms to create chains of equivalence between what an individual Californian or Texan does during their day and the seemingly impenetrable fog of the concept of climate change. This is an effective technique, because as well as describing how the concept of climate change or the production of energy is linked to a local identity, it allows politicians to touch on stories or ideas about these local identities in order to justify their policies. In a similar manner, political leaders may cite the side benefits of acting on climate change, such the ecological modernisation argument that a healthy environment can does not mean an unhealthy economy. The strength of the American economy, and on a larger scale, the continuation of capitalism is a universal goal in the US, and so touching on larger-scale American values and narratives may also aid a leader as they attempt to legitimise their climate or energy policies.

Local and American narratives may be used by governors to both connect and divide audiences. It may be used to divide as governors highlight the differences between their political ideology and goals, and that of politicians or political bodies, such as the Federal Government in Washington, DC. At the same time, it may be used to connect with local audiences as local values are played up, which exist irrespective of political ideology, and it may be used to connect with wider audiences by touching on American values, which are universal throughout the country. In these cases, we can see both bridging and bonding strategies being used simultaneously where by differences at the local (ie. state) level are bridged by reinforcing differences with the national community by bonding with the local community.

Methodology: Policy History and Discourse Analysis

I have chosen to use a mixed methodology approach in order to analyse my case studies, which is consistent with critical discourse analysis. The first is to provide a brief climate and energy policy history, in order to provide background context. However, the primary method was a discourse analysis of the texts [understood here to include written and verbal statements] produced by each governor on relevant environmental issues and legislation, including climate change and renewable energy. With my analytical framework of possible discursive strategies in mind, I analysed their texts and examined how both case studies attempted to justify their policy responses to climate and energy issues, how they dealt with
the highly politicised nature of climate and energy issues, and whether or not they invoked a political ideology, in particular, a Republican ideology.

Before analysing Governor Schwarzenegger’s and Perry’s actual texts, the significant political events that occurred during their time as governors were tracked. Shanahan, Jones and McBeth (2011) note that the ‘policy environment’ has in recent years become increasingly complex (and, as we have seen, increasingly polarised), and so it has become more important than ever to be able to track and understand the process and political narratives of particular polices (p. 536). Indeed, my use of policy tracing was a significant undertaking, as Jones and McBeth (2010) argue that ‘political change is theorized to occur when a new discourse and its constituent stories become dominant’ (p. 334), so understanding and linking the relationship between the discourse of an issue the way it is reflected in policy and legislation is important. Moreover, having an understanding of the actual policies was also vital: for example, a government that chooses to implement incentives rather than punitive measures in order to reduce emissions or increase the use of renewable energy reveals a lot about the government’s preferred relationship with the economy and big business, and its views on nature and climate; all of which makes policy tracing an invaluable method for my research (and a necessary part of critical discourse analysis).

Hajer (1995) argues that the process of analysing discourse is done so with the end-goal of being able to explain ‘how a given actor (whether it is an organisation or a person) secures the reproduction of [their] discursive position (or manages to alter this)’ (pp. 45, 52). This conceptualisation of discourse analysis is highly pertinent to the analysis I conducted in my case studies, as I aimed to uncover how both governors have, through their texts, attempted to secure their interpretation of climate change and subsequently what policy actions are justified.

**Case study selection**

After analysing a range of options and case studies, it was determined that the most efficient and effective way to analyse the chosen two case studies, considering the time and word length constraints on this thesis, was to look solely at the discourse of Republican Governors in states that have overseen significant initiatives in climate and energy policy.
over broadly similar periods. Not only would this be the most efficient technique, but it would also allow for the most useful and insightful findings to come to light. Given the polarised nature of climate change, finding out why, say, Texas, a state whose policies reflect a climate denialist stance, is working to reduce its emissions, rather than why Colorado, whose politicians are (broadly speaking) apathetic towards the issue of climate change but may also be working to do so, would be more revealing. In essence, the choice of two Republican governors would allow me to compare the discourses of Republican leaders in both a red and a blue state and therefore examine how they address different electorates.

Specifically, I selected two Republican governors – Arnold Schwarzenegger of California (2003-2011) and Rick Perry of Texas (2000-2015), and tracked significant climate and energy policies that were enacted by their respective states during their time as governors. Then I analysed their texts: for example, speeches, remarks, etc., that they made regarding climate and energy issues or legislation. My choice to analyse the discourses of Republican governors was significant: Republicans are generally less likely to be concerned with climate protection and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and yet both governors have overseen the passage of significant legislation that has helped to reduce emissions and incite more investment in renewable energy. By focusing on these counter-intuitive policy outcomes, I hoped to shed some light on the question of how each governor legitimised their climate and energy policies, and to what extent did they invoke Republican (or Democratic) ideology.

Limitations to this methodology

Like all research methods, discourse analysis has strengths and limitations. For example, discourse analysis allows us to examine the ways in which particular political issues are framed and articulated by politicians. And with regards to critical discourse analysis in particular, we can examine if there are discrepancies between what a person claims to be happening versus what is really going on in reality. However, as discourse analysis was used in this thesis to examine the master frames, storylines, etc., of each of my chosen case studies, it therefore did not take into consideration audience reception of the governors’ speeches. Discourse analysis can make no claims about how successful each of the
governors were in justifying their climate and energy policies to their electorates, and on a larger scale perhaps to the US overall.

Nonetheless, though discourse analysis as a method does not examine audience reception in ways that can evaluate the success of the governors’ attempts to legitimise their policies, it is nonetheless possible to make reasonable inferences. For example, one can infer from the length of time that each Governor was in office that their discursive strategies did not fail, even if it is not possible to evaluate the degree of success without undertaking further research on opinion polls etc. Indeed, though the scope of this thesis was only large enough to examine these two Republican Governors, the choosing of these two case studies was deliberate, as they have bucked the Republican trend on dealing with climate change, and so understanding how they have done this is highly significant.

The Discourse Analysis: Sources and Method

In order to conduct a discourse analysis of both governors, I found transcripts of their speeches on the topics of climate change and renewable energy from three main websites: on their official governor websites; on OnTheIssues.org, which archives statements highlighting politicians’ positions on a large number of political issues including climate change and energy; and on Project Vote Smart (votesmart.org), a website that holds a large number of speeches made by thousands of politicians on a vast array of issues. I also found a small number of transcripts of speeches made by Governor Schwarzenegger by conducting a simple Google search of the phrase “Governor Schwarzenegger climate change speech” which resulted in a few relevant results, including a speech he made to the United Nations about climate change, hosted on a website called American Rhetoric.

Initially it was difficult to find a significant number of speeches made by Governor Perry on the topic of climate change, although it was possible to find many speeches on energy policy. To supplement the transcripts I had found, I also conducted a YouTube search for both Governors’ speeches. This proved to be very successful, as Governor Perry had an official website and a playlist of speeches all of which were about energy and natural resources issues (although he did not have such a playlist with similar speeches on climate change or the environment). Though Governor Schwarzenegger also had an official YouTube channel, the topics of its videos were not just related to his political work, but also included
videos related to his time as an actor, bodybuilder, etc. Despite this, a simple YouTube search using the phrase “Schwarzenegger climate change” was nonetheless highly successful, and I was able to find a number of videos of Governor Schwarzenegger making speeches about climate change from a variety of YouTube accounts, published by the news agencies such as CBS, various non-government organisations, the UNFCCC, and individuals.

With regards to the videos of speeches I sourced, the selection was based on whether a discussion of climate change, environmental regulation, or energy production was the central topic of the video. As previously mentioned, most of Governor Perry’s YouTube speeches came from his official video channel, from the ‘Energy and Natural Resources’ playlist (since, as noted, he does not have a playlist on environmental or climate related issues). A number of speeches in this playlist related to energy issues, however not all focused specifically on government policies. Instead a number were profiles of individuals, or were speeches not made by Governor Perry himself, but by other government members. These were discounted from my potential database of texts. After assessing each of these transcripts, soundbytes, and videos, and determining if their central focus matched my topic of either climate change or energy issues, I was left with a database of texts from both governors. For Governor Schwarzenegger this amounted to 19 texts: 14 speeches (both in transcript and video form), one interview, three sets of soundbytes, and one video message ranging from November 2006 until November 2010. For Governor Perry this entailed 15 texts: 12 speeches, one interview, and one set of soundbytes and one statement, ranging from November 2003 until March 2015 (see above; see Table 2.1). For the purposes of this research, a speech was considered a speech regardless of its form (that is, either a transcript or a video) and its audience (Governor Schwarzenegger for example makes speeches in small settings in California and to international climate conferences). An interview, like a speech was considered so regardless of format. A statement referred to an official document produced by the relevant Office of the Governor. A soundbyte was a short quote, most of which had been compiled by the website OnTheIssues.org, and were meant to be demonstrative of a politician’s position on a particular issue. A video message was a video hosted on the website YouTube, where the audience is those who view the video.

Table 1.1: Databases of the Governors’ texts
In order to analyse the governors’ texts and keep track of my analysis, I used Evernote note-taking software as a platform to store my research. I created separate notebooks for each of the governors, and within these, I created a separate note for each text. I also gave each note a number of tags – for example, for a video of a speech made by Governor Perry I gave it the tags, ‘rick perry’, ‘speeches’, and ‘youtube’, in order to able to further categorise and make it easier to find notes with certain contents or topics within my overall digital notebooks. Using the Evernote software and storing each text as a separate note had the added benefit of the software automatically recording the date when the note had been created and, if applicable, modified, so the date of when I accessed the videos and speeches would be recorded. (See Appendix A).

Once my database of texts was set up, I selected four categories of analysis in descending order of generality. These were master frames (central, overarching ideas that were the foundation of the governors’ discourses), storylines (ideas and stories they referred to in order to articulate a particular point or flesh out the meaning of the master frame), subject positions (how each governor positioned himself and his audience in the storyline to distinguish self/other and we/them), and rhetorical devices (communicative techniques used in their speeches, such as repetition or metaphors, to convince the audience). These analysis points were reminiscent of analysis conducted by Carvalho and Burgess (2005), and the purpose of these analysis points was to give the process of analysis some concrete analytical structure. They would ensure I was examining the discursive strategies of both governors specifically, rather than looking at the two discourses in an ad-hoc manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Speeches</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Soundbytes</th>
<th>Video messages</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schwarzenegger</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After setting up my database of texts and preparing for the process of analysis, I immersed myself in the process of watching and reading each of the governors’ texts. As I did so I took notes under my analysis category headings. When I encountered anecdotes or statements about topics like climate change, energy, or the governors’ own states, I would make note of
them under the storyline heading analysis, until such time as patterns began to emerge, and it became possible to recognise a larger master frame. For example, Governor Perry frequently made remarks demonstrating his belief that Texas was the best state in the US, if not the best place in the world, and also used colloquial language about the Texan way of life – ‘the great news about our state is that we don't back down from a challenge.’ (Perry 2010). I gave this collection of quotes the working title, the “Texan narrative”. As I continued my analysis of these texts more repetitions of particular ideas and even phrases would emerge, and depending on their prevalence and ubiquitousness, I began to categorise them as storylines, or master frames. For example, Governor Schwarzenegger’s acceptance of the science behind climate was not only apparent in his speeches, but was also clearly a major impetus for his speeches, so I determined this was a master frame of his discourse.

Once I had read and watched all the governors’ texts, I synthesised my findings and planned how I would present the results. Chapters 2 and 3 present the discourses of each governor and show how each governor had sought to legitimise their policy responses to climate change and energy through the use of different environmental frames, trans-national ideals, local stories and anecdotes, or especially, their political ideologies. Chapter 4 provides a comparative analysis of the two discursive strategies.
Chapter 2: Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger: California leading the charge

INTERVIEWER: ‘Do you worry, though [about the health of California’s economy, in the face of Governor Schwarzenegger’s large-scale climate change legislation]? What about some of the traditional firms, cement makers, for instance? The business they do causes a lot of emissions. They worry that some of these rules will simply be so costly. And you as a governor, you risk in an economy like ours, they could move to another state.

GOV. SCHWARZENEGGER: ‘Well, that’s always the danger that we have. But what we have seen is that those businesses that are the biggest polluters have come to the table and they recognize that we are very serious about our cap and trade. And I think that there are some states and there are some countries, that shoot for certain goals in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, but they will never get there, I think, because unless you put a serious cap on it, you will not get there.

I mean, it's the same thing when you try to lose weight. If you say, “Let me shoot for losing 20 pounds by the summer so I look a little bit sexier on the beach,” the chances are that most likely you will not get there. But if a fighter that has to meet a certain weight category and a certain poundage in order to get into that category, he would most likely make it. Sometimes they don't, but in most cases they make it, because that's the rule. You cannot fight if you're not that particular body weight or below that bodyweight.

So, it's the same with everything. You've got to put the cap on it. That's when you signal to everyone, we are serious about that.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008d)

Arnold Schwarzenegger, a Republican, was elected Governor of California in 2003, a position he held until 2011. During his time in power he played a significant role in introducing numerous climate change and emissions-related policies and projects. He has declared that ‘no single issue ... threatens the health and prosperity of our nations and humanity more than climate change.’ (climateconference 2009). The above quote was a response to a question at the Wall Street Journal ECO:nomics Conference California in 2008 in which he was put on the spot, and asked point-blank if he believed California could “have its cake and eat it too” – if it truly could be a forerunner of climate mitigation and still be a an economic
powerhouse. And the response he gave is demonstrative of the style and strength with which he frequently talked about climate change (in this case drawing on his personal determination and strength as a body builder). His characteristic response is not to dodge the question, or back down, but instead to deliver a straightforward, optimistic response.

California has the largest GDP of any state in the US, at $2,202,678 million in 2013 (Bureau of Economic Analysis 2015). California also has a high rate of greenhouse gas emissions, as the state emitted 345.8 million metric tons of carbon dioxide in 2011, and second only to Texas, which emitted 655.5 million metric tons of carbon dioxide (US Energy Information Administration 2014a). However, unlike Texas, California has one of the lowest rates of per capita emissions in the US. In 2011 the rate was 9.2 metric tons of carbon dioxide per person. This amount is third only to Vermont and New York State. Comparatively, Texas has the 14th highest rate of per capita emissions in the US, at just under 30 metric tons of carbon dioxide per person (US Energy Information Administration 2014a).

Governor Schwarzenegger was chosen as a case study in my research for a number of reasons. Like Governor Perry, he is a Republican, and so his discourses can provide insight into how a Republican politician may approach and attempt to legitimise their policies on climate change. However, he provides an interesting counterpoint to Governor Perry. As governor of California, one of the most liberal states in the US, Governor Schwarzenegger’s discourse is not typical of most Republican governors, insofar as he readily accepts the existence of climate change. As such, Governor Schwarzenegger was chosen as a case study because he provides a good example of how a Republican might choose to legitimise climate change policies in a predominantly Democratic state. As previously discussed, this chapter will examine how he has used his Republican ideology to do so, whether this is by attempting to connect with his audiences, to divide them, by transcending the ideals of his ideology, or by avoiding them all together.

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the climate, emissions, and renewable energy policies Governor Schwarzenegger oversaw during his time in office in order to provide some policy context for the discourse analysis. The remainder of this chapter presents the findings of the discourse analysis of Governor Schwarzenegger’s texts. This entails drawing out his ‘master frames’, and the key storylines he uses when discussing climate and energy topics, including those that place California at the heart of an ambitious, potentially
international movement which aims to redesign the way climate change is discussed and legislated on (See Figure 4.1 for a “map” of Governor Schwarzenegger’s discursive strategies). The chapter concludes with a discussion on the links between Governor Schwarzenegger’s policies and his Republican ideology.

**California’s climate and renewable energy policies**

Two of California’s most prominent climate and emissions-related policies that have earned it the title of climate leader are Assembly Bill 32 and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Under Assembly Bill (AB) 32, or the ‘California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006’, California will reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, which roughly equates to a 15 per cent reduction (Air Resources Board 2013, paras. 1-2). In 2011, the California Air Resources Board adopted a cap-and-trade program, which covers ‘major sources of [greenhouse gas] emissions in the State such as refineries, power plants, industrial facilities and transportation fuels’ (Air Resources Board 2013, para. 6). The program commenced in 2012, and ‘enforceable compliance obligations’ came into effect in relation to emissions generated in 2013. It is planned that the cap-and trade program will aid the achievement of an 80% reduction of emissions, as dictated by AB 32 (Air Resources Board 2013, Background Information section). The Low Carbon Fuel Standard, based on Governor Schwarzenegger’s Executive Order S-1-07, which was issued in 2007, ‘calls for a reduction of at least 10 percent in the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by 2020’ (Air Resources Board 2010, para. 2). Overall, it is estimated that these regulations will result in an ‘18% reduction in climate change emissions from the light-duty fleet [of vehicles] in 2020 and a 27% reduction in 2030.’ (Board 2004, p. 3).

California has a number of other clean energy policies, including the Green Building Initiative, the goal of which is to increase the energy efficiency of government buildings by 2015; the Million Solar Roof Initiative, which offers tax incentives to the general public in return for installing solar panels on their homes; and the Hydrogen Highway project, which is designed to ensure that those who buy hydrogen powered cars will have access to hydrogen fuelling stations throughout the state (Schwarzenegger 2008c). Governor Schwarzenegger has overseen the implementation of all these policies.
Governor Schwarzenegger oversaw this suite of climate and energy policies in the face of severe political polarisation and climate scepticism and denialism at the national level and in many Republican states. Perhaps it was partly this challenging national context that explains the extremely wide range of themes in his speeches in his effort to justify why it should be California that should take the lead on such a global issue as climate change. Nonetheless it was possible to identify two master frames and a number of storylines to articulate his position. His two master frames were ‘The Great Problem’, which includes discussions of his acceptance of the compelling science behind climate change. The second was an ecological modernisation frame, in which he discussed how he believed that a state or country can have a clean environment as well as a strong economy. From these two master frames were multiple storylines, including ones that touched on topics including Californian identity, the role of subnational governments in the mitigation of climate change, Republican values, and bipartisanship.

Master frame I: ‘The Great Problem’

Governor Schwarzenegger has a small number of central ideas he uses to frame his discussions of climate change and energy, from which a number of storylines emerge, supported by an even larger number of anecdotes, stories, and ideas in his discourse which serve as tributaries to his storylines. The first master frame he used is what I refer to as ‘The Great Problem’. To Governor Schwarzenegger, the question is not of whether climate change exists or if humans are responsible, but instead what can humanity do to avoid catastrophe?

‘I don’t think that we can afford to waste any more time. I think that global warming is real; it is a huge, huge problem.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007e, p. 3)

‘No single issue that threatens the health and prosperity of our nations and humanity more than climate change.’ (climateconference 2009)

In a number of speeches, he cited the importance of the scientific process around climate change, including the need to comprehensively measure a state or city’s greenhouse gas emissions, a vital step that needs to be taken before these emission can be reduced.
‘And before, of course, we can get started to reduce greenhouse gases we must first measure – measure the greenhouse gases coming from literally thousands of different sources. Because if you don't measure and if you don't know how much we are emitting now, you don't have anything.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008a, p. 2)

‘Now, all of this stuff where we talk about China now measuring their greenhouse gas emissions is very important because the only way we really know if any country is reducing greenhouse gases is if we know what they are emitting right now, and we have to measure that. So unless they’re measured, we have nothing. So this is now why this was a very important step, and I think it's fantastic for the future and it's fantastic for our environment.’ (Schwarzenegger 2009a, p. 3)

Statements such as these demonstrated his understanding and resounding acceptance of the science of climate change and the nature of the problem and its impacts. They also demonstrated his wish for the issue of climate change to be understood and discussed by the general public, and not just by scientists or in the media. By articulating some of the basic scientific processes that go into understanding and mitigating climate change, he used his position to educate his citizens, and to familiarise them with the issue, so it is not perceived as a theory that is talked about by foreign government bodies, such as the UN, but then has no real effect on the lives of individuals.

*Storyline I: The cost of inaction*

Building on this public discussion of climate change, Schwarzenegger also raised *the cost of inaction*, and the issue of the health impacts of climate change on a number of occasions. He again connected climate change to the general public’s everyday life, rather than discussing it as an abstract and intangible idea.

‘Have they ever considered the human costs... ? The cost of 19,000 people that are dying here in California alone every year because of smog, the cost of millions of hospital visits every year for smog related illnesses?’ (Schwarzenegger 2010b, p. 5)

‘Because we know what’s going on with global warming and we know what’s going on with the pollution, what kind of a health hazard it is...’ (Schwarzenegger 2010a, p. 7)
Not only did this discussion of the health ramifications of climate change help to illuminate the link between climate change as an abstract issue and its real life ramifications for local people, but it also helped Governor Schwarzenegger justify the fact that he is keen for California to lead an international, collective effort to mitigate the problem. The discussion of health risks crystallised the effects climate change will have on people, and so was effective in helping to show local Californian audiences the importance of the issue in ways that could be grasped by lay people.

_Storyline II: Captain California_

In his discussions of climate change and renewable energy, Governor Schwarzenegger used a large and varied number of storylines to articulate his ideas. A key storyline he used frequently was one about California as a leader and a pioneer; setting the pace and inducing others to follow. That is, California is an economic leader and it therefore follows naturally that California should also be a climate leader. This was a cunning storyline for Governor Schwarzenegger to use, as it touched on California identity in that it was flattering to Californians and played to the self-importance of the state.

‘As you all know, California has taken the leadership role in fighting global warming and cleaning our environment, and we have worked very hard to pass laws in the last few years to make sure that we are fighting global warming and do everything to clean our environment.’ (Schwarzenegger 2006, p. 2)

‘This is the challenge of our generation, and we will meet it with innovation and technology, and with total commitment that matches the greatest pioneers in our history, because that’s the way California works. That’s what California is all about.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007c, p. 4)

‘I’m the governor of the great state of California, and I’ve a little right to brag about our state, right? [Laughter]. And also, California is the seventh largest economy in the world, and also America’s trendsetter. So what we do has consequences. And maybe even when you look at the globe it is just a little dot, or maybe you cannot even find California. But the power of influence we have is equivalent to a continent.’ (UpTakeVideo 2009)
Governor Schwarzenegger also acknowledged the fact that California had something to lose if climate change is not addressed. He was aware that California’s natural environment, for example, its coastlines, are particularly vulnerable to events such as erosion from sea level rise. He was also aware that if such natural areas are damaged, this will have financial repercussions for the state.

‘California is identified for its beaches and magnificent coastline more than any other single feature.’ (OnTheIssues 2014a)

‘I believe that part of California’s greatness lies in its natural resources and beauty. It is an essential part of the California experience. ... If we have beaches soiled by oil spills, tourists will not come to this state. If we log our forests irresponsibly, stream beds will be destroyed and our fishing industry will be damaged.’ (OnTheIssues 2014b, para. 5)

**Storyline III: Mutual, hopeful inspiration**

Nonetheless, in the face of (or perhaps because of) environmental and economic risk, California continues to lead the charge. Governor Schwarzenegger linked another idea to California’s leadership, which was the idea that the American and larger international community must be hopeful about the fight against climate change, because such a positive attitude will help them succeed.

[Referring to the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Symposium, where this speech takes place], ‘You’re here for a really positive purpose.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007c, p. 3)

[Referring to becoming California’s governor and talking about the environment], ‘It just shows you that sometimes reality goes way beyond, actually, your dreams and your visions.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008a, p. 1)

‘We can put not just our nation but the entire world on a path towards a clean and sustainable future. Wouldn’t that be a great, great thing? Wouldn’t that be a great legacy for our generation to do that? ... So this is why I say let’s go to work, let’s roll up our sleeves make it happen.’ (Schwarzenegger 2009a, p. 4)

Building on this, Governor Schwarzenegger repeatedly talked about not just California’s role as the leader against climate change, but also about other members of the international
community, whether it was other states in the US or other countries such as China or India. This demonstrates his desire for a global solution to climate change. As well as keeping the message positive, he believed the larger international community would have a role to play.

[Referring to the largest solar plant in the world, located in California] ‘And it is not in China and it's not in Germany or in Spain or in Texas.’ (Schwarzenegger 2010a)

‘We are inspiring the rest of the world to look at this seriously. And we got inspired by Tony Blair and by Great Britain, of what they have done,’ (Schwarzenegger 2008d, p. 6)

Storyline IV: Unity across society

Linked to his discussion of the goal of the global community working together to find a solution to climate change is his acknowledgment of the potential of members from across society to be part of the solution. In a number of his speeches he cited the fact that people from government, from the private sector, and from other parts of society have helped to create California’s climate legislation, and have attended his public events. Their physical presence and the fact that he acknowledged them demonstrates his desire for a united force in California’s (and the world’s) work on climate change.

‘We have all the scientists, and so many of the economists and environmentalists and business leaders and … journalists from around the world coming together,’ (Schwarzenegger 2007c, p. 3)

‘I want to say this loud and clear, because I want the CEOs and I want the scientists and the policy makers to hear me here today.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008b, p. 2)

Storyline V: The role of subnational governments

Beyond the role of the international community overall and that of different members of society, Governor Schwarzenegger’s discourse played up the importance of subnational actors in the fight against climate change, in particular to help build momentum for action by other states which may have been dragging their feet. Multiple times he discussed the importance of state and city governments, including in 2009 when he attended the Copenhagen Climate Summit and made a speech about this exact topic.
‘Perhaps the real success of Copenhagen is to give us the opportunity to think differently... Perhaps the success comes in realising that something different needs to be done, and in fact is already being done. It’s being done on the subnational level.’ (Schwarzenegger 2009b)

‘Now why subnational governments? Because many national governments have not yet come to a global agreement. So we feel strongly that we should create a groundswell, because all great movements start at the grassroots level and then slowly get up to the federal government.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008c, p. 2)

**Storyline VI: Bipartisanship into the future**

Linked to all these storylines of united, global efforts led by California and by other subnational governments, was Governor Schwarzenegger’s call for work on climate change, the environment, and energy to be *bipartisan*. This was significant, considering the highly polarised nature of the issue of climate change in politics generally. Governor Schwarzenegger repeatedly held up California as a shining example of a bipartisan approach to the issue of climate change, and frequently called for more bi- or non-partisan work to be done.

‘It makes no difference, Democrats or Republicans, we work together to do what is best for the people.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007e, p. 2)

‘You can do nothing if you don’t have Democrats and Republicans come together and solve the problems.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008d, p. 7)

‘I think that when it comes to doing this in a post-partisan way or in a bipartisan way, when you talk about the environment I think that you could not do it any other way, because it is not a political issue. I mean, it has nothing to do with Democrats versus Republicans. I think that for both Democratic families or Republican families the kids ought to breathe clean air, and that we all want to have an energy efficient state, that we all want to have a reduction in global warming and [to] fight global warming and [to] fight the increase of greenhouse gases.’ (Schwarzenegger 2009a, p. 5)

This storyline was of particular significance because it deliberately sought to transcend ideological divisions by depoliticising the problem and instead making it *everyone’s* problem.
The values presented here were an example of Governor Schwarzenegger transcending his political ideology, and instead playing on ideas that are just as important to Democrats, and are also fairly central to American capitalism.

Governor Schwarzenegger was also aware of the longevity of climate change and of other environmental issues. He was aware that there were no quick fixes, and for concrete change to occur, people and politicians could not think in terms of the next election cycle, but instead they had to look decades and even further ahead.

‘Every industry has to participate in this in order to keep our environment clean, or to clean our environment and to keep our future generations protected.’ (Schwarzenegger 2006, p. 2)

‘When Californians turn on that faucet there is safe and reliable and clean water coming out that tap and not just five years from now but 30, 40 and 50 years from now.’ (OnTheIssues 2014b, p. 1)

**Master frame II: Ecological modernisation**

Whereas Governor Schwarzenegger’s acceptance of the problem and the science climate change acts as a bedrock of his discourse, the second master frame of ecological modernisation was one he mentioned much more strategically and frequently. His message was that acting on climate change was not detrimental to the economy, and instead could help invigorate it. Doing so could cause new industries to appear, ones that would help to find new, scientific solutions to the problem, and create vast numbers of new jobs at the same time.

‘We can do this simultaneously. We can make the economy grow and also protect our economy and protect our environment. AB 32 is good for business.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007d, p. 3)

‘We can do both, we can protect the environment and we can protect the economy at the same time.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008c, p. 5)

‘We should stop the fight over should we protect the environment or should we protect the economy. I always said that we can do both.’ (Schwarzenegger 2010a, p. 7)
Governor Schwarzenegger’s use of the ecological modernisation frame directly confronted the conservative discourse that action on climate change would have a detrimental effect on the economy.

**Storyline VII: Have our cake and eat it too**

Connected to this ecological modernisation frame was a storyline that argued the way climate change had been discussed so far needed to change. He noted that previously, the story of climate change had been one of blame and guilt. People, companies and countries were all at fault because they contributed to problems like greenhouse gas emissions. He argued this should change, and instead of telling people they were blameworthy and a part of the problem, they should instead be given the chance to be forward-looking and a part of the solution.

‘The time has come to stop looking back in blame or suspicion.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007a, p. 3)

‘We all know that the guilt trip that we have put on people has not worked, to tell them that they should not use the Jacuzzi, or the big, large plasma TV ... All of those things did not work because the fact of the matter is the people should use a big television set but it should be powered by solar. They should go and sit in the Jacuzzi, in the biggest Jacuzzi in the world but it should be powered by solar.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008c, p. 4)

‘And the important thing is, of course, that we are seeing all of this great action not because of guilt.’ (Schwarzenegger 2009a, p. 3)

Governor Schwarzenegger was intent on California leading the charge on climate change, on Californians remaining positive, secure in the knowledge that there will be no threat to their high consumption lifestyle in a positive sum game of economic growth and emissions reductions.

**Storyline VIII: Fostering the new Californian gold rush**

Throughout Governor Schwarzenegger’s speeches on climate change and energy issues, he frequently used a number of storylines that draw upon the American Republican ideology. This was significant because though there was never any doubt of Governor
Schwarzenegger’s Republican and political identity, it was nonetheless true that he was the leader of one of the most liberal and “blue” states in the US, and he was at the head of a number of climate change-related policies, a position not many Republican politicians found themselves in. So it was important to understand whether or how Governor Schwarzenegger linked such policies to his Republican identity. As noted above, he picked elements of Republicanism that had close affinity with elements of Democratic ideology in relation to a shared faith in capitalism; this minimised any tension with his Republicanism and helped to maintain bipartisanship between supporters of both ideologies.

Governor Schwarzenegger routinely discussed the importance of fostering innovation, and the role technology would play in mitigating climate change. Multiple times he discussed how California was a beacon of innovation and was home to industries which were on the cutting edge of green technology. He argued that by providing a home for these industries, California was leading the charge on finding technological solutions to climate and energy problems.

‘This is the challenge of our generation, and we will meet it with innovation and technology’ (Schwarzenegger 2007c, p. 4)

‘... In California we have been adopting green policies as fast as we can develop them, because we know this is the only way to go and that’s how we can inspire the creation of new technology, which I think will save us all.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008c, p. 2)

‘So this is why I always say technology will save us all. ... That's why it's important to come up with those types of clean and green technologies.’ (Schwarzenegger 2009a, p. 3)

Linked to this faith in technology and innovation was another Republican ideal, the strong private sector, free from the burdens of big government. Governor Schwarzenegger’s discourses maintained that not only would solutions to the world’s problems of climate change and unregulated emissions (eg. From cars) come from technological advancements, but also that these solutions would be found not by government efforts, but by those in the private sector, and by those who were willing to inject venture capital into California’s economy. A number of times Governor Schwarzenegger discussed the benefits that would
come from having a strong private sector in California, including benefits to the environment as new technology was created, but also to California, as new jobs were created too.

‘Companies large and small are being drawn to what the Wall Street Journal called the California New Gold Rush’ (Schwarzenegger 2007c, p. 3)

‘That's why it's important to unleash the tremendous power of the capitalist spirit and the private marketplace. (Schwarzenegger 2009a, p. 3)

‘Businesses got used to it, they realized that … our objective is to fight global warming and to really clean our environment. … So, I think that people have become more comfortable with that and they have recognized that actually that change creates an extra economy, the green clean technology. And so we have seen that more jobs are being created, more venture capital is coming into California and there is a big boom in that area. As a matter of fact the Wall Street Journal called it the 'New Gold Rush' and I think that's what we're seeing now.’ (Schwarzenegger 2008d, p. 3)

The use of the metaphor, the Californian New Gold Rush, was significant as well, as it was a nudge to California’s history and its identity as a place for pioneers.

*Storyline IX: Energy independence and security*

Another Republican value Governor Schwarzenegger touches on in his speeches was the goal of *energy independence and security*. He was concerned about the unforeseen consequences of America having to rely on other countries for their energy and other resources, and about the risks of relying too heavily on one or only a few sources of energy, such as oil and coal. He argued that by diversifying California’s and the US’s energy portfolio, and by paying particular attention to renewable energy and new green technology, the US would be able to simultaneously protect itself from insecurities in the global market, and from climate change. Indeed, the diversification of the US’s energy sources, along with the protection of the US’s energy sources, is another Republican value that sits relatively comfortably with Democratic values; both Republicans and Democrats find common cause in protection the US’s security in all its dimensions.
‘Being dependent on one source of fuel leaves our economy and our national security vulnerable to price shocks and global events beyond our control.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007b, p. 2)

‘Hydrogen [as a fuel source in cars] leaves no trail of pollution and causes no global warming. Using it does not fund the terrorists who would destroy us.’ (OnTheIssues 2014a, p. 1)

‘I believe that we have economics on our side. Since the supply of wind and sun and algae is unlimited, their prices will not jump. That cannot be said of oil, the supply of which is limited and declining.’ (UpTakeVideo 2009)

**Storyline X: Us (California) versus them (Washington)**

A final Republican value Governor Schwarzenegger touched on in his speeches is the importance of what individual states can do in the face of Federal inaction. A number of times he argued that the Federal government in Washington had, whether deliberately or not, been too slow to come to terms with the issue of global warming, and so it was up to the states to find their own solutions to the problem. Such solutions may have come in the form of legislation, new technological advancements created by the private sector, etc.

‘Whether you’re facing all of those challenges locally -- we are facing them locally here, while in Washington they are still taking their time and they are not doing anything to act on curbing the greenhouse gas emissions, so we have to put the pressure on Washington to make sure that we can solve those problems together.’ (Schwarzenegger 2007e, p. 3)

‘I believe technological and economic forces will overtake... the political and the regulatory efforts of national governments.’ (UpTakeVideo 2009)

Here Governor Schwarzenegger has used both bridging and bonding rhetoric together in ways that unite Californians by dividing them from Washington.

**Concluding remarks**

Though Governor Schwarzenegger’s legitimising of his climate and energy policies seems to have been a success – he remained in office long after they were implemented, and a
number of other states and the Federal government had since replicated his policies, particularly his regulations on vehicle emissions (Engel 2006) – there a those within the Republican party who were inclined to question Schwarzenegger’s identity as a Republican. His liberal stance and action on climate change, as well as on other political issues including gun control and stem cell research caused websites such as Conservapedia to dismiss his claims to being a true Republican, instead labelling him a RINO (Republican In Name Only), or a ‘California[n] Republican’ (Conservapedia 2015a, Political Views section). In contrast, as we will see, through his deeply held belief in the Republican ideology, and his living and breathing the Texan way of life, there was no doubt to the red blooded nature of Rick Perry’s Southern, Texan, Republicanism.
‘That’s how we do things in Texas. ... Combining innovation and incentives to achieve those type of successes [in energy production]. ... Our progress comes from decisions that have been made on the basis of good, sound science, good business principles, not, you know, the “guesses” of government bureaucrats somewhere. ... We prefer to make renewable energy more accessible by cultivating a job-friendly climate, offering incentives to make it more affordable. And I think the results speak for themselves. Today, Texas produces more wind energy than any state in the nation. As a matter of fact, ... more than all but four other countries in the world. [...]’ (Perry 2010c)

‘Even if clear-thinking Americans can persuade their representatives in Washington to kill this cap-and-trade legislation before it blows a hole in our economy, we’ll still have challenges presented by an increasingly activist Environmental Protection Agency. You know, when the EPA declared carbon dioxide a toxic substance, there were countless businesses and farms and even large churches that [ended up] in their cross hairs.’ (Perry 2010c)

Governor Rick Perry was elected to office in 2000 and stepped down in 2015, as the longest serving governor in Texan history. He is a Republican, and is described as a ‘social conservative’ (Bio. 2015, Political Views section). With regards to climate change, he is a sceptic, arguing that ‘the idea that we would put Americans’ economy in jeopardy based on scientific theory that’s not settled yet, to me, is just nonsense.’ (OnTheIssues 2013, para. 3). As demonstrated in the above quote, the ongoing success of Texan industry and culture is a goal Perry is willing to fight for, particularly against what he sees as the Federal government and its relevant agencies overstepping their bounds and attempting to halt Texas’ progress, all on the basis of unsettled science. Yet despite this climate scepticism and strong support for fossil fuel production, Texas also produces the most wind energy, a renewable source, of any state in the US. Texas, with a GDP of $1,532,623 million, is second only to California in terms of wealth (Bureau of Economic Analysis 2015). However, in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, the state ranks first, emitting 655.5 million metric tons of carbon dioxide in 2011 (comparatively, as previously discussed, California emitted 345.8 million metric tons of carbon dioxide in the same year, roughly half of what Texas emits). The state has the 14th highest rate of emission per capita in the US, at just under 30 metric tons of carbon dioxide
per person, and Texas also produces the most crude oil, natural gas, and generates the most electricity of any state in the US (US Energy Information Administration 2014b).

Governor Perry was selected as my second case study because he provides a very different example of a Republican politician, in this case, one that has facilitated the expansion of wind energy with direct climatic benefits. Under his leadership, Texas has become the largest producer of wind energy of any state in the US. Consequently, they have also successfully reduced their greenhouse gas emissions. In 2000 Texas emitted 720.3 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. As previously mentioned, by 2011 this number had dropped by 9 per cent, to 655.5 million metric tons (US Energy Information Administration 2014a). All this however is in stark contrast to his climate scepticism (bordering on denialism), and as such his discourse was selected for analysis in order to determine how he has attempted to legitimise these policies that have resulted in climate mitigation.

This chapter begins with an overview of renewable energy policies introduced in Texas in order to provide a policy context for the discourse analysis. The rest of the chapter presents the findings of the discourse analysis of the speeches of Governor Perry. This will be divided into a number of sections, including the ‘master frames’ of his texts, the way his policies match up with his ideas about what it means to be Texan (See Figure 4.2 for a “map” of Governor Perry’s discursive strategies), and what Governor Perry says – and more frequently, does not say – about environmental and climate change issues. Finally, the chapter examines the extent to which Governor Perry’s ideas about renewable energy and climate change align with his Republican ideology.

Policy Background: Renewable Energy

Texas’ journey into the production of renewable energy started late compared to other states in the US. In 1995, Texas produced the least amount of electricity from renewable sources of any state (Rabe 2004). However, in George W Bush’s last year as governor, he signed into law a bill the central aim of which was to deregulate Texas’ electricity generation industry, which also included a plan to increase the amount of electricity generated by renewable sources. Within the bill was a set of renewable portfolio standards (RPS). This included a mandated increase from 880 megawatts (MW) to 2,880 MW, or 3 per cent of Texas’ total energy production to come from renewables by 2009 (Rabe 2004, p. 52).
Specifically, this included an increase in wind power, up to 5,880 MW in 2015, followed by a ‘voluntary’ target of 10,000 MW by 2015. By 2011, Texas had already met the 2015 goal. The RPS also mandated an increase to 500 MW from renewable sources other than wind by 2005 such as solar, however, by 2011, this goal had not been met (Zarnikau 2011, p. 3908).

Environmental and energy issues were slow to ping Governor Perry’s radar. It was not until 2003 that he made an executive order to create an Energy Planning Council. This was in response to then President George W Bush pushing for a national energy plan, in the face of forecasts that predicted an increase in energy consumption coupled with a decrease in rates of domestic production of energy. In his executive order, Governor Perry acknowledged the fact that Texas’ production of oil and conventional gas had been in decline since the 1970s. In order to ensure Texas’ energy security and future, particularly when considering the US was importing half of all the oil it was consuming (Perry 2003), the Energy Planning Council was formed. Its role was to determine how Texas’ energy security could be guaranteed for the future, and to look into how sources of energy other than oil and gas, including nuclear, clean coal, and renewables, might help to diversify Texas’ future energy supply (Perry 2003).

Then in 2005, these energy policies and projects culminated in the signing of a bill that would build on the 1999 legislation, and steadily increase the amount of energy produced by renewable sources. Where the 1999 legislation required 2,880 MW of Texas’ total energy to come from renewables by 2009, the targets set by the 2005 bill jumped dramatically: by 2015, 5,880 MW were required, and 10,000 MW by 2025. The legislation also created ‘Competitive Renewable Energy Zones’, which would be based on the available ‘renewable energy sources and developer commitments’ (Zarnikau 2011, p. 3910). The legislation was very successful: according to the American Wind Energy Association (2013), Texas produced the most wind energy in the US, and employed the largest number of people in the wind power sector of any state.

There is no doubt that under Governor Perry’s leadership Texas went from sitting idle when it came to renewable energy, to becoming a leader on the national stage. This has produced a number of significant benefits, including the protection of Texas’ energy security, the guarantee that Texan jobs would be secured, and the reduction of Texas’ greenhouse gas emissions. However, in leading this charge, Governor Perry handed himself a potential problem: how to justify such a proactive stance on renewable energy when he did not
accept the existence of climate change. He attempted to do so, using a small number of master frames, supported by storylines in order to articulate his position. His master frames concentrate on the importance of energy security and independence in Texas and the US more largely, and on the importance of innovation in the private sector in Texas. His storylines touch on Texan values and ways of life, and reflect his Republican values, by emphasising the importance of the 10th Amendment.

**Master frame I: Energy security**

Throughout the speeches Governor Perry made on energy-related topics during his time as Governor, he used three central themes to frame his ideas regarding the meaning of energy in Texas. The first overarching frame is that the production of energy in Texas, be it via traditional methods, or alternative or renewable sources, is a matter of national security, both for Texas and for the US overall. He argued that the US’ reliance on foreign sources of energy, including oil, is a national security issue, and is one that can be resolved by taking more advantage of the US’ own energy resources. By doing so, he created a chain of equivalence between the idea of security and independence and self-reliance, and freedom from foreign control.

‘Our reliance on foreign sources of oil continues to grow, thus jeopardising our energy security.’ (Perry 2003)

‘Increasing dependence on foreign energy sources is not only an economic issue, it is a homeland security issue.’ (Perry 2005b)

‘If there is an issue that’s any more important, I think, for our nation, than energy independence, I don’t know what it is.’ (Perry 2010d).

‘I’m talking about a world where the United States is no longer dependent upon foreign countries for our energy. Our dependence is a national security issue.’ (Perry 2010a)

‘... Getting America independent on the domestic energy side. It's time for another American Declaration of Independence. It's time for energy independence.’ (OnTheIssues 2013)
The speeches in which Perry mentioned the importance of energy independence for the US were spread across nearly his entire time as Governor, highlighting the significance this issue holds for him. Understanding this significance is crucial in comprehending the way in which Perry talked about and acted upon matters of energy. For example, by positioning the production of energy as a security issue rather than, say, an environmental issue, or a climate-related one (the production of energy is generally one of the most greenhouse gas intensive practices), he is able to avoid engaging with climate change and protect his conservative stance on climate change. This master frame was the dominant frame Governor Perry used to link his state and his policies with the otherwise liberal agenda of renewable energy. By instead positioning it as national security issue, he was able to avoid any potential questions about inconsistencies. Positioning this issue in the way he did also allowed him to build a Texan political identity, and subsequently was able to call on it when he was required to justify his policies. This political identity linked to both national (ie. national security) and to local values, namely the Texan values of independence and of energy production.

Perry’s ideas about state and national energy security were also intimately linked with his Republican ideology. Energy independence is one of the Republican party’s central goals when it comes to the US’ natural resources. This is for a number of reasons, including that US’ reliance on its own resources will ensure money that would have otherwise been used to buy resources from foreign states will not potentially end up in the hands of terrorist groups. Furthermore, a domestic energy industry is ‘a job generator and a catalyst of economic growth’ (Republican National Committee 2014, Domestic Energy Independence Section).

*Storyline I: Texas (energy) forever*

Nearly all of Governor Perry’s storylines used language and ideas that touched on Texan identity. One such storyline emphasised that Texas, the ‘Lone Star State’ was, according to Perry, the best state in the US. This was demonstrated through, amongst other things, the fact that it produces the most energy (both from traditional and alternative sources) of any state in the US.

‘One thing we know in Texas is energy.’ (Perry 2010d)
‘I’m proud to say that Texas leads the nation in crude oil production... We also lead the nation in natural gas production, contributing nearly one third of the nation’s supply’ (Perry 2008a)

‘But our success doesn’t stop with traditional fuel sources. You can be proud that Texas produces more energy from wind turbines than all but five other countries.’ (Perry 2015)

Indeed, when discussing different sources of energy, Governor Perry stated that Texas had what he referred to as an ‘all of the above’ energy strategy, one that included energy from traditional energy sources such as coal, from alternative sources, including unconventional natural gas, and from renewable sources such as wind (Perry 2010d). By focusing on rising net energy production, and linking this with the Texan identity of being the best and greatest, Governor Perry was able to shift the focus away from the source of energy in question (eg. renewables), and instead focused on the sheer amount of energy Texas was able to produce, so that producing more renewable energy was consistent with the being Texan. He could then take pride in Texas’ approach to energy production and to cleaner air programs, and suggested that other states as well as members of the Federal government in Washington DC should ‘come on down to ... Texas and let us educate you about why... Texas has a better... way to make our energy business more efficient, effective, and economical’ (Perry 2010d).

*Master frame II: the importance of the Texan private sector*

Feeding from this first frame was a second, made up of two parts. The first was the importance of innovation of the *private sector in Texas*, and the second was the role that government should play in the process, namely, that government should help to create a hospitable environment for businesses, but beyond that, they should not take part in the process.

Governor Perry believed that one key to ensuring the US’ and Texas’ energy security and future was the technology that would come out of an innovative and entrepreneurial private sector in Texas:
‘America needs all the innovation it can muster to reduce our dependency on foreign sources of energy.’ (Perry 2011).

[With regards to new nuclear technology], ‘Innovation is the answer to this.’ (OnTheIssues 2013).

Like the master frame of energy security, this frame also had strong links to his Republican ideology. This included the idea that innovation should come not from government efforts but instead as a result of ingenuity in a free, open market system. This frame also linked to his Republican values on the role of government and the importance of free enterprise. As well as arguing that governments should be small, and its power should be decentralised (Clouthier 2011; Perry 2010a), he also argued that it is the government’s role is to create a hospitable environment for business, and then ‘get out of the way’ (Perry 2011):

‘When I go and meet with other governors from other places, I want to challenge them... is your tax policy the type of policy that allows entrepreneurs to risk their capital because they know they’re going to get a return on their investment?’ (Perry 2010d).

‘When we apply incentives instead of crushing mandates, we appeal to the innovators, we appeal to the visionaries, and we end up with better technology and smarter approaches,’ (Perry 2010c).

Even far back as 2005, Governor Perry clearly believed the private sector had a vital role to play in securing Texas’ energy production. He stated that in the wake of Governor Bush’s legislation to increase Texas’ renewable energy, the private sector played a central role and ‘rushed in to help Texas meet that goal’ (Perry 2005a). Quotes such as these are demonstrative of Governor Perry’s ideas about not only the issue of energy production and security, but also the role of government, particularly with regards to its relationship with the private sector. It was also clear that whatever ways Governor Perry chose to legitimise his policies, such as his use of the trans-ideological energy security master frame, his political ideology played a very strong role in informing them.

*Storyline II: Energy success as told by a Texan*
This storyline combined Governor Perry’s high esteem for his state’s success in energy production with the rhetorical devices he used most frequently. Namely, Texas-oriented layman’s language that would appeal to and indeed be used by his audiences. That Texas was so successful in producing energy from a variety of sources was clearly a fact that was important to Governor Perry. He frequently cited Texas’ success in the sector, and used particular, Texas-oriented language to emphasise this fact.

‘[To the American Wind Energy Association] your presence today in the Lone Star State is not [an] accident – you are in what we would call friendly territory.’ (Perry 2008b)

‘In true Texas style, we already hit those marks.’ [referring to the renewable energy targets set by the 2005 legislation] (Perry 2010d)

‘The great news about our state is that we don’t back down from a challenge.’ (Perry 2010d)

Use of this language was a calculated move on Governor Perry’s behalf. Using the energy success storyline was an effective way of connecting with local audiences. It had the potential to reassure them that though he was a politician (in a state where Republican values permeate everyday ways of life, and so large government is something to be wary of), he could still be trusted to share their values.

**Storyline III: Us (Texas) versus them (Washington)**

Governor Perry used references to the Texan way of life not only to congratulate his state on its successes in the energy sector, but also as a means to position Federal legislation and government agencies which he believed through their actions may have had a detrimental effect on Texas, more so than any other state. Compared to his predecessor, President Obama has taken a much tougher stance on environmental protection and regulation. One such example of this stance is his work with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on issues such as greenhouse gases and higher efficiency in vehicles (EPA 2014). Time and time again Governor Perry made comments and even entire speeches expressing his contempt for EPA programs such as these, or what he saw as an intrusion into areas of regulation that belonged solely to the states. And while it is true that Texas as a state might have been
adversely affected by such regulations, given that it has the highest level of greenhouse gas emissions of any state, Governor Perry took the issue further, and built on his Republican value of non-intrusive, small government, and posited the Federal government in Washington, DC as an entity that is intent on attacking the Texan way of life.

‘When the EPA recently declared carbon dioxide a toxic substance, they put countless businesses, farms, [and] even large churches in their crosshairs.’ (Perry 2010f)

‘This new energy tax [ie. The potential cap and trade system outlined in the Waxman Markey bill] will affect every Texas household and business. I will tell you, we’re in trouble if a federal agency [ie. the EPA] can enact regulations that… potentially, for the first time impose burdens and regulations on family farms, on job-creating factories, and even large buildings, such as hospitals and churches.’ (Perry 2010b)

Given the strength of Texas’ agricultural industry and the size of its Christian population (Texas Department of Agriculture 2015; Texas Almanac 2010), it was not difficult to see that Governor Perry was trying to position the EPA and the Federal government, led by President Obama, as deliberately singling out and attacking Texas with the proposed environmental regulations.

*Storyline IV: The 10th Amendment*

A final storyline used by Governor Perry, although not as prominent as the previous ones, was one that was linked to the 10th Amendment. The 10th Amendment states, in short, that ‘the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.’ (Legal Information Institute n.d., para. 1). In a number of speeches, Governor Perry cited the 10th Amendment, and suggested that as the Federal government continued to introduce regulation on environmental issues, it may have been overstepping its bounds and encroaching on state powers:

‘We need to have a discussion in this country about our 10th Amendment and the appropriateness of it, as it’s been eroded by Washington, DC’ (OnTheIssues 2013)
‘In defence of not only of our clean air program, but also our rights under the Tenth Amendment, I’m calling upon President Obama to reign in the EPA.’ (Perry 2010e)

This particular storyline line, like his master frame of innovation in the private sector, again linked to his Republican values, including that of small, not overly-intrusive government.

**Governor Perry and the environment: what he doesn’t say**

Though Governor Perry was in power for 15 years, many of the speeches on the issue of energy come from his later years in office. This was because in his earlier years, energy production was only a relatively minor issue. The scales were tipped in 2008, when President Obama, a Democrat and a politician with plans for dealing with climate change, was elected to the White House. After President Obama’s inauguration, there was a notable increase in the number of speeches Governor Perry made about energy issues, particularly as the EPA was given projects by President Obama, including the tightening of regulations of emissions from vehicles. As Congress and the White House continued to edge closer to stricter climate regulation, through policies like a cap and trade system, the frequency of Governor Perry’s speeches on the same issue went up. In this section I will analyse the various comments Governor Perry made about the environment and climate-related topics, and perhaps even more compelling, are the times when he was silent on these issues.

It is true that Texas now produces the most wind energy of any state in the US. For many governments, such a fact would be a crowning jewel in an effective and successful climate change policy. By using more renewable energy relative to fossil fuels, it is possible for a state or country (for example, California) to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and slow their contribution to climate change. Indeed, Texas’ greenhouse gas emissions have dropped since they introduced their renewable energy targets. However, whilst occasionally Governor Perry may have acknowledged that having sources of renewable energy may result in cleaner air, he rarely explicitly linked renewable energy projects to their potential to mitigate climate change. Below is an illustrative sample of quotes taken from Governor Perry’s speeches showing how he managed to avoid or side-step any explicit linkage between renewable energy, reduced emissions, and climate change mitigation.

‘I am proud to put my name on this bill [Senate Bill 20] because it is good for our economy, our environment and our future.’ (Perry 2005a).
This quote is from 2005, when Governor Perry signed into law the bill which significantly increased Texas’ renewable energy targets. This would have been a perfect opportunity to link such policies with a discussion on Texas’ efforts to counter climate change, however, this did not occur.

‘The solution is to... pursue with greater passion alternative sources of fuel.’ (Perry 2005b).

‘This push for alternative fuel is the next, reasonable step in an effort to continue leading in [the] energy sector.’ (Perry 2010c)

These quotes were demonstrative of Governor Perry’s ideas about the future of energy production. The fact that he used the word ‘alternative’, rather than, say, renewable is telling, and it remains consistent with his all of the above energy program, one that will include nuclear and clean coal power plants as well as renewable sources (Perry 2008a). It was significant for another reason: whilst it is true that power plants that use clean coal, natural gas, and nuclear energy might emit less greenhouse gas than conventional power plants that run on fuels such as coal, it is generally agreed that if a government or corporation is truly committed to reducing their emissions, then they will bypass these bridging fuel sources, and instead switch directly to purely renewable sources, such as wind or solar. Governor Perry’s reference to Texas’ goals of using alternative fuel is demonstrative of his idea that any energy source will do, and climate change is beside the point.

On a side note, in the second quote he referred to Texas’ push to increase the use of alternative fuels as ‘reasonable’. This was likely a jab at the Federal government, as he believed the plans for a cap and trade system in the Waxman-Markey bill that was before Congress were completely out of proportion to the problem, and would have a devastating effect on jobs and the Texan economy.

‘Between 2000 and 2008, Texas achieved a 22 per cent reduction in the state-wide levels of ozone, [laughs] which is actually harmful to our health, right?’ (Perry 2010b)

‘... The EPA declared carbon dioxide a “toxic substance”... I happen to think this is just some very over-zealous regulation.’ (Perry 2010c)
‘Today the EPA is operating with an activist mindset, more suited to an on-campus rally at one of those California campuses.’ (Perry 2010a)

‘Our progress [in Texas] has been made on the basis of sound science, [and] good business principles, not... the guesses of government bureaucrats somewhere.’ (Perry 2010c)

Continuing from the comment Governor Perry made about the Federal government’s proposed regulation on greenhouse gas emissions, these quotes were demonstrative of Perry’s dismissive and hostile attitude not only towards the Federal government’s plans to increase environmental regulation, but also towards the EPA and of the science driving climate change legislation. It seemed that he believed that if he could make the Federal government’s plans seem illegitimate, he could act accordingly and so continued to deny climate change, and any role his state’s energy programs may have in mitigating it.

‘Between 2000 and 2008, we achieved a 22 per cent reduction in state-wide ozone levels. NOx [nitrogen oxide] has fallen by 53 per cent.’ (Perry 2010a)

This quote was from a speech given in 2010, and was exemplary of Governor Perry’s approach to the topic of air quality. In multiple speeches he talked about how Texas had successfully reduced the levels of these two substances. However, any discussion of the more well-known gases that are directly linked to climate change, including carbon dioxide and methane, were almost non-existent. It was not until very late in his time as governor, in 2010 (ten years after being elected to office), that he mentioned carbon dioxide as well as ozone and nitrous oxide:

‘We’ve reduced nitrous oxide emissions [by] 46%, cut ozone levels [by] 22%, and watched our CO2 emissions fall farther than almost any other state.’ (Perry 2010f)

However, in another speech in 2011, he listed ozone and nitrous oxide again, but failed to mention carbon dioxide (Perry 2011). Finally, it is not until his outgoing speech as Governor in 2015 that he used the phrase ‘carbon footprint’:

‘Our carbon footprint has been reduced by 9%.’ (Perry 2015)

Finally, over the years Governor Perry did on occasion let slip terms and phrases that, given their links to the lexicon of climate change, suggested that Governor Perry had a deeper
understanding of climate change than he liked to let on. Although it was impossible to make broad generalisations based on a small number of quotes, the particular comments below, both from 2008, were perhaps some of the most revealing about Governor Perry’s views about energy and climate change.

‘The Federal government [may] prematurely pass... legislation regulating carbon, without considering the impact on our state.’ (Perry 2008a)

‘Nationwide, per capita usage continues to climb as people add power-draining gadgets to their homes every day.’ (Perry 2008)

The first quote, in which he mentioned Federal carbon regulations, was made well before the Waxman-Markey Bill was introduced, and even longer before Governor Perry himself began to include carbon dioxide in his list of pollutants Texas had begun to remove from the air (including ozone and nitrous oxide). In the second quote he mentioned per capita usage of electricity, or, by another name, per capita emissions. The use of this phrase, as well as his mention of carbon, suggested that Governor Perry was knowledgeable about greenhouse gas emissions and climate change long before he chose to deliberately discuss it. What was also interesting about the second quote was that he argued that per capita consumption of electricity was increasing because of the gadgets people have in their homes. However, the economic sectors with the largest greenhouse gas emissions are electricity production and transportation; emissions from the commercial and residential sector only make up 10% of the US’ overall emissions (EPA 2014). It was possible that given Perry’s familiarity with terms such as ‘carbon’ and ‘per capita’ emissions, that he was aware of how little the residential sector actually emitted, but nonetheless chose to deflect any potential blame away from the private, energy producing sector in which he believed so strongly.

Concluding remarks

In order to legitimise his policies, specifically those related to renewable energy production, despite his climate scepticism, Governor Perry blends a number of different frames. This included a strong emphasis on his Republican ideology and local narratives. Though he avoided environmental frames including ecological modernisation, one of his master frames was that of energy security, a trans-ideological value, though one that certainly also has
links to his party ideology. As we have seen, one of his storylines was of state self-determination, linked to the powers bestowed by the 10th Amendment, another staple of the Republican platform. There were many other examples of times when Governor Perry has interweaved his Republican ideology into the justification of his policies, including in his master frame of the importance of innovation in the private sector. In order to tie this all together and make it even more palatable to his constituency in Texas, Governor Perry frequently used local narratives about the Texan identity, such as when he stated that Texans don’t back down from a fight, and when he argued that churches and farms would be in the EPA’s cross hairs. In doing so he successfully built a chain of equivalence between the Texan way of life and the production of renewable energy, a practice that would otherwise normally be the realm of more liberal states.
Chapter 4: Beyond Ideology?

The two previous chapters conducted a discourse analysis of political texts of Governors Schwarzenegger and Perry. The purpose of this chapter is to compare, and reflect on the discursive strategies chosen by each governor, and the extent to which each of the governors made use of the various discursive strategies, identified in the theoretical framework section of this thesis. That is, to what extent and in what manner they have drawn on their political ideology, and to what extent did that seek to transcend Republican ideology by using other frames. This chapter will also examine the similarities between the discourses of the two governors, and the broader findings of this discourse analysis, including the ramifications for the way other governors and politicians, both Democratic and Republican, may communicate their ideas and policies on climate change and energy.

Governor Schwarzenegger

Governor Schwarzenegger used a wide variety of ways to articulate and justify his position on climate change and energy policy, and used all manner of discursive strategies (see Figure 4.1). This included both bonding and bridging rhetoric, as well as frames that transcended his ideology. From a foundation of two master frames – of The Great Problem of climate change, and the second frame of ecological modernisation – he used ten separate storylines and countless other short anecdotes or asides. His mastering of the arts of rhetoric and persuasion are clear through the diversity of his storylines, and his used of all three of the analytically possible discursive strategies discussed previously. Time and time again he sought to connect with his audience by acknowledging people from various sectors across society, and by emphasising the importance of bipartisan action on climate change. When he tapped into Republican ideology he drew on some of the less contentious aspects, including faith in economic innovation and in technological development, to connect with his voters, and with international audiences when he spoke at global conferences, all of which are clear examples of bridging rhetoric. On the occasions he sought to incite division in his audience and used bonding rhetoric, such as when he criticised the US Federal government for its inaction climate change, and hence also playing up the Republican value of power to the states rather than to Washington, he used it as a means of bridging differences within California. This was significant in itself; though he did use bridging
rhetoric when he addresses Californians, at all times he assiduously avoided using bonding rhetoric to divide them.

One of Governor Schwarzenegger’s storylines touched on the issue of American energy security, an American value and a value also held strongly by the Republican Party. But larger than his concern for energy security was his belief in the role technology will play, both now and the future, to resolve climate risks. This was also an example of his use of the ecological modernisation frame. Speeches he made in 2008 and 2009 included the statement ‘technology will save us all’ (Schwarzenegger 2008c, 2009a). These ideas about the role he intended for technology to play in mitigating climate change provide textbook examples of what theorists have characterised as ecological modernisation, which fixates on technological solutions and assumes that high consumption, western lifestyles (such as the aforementioned Jacuzzis) can otherwise continue unabated. Perhaps most significantly, he repeatedly discussed the united role both Democrats and Republicans have in the mitigation of climate change, in order to encourage bipartisanship. He made frequent use of master frames and storylines that transcended his Republican ideology, particularly in the way he framed the problem of climate change, and its impacts on health. He also drew on centre-of-the-road American values, such as the ongoing health of the economy (in harmony with the health of the natural environment). He also used local narratives to appeal to his electorate, such as when he drummed up the mentality of exceptionalism that exists in California, and made it seem natural that they would lead a global charge against climate change.

Governor Schwarzenegger used a combination of all three discursive strategies throughout his time in power, though it is clear. He was willing to transcend his ideology and instead use stories and ideas that touched on local and American mythology. On occasion reminded them of the gap (divide) between them and the Federal government and Washington, and even more frequently sought to connect with nearly all his audiences. When he did employ his ideology, he virtually never uses bonding rhetoric, and instead only employs bridging rhetoric – his call for bipartisanship action is testament to this. In contrast, Governor Perry favours very different techniques in order to use his ideology to legitimise his policies.

Governor Perry
In comparison to Governor Schwarzenegger, Governor Perry used a much smaller number of storylines to articulate his ideas about climate change and energy (see Figure 4.2). He also frequently employed bonding rhetoric as he wielded his Republican ideology in ways that were more prone to reinforcing rather than softening political divisions. Indeed in most respects, his master frames and storylines were politically divisive rather than unifying, and created divides between Republicans in his audience and those whom he deems the “Other”. This included the Federal government in Washington, the EPA, and various other groups concerned with climate change. While he sometimes employed an ecological modernisation frame, he fleshed it out with Republican terms or else repeatedly focused on his home state of Texas, whether this was through the use of Texan expressions – telling various audiences they were welcome in the Lone Star State, or through references to the Christian, and often rural, Texan way of life. There were times when Governor Perry did touch on values that are shared by both major parties, including in his master frame of energy security. However, rather than an example of bridging rhetoric, this was arguably a case of him instead using a narrative that transcended his ideology.

Despite the clear links between renewable energy policy and climate change, it is important to reiterate the lengths Governor Perry went to in order to avoid making a connection between the two. Others such as Rabe (2004) have been able to predict the exact amount of carbon dioxide that Texas would save with every megawatt of energy they produce from renewable sources – 3,863 tons (p. 53). In short, Texas has made significant reductions in its levels of greenhouse gas emissions since these energy policies were introduced. And yet, not once did Governor Perry ever use the phrase ‘climate change’. In his later years as governor he acknowledged that Texas’ emissions of carbon dioxide had reduced, along with the state’s emissions of ozone and nitrous oxide, but in all bar two occasions he pointedly ignored how reducing these levels of carbon dioxide could be a step towards mitigating climate change. The closest he came to tacitly conceding the problem was in 2015, in his final speech as governor he mentioned how Texas had reduced its ‘carbon footprint’, and in a speech in 2008 he referred to the US’ per capita usage of energy (Perry 2008b, 2015).

Governor Perry’s treatment of the climate issue, notably his defence of renewable energy and his avoidance of the subject of climate change provides a good illustration of what Glasson (2015) refers to as subversive rearticulation. According to Glasson this refers to a
‘single, apparently innocuous articulation’, which in itself does not ‘threaten an ideological edifice’ but nonetheless can ‘underpin a signifying chain that ultimately circumvents the binary prohibitions that reproduce dominant social orders.’ (p. 1). Here the binary prohibition of A not equalling B is that ‘being Republican means not taking action on climate change’, and ‘being Texan implies a scepticism of climate change’. Nonetheless, Perry introduced regulations on how much of Texas’ energy would come from renewable sources, which directly addressed the problem of climate change. He found ways of arguing that this was consistent with both ‘being Republican’ and ‘being Texan’, because it was consistent with the Texan ideal of “Being Independent”. Yet this apparently politically innocuous articulation for Republicans and Texans anchored the chain of equivalence that enabled Texas to take action on climate change without apparent contradiction. For Governor Perry, ensuring Texas’ energy future and the health of the private sector meant diversifying Texas’ energy portfolio to include renewable energy. This has meant that since 2000 Texas greenhouse gas emissions have continued to decrease, thanks to the increased use of renewable energy. Texas means independence, and not shying away from a fight. So while A does not equal B, but A plus X might pave the path for B in ways that avoid the direct contradiction. Texas, according to Perry, means innovation and leading the way, and that just happens to be leading the charge on wind energy, and so by any other standard, is not shying away from the fight on climate change.

There are clear contrasts between both governors. Where Governor Schwarzenegger’s favoured discursive strategy was aimed at connecting with every audience he spoke to, Governor Perry was quick to separate his audiences from those he saw as the “Other”. With regards to their rhetoric, there again exists a binary. Where Governor Schwarzenegger at all times attempted to avoid the use of bonding rhetoric and instead offered the olive branch of bridging rhetoric, Governor Perry had no qualms about reinforcing political divisions, and continually employed bonding rhetoric. There are also, however, singular instances in both their discourses where their text and talk align and similarities appear.
Figure 4.1: Governor Schwarzenegger’s discursive strategies
Figure 4.2: Governor Perry's discursive strategies
Similarities between discourses

Despite the many differences, there are some noteworthy similarities in the discourses of both governors. This is despite significant differences in their backgrounds – Governor Schwarzenegger held a plethora of other jobs before he took office, ranging from actor to bodybuilder, whereas Governor Perry is a career politician, and the states of California and Texas could not be different in terms of political culture, particularly on the issue of climate change. Yet, both governors have drawn on some similar arguments on particular issues, and occasionally even mimicked each other nearly word for word.

If there is one issue both governors certainly agree on, it is that the Federal government in Washington, DC should be treated with hostility. Though they do so for different reasons, there are recurring elements in both governors’ discourses that are critical of the Federal government, and deliberately position it as the “other”, and as an institution to be wary of. In a radio address in 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger declared that ‘Washington should take a lesson from what is happening right here in California’, referring to the fact that Proposition 23, which intended to reduce some of the environmental regulation which exists in the state, was voted down (Schwarzenegger 2010c, p. 3). And in a speech in 2010, Governor Perry declared that members of the Federal government should ‘come on down to ... Texas and let us educate you about why... Texas has a better... way to make our energy business more efficient, effective, and economical.’ (Perry 2010d). Each governor wants the Federal government to emulate their processes and success, albeit for very different reasons, but through similar positioning.

Another, highly significant idea on which both governors agree on is the role governments should play in enabling innovation in the private sector. A number of times Governor Perry described his government’s role in the process, stating that they use incentives, rather than regulations, to entice businesses to operate out of Texas, and the government should then ‘get out of the way’, a phrase he is particularly fond of (Perry 2011). In a speech in 2009, Governor Schwarzenegger likewise talks up the importance of the private sector:

‘What we are doing here in California is the best kind of public-private partnership which means, basically, that government is doing what it does best, which is passing
laws, setting standards and regulations, and then get out of the way so the entrepreneurs and innovators can do what they do best.’ (Schwarzenegger 2009a).

Despite differences in their approaches – Schwarzenegger’s California does favour more regulation, as can be seen by the implementation of AB 32 – their ideas about working hand in hand with the private sector and creating a hospitable environment in which to do business, are certainly similar. Other similarities include moving away from relying on foreign sources of energy, particularly from the Middle East, and they agree that their respective states’ – and the US’ – energy portfolios need to be further diversified, to include new sources of fuel such as alternatives and renewables.

**Political lessons arising from this research**

In the light of the findings of the previous chapters, and having determined how both governors use their ideology in order to legitimise their climate and energy policies, it is now possible to step back and consider the broader ramifications of the findings of this research. It is clear that both governors were successful in justifying their energy and climate policies, as none of these policies have since removed or weakened, and both remained in office for a number of years after implementing their policies.

Considering the way Governor Schwarzenegger time and time again used his ideology not to divide but to connect (ie. to bridge) in a bipartisan way, then Democratic leaders would be well advised to pursue a similar discursive strategy if they want to reach a Republican audience. Alternatively, they could go down the path of transcending their ideology, and instead using local narratives to appeal to their electorate, or larger scale ones that appeal to American values, such as securitisation, or broader, internationally accepted ideas about how to approach environmental ideas, including ecological modernisation. Governor Schwarzenegger frequently used a mix of these techniques, to great success.

Likewise, Governor Perry provided lessons for other Republican leaders who might want to pursue renewable energy policies without losing face as Republicans. The techniques Governor Perry used most frequently were either examples of using his ideology to divide and to magnify differences between Republicans and Democrats, or where he used his ideology to connect, but only with local Texan identity.
More generally, for both Democrat and Republican leaders of red states, appealing to local identities provides a powerful means of building support given the importance of identity to Republican voters.

Governor Perry’s use of his ideology has other lessons, apart from how strongly he links his policies and his ideology to Texan identity. His discourse of subversive rearticulation, which enabled him to defend policies that were inconsistent with Republican ideology but were made to appear consistent, shows how discourses can create coherence in face-saving ways. By connecting climate and energy policies to areas other than the actual issues of climate change and renewable energy, for example, to ideas about state and national security, and to innovation and the protection of the economy, it is clearly possible to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for reasons other than climate protection. This also provides lessons for Governors of Democratic states, who could draw on these arguments to highlight co-benefits that might appeal to Republican voters.

Governor Perry’s discursive strategy of subversive rearticulation is not unique among Republicans. The Atlanta Tea Party has won a number of battles in order for private citizens to install solar panels on their rooftops, allowing them to generate their own electricity. They have argued that if a person can install solar on their roof, they can have ‘energy autonomy’, an idea that appeals to the concept of rugged individualism that exists in the American psyche (and hence appeals to both Republicans and Democrats) (Kormann 2015, para. 2). They also pointed out that having solar panels across a number of locations, rather than a single, central electricity plant, would make it much more difficult for terrorist attacks to disrupt an energy supply, and hence further securing a necessary utility. At the same time, the leaders of the Atlanta Tea Party are aware of the political ideology of their organisation, and therefore avoided any mention of climate change (Kormann 2015).

There are other places in the US where the standard liberal-Democrat/conservative-Republican binary is subverted by conservative democrats who for various reasons do not adhere to party policy and are climate sceptics or deniers. For example, Congressman Colin Peterson, a democrat from Minnesota has argued that climate change and its subsequent warming will be good for his state, as it will allow farmers to grow more corn, and Democrat Senator Joe Manchin from West Virginia has labelled President Obama’s climate mitigation
efforts a ‘war on America’ (Johnson 2009; Leber 2013 para. 3). Senator Manchin has also reportedly been paid near $2 million by coal companies (Leber 2013).

Of course, there are times when it would be all but virtually impossible for a leader of a red state to call for action on climate change, for fear of loss of face or even loss of office. It wasn’t until very late in Perry’s time as governor before he even mentioned things like carbon dioxide, and it wasn’t until his outgoing speech as governor that he used the phrase ‘carbon footprint’ (Perry 2008b, 2015). Whether this can be interpreted as a concession that a climate problem exists or simply that his political communication was less consequential in the twilight of his period in office remains unclear. However, it is likely that more time simply has to pass before many Republicans are able to change their discourses. That said, change is taking place elsewhere, the policies of other states, and action taken at the Federal level, including the Executive Orders of President Obama may begin to snowball until not acting on climate change would result in a loss of face.

The development of renewable energy like that overseen by Governor Perry, can have a powerful catalytic effect in building new political constituencies and easing hostilities to what have hitherto been regarded as Democratic policies. It is certainly possible that as more wind farms are built and more solar panels are installed, more politicians will be able to support such developments without the risk of losing face by emphasising the other benefits of these new energy sources. The cost of renewable energy drops every day, and in multiple places throughout the world including Germany, Australia, and Dubai it has already become cheaper than conventional fuels such as coal (Guerrini 2015; Parkinson 2013). As such, it is likely that instead of having to implement punitive measures in order to mitigate climate change, for example, carbon taxes, the economy will move in such a way that will favour renewable energy sources, not because they are environmentally safer, but simply because they are cheaper.

While this inquiry has been able to offer some broad lessons in political communication, it would not be possible for other politicians, both in the US and beyond, to replicate Governor Schwarzenegger’s or Governor Perry’s approach to climate change and renewable energy. The government of every city, state, and country, and in turn the populations thereof have their own set of circumstances surrounding the topics of climate change and energy, and so it would not necessarily fly, for example, for a politician in the deep south of
the US to suddenly jump on the bandwagon of climate mitigation, and using a centre-of-the-road Republican/American discourse such as security to justify doing so (though if approached carefully could nonetheless be successful). So while the discourses of Governors Schwarzenegger and Perry could undoubtedly provide other politicians and leaders tools for justifying their own climate and energy policies, it would be essential for such a politician or leader to be highly cognizant of the particular circumstances surrounding their electorate and its ideas about climate action.

**A note on limitations**

As with any research methodology, the use of discourse analysis is not without limitations. Due to the nature of the methodology, it was not possible to measure audience reception of the governors’ texts, or the success of the governors’ climate and renewable energy policies, though such analysis would have allowed us to gauge the success of their discourses. Moreover, it was not possible to paint a broader picture of “rogue” politicians by examining the other side of the coin, so to speak, and analyse the discourses of conservative and radical democrat Governors and their policies. However, it was possible nonetheless to infer that they were not unsuccessful. Both of the governors’ policy frameworks are still in place and neither were forced to resign or were voted out of office for many years after they introduced their policies. From a more real-world perspective, greenhouse gas emissions dropped in the years following the implementation of their climate and energy policies (California’s emissions increased in 2012, for various reasons not limited to the drought continuing to affect the state) (Air Resources Board 2014).
Conclusion

There is no denying that both Governors Schwarzenegger and Perry have taken action that has reduced both their states’ greenhouse gas emissions and thus their contributions to climate change. And both have done so against the backdrop of a political landscape in the US that has never been more polarised than at the time of writing this thesis. Despite mutual contempt for the other side of politics, despite the intense disparity between the ideologies of the two major political parties, which has on multiple occasions reduced the entirety of Congress to paralysis, and despite the rise of pseudoscience think tanks continually expressing doubt about humanity’s role in climate change, or expressing doubt about its existence at all, these two governors have successfully passed legislation to mitigate climate change. They have done this in a way that has allowed them to connect their policies with their Republican ideology, a set of values and ideals that is normally at odds with any sort of action on climate change. In this respect, they have succeeded where to a large extent, the Federal legislature has failed. However, we have also seen that the stronger and more proactive policies on climate change (rather than just energy policy) in California have been defended by bridging rather than bonding rhetoric.

Their discursive strategies – including the ways the two Governors used their political ideologies in order to legitimise their policies – provide some valuable lessons for other Governors and politicians, particularly Republicans, who may wish to implement similar policies in their own states, or even quietly at the Federal level. Governor Schwarzenegger’s use of his ideology in order to connect with audiences across partisan gaps, and by ensuring that people can continue with their (occasionally extravagant) lifestyles, while still contributing to environmental protection and preservation ensures people who previously felt powerless or at fault can now be a part of the solution (they can have their cake and eat it too!). Governor Perry’s manner of singling out his audience by dividing them into those who share his values and those who do not, and by placing local values, including for example those that revere Texan identity and way of life – “livin’ large in Texas forever” – has been instrumental in justifying his renewable energy policies. Moreover, Governor Perry has cleverly employed a way of addressing climate change while maintaining a distance from the issue – by simply never discussing climate change or linking it to any of his energy policies or environmental protection projects – and has thus come up with a way of dealing
with the issue without losing face or reputation, considering the otherwise hostile way Republican politicians perceive climate change programs. The way both governors have articulated why they should take it upon themselves to lead the whole world, and why they should not back down from a fight, is not something to be ignored, but instead celebrated, and replicated wherever possible.
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Appendix A

List of all texts used in the case studies of this thesis

Texts of Governor Schwarzenegger


Schwarzenegger, A 2009b, Schwarzenegger: Cities Key to Fighting Climate Change, ForaTv, 19 March 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Eta_1cTWzSI>.


Texts of Governor Perry


Perry, R 2011, Gov. Perry: Texas Continues to Lead the Nation in Energy Production, Texas Governor's Office Official YouTube Channel, 3 March 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8NGU7t1KZk8&list=PL4BC8CEA8B175F5EA&index=3>.

Appendix B

Screenshot displaying an example of notes taken on a text produced by Governor Schwarzenegger in the note taking software, Evernote. To the left are the other notes within this particular “Notebook” (‘Case study: CALIFORNIA’), with each separate note documenting the discourse of various speeches. Above the note itself lie the data tags (‘speeches; arnold schwarzenegger’), used to catalogue various topics within my overall of notes. Within the note itself is a hyperlink (in blue) to the original source of the transcript, a reminder of when this particular speech was made (‘From 2010’), and then various quotes from the speech which demonstrate Schwarzenegger’s various master frames and storylines.
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