

DOI: 10.22363/2312-9220-2025-30-2-298-309

EDN: JGLRKM


UDC 821.111

Research article / Научная статья

Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*: A Plea for Changing Environmental Policy

Ravindra Neupane¹, Vasily V. Verkhoturov²

¹Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

²Kaliningrad State Technical University, Kaliningrad, Russian Federation
epedagogy@mail.ru

Abstract. Analyzes how Rachel Carson's 1962 book *Silent Spring* significantly influenced the Change in Environmental Policy. Historically, when academics talk about attempts to change environmental policy, they primarily focus on the contributions of natural and social scientists who assess the effects of pollution and other harmful factors on the environmental response to the increased use of pesticides in the 1960s, Carson produced her cross-disciplinary book, which combined environmental science and narrative. *Silent Spring* was able to influence and start changes in the laws governing chemical insect control and the outlawing of the synthetic pesticide DDT (dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane). By challenging the conventional wisdom that viewed man as the master and master of nature, Carson's book changed policy and inspired new research, demonstrating that the overuse of pesticides is both dangerous and immoral. Her book is considered a founding work of the contemporary environmental movement. The links between science, literature, and public participation that have the potential to increase public understanding of the significance of environmental literature as a tool for influencing environmental policy is the issue this paper has explored in the novel. Applying qualitative research design, this article critically examines and analyzes the environment from a cross-disciplinary approach, using *Silent Spring* as an exemplary case of a literary text that can affect environmental policy, both in the academic and, more crucially, in real life. Lawrence Buell's critical insights on the environmental realities that the text portrays serve as a theoretical perspective to analyze the novel.

Keywords: literature, novel, environment, interdisciplinary, environmental policy, climate change

Author's contribution. Development of the research idea, manuscript writing and editing – Ravindra Neupane; research data collection & analysis – Vasily V. Verkhoturov. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest. The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Article history: submitted January 10, 2025; revised February 20, 2025; accepted March 25, 2025.

© Neupane R., Verkhoturov V.V., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

For citation: Neupane, R., & Verkhoturov, V.V. (2025). Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*: A Plea for Changing Environmental Policy. *RUDN Journal of Studies in Literature and Journalism*, 30(2), 298–309. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9220-2024-30-2-298-309>

«Безмолвная весна» Рэйчел Карсон: призыв к изменению экологической политики

Равиндра Неупане¹, В.В. Верхотуров²✉

¹Университет Трибхувана, Киртипур, Катманду, Непал

²Калининградский государственный технический университет, Калининград, Россия
✉epedagogy@mail.ru

Аннотация. Рассматривается, каким образом книга Рэйчел Карсон «Безмолвная весна», опубликованная в 1962 г., оказала значительное влияние на изменение экоповестки. Традиционно, когда ученые обсуждают попытки реформирования экологической политики, основное внимание уделяется работам естествоиспытателей и социологов, оценивающих воздействие загрязнений и других негативных факторов на окружающую среду в результате увеличения использования пестицидов в 1960-е гг. Карсон представила междисциплинарную книгу, объединяющую экологическую науку и литературу. «Безмолвная весна» – катализатор изменений в законодательстве, регулирующем применение химических средств контроля над насекомыми. Книга способствовала установлению запрета использования синтетического пестицида ДДТ (дихлордифенилтрихлорэтана). Вызывая сомнения в общепринятой точке зрения, согласно которой человек является господином и властелином природы, работа Карсон изменила политику и стимулировала новые исследования, демонстрируя, что чрезмерное использование пестицидов не только опасно, но и аморально. Ее книга признана фундаментальной работой современного экологического движения. Связи между наукой, литературой и общественной активностью, обладающие потенциалом для повышения общественного осознания роли экологической литературы как средства воздействия на экологическую политику, составляют тему данной работы. Используя исследовательский подход, статья критически изучает и анализирует окружающую среду с междисциплинарной точки зрения, рассматривает «Безмолвную весну» как образец литературного текста, способного влиять на экологическую политику как в академическом сообществе, так и, что еще важнее, в реальной жизни. Критические идеи Лоуренса Бьюэлла об экологических реалиях служат теоретической основой для анализа романа.

Ключевые слова: литература, роман, окружающая среда, междисциплинарность, экологическая политика, изменение климата

Вклад авторов. Разработка идеи исследования, написание и редактирование рукописи – Равиндра Неупане; сбор и анализ исследовательских данных – В.В. Верхотуров. Все авторы прочли и одобрили окончательную версию рукописи.

Заявление о конфликте интересов. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи: поступила в редакцию 10 января 2025 г.; отрецензирована 20 февраля 2025 г.; принята к публикации 25 марта 2025 г.

Для цитирования: Neupane R., Verkhoturov V.V. Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*: A Plea for Changing Environmental Policy // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Литературоведение. Журналистика. 2025. Т. 30. № 2. С. 298–309. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9220-2025-30-2-298-309>

Introduction

Carson Rachel, a pioneering environmental heroine who published *Silent Spring* in 1962, had little public discussion of environmental risks before her book appeared (Montefiore, 2001, p. 45; Wills-Toker, 2003, p. 293). But after *The New Yorker* published passages from the book and CBS Reports aired a 60-minute special on the author and her book, there was a lot of discussion among the general public and the businesses making money from the essentially unregulated production and use of pesticides. “The first publisher of *Silent Spring* reportedly said that Rachel Carson made concern about pesticides into literature” (Savory, 2024, p. 1). According to the 15 May 1963 report of the President’s Science Advisory Committee (PSAC), during a press conference, President John F. Kennedy talked about *Silent Spring* and mentioned “Miss Carson’s book”, which prompted the US Department of Agriculture and Public Health Service to look into its consequences. Nowadays, the scientific community and other quarters universally acknowledge *Silent Spring* as the driving force behind the eventual prohibition of DDT and the tighter controls imposed on pesticides.

The publication of Rachel Carson’s book *Silent Spring* sparked heated debate because the author questioned the safety of pesticides and raised questions about society’s moral responsibility to nature. Carson emphasized that the problem of pesticides cannot be viewed solely in terms of their effectiveness; she noted the need to consider the long-term consequences for ecosystems and human health, as well as the influence of corporate interests on public opinion. Thanks to her work, the public could actively engage in the discussion of these issues and form their scientific arguments. The open debates initiated by Carson played an important role in understanding the scale of the environmental threat and finding ways to overcome it (Murphy, 2018, p. 194).

The 1962 public was ready to launch into an environmental movement, and former Vice President Al Gore notes in his 1994 introduction to *Silent Spring* that Carson “gave a human face to an already dominant national concern”. In order to convey science’s message and the ensuing catalyst to the American people, *Silent Spring* used personification, a literary technique that endows inanimate objects with human characteristics and has the capacity to sentimentalize the issue. The title of *Silent Spring* itself evokes sadness and demands action, as Carson illustrates what may happen if pesticide use is allowed to continue unchecked. Lawrence Buell argues that when writers adhere too closely to an objective interpretation of nature, they lose the emotional impact of the scene. He speaks of the literary style of Realism, in which writers avoid sentimentalizing in favor of a more descriptive and observation-based “accurate representation of reality” (Buell, 2005,

p. 255). Buell further notes that the denseness of Realism can be both superficial and tiresome. Even though realism aims to act as a bridge, it can actually widen the gap between narrative consciousness and the world the text portrays (Buell, 2005, p. 40). Carson encourages the reader to see nature as an essential component of human development rather than just a collection of facts by adopting a more emotive or romantic perspective on it. “Each of us begins his individual life in a miniature ocean within his mother’s womb, and in the stages of his embryonic development repeats the stages by which his race evolved, from gill-breathing inhabitants of a water world to creatures able to live on land”, writes Carson, using her literary license, in her earlier (1951) book *The Sea Around Us* (Carson, 1962, p. 14). Here, Carson makes a connection between mankind and the ocean and the individual’s birth, evoking empathy in readers for the ocean and its essential relationships.

Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* was the catalyst for the formation of an environmental movement that, combined with growing concerns about climate change, grew into a powerful global phenomenon that continues today. While nature has created incredible biodiversity, humans have sought to simplify this complex landscape. Their actions have disrupted the natural regulatory mechanisms that ensure balance between species and prevent them from spreading out of control (Massey, 2021, p. 53).

This article takes a multifaceted approach to discussing Carson’s *Silent Spring*. First, the narrative style Carson utilizes and what others think she uses are examined. Carson’s experience and reputation made this new literary genre – which combined science, literature, and narrative to produce an informed readership – effective. Readers could act with a fresh understanding of the risks associated with chemicals and pesticides by following Carson’s lead. After learning about the science, they would be able to comprehend it thanks to the story. Carson hoped – and somewhat succeeded in – that political and public pressure would lead to the creation of additional laws, rules, and safeguards. Second, *Silent Spring*’s publication date sheds light on the necessity of this new genre and its applicability at the time. There were many opportunities throughout that time to elicit a variety of feelings, but Carson chose to give readers the facts instead, which brings us to the third portion. Carson had to make sure that her information was clear and accurate for readers who were not experts. She understood the impact of the big, strong businesses and companies that were manufacturing and distributing these lethal chemical contagions and how they would react if the public was informed of the truth. The article’s last sections concentrate on Carson’s use of emotive appeals and how they relate to the debate over climate change. In the final chapter, Carson proposed radiation as a cure, but this seemed out of character for her other works because she did so without knowing how it would turn out and by speculating on the hopes and anxieties of the readers. Ultimately, this essay concentrates on such optimism in light of current environmental and climate change ‘debate’ conditions and raises some important questions about the future applicability of well-written, thorough writings like Carson’s. In doing so, the conclusion highlights how advancement and potentially life-saving science and the concept of justice have been perverted.

Ultimately, it becomes evident that either the human race will start to make amends for the wrongs we have done to the earth, or we will keep trying in vain, haphazardly, and inadequately, which will eventually and gradually render the planet uninhabitable for life, especially human life. Well-researched and narratively driven books like Carson's provide a means of effectively communicating with the public to encourage significant action on climate catastrophe.

Results and Discussion

Carson opens *Silent Spring* with a worst-case scenario chapter titled *A Fable for Tomorrow*, rather than with scientific data. The reader is immersed in the legendary setting of “a town in the heart of America” in this entirely literary chapter, where the wildlife and plants have perished due to chemical pollution (Carson, 1962, p. 1). According to Carson, neither witchcraft nor hostile action had silenced the rebirth of new life in this struck world. People had carried it out on their own (Carson, 1962, p. 3). Instead of offering a dystopian vision of the future in this work, Carson gathers numerous examples of human-caused environmental horrors in one town. The last line of her introduction, which Carson suggests is ripping at the very “heart” of American civilization, is a demand for the reader to accept responsibility for humanity's devastation of the environment. Naturally, Carson embellishes this mythical town, but as she points out, “every one of these disasters has actually happened somewhere” (Carson, 1962, p. 3). She starts her book with this literary interpretation of scientific truth and then uses a similar literary technique to discuss the scientific results.

Rachel Carson pioneered a new genre of non-fiction with *Silent Spring*, which seamlessly blends environmental science with artistic techniques. Her work demonstrates the close relationship between literature, science, and social activism, contributing to a deeper understanding of the importance of environmental literature as a tool for raising awareness of climate issues. Carson sometimes uses apocalyptic overtones, but these moments do not dominate the main content of the book. This approach allows the reader to engage by connecting scientific data with current news of the time and presenting it in an accessible and engaging manner. The genre created by Carson combines elements of fiction and scientific analysis to interest a wide audience, rather than simply overloading them with complex research. Literary techniques help to engage readers, making the information more memorable. Carson's challenge was to convey complex scientific concepts to an untrained audience while keeping them interested, and she accomplished this task by presenting the facts in an engaging format (Meyer, 2021, p. 13).

Making the current societal value system clear and then pointing out its flaws is one of Carson's strategies for trying to shift the way people think about the environment. She states, “We have a singularly narrow attitude toward plants. We nurture a plant if we perceive any immediate utility in it” (Carson, 1962, p. 63). To illustrate how the ecosystem is all interconnected, Carson goes on to show how changing one component of it has an impact on the system as a whole. She disavows

man's role as an all-powerful, external controller and instead situates him within the environment. She continues, highlighting some "of the most tragic examples of our unthinking bludgeoning of the landscape", after writing that "the earth's vegetation is part of a web of life in which there are intimate and essential relations between plants and the earth, between plants and other plants, and between plants and animals" (Carson, 1962, p. 64). Carson demonstrates that by criticizing the environment, we are doing more harm to ourselves. While Carson's vocabulary is similarly oppressive throughout the novel, it effectively creates a somber shadow that inspires readers to take action and defend their surroundings because of the emotions ingrained in the language.

Rachel Carson's work reminds us of the importance of literature, its impact on society, and the way people perceive and interpret written material. Without *Silent Spring*, the climate crisis we face today could be even worse. We need to learn and apply these lessons before it's too late. Carson ends her book with an important message and warns that humans should not try to control nature from a position of arrogance, because nature does not exist for the convenience of humanity (Meyer, 2021, p. 13). One could refer to the genre that *Silent Spring* established as science nonfiction literature (Killingsworth, Palmer, 2000, p. 175). Her science nonfiction works adhere to the conventional conventions of science writing, including rational data reporting, while also including elements of fiction writing and storytelling. Indeed, some authors have drawn comparisons between Carson and the Romantics (Lytle, 2007, p. 134). She takes a different approach to understanding – albeit one that is not as utopian as other Romantics – through emotional appeal and awe-inspiring storytelling; however, she swiftly abandons this when the chapters go on to present a long list of studies regarding the use of poisons, pesticides, and dangerous chemicals. A closer look at Carson's writing reveals that, according to historian Carol B. Gartner, Carson combined science and literary art so seamlessly that the effect is seductive (Gartner, 2000, p. 103). The amount of actual data gathered from hundreds of sources (not unlike what the facts of climate science tell us) balances the seductive scale derived from the science and the fictional imprints. How Carson consistently "uses repeated themes, ideas, motifs, and images" that are mainstays in fiction writing (Carson, 1962, p. 104). Carson knew the mechanics of presenting a narrative and the "poetic technique" of fusing difficult subject matter with plausible scenarios. Carson had already made a name for herself as a best-selling novelist with her earlier works (Carson, 1962, p. 105). Given that she read literature at Pennsylvania College for Women and experienced a "struggle to decide whether or not to change her major from English to biology", she undoubtedly possessed storytelling skills (McCay, 1993, p. 5). She went with the latter, but she kept the effectiveness and efficiency of the former.

Additionally, Carson addresses the events of the era in her writing, as well as the increasing awareness of the chemicals that were – and still are – introduced into our communities but had received little research or understanding. *Silent Spring* was released at the perfect time, as seen by the waves of change it helped bring about, including a government investigation of pesticide use and her final public

speech at a meeting of President John F. Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee. Carson's early works and their corresponding popularity – most notably, *The Sea Around Us* – established her credentials in part. Her tenure at the Fish and Wildlife Service turned out to be a crucial asset for *Silent Spring* due to the knowledge and relationships she made there. She was inspired by the response to her writings while she was there, and she finally left to continue writing. Still, her name was known and her work was undoubtedly well known. The first two pages paint a vivid, emotional, even terrifying picture for readers, offering a reality they are unprepared for: their demise through frequently unseen, untouched, unheard, untasted, or even unsmelt bits of death magnified by repeated exposure. Carson does this by setting up the scenario of some “strange blight”, some “evil spell”, and presenting the “shadow of death” (Carson, 1962, p. 2). Through the use of logic and supporting details interwoven throughout the book, Carson builds her case. She includes nearly fifty pages of references, most of which are to research, interviews, and other collections of scientific knowledge that support her position.

Rarely do books change the course of history, but the publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962 was one of those exceptional works. It presaged a paradigm shift in the public's understanding of the impact of chemicals on the environment. In the decades that followed, the study of the effects of these chemicals on human health, as well as the introduction of technological and sanitary measures, had a significant positive impact on both populations and the environment. But the movement that Carson's work ignited ushered in a new era of mass tort litigation, set legal precedents for business liability, and forced society to rethink how it attributed liability for harm caused by a wide range of consumer products and services (Carlo, 2000, p. 55).

Carson authored a provocative book about the usage of herbicides and pesticides without holding back. Because the insects in *Silent Spring* just evolved and adapted before taking over, the book alarmed people into thinking that chemicals might be what ended humanity as we know it. Carson tried to drastically reduce the use of these poisons, even if she did not wish to do away with them entirely. “In this now universal contamination of the environment, chemicals are the sinister and little-recognized partners of radiation in changing the very nature of the world – the very nature of its life”, writes Rachel Carson in the first few chapters of her book *Silent Spring*. Think about what Carson is saying when you read this statement. Carson informs readers about the different chemicals that are added to our environments to “change the very nature” of those ecosystems (Carson, 1962, p. 6). She also combines these substances with radiation, which is a powerful move when readers take into account the risks associated with it, the Cold War, and the then-possible nuclear apocalypse. She makes it very evident to readers that radiation and chemicals are changing nature, and not in a way that is good for either it or us.

Unfazed, Carson keeps listing examples of how poisons have destroyed fish, birds, and other species. She goes on to describe incidents where chemical spraying or release caused people to become unwell or even die. Even more, she creates intricate settings; in the opening chapter, readers are drawn to a terrible, barren

terrain unfit for human habitation as “a strange stillness” permeates the surroundings (Carson, 1962, p. 2). Carson follows this direction of apocalyptic detail for more than 250 pages, citing hundreds of studies to bolster her story. She is relentless in her attempt to vilify chemicals by employing expressions that are common in the nuclear doomsday culture. But it appears that the last chapter is the most important and the one in which she stumbles. Carson’s error is not providing facts to back up her suggested fixes; instead, she depends only on hunches and supposition.

A concept of the environmental sublime is advanced that challenges hierarchical distinctions between the beautiful and the sublime, and between the domestic sphere and the ‘wild’ (Murphy, 2024, p. 15). Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* uses a combination of inductive and deductive approaches to explain the empirical results. Three models of coverage are considered: conflict theory, sensationalism, and issue framing. These models are used in chronological order because the analysis revealed a complex structure of insurance coverage that first emphasized and then downplayed risks (Gunter, 2005, p. 698). “A truly extraordinary variety of alternatives to the chemical control of insects” is how Carson begins her last chapter (Carson, 1962, p. 278). Some are “ideas in the minds of imaginative scientists”, while others have achieved “brilliant success” (Carson, 1962, p. 278). Carson gives the impression that scientific creativity will materialize out of nowhere to solve the issue. She also made a few strange recommendations. Carson was particularly interested in biological controls, according to Frank Graham Jr. (Graham, 1972, p. 22). He goes on to say that Carson aimed to “attack the pests by artificially introduced diseases, predators, and sterilizers” (Carson, 1962, p. 54). Stated differently, the artificial methods of control she has been cautioning readers against throughout her book is her big answer. This is undoubtedly Carson’s biggest error. Carson has been hitting readers over the head with how big of a mess we have made of ourselves by attempting to manage these presumed pests with chemicals – an artificial method of control – for over three hundred pages. She now claims that we can get reasonable success at control by combining “attractants and poisons”, or chemicals (Carson, 1962, p. 287).

However, it is elimination rather than control. She cites examples of such tactics being applied in her last chapter, where entire regions of specific insects have been eradicated. She does not, however, provide any research on the ecological effects of the extinction of any specific bug or other species that would have replaced it in the ecosystem. The use of chemical pesticides increased significantly after the Second World War, and by the late 1940s, environmental damage was visible. Pressure from the public and British scientists led, among other things, to the creation of the Natural Environment Research Council in 1965 (Gay, 2012, p. 90).

Carson advises using ultrasonic radiation to eliminate mosquito larvae but cautions that this method also kills other aquatic organisms (Carson, 1962, p. 288). Echoing the same worries, she raised before, time and time again, an elimination technique will harm non-targeted life in addition to its intended target. Astute readers will wonder what will replace the hole that humans have made in the environment, and Carson doesn’t offer a solution. Carson says that “introducing

parasites and predators” might be a more sensible course of action if that is still insufficient. She uses the possibility of bringing the forest red ant, a species not native to the continent, to North America as an example (Carson, 1962, p. 293). Carson omits *Formica rufa*, which I discovered after conducting a brief inquiry into the aforementioned forest red ant. However, she does use research from Germany, the natural home of *Formica rufa*, in her text. I take it that Carson is referring to this ant in her text. Again, she goes into great detail to describe how “a youth corps from the local school, children 10 to 14 years old” might take care of these ant colonies and how cheap, affordable, and straightforward this solution is (Carson, 1962, p. 294). Once more, she offers no proof of the long-term consequences of these introductions or their impact on other life in these regions. More invasive, more parasitic, and more destructive life forms may put these ecosystems in grave danger if they were allowed to proliferate. For instance, two invasive species that decimate local fish and trees are Asian carp and white poplar. Because they have no natural counterparts, they proliferate and drive out the native species in the process. Put differently, Carson offered a solution devoid of the unparalleled skill that she employed so well in so much of her story.

But there’s something much more unsettling about this: radio-sterilizing insects. At first, Carson seems hesitant to use the term radiation, so she chooses the more benign phrase “X-ray” (Carson, 1962, p. 279). But even before Carson’s book came out, E.B. White stated that radiation is always dangerous, shortens life, accumulates over time, nobody keeps track of how much radiation a person receives from radiation treatments or X-rays, and impacts both the recipient and his heirs (Carson, 1962, p. 331). Carson, despite her thorough research, concentrates on studies and trials that have sterilized large numbers of specific insect species, most notably the tsetse fly and the screw-worm fly. The word “radiation” is used by her for the first time, after nearly three full pages of extolling the wonders of radiation sterilization (Carson, 1962, p. 282). That is after she explains the advantages of such measures and her presentation of their practical use.

To be clear, she started with apocalyptic, nuclear holocaust-type scenarios and used them throughout her writing. Radiation was one of her remedies. In contrast to other poorly thought-out choices previously detailed in her work, this option, according to her own words, had not been well examined. Her suggested remedy seems as reckless as throwing poisons in the path of any insect that might cause trouble. The question therefore becomes, how is the use of such reckless measures made possible by humans any different from those of the chemical sprays she is opposing? Most people are unable to account for the infinite number of variables that exist, such as the introduction of a disease or predator into a biosphere where the natural defenses have been eliminated. Then, what occurs? According to Mollie K. Murphy, Carson argued that it warranted policy change, rather than arguing that an unresolved, ongoing debate justified postponing policy. She promoted precautionary policies by taking advantage of the unresolved nature of the argument (Murphy, 2019, p. 202). “The ‘control of nature’ is a phrase conceived in arrogance, born in the Neanderthal age of biology and philosophy, when it was supposed that

nature exists for the convenience of man”, writes Rachel Carson near the end of *Silent Spring*. It is now without doubt that the opposite is true. Science writer Rachel Carson uses a variety of narrative strategies to describe natural phenomena and explain scientific concepts. This book makes excellent use of metaphors and points of view, the creation of narrative characters, emotional appeals, and appeals to the imagination (Bryson, 2003, p. 387).

Unfortunately, Carson’s viewpoint is tainted by radiation and tampering since, as she makes clear throughout her work, we should learn from our mistakes and not repeat them. However, Carson abandons this idea in her last chapter. However, the criticism of Carson’s radiation remedy needs to be viewed from the perspective of her entire life. A few years before *Silent Spring* was released, in 1960, Carson learned she had breast cancer while taking care of her ailing mother, who passed away that year and immersed in an intricate and meticulous reading of scientific journals. She began receiving radiation treatments, which could support her incorrect application of radiation therapy. Yes, it seems like it was her way of just managing to survive. It is also possible that Carson was under pressure to finish the piece and provide some solutions, whether they were excellent, awful, or neutral, from either her editor or herself. Taking this into consideration, one may question what Carson might have invented to deal with the incursion of nature, the chemicals, or radiation if her health had been a little better. It is only possible to speculate. In any case, we can take note of this realization while we keep talking about climate change and concentrate on the positive aspects of the genre.

Conclusion

Literature plays a key role in shaping cultural heritage, allowing future generations to understand the particularities of our perception of the world at a certain historical period. Texts have the power to change people’s worldviews, and Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* is a striking example of this. In it, Carson created a new literary genre that combines science, fiction, and public participation, forming a conscious attitude towards environmental issues in readers. With the advent of the environmental movement, Carson upended economic systems built on the exploitation of all things in the name of profit maximization. However, after finishing *Silent Spring*, readers are faced with the difficult task of choosing what to do next. We may apply the lessons she taught in her text and her reply to its response to the issue of climate change. She began by reporting the evidence as conclusive in scientific research and providing readers with an explanation. Second, by referencing the study findings again, Carson allayed critics. Thirdly, she pointed out that everyone may contribute to the solution, regardless of prior roles. Last but not least, and perhaps most significantly, she prioritized proactive over reactive policy reforms.

For Carson, the task was to persuade others of the evidence and its conclusions. To accomplish this, she crafted the narrative found in *Silent Spring* and integrated the data that enabled readers to make the necessary connections and draw their conclusions. We are able to follow suit. Even though science has reached a consensus,

there would still be no justification for inaction or for loosening environmental laws. It is evident from using Carson as an example that adopting a proactive and preventive strategy can only result in favorable consequences. In fact, this strategy addresses the worsening situation, which is becoming more glaringly and painfully evident every year. The significance of literature, its impact, its influence, and the ways in which people might interact with it are all brought home by Carson's work. The current climate problem could have been far worse if not for *Silent Spring*. Before it's too late, we must absorb and put into practice its lessons. Carson poses a rhetorical question at the end of a chapter in her hybrid text, "When will the public become sufficiently aware of the facts to demand such action?" in an attempt to further prod the reader to consider the nature of society's interaction with its surroundings. However, *Silent Spring* provides an answer to this query in and of itself. The book's reception by the general population demonstrates that concerns can be brought to society's attention in an approachable and emotionally charged manner. Carson achieved this by using information from scientific research and crafting an engrossing story about the environment. Just eighteen months after the release of *Silent Spring*, Rachel Carson passed away from breast cancer, but she had already significantly altered public perception of the environment. Her work continues to have an impact on environmental policies as well as societal perspectives. Rachel Carson demonstrates via the widespread influence of her book that motivating people to take action frequently calls for more than one rigorous strategy.

References

- Bryson, M.A. (2003). Nature, Narrative, and the Scientist-Writer: Rachel Carson's and Loren Eiseley's Critique of Science. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 12(4), 369–387. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1204_2
- Buell, L. (2005). *The Future of Environmental Criticism*. Blackwell.
- Carlo, G.L. (2000). Radio waves, wireless signals, and public health: Is this the next silent spring? *Environmental Claims Journal*, 12(4), 55–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10406020009355139>
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring*. Houghton.
- Gartner, C.B. (2000). When Science Writing Becomes Literary Art: The Success of *Silent Spring*. In C. Waddell (Ed.), *And No Birds Sing: Rhetorical Analysis of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring* (pp. 103–225). Southern Illinois UP.
- Gay, H. (2012). Before and After Silent Spring: From Chemical Pesticides to Biological Control and Integrated Pest Management – Britain, 1945–1980. *Ambix*, 59(2), 88–108. <https://doi.org/10.1179/174582312X13345259995930>
- Gore, A. (1962). *Introduction. Silent Spring. By Rachel Carson*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Graham, F.Jr. (1970). *Since Silent Spring*. Houghton.
- Gunter, V.J. (2005). News Media and Technological Risks: The Case of Pesticides after Silent Spring. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 46(4), 671–698. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2005.00031.x>
- Killingsworth, J.M., & Jacqueline, P.S. (2000). *Silent Spring* and Science Fiction: An Essay in the History and Rhetoric of Narrative. In Craig Waddell (Ed.), *And No Birds Sing: Rhetorical Analyses of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring* (pp. 174–204). Southern Illinois UP.

- Lytle, M.H. (2007). *The Gentle Subversive: Rachel Carson, Silent Spring, and the Rise of the Environmental Movement*. Oxford UP.
- Massey, A. (2021). Editorial: Silent Spring: can we fix wicked problems? *Public Money & Management*, 42(2), 53–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2022.2003595>
- McCay, M.A. (1993). *Rachel Carson*. Twayne.
- Meyer, C.A. (2021). Taking Lessons from Silent Spring: Using Environmental Literature for Climate Change. *Literature*, 1(1), 2–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/literature1010002>
- Montefiore, J. (2001). ‘The fact that possesses my imagination’: Rachel Carson, Science and Writing. *Women: A Cultural Review*, 12(1), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09574040110034110>
- Murphy, M.K. (2018). Scientific argument without a scientific consensus: Rachel Carson’s rhetorical strategies in the Silent Spring debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 55(3), 194–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2018.1429065>
- Murphy, M.K. (2024). Sublime Wonder: Rachel Carson, Nature Writing, and Human-Nature Connection. *Western Journal of Communication*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2024.2366213>
- Papers of John F. Kennedy. (1963, May 15). Presidential Papers. President’s Office Files. Departments and Agencies. President’s Science Advisory Committee (PSAC): Pesticides report.
- Savory, E. (2024). Rachel Carson’s Strategies for Literary Science and Silent Spring. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 66(3), 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00139157.2024.2319633>
- Wills-Toker, C. (2003). The Environmental Rhetoric of Rachel Carson. *Review of Communication*, 3(3), 293–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0308407>

Bio notes:

Ravindra Neupane, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Ratna Rajyalaxmi Campus, Kirtipur, Kathmandu, 44613, Nepal. ORCID: 0009-0005-9180-9255.

Vasily V. Verkhoturov, Grand PhD in Pedagogy, Professor at the Department of Pedagogy, Kaliningrad State Technical University, 1 Sovetsky Prospekt, Kaliningrad, 236022, Russian Federation. ORCID: 0000-0003-2979-9867. E-mail: epedagogy@mail.ru

Сведения об авторах:

Неупане Равиндра, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры английского языка, Университет Трибхувана, Непал, 44613, Катманду, Киртипур, кампус Ратна Раджьялакшми. ORCID: 0009-0005-9180-9255.

Верхотуров Василий Владимирович, доктор педагогических наук, профессор кафедры педагогики, Калининградский государственный технический университет, Российская Федерация, 236022, Калининград, Советский проспект, д. 1. ORCID: 0000-0003-2979-9867. E-mail: epedagogy@mail.ru