

SCHOLARS: Journal of Arts & Humanities

Print ISSN: 2773-7829; e-ISSN: 2773-7837

eJournal Site: www.cdetu.edu.np/ejournal/

- Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Journal
- Indexed in NepJOL; Star-Ranked in JPPS
- Permanently Archived in Portico



Central Department of English
Tribhuvan University
Kirtipur, Nepal

URL: www.cdetu.edu.np

Research Article/ DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/sjah.v6i2.68743>

The Neoliberal Rhetoric of Environmental Justice in Mike Davis' *Planet of Slums* and Arundhati Roy's *Capitalism: A Ghost Story*

Madhav Prasad Dahal, PhD 

Pulchowk Campus, Tribhuvan University Institute of Engineering, Lalitpur, Nepal

Article History: Submitted 04 Apr. 2024; Reviewed 09 Jun. 2024; Revised 12 Jul. 2024

Corresponding Author: Madhav Prasad Dahal, Email: mpdahal076@gmail.com

Copyright 2024 © The Author(s). The publisher may reuse published articles with prior permission of the concerned author(s). The work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). www.cdetu.edu.np



Abstract

This paper explores the practical implications of the rhetorical strategies used by the advocates of neoliberal market economy to find out if global capitalism can deliver environmental justice. Using the “environmental justice discourse” within the Ecocritical perspective, the paper analyzes the two representative texts: *Planet of Slums* (2005) by Mike Davis and *Capitalism: A Ghost Story* (2014) by Arundhati Roy. The exponents of neoliberalism take the market competition as an umpire of economic growth and regard government regulations as its impediment. They argue that the private sector is the most reliable entity that ensures scientific management, conservation, and environmental justice by making a prudent use of natural resources. However, Davis’ and Roy’s texts disclose that the corporate houses under the neoliberal policy of market expansion are misleading people by claiming to ensure environmental justice. This study examines and dissects the conflict between market advocates and environmental justice activist, with a specific focus on neoliberal rhetoric. The paper argues that, rather than ensuring social and environmental justice, the neoliberal economic system facilitates the accumulation of wealth and resources in the hands of a few corporations and their owners, paving the way for further exploitation of natural resources and cheap labor. By introducing a fresh interpretive tool within academia, it contributes to scholarly pursuits.

Keywords: Ecocriticism, environmental justice, neoliberalism, neoliberal rhetoric

Introduction

This paper investigates the rhetorical appeals used in advocating neoliberal market policies to assess whether the global neoliberal economy and environmental justice can remain synchronous to each other. It analyzes the two representative texts: *Planet of Slums* (2005) by Mike Davis, and *Capitalism: A Ghost Story* (2014) by

Arundhati Roy by using an environmental justice lens within the field of ecocriticism. The environmental justice discourse addresses the unequal distribution of environmental benefits and hazards across population groups regardless of their socioeconomic status and ethnicity (Buell et.al 419). It advocates for environmental, political, and social equity. This study unfolds that the advocates of neoliberal market economy exploit 'logos', a rhetoric that makes an appeal to our reason, to claim their rationalities for environmental justice. For Jen Schneider, "neoliberalism exploits five rhetorical strategies to advance its interest in the clash between the pressures of profit and environmental protection: industrial apocalypticism, corporate ventriloquism, technological shell game, hypocrite's trap, and energy utopia" (3-4). This paper analyses how the market economy uses the above-mentioned five strategies to justify market rationality by examining how neoliberal rationality is put into action and spread through various frameworks and approaches that influence the social sphere and its everyday behavior. In doing so, it uses the critical insights envisioned by Jane Schneider, Steve Schwarze, Peter K. Bsumek, Jennifer Peeples, and Rob Nixon as theoretical parameters. These critical thinkers, by raising their voice against inequality and marginalization, advocate for political, social, and environmental justice. Using their insights, the researcher argues that Davis' and Roy's texts bring to light how these two writers unmask neoliberal agenda that essentially promotes extending profits. It also claims that Davis and Roy, by resisting neoliberal market advocacy, fight to establish environmental and social justice.

Mike Davis' *Planet of Slums* and Arundhati Roy's *Capitalism: A Ghost Story* unfold the horrors of neoliberal economic system. Based on a close examination and analysis of these texts, the study claims that these texts are commentaries upon the way the neoliberal economic system facilitates the accumulation of wealth and resources in the hands of a few corporations and their owners, paving the way for further exploitation of natural resources and cheap labor. Davis' text brings to light that the slums are always suffering from the problems of poor facilities. Roy's text gives an insight into how the neoliberal economic system, by manipulating deceptive rhetoric, pushes poor working-class people to starve. In this context, this study aims to find out different rhetorical strategies used by the advocates of global neoliberal market economy to claim their rationalities. It focuses on why they use such rhetoric over many others. It also analyzes how they mislead people by using those rhetoric, and how this deception is reflected in Davis' *Planet of Slums*, and Roy's *Capitalism: A Ghost Story*.

Review of Literature

There are various critical responses on the primary texts selected for the present study. *Planet of Slums* by Davis has received quite a number of critics' attention. In response to the report that Davis presents about a huge urban population living in slums, Tom Angotti claims, "Davis's dualistic analysis oversimplifies the complex process of urbanization" (962). Angotti's point is that Davis' categorization of 'urban' and 'rural', supports the anti-urban bias and the conservative political agendas. He further argues that "anti-urban discourses often accompany liberal and neoliberal condemnation of poverty" (962). Angotti does not see urban settlement as a problem; he asserts that the cities make it easier for grassroots-level movements to organize opposition to oppression in all its forms. He claims, "Democratic institutions can evolve and mature in the public places of cities and the cities can potentially create wider ranges of services and a more diverse cultural life than a ruralized world" (966). He understands urbanization in a positive light.

Richard Grant blames that David's entire text lacks first-hand observations. He asserts, "Davis has not yet set foot inside a slum" (217). As a result, slum dwellers are depicted as individuals without agencies, and their voices are seldom heard. For Grant, or any other, first-hand information can be obtained only when we step inside an issue or place. Lisa Brawley states, "*Planet of Slums* depicts a darkly dystopic picture of a planet brutally divided into warring zones: securitized enclave for the few, and sprawling, impoverished zones of disease and despair for the many" (157). Brawley finds Davis has an apocalyptic vision of the cities if the number of impoverished dwellers goes soaring.

Sean Sweeney regards Davis' overall analysis is important for today's labor movement. He remarks, "Davis details how neoliberal policies have transcended housing and property markets in ways that have enriched some at the expense of the many" (99). Sweeney expresses pain to remark that neoliberal policies of housing have forced multitude of people to sacrifice for the benefit of a handful of developers. William Lever finds *Planet of Slums* as severely critical of the various attempts to improve the millions of slum-dwellers in the Third World. As he outlines one possible solution after another, each is deemed to be fundamentally flawed at best or a regressive failure at worst (227). For Lever, Davis' solution to improve the position of slum is not practicable. In addition, slumdom is the result of First World's selfishness linked to economic adjustment policies, globalization, capitalism, and colonial legacies.

Another primary text *Capitalism: A Ghost Story* by Roy has also attracted many critics and scholars who have interpreted it from different lenses. Louise Rawlings remarks that Roy makes a significant headway in examining Indian society nearly a quarter of a century after India's first major wave of economic liberalization though she is not a trained economist by chronicling rich accounts of the allocation of resources within Indian society and relationships between individuals and the state (322). Rawlings also asserts that Roy gets behind the data in the Indian context to understand the societal, psychological, and cultural impacts of these unequal distributions.

Ranjan Ghosh finds that Roy speaks against the repression of her voice, the active repression of the social movements striving to challenge privatization and expropriation (137). Ghosh confirms that the principal intent of the corporate sectors is to let financially stronger groups expand further disempowering the marginalized class of people. Though the advocates of neoliberal principles make high claims of human rights and democracy, Ghosh regards that their intrinsic intent is in the direction of establishing a plutocracy. Gary Stanley Becker and Guity Nashat Becker admit that capitalism with free markets is the most effective system yet devised for raising both economic well-being and political freedom (23). They credit capitalism for the wonders brought about by the capitalist economic political system and believe life in the twenty-first century has certainly ascended the ladder of success.

Jurgen Kocka condemns those who speak in favor of capitalism using public forums. He finds that their arguments are enticing. They demonstrate capitalism as glorious economic system, having a history of ensuring progress. Nevertheless, he notices so many critical, skeptical and pessimistic arguments, connotations, and overtones against capitalism (84). Some welfare programs run by profit earners by investing a tiny amount of profit are essentially business promotional tools.

All these critical opinions of different critics focus on slums, their origin, their impact on socio-political life, and the role of neoliberal market economy in development. However, the exploration of how proponents of neoliberalism manipulate people through different rhetorical strategies is yet to be explored. This study concentrates on this gap.

Research Methods

This study has used the “environmental justice” perspective under ecocriticism as the theoretical parameter. It is a minority community movement that emerged in the US in response to environmental and social inequalities, threats to public health, unequal protection, differential enforcement, and disparate treatment received by poor and less privileged people (Bullard 445). It originated as a social movement aiming to fight against discriminatory public policy. It advocates for procedural, geographical, and social equity. The theoretical parameters of this study have been developed from Jane Schneider’s, Steve Schwarze’s, Peter K. Bsumek’s, and Jennifer Peeples’s ideas on “Coal Industry rhetoric.” It applies the parameters of qualitative research design. This approach falls under the paradigm of hermeneutic research. It uses the texts under scrutiny as primary data, and the scholarly articles related to the issue raised are taken as secondary sources.

The study is limited to the study and analysis of manipulative rhetoric used by the advocates of neoliberalism. These rhetorical strategies, for Dorceta Taylor, are “the pragmatic and constitutive means for influencing audience in specific situations” (12). John Lyne regards them as the counterpart of ideology (37) applied to think differently from what ideology proclaims. Debra Hawhee assumes that they started alongside democracy in ancient Athens where people gathered to debate about public issues such as the subjects that students should study in schools, the merits of Sophocle’s latest play, or whether or not to go to war (161). Later, it became so diverse that people began to use it to have positive effect of what they delivered. This study examines and analyzes the deceptive rhetoric used by the neoliberal economy.

Results and Discussion

There are several rhetorical strategies that the supporters of neoliberalism exploit to buttress their market rationalities and avoid environmental responsibilities. The white elitists exploit the ‘logos’- an appeal to logic, rather than ‘ethos’ and ‘pathos’ to claim their rationalities and responsibilities for environmental justice (Schneider et al. 3). These strategies narrate compelling stories mentioning the corporate industries as the epitome of progress and prosperity. Those who advocate market solutions – “the market environmentalists” – believe that improved efficiency, fostering technological innovation, promoting free trade and implementing effective pricing mechanisms can address environmental problems (Bell 2). They argue that the scientific prices set in the market reduce natural destruction. They stress the need for competitive and innovative profit-making market opportunities. The neoliberal ideology emphasizes on economic growth and technological development as well as limited environmental regulation and governmental intervention by ultimately delegitimizing resistance efforts. It presents neoliberalism as a rationale to stabilize precarious markets (Picciotto 228) and presents it as the ultimate solution of all environmental, social or economic problems. Davis’ *Planet of Slums* and Roy’s *Capitalism: A Ghost Story* are perfect examples of how market forces manipulate rhetorical strategies like “industrial apocalypticism,” “corporate ventriloquism,” “technological shell game,” “hypocrite’s trap,” and “energy utopia” for an unhindered control of natural resources and cheap labor. As these rhetorical strategies make an appeal to people’s reason to claim environmental, social and political rationalities, they fall under ‘logos’.

In *Planet of Slums*, Davis sketches a dark picture of how metropolitan cities with a population of more than a million. He explains that in 1950 the number of metropolitan cities was only 86; this number soared to 550 in 2015 (1). He points out that the most celebrated phenomenon is the burgeoning of new megacities with population in excess of

8 million, even more spectacularly, hyper-cities with more than 20 million inhabitants (5). For him, such increase in the number of metropolitan cities is strategic. He asserts that there are numbers of reasons behind the soaring number of cities with dense population. He remarks, “This is the result of conscious planning” (7) backed up by the corporate sector.

The corporate sector sets different kinds of rhetoric in the name of addressing people’s poverty, injustice, and lack of access to power or prosperity. One such rhetoric, according to Jen Schneider, is “energy utopia, a set of rhetorical appeals that position a particular energy source as the key to providing a ‘good life’ that transcends the conflicts of environment, justice, and politics” (4). She narrates an event in which Peabody Energy – an institution, launched a major public campaign in 2014 under the name of American Energy for Life (AEFL). The campaign published a full-page color advertisement featuring photos of children and women from various nationalities. The statistics showed billions of people who lack access to energy (135). But the intention of such portrayal was to claim that corporate sector can help people end their poverty, and support them gain access to energy. Schneider urges that this is just a manipulation of “energy utopia” rhetoric that appeals people from the village to migrate to cities with the hope that they would get rid of their poverty there. The cities thus lure people as the centers that can support new dreamers to make their lives better. But as these migrants cannot adjust themselves with the soaring expenses of the cities, they are ultimately forced to live in the unhygienic and poorly built settlements known as ‘slums’. Davis finds that the politicians, legislators and police officers turn docile in front of corporate sectors that easily influence the administrative bodies of the government by bribes (38). This facilitates the real estate business groups to develop the city in any way they plan. Thus, the neoliberal rhetoric becomes the cause of the growth of slums.

There are also other reasons for the increase of slums. Karachi land invasion and pirate subdivisions increased during the election years (Davis 56). Likewise, the forced urbanization has taken place due to American military strategy. Samuel Huntington explains that the American terror bombing on Vietnam produced massive migration from the countryside to the city (50-53). The Maoist violent revolution that started in Nepal in 1996 forced people from the countryside to migrate to cities for security reason. Davis points out that as the industrialists and foreign investors need cheap labor as well as the opportunities to play a foul game on worker’s demands for cheap housing (59), they conspire by causing insecurity in the rural areas and force people to migrate to cities. They use “corporate ventriloquism,” a rhetorical process by which they transmit messages through other entities, usually of their own making, in order to advance their interests (Schneider 3). Slum population has always been deceived by metropolitan housing projects, too. Neelima Risbud describes that, in Delhi, the Development Agency distributed one half million plots, but most were grabbed by the well-to-do. Her research reveals that only 110,000 homes were built for the poor in the city that was evicting 450,000 illegal slum dwellers (qtd. in Davis 66). This depicts that the houses made for the poor were not enough and rather than solving their problem, the state wanted to displace the poor. This is not only the case in India but the overall trend in many parts of the world's metropolitan cities.

Davis claims that the rise of urbanization is under the policies of agricultural deregulation and financial discipline imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank that continued to generate an exodus of surplus rural labor to urban slums even when the cities ceased to be the job machines (15). He regards the IMF and the World Bank as the major culprits for dismantling the rural harmony. Debora

Bryceson also charges the blame for weakening peasants and rural agricultural model to the Structural Adjustment Program (SAPs) and the IMF:

One by one, national governments, gripped in debt, became subject to structural adjustment program (SAPs) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) conditionality. Subsidized, improved agricultural input packages and rural infrastructural building were drastically reduced. As the peasant “modernization” effort in Latin America and African nations was abandoned, peasant farmers were subjected to the international financial institutions’ “sink or swim” strategy. National market deregulations pushed agricultural producers into global commodity markets where middle as well as poor peasants found it hard to compete. SAPs and economic liberalization policies represented the convergence of the worldwide forces of de- agrarianization and national policies promoting de- peasantization. (qtd. in Davis 15)

Bryceson’s claim is that the economic liberalization policy converted the producers of agricultural goods into mere consumers. The de-agrarianization and de-peasantization rhetoric exploited by the SAPs and the IMF collapsed the agricultural society and influenced the peasants to dream for cities for their survival.

Ordinary people of lower economic background never have any access to valuable urban land. William A. Doebele describes that the urban land of any significant value is normally controlled by existing propertied class of people, who will reap the profits of its increasing value due to city growth (531). Ayse Yonder finds that such settlers pay local strong men for the right to occupy even public land (qtd. in Davis 42). These new settlements show how even the public property is in the control of a gang that are the agents of corporate industry as well as the government agency. Such groups of strong men certainly work in favor of profit rather than social welfare. The World Bank and the NGOs argue that they are upgrading the slums, but they leave a vast majority of poor behind. Davis confirms that the syrupy official assurances about “enablement” and “good governance” sidestep core issues of global inequality and debt, and ultimately they are just language games (79) to advocate market rationality. The profit-oriented sector uses “corporate ventriloquism” rhetoric by making IMF and the World Bank work on its favor. These arguments establish that neoliberalism is responsible for the extensions of the slums keeping the dwellers of such settlements always vulnerable and at a risk of catching pandemic diseases and spreading them to the entire world.

In spite of the fact that a number of programs have been launched to settle the problems of the slum residents, this is just the manipulations of “technological shell game,” a rhetorical process of misdirection that relies on strategic ambiguity about the feasibility, costs, and successful implementation of technologies in order to deflect attention from environmental pollution and health concerns (Schneider et al. 4). The slum population has always been the victim of natural disasters. Rob Nixon states that neoliberal ideology turns answerability into the bewildering maze to sustain an evasive geopolitics of deferral in matters of environmental disasters, injury, remediation, and redress (46). It turns deaf towards problems related to fatal diseases and natural disasters. The slum dwellers suffer from “technological shell games” of corporate sector during natural disasters and threats.

In *Planet of Slums*, Davis illustrates how different management programs such as traffic, drinking water, health, and sanitation, have turned into industries. He describes, “Bicycle commuters are now heavily penalized by new license fee, restriction on using arterial roads and the bicycle subsidies given formerly are cut off now” (132). Likewise, “drinking water management has turned into plastic water bottle business” (145-46). Additionally, health care program has turned into kidney trade (190).

Sanitation rules for pay toilets, voicing women's gender equity and health right for making them silent to medical companies, traffic safety rules that force to buy family cars are all manipulations of technological shell game. With the help of these evidences, it can be said that the neoliberal market economy has betrayed the poor by manipulating the rhetoric of 'development,' 'change,' and 'progress.'

Roy's *Capitalism: A Ghost Story* deals with how millions of poor farmers and labors have been the subject to inequality and exploitation due to mega corporations that plunder natural resources. It explores the environmental horror caused by the ruthless power of crony capitalism. There are many instances in Roy's text about how the advocates of neoliberalism exploit different rhetoric to justify their social, economic, and environmental responsibilities. Roy starts with how under the neoliberal strategy, the people living in the village are influenced to migrate to the cities with enticing 'logos' and technological slogans. Jen Schneider, in this context, adds that neoliberalism always tempts people with the technological innovations, that they claim, can address public's fears of environmental degradation and public health risks (97). Roy mentions that the Minister of the Indian government himself advises public to "leave village and move to the cities" (1). She argues that encouraging people to migrate to the city, is not for a fair intention. It is for making a good business opportunity. It is "technological shell game" played by the state. As Faith Karesh states that there is a lot of money in poverty (183), it is what is happening in the case of inspiring poor people to shift to cities. The state itself is taking advantage of people's poverty.

Being easily convinced by the manipulation of "technological shell game," poor people manage money to buy expensive land in the cities, but about a quarter of their total budget is taken away by the mediators who go on becoming robust by such money. The poor village people are forced to contact these land agents for their settlements in the urban areas as Gwen Ottinger states neoliberalism channels the public's desire for social change through approaches such as corporate social responsibility (qtd. in Roy 125). Roy adds that soon after the village people migrate to the cities, they are treated as the evils. A judge in Bombay called the slum dwellers pickpockets of the urban land (Roy 1). It is not only the judge who blamed slum dwellers as pickpockets, the Minister who had encouraged people to leave villages for cities also began to say "the migrants to the cities were mostly criminals and carried a kind of behavior which is unacceptable to modern cities" (Roy 2). The Minister also threatened to recruit more policemen and police vehicle on the road to improve law and order. The slum settlements of the cities become the burdens later. They are interrupted by the metropolis time and again in different pretexts. Roy describes how the Commonwealth Games had impacted the Delhi slum dwellers:

In the drive to beautify Delhi for the Commonwealth Games, laws were passed that made the poor vanish, like laundry stain. Street vendors disappeared, rickshaw pullers lost their licenses, small shops and businesses were shut down. Beggars were rounded up, tried by mobile magistrates in mobile courts, and dropped outside the city limits. (2)

In these lines, Roy mentions about the celebration of the sixty second anniversary of India's Republic Day when the president took the salute at the reflection of street beggars who were the product of city slums and these slums were formed as per the design of corporate sector in collaboration with the government. By displacing the poor public from the core areas, globalized capitalism has thus subjugated billions of people all over the world. This is a good example of 'technological shell game' used by ruthless neoliberal capitalism.

Roy describes how black people's liberation movement led by Nelson Mandela was also influenced by the manipulation of capitalists' rhetoric. She remembers when Mandela took over as South Africa's first black President, he was applauded and praised. But later, the socialism he aspired for, was completely absent from South African National Congress's agenda. The reason why Mandela's revolution was also supported, applauded and praised by media. Thus, Mandela could not implement the land reform and there was no nationalization of African mines. Instead there was privatization and structural adjustment (Roy 39-40). Even Mandela, who fought for people's liberation and was in prison for 27 years was also invisibly influenced by the power of neoliberalism.

Roy blames Anna Hazare, a political activist who led an anti-corruption movement in India around 2010. She regards him a terrorist since both the Maoists and Anna's Lok Pal Bill have one thing in common – that is, they both want the overthrow of Indian State. She writes, "The Maoists want to do so from bottom up and Anna from top down by means of a bloodless coup" (49). Roy charges Anna for his intrinsic desire to establish a new oligarchy. She blames that Anna speaks nothing against debt ridden farmers' suicide in his neighborhood, farmers' agitation against the Special Economic Zones (SEZs). He does not seem to have his view about government's plan to deploy Indian Army to devastate the forest. For Roy, what he does is he supports development model of Gujarat's Chief Minister who oversaw 2002 pogrom against Muslim (53). Roy claims that Anna's compassion is funded by corporation.

The privatization of mass media is another example of how the corporate sector manipulates 'logos' through development agenda. Alan Wells remarks that since the media are invariably operated by a small group of people, they always have a stimulating potential (21). The commercial televisions are supposed to facilitate economic growth and development. But Alan Wells claims that they are not necessarily the promoter of economic growth (23). They influence the mass but together they are also influenced by corporate agencies. The private corporations have influenced the media, too. It is not surprising that the events that are run by the critics and intellectual also are funded by corporate agencies. Referring to an event at the Jaipur Literary Festival which was advertised as the "Greatest Literary Show on Earth," Roy describes:

Big corporate houses like the Tata Steel and Rio Tinto were among the chief sponsor of the event. Many of the world's best and brightest writers gathered in Jaipur to discuss love, literature, politics and Sufi poetry. Some defended Salman Rushdie's right to free speech. Every TV frame and newspaper photograph, the logo of Tata Steel loomed behind them, a benign, benevolent host. (18-19)

Intellectuals and critical thinkers are seen to be paralyzed by the kind host of corporate houses. Media houses focused on the rights to free speech for Rushdie. The news about the literary event sponsored by different industries got published as the major coverage, but not a sentence about the war in the forest.

Another key rhetoric that the private sector deploys to extend business and profits is "hypocrite's trap," a set of interrelated arguments that attempts to disarm critics of industries that provide particular goods or technologies, based on the critics' own consumption of or reliance on those goods (Schneider et al. 3) that is done through corporate philanthropy. This is a very powerful neoliberal rhetoric which makes people hesitate to speak against corporate houses. Corporate houses arrange training programs and provide different incentives for educational scholarships. Donald Fisher outlines in his essay "American Philanthropy and Social Sciences" how the US foundations have played roles in shaping political thought in academia globally. Fisher describes that corporate foundations play significant role in funding Social Sciences and Arts and student scholarship. These foundations often support fields such as development studies,

cultural studies, behavioral science, and human rights (qtd. in Roy 30). Roy finds that US universities have opened the gates to international students, including those from the Third World countries and individuals who cannot afford tuition fees. Today it is rare to find any families whose children have not studied in the United States. From there, good scholars, academics, finance ministers, economists, corporate lawyers, bankers, bureaucrats, and prime ministers have also been produced. These people later help open up the economy of their country to global corporations (30). The corporate sector has indeed colonized the society in the name of philanthropy. It provides aids on health, education, and multiple sectors for permanent imperialism.

Roy presents an example of how the corporations use “industrial apocalyptic,” a rhetorical appeal that suggests the impending demise of an industry leads to the collapse of society (Schneider et al. 3). According to Roy, we watch Tata Sky for watching television, Tata photon for internet browsing, Tata taxis for transportations, stay at Tata Hotels, sip our Tata tea in a Tata bone China, and stir it with spoons made of Tata steel. Additionally, we buy Tata books on Tata Bookstores (20). We are under the impression that the collapse of the Tata Industry would be equal to the collapse of our society.

The next rhetoric that neoliberalism deploys to extend privatization is that of economic reforms, human rights, justice, and world peace. All these fall under ‘logos’. The weapons manufacturers always pretend to be producing arms in the name of peace. Roy mentions that Raytheon and Lockheed Martin, the world’s leading weapon manufacturers turned their attention to India (43). She narrates further that their objectives seemed to build consensus in support of economic reforms in India, but they wanted to influence India hoping that it would spend at least a part of the \$32 billion annual defense budget on weapons, guided by missiles, aircraft, warships, and surveillance equipment made by them (43). Roy asks, “Do we need weapons to fight wars? Or do we need wars to create a market for weapons?” (43). They intend to sell weapons for business purposes in the name of economic reform, peace, human rights, and justice. The promise of the neoliberal market economy to bring economic reforms is an illusion. What it has with it is only strategic brilliance that deceives people this way or that.

Like economic reforms, justice, and world peace rhetoric, neoliberalism also deploys ‘award’ and ‘scholarship’ as rhetoric to convince people to free trade opportunities and expansion of capital. Jen Schneider has described how the American coal industry brings some celebrated people as its mouth- persons to accept and declare that they survive because of the Coal Industry. He writes:

In 2009, The West Virginia Coal Association launched a website under the name FACES (Federation for American Coal, Energy and Security) which featured photographs of Americans from all walks of life, including firefighters, doctors and nurses, teachers, artists and others, with captions noting that their jobs exist because of the income generated by coal mining. This “Faces of Coal” campaign attempted to humanize coal industry’s image and make the point that it is not just the coal miners who benefit from coal. (51)

The coal industry, in doing so, wanted to construct a web of relationship with community people by this corporate ventriloquism rhetoric in which corporate message is passed from other entities.

The massive environmental problems that we face today are related to economic problems. David Schweickart also claims that national and global unemployment, poverty, and political dominance by an immensely wealthy people is because of the loopholes of neoliberal economy that deforms democratic governance. He urges, “The dominant economic order of our time, namely global capitalism is the cause of all of

these problems” (6750). In their book *Natural Capitalism: Creating the Next Industrial Revolution*, Paul Hawken, Amory Lovins, and Hunter Lovins also agree that “the current model of capitalism is problematic” (5). They feel that we need a revolution against neoliberal economy. They see a tension between environmentalism and neoliberalism.

Conclusion

From a thorough textual analysis of the selected primary texts, this study finds that the advocates of neoliberal market economy use ‘logos’ like ‘development,’ ‘change,’ and ‘progress’ rhetoric to claim their rationalities for environmental justice. They apply five rhetorical strategies: “industrial apocalypticism,” “corporate ventriloquism,” “technological shell game,” “hypocrite’s trap,” and “energy utopia” to advance their interest in the clash between the pressures of profit and environmental protection. They use ‘logos’ over other rhetoric as these rhetorical strategies are apt tools for them to advance their rationalities. The chosen texts have helped bring out the tension between the environmental justice program and the advocacy of free market management by critiquing the neoliberal stratum. By unmasking the neoliberal deceptive rhetoric of development, change, progress, and justice, these texts have instigated the reign of capitalism in favor of environmental, social, and racial justice. They have set a ground to argue that neoliberalism and environmental justice are not synchronous to each other. Environmental or social justice can spring only in an environment where the states are devoted to the welfare of people and responsible for the preservation of nature and biodiversity. The neoliberal economic system that intends to earn profit through its services can deliver neither justice nor sustainable development. These facts establish that neoliberal promise of environmental justice is only illusory.

Acknowledgement

I acknowledge that this paper is based on my doctoral dissertation that I defended on March 15, 2024. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisors for their genuine guideline.

Works Cited

- Angotti, Tom. “Apocalyptic Anti-Urbanism: Mike Davis and His Planet of Slums.” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2006, pp. 961-67.
- Becker, Gary Stanley, and Guity Nashat Becker. *The Economics of Life: From Baseball to Affirmative Action to Immigration, How Real-World Issues Affect Our Everyday Life*. McGraw-HillEducation, 1997.
- Bell, Karen. “Can the Capitalist Economic System Deliver Environmental Justice?” *Environmental Research Letters*, vol. 10, no. 12, 2015, pp. 1-8, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/10/12/125017.
- Brawley, Lisa. “The Desire Called Dystopia.” *Criticism*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2008, pp. 153-59, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23130872>. Accessed 25 Apr. 2022.
- Buell, Lawrence, et al. “Literature and Environment.” *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2011, pp. 417-40.
- Bullard, Robert D, and Joe Richard Feagin. “Racism and the City.” *Urban Life in Transition*, edited by M. Gottdiener and C. Pickvance, Sage, 1991, pp. 55-76.
- Davis, Mike. *Planet of Slums*. Verso, 2005.
- Doebele, William A. “The Private Market and Low Income Urbanization: The ‘Pirate’ Subdivisions of Bogota.” *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, vol. 25, no. 3, 1977, pp. 531-64, <https://doi.org/10.2307/839692>. Accessed 17 May 2022.

- Ghosh, Ranjan, and Antonia Navarro-Tejero, editors. "How to Tell a Story to Change the World." *Globalizing Dissent: Essays on Arundhati Roy*. Routledge, 2009, pp. 118-42.
- Grant, Richard. "A Review of Planet of Slums." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 99, no.1, 2008, pp. 216-19.
- Hawhee, Debra. "Rhetorics, Bodies, and Everyday Life." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2006, pp. 155-64. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3886172>. Accessed 31 May 2023.
- Hawken, Paul, et al. *Natural Capitalism: Creating the Next Industrial Revolution*. Little Brown, 1999.
- Huntington, Samuel. "The Bases of Accommodation." *Fagian Affairs*, vol. 46, no. 4, 1968, pp. 650-53.
- Karesh, Faith R. "Practicing 'Enlightened Capitalism' 'Fil-Am' Heroes, NGO Activism, and the Reconstitution of Class Difference in the Philippines." *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints*, vol. 62, no. 2, 2014, pp. 175-204, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24672294>.
- Kocka, Jurgen. "Capitalism and Its Critics: A Long-Term View." *The Lifework of a Labor Historian: Essays in Honor of Marcel van der Linden*, edited by Ulbe Bosma and Karin Hofmeester, Brill, 2018, pp. 71-89.
- Lever, William. "Book Review of *Planet of Slums* by Mike Davis." *Sage Journal*, vol. 46, no. 8, 2007, pp. 1751-54.
- Lyne, John. "Bio-rhetorics: Moralizing the Life Sciences." *The Rhetorical Turn: Invention and Persuasion in the Conduct of Inquiry*, U of Chicago P, 1990, pp. 35-57.
- Nixon, Rob. *Slow Violence and Environmentalism of the Poor*. Harvard UP, 2011.
- Picciotto, Bryan. "Under Pressure: Coal Industry Rhetoric and Neoliberalism by Jen Schneider, Steve Schwarze, Peter K. Bsumek, and Jennifer Peeples." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 48, no.2, 2018, pp. 227-30.
- Rawlings, Louise. "Rana Dasgupta, *Capital: A Portrait of Twenty-First Century Delhi* and Arundhati Roy, *Capitalism: A Ghost Story*." *The Economic and Labor Relations Review*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2015, pp. 322-31.
- Roy, Arundhati. *Capitalism: A Ghost Story*. Haymarker Books, 2014.
- Schneider, Jen et al., editors. *Under Pressure: Coal Industry Rhetoric and Neoliberalization*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2016.
- Schweickart, David. "Is Sustainable Capitalism Possible?" *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 41, 2010, pp. 6739-52.
- Sweeney, Sean. "Neoliberalism: Planetary Slumlord." *New Labor Forum*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2006, pp. 97-101, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40342649>.
- Taylor, Dorceta. "The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm: Injustice Framing and the Social Construction of Environmental Discourses". *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 43, no. 4, 2000, pp. 508-80.
- Wells, Alan. "Mass Media Systems, Economic Development, and the Public Private Continuum." *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1976, pp. 21-30, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24489998>.