

The Tributaries of Radical Environmentalism

■ **Bron Taylor**, *University of Florida*

Radical environmentalism most commonly brings to mind the actions of those who break laws in dramatic displays of “direct action” in defense of nature. Such action—which may involve civil disobedience and sabotage—has led to charges that these activists are terrorists and fears that they may harbor or hope to develop weapons of mass death.¹ The focus on their tactics, real and imagined, often obscures their religious motivations as well as their ecological, political, and moral claims, which I have analyzed in a series of articles published since the early 1990s.² Here, after providing a primer on the beliefs and motivations that undergird radical environmental action, I examine the tributaries to such movements, primarily focusing on the period before they came into public view in 1980 after the formation of Earth First!³

Contrary to a declaration in the movement’s first official newsletter, Earth First! did not emerge fully formed like Athena from the head of Zeus, but it may have seemed so to many of those attracted to the movement, and later for those who studied such radical social movements in retrospect.⁴ My evaluation examines the many distinctive but related streams—religious, ecological, philosophical, and scientific—that have been channeled into the radical environmental movement, and underscores that the emergence of Earth First! and other radical environmental movements that followed drew deeply from many sources that had been present for decades or more.

A Primer on Radical Environmentalism

Radical environmentalists can be recognized easily by their diagnoses and prescriptions regarding the environmental crisis. Their diagnoses generally involve a critique of the dominant streams of occidental religion and philosophy, which, radical environmentalist argue, desacralize nature and thereby promote its destruction. In addition to aggressive and passionate resistance to such destruction, prescriptions generally include “reconnecting” with and “resacralizing” nature, as well as overturning the anthropocentric and dualistic beliefs they believe alienate people from nature and produce an ideology of human superiority that precludes feelings of kinship with other life forms. The most decisive perception animating radical environmentalism, however, is that the earth and all life is sacred and worthy of passionate defense.

Such perception and action requires that modern, industrial humans undergo dramatic change by adhering to an ecocentric (ecosystem-centered) ideology that includes compassion for all nonhuman species. This identity, in turn, depends on humans reconnecting with nature. This can be facilitated in a number of ways, but most importantly, by spending time in nature with a receptive heart, for the central spiritual episteme among radical environmentalists is that people can learn to “listen to the land” and discern its sacred voices.⁵ Other means activists employ to evoke and deepen a proper spiritual perception include visual and performance art, music, dancing, and drumming (sometimes combined with the use of sacred plants or “entheogens”). Such ritualization is believed capable of eroding the everyday sense of ego and independence in favor of feelings of belonging to the universe, kindling animistic perceptions of interspecies communication and evoking one’s intuitive sense of the sacredness of intact ecosystems.⁶

Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front, given their high-profile illegal activities, which sometimes have precipitated well-publicized court cases and led to long prison sentences, have become the best known branches of radical environmentalism.⁷ EF! and ELF activists certainly believe that modern political systems are corrupt and dominated by corporate and nation-state elites that cannot be reformed and must be resisted, which has tended to make EF! and the ELF among the most apocalyptic of all environmental movements. But from where have such movements come?

The present analysis explores the major tributaries inspiring and shaping the emergence of radical environmentalism. I then introduce two critical inspirations of the movement that emerged primarily in the 1970s, the decade before the founding of Earth First!, namely, deep ecology philosophy and

organized monkeywrenching campaigns, both of which are grounded in the perception that wild places are sacred spaces. Subsequently, I offer an overview of conservation biology, a scientific discipline that, since the founding of Earth First! in 1980, has influenced and sometimes been used effectively by radical environmentalists. Finally, I overview a variety of smaller tributaries that, along with the more influential ones, have helped sculpt the watershed that is radical environmentalism.⁸

Wild Places as Sacred Spaces

A look at John Muir, Gary Snyder, and Edward Abbey illuminates radical environmental spirituality and its sense of the sacred in nature. I focus on these figures because they are presently the most influential “elders” among radical environmentalists. Their perceptions and advocacy on behalf of wild places and creatures, as well as their various calls for the defense of such sacred areas and beings, fed directly into radical environmental thought and action. By reviewing their works and influence, it is possible to gain an understanding of some of the fundamental premises shared by most radical environmentalists.

John Muir: From The Mountains of California to the Sierra Club

When we try to pick out anything by itself we find that it is bound fast by a thousand invisible cords that cannot be broken to everything else in the universe. I fancy I can hear a heart beating in every crystal, in every grain of sand and see a wise plan in the making and shaping and placing of every one of them. All seems to be dancing to divine music.⁹

The clearest way into the Universe is through a forest wilderness.¹⁰

These statements by John Muir (1838–1914), the father of the wilderness preservation movement and the founder of the Sierra Club,¹¹ intimate a pantheistic spirituality and have become favorites among environmentalists. Although remnants of his Christian upbringing are found scattered through Muir’s writings, recent scholarship has clearly revealed Muir’s pantheistic and animistic spirituality.¹²

Muir came to his pantheistic and animistic spirituality through his own experiences in wilderness. Although he camouflaged pagan spirituality with

theistic rhetoric, Muir routinely called wilderness places sacred and spoke of extractive enterprises as desecrating acts. He called the Sierra Nevada mountains “Holy as Sinai,”¹³ analogized wilderness to the Garden of Eden,¹⁴ and referred to specific wilderness places, mountains, groves, and rivers as “cathedrals” or “temples.”¹⁵ Like some contemporary radical environmentalists, but in his own way, Muir demonized his wilderness-altering adversaries, periodically calling them agents of Satan.

Wilderness was a sacred environment for Muir because it was the place where spiritual epiphanies could occur. Upon seeing a rare orchid, *Calypso borealis*, the young Muir wrote, “I never before saw a plant so full of life; so perfectly spiritual. It seemed pure enough for the throne of the Creator. I felt as if I were in the presence of superior beings.”¹⁶ In this passage, to use today’s terminology, Muir’s *biocentrism* is clear.

Unitary consciousness regarding the interrelatedness of all life was the other central meaning Muir gained from his wilderness epiphanies. About an experience on Yosemite’s Cathedral Peak Muir wrote, “earth and sky [drew] together as one [making me feel] part of wild nature, kin to everything . . . the Cathedral itself [is] a temple displaying Nature’s best masonry and sermons in stone.”¹⁷ Sacred wilderness promoted proper spiritual perception for Muir, since, as he put it, “in our best times everything turns into religion, all the world seems a church and the mountains altars.”¹⁸

Many radical environmentalists express similar ideas about the epistemological value of wilderness, viewing time in wild places as a prerequisite to achieving proper perception of the land and life as sacred and valuable. Equally striking is the view, shared by Muir and many latter-day biocentrists, that domesticated humans and other animals are desecrated creatures and, at the same time, agents of desecration. Muir called overgrazing sheep “hoofed locusts” likening them to “money-changers . . . in the temple,”¹⁹ a clear allusion to Jesus’s outburst when he encountered people peddling their material goods in the temple of Jerusalem.

For Muir, however, domestic animals were not simply agents of despoliation, they were themselves desecrated. Humans were responsible for breeding into oblivion the sacred wildness of these animals. Yet tamed animals were not the only creatures defiled through domestication; by their own overcivilization and arrogance, humans were too.²⁰ Sounding as if he might have borrowed from Henry David Thoreau’s famous dictum “in wildness is the preservation of the world”²¹ or his claim that people “need the tonic of wildness,”²² Muir concluded, “A little pure wildness is the one great present want, both of men and sheep.”²³

In addition to his view of animals and the land as sacred, sometimes desecrated, and worthy of conservation, Muir also clearly expressed animistic beliefs,²⁴ as in this effusive 1871 letter to Ralph Waldo Emerson when Emerson was visiting Muir's beloved Yosemite, imploring the aging Transcendentalist to linger long enough to hear Yosemite's sacred voices:

Do not thus drift away with the mob while the spirits of these rocks and waters hail you after long waiting as their kinsman and persuade you to closer communion . . . I invite you join me in a month's worship with Nature in the high temples of the great Sierra Crown beyond our holy Yosemite . . . In the name of a hundred glacial lakes—of a hundred glacial-daisy-gentian meadows, In the name of a hundred cascades that barbarous visitors never see. . . . In the name of the grand upper forests of *Picea amabilis* and *P. grandis*, and in the name of all the spirit creatures of these rocks and of this whole spiritual atmosphere. Do not leave us *now*.²⁵

Such spirituality led to Muir's primary missionary strategy—to get people into the wild to listen to Earth's sacred voices—for “Few are altogether deaf to the preaching of pine-trees . . . if people in general could be got into the woods . . . to hear the trees speak for themselves, all difficulties in the way of forest preservation would vanish.”²⁶

Here is the fundamental epistemological premise of the radical environmental movement—then and now. If people will only still themselves and listen to Earth's sacred voices, they and it will be healed. This hope produced the tradition of Sierra Club outings, and similar strategies continue to inform preservationist agendas, both in the Club and beyond. From the 1930s on, for example, the dissemination of landscape photographs of undefiled places, free from human artifice but slated for despoliation, has been a central conservationist tactic.²⁷

Fellow Travelers

John Muir was not alone among the twentieth century's most prominent conservationists in being inspired by pantheistic (and animistic) spirituality. So were most conservationists prior to the 1960s, including Bob Marshall, Charles Lindbergh, Alexander Skutch, Joseph Wood Krutch, Aldo Leopold, Rachel Carson, David Brower, and Ansel Adams.²⁸ This has not been widely known because Muir and such kindred spirits considered it counterproductive

to express publicly such religious beliefs in the overwhelmingly Christian culture of the United States.²⁹

With the social and spiritual ferment of the 1960s and its greater tolerance for nonwestern spiritualities, some conservationists began to express their pagan spiritualities forthrightly, while others blamed western religion and science for promoting anti-environmental attitudes. By 1970 and since then, many if not most environment-related social conflicts have been overlaid with religious dimensions, often with Christians counterattacking what they consider to be the heresies of environmentalists.³⁰

Although pagan spiritual sentiments animated John Muir and many preservationists prior to the formation of Earth First! in 1980, two writers in particular, Edward Abbey and Gary Snyder, signaled the emergence of a new and more militant form of pagan environmentalism in the post-War era. Together they helped shape the religious subcultures that would fuel the emergence of Earth First!'s militant form of environmental paganism.³¹

Edward Abbey: From Desert Solitaire to The Monkeywrench Gang

The southwestern writer Edward Abbey (1928–1989) published *The Monkeywrench Gang* in 1975, a novel inspired by ecological saboteurs in Arizona that provided inspiration to many radical environmentalists. Abbey's experiences working for the National Park and Forest Services and studying anarchist philosophy shaped this novel as well as other works. Although his writings are often credited with precipitating the radical environmental movement known as Earth First!, it is more accurate to say that he was the first to write prose and novels celebrating and thus promoting a wave of illegal direct action against development schemes that began as early as the mid-1950s.

Abbey is important for more than taking note of and promoting monkeywrenching. He provides an archetypal example of those environmental pagans who are agnostic about ultimate metaphysical questions but who nevertheless rely on metaphors of the sacred to express their convictions about the value of nature. After he wrote about his experiences during a mid-1950s stint as a ranger at Utah's Arches National Park in *Desert Solitaire*,³² Abbey's work immediately found a responsive readership among conservationists.

Abbey considered desert landscapes, not mountains, to be the most holy of places because they were the places best suited to fostering proper humility and a biocentric vision. But he shared Muir's contempt for disrespectful tourists as agents of pollution, ridiculing their dependence on cars and other

modern conveniences. Like Muir (and Thoreau before him), Abbey viewed citified humans as both perpetrators and victims of industrial culture—with a consequently flawed human character: “Mechanized tourists are at once the consumers, the raw material and the victims of Industrial Tourism.”³³

So Abbey pled for reverent behavior in America’s “holy” National Parks,³⁴ and like Muir, he appropriated Eden as a metaphor to convey the sacredness of wilderness landscapes. “I saw only part of it,” Abbey reminisced, reflecting on the canyon drowned behind Arizona’s massive Glen Canyon dam, “but enough to realize that here was an Eden, a portion of the earth’s original paradise. To grasp the nature of the crime that was committed imagine the Taj Mahal or Chartres Cathedral buried in mud until only the spires remain visible.”³⁵ With such a view of the dam as desecration, it would be logical to view its detonation, as envisioned in *The Monkeywrench Gang*,³⁶ as an act of (canyon) consecration.

Like Muir, Abbey also articulated the spiritual episteme of all radical environmentalism: it is the ability of wilderness places to convey spiritual truth that reveals their sacrality. Muir and Abbey’s wilderness epiphanies led to strikingly similar perceptions: a relativized sense of self, recognition of one’s place as embedded in all reality, and the experience and affirmation of the intrinsic value of all earthly entities. Abbey once described, for example, a wilderness epiphany when, during an extended stay in the remote canyons of Arizona’s Havasu Indian reservation, the boundaries between him and all else blurred:

I went native and dreamed away days on the shore of the pool under the water-fall, wandered naked as Adam under the cottonwoods, inspecting my cactus gardens . . . I lived narcotic hours in which like the Taoist Chang-tse I worried about butterflies and who was dreaming what . . . I slipped by degrees into lunacy, me and the moon, and lost to a certain extent the power to distinguish between what was and was not myself: looking at my hand I would see a leaf trembling on a branch.³⁷

Abbey knew his experience was not unique, and mentioned several books whose spiritualities are based on desert experiences, including Joseph Wood Krutch’s pantheistic classic, *The Voice of the Desert*. All this led Abbey to wonder,

What is the peculiar quality or character of the desert that distinguishes it, in spiritual appeal, from other forms of landscape? . . . [W]hat does the desert say?

The desert says nothing. Completely passive, acted upon but never acting, the desert lies there like the bare skeleton of Being, spare, sparse, austere, utterly worthless, inviting not love but contemplation. In its simplicity and order it [rejects the idea that] only the human is . . . significant or even . . . real.³⁸

Thus the desert is sacred because no place has greater power to evoke a proper spiritual understanding of one's place in the universe. Abbey concluded from his desert-fostered perception of human insignificance that an authentic death is when one dies and is eaten by other living entities. A proper death is one final means of being absorbed into the entire universe.

Despite his frequent allusions to the desert as a sacred place (even the most sacred place), Abbey remained agnostic about ultimate metaphysical questions, such as whether there is life after death. In his farewell preface to a revised edition of *Desert Solitaire*, written shortly before his death, Abbey urged his readers to refrain from metaphysical speculation. Addressing those who complain that in *Desert Solitaire* he

does not reveal the patterns of unifying relationships that many believe form the true and underlying reality of existence, I can only reply that I am content with surfaces, with appearances. I know nothing about *underlying reality*, having never encountered any. I've looked and I've looked, tried fasting, drugs, meditation, religious experience, even self-mortification, but never seem to get any closer to basic reality than the lizard on a rock, a hawk in the sky, a dead pig in the sunshine . . . Appearance *is* reality, I say, and more than most of us deserve.³⁹

Abbey concluded we should “throw metaphysics to the dogs” for one can know that the desert and other wild places are sacred—and that honor requires their defense—without obsessively speculating as to why.

The desert not only fosters a proper spiritual perception by vitiating anthropocentrism, it also overturns nationalist pretensions and fidelities. In *Desert Solitaire*, Abbey recounted an all-night discussion with a visitor who accused him of being “against civilization, against science, against humanity.” Through this discussion, Abbey wrote,

I discovered that I was not opposed to mankind but only to man-centeredness, anthropocentricity, the opinion that the world exists solely for the sake of man; not to science, which means simply knowledge, but to science misapplied, to the worship of technique and technology, and to the perversion of science

properly called scientism; and not to civilization, but to [the United States and other] industrial culture[s].⁴⁰

With such statements Abbey denied any special status to the U.S. nation-state, presaging his and his progeny's collision with religious nationalism and Christian fundamentalism, both of which usually assume that God has given the United States a special, earthly mission. Abbey was deeply influenced by the Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921), who stressed the capacity of people and other creatures to cooperate and render “mutual aid” to each other when unfettered by plutocracy and statism.

Despite his view of the present era as one in which freedom and ecologically appropriate lifeways had been squashed by industrial oligopolies, Abbey nevertheless maintained an eschatological hope in the reversal of human desecrating crimes and a reharmonization of life on earth. He clearly thought this would involve a period of great tribulation and suffering, but ironically, since this would be necessary to bring the needed changes, this would be *Good News*. In this 1980 novel, set after the collapse of industrial civilization, anarchist revolutionaries battle those who would reestablish a totalitarian, industrial nation. Jack Burns, the phantom-like ecoteur in *The Monkeywrench Gang*, was apparently killed toward the end of *Good News*. But in a plot twist, the novel ended on a hopeful note: Burns's body turned up missing, and the revolutionaries were in the process of liberating Phoenix, Arizona.

Despite holding out some hope, Abbey was not optimistic about a positive human role in the reharmonization of life on earth. Instead, the primary agent for the coming restoration would likely be Earth herself. “Glen Canyon will be restored eventually, through natural processes,” Abbey wrote, so “pray for an earthquake!”⁴¹ But at several points he at least fantasized about a more direct human role. In *Desert Solitaire* he enthused that Americans were becoming “an increasingly pagan and hedonistic people (thank God!),” adding hopefully that they are “learning finally that the forests and mountains and desert canyons are holier than our churches.”⁴² He also took encouragement from the nascent, illegal, direct action, ecological resistance movement he learned about during his tenure as a Park Service ranger. In this capacity he would occasionally encounter “rumors from the underground where whatever hope we still have must be found,”⁴³—and of course he was also heartened by the formation of Earth First!, even celebrating it in his last novel, *Hayduke Lives*.⁴⁴

But it was wilderness itself where Abbey's hopes were ultimately grounded. Wilderness was a prerequisite to liberty, he wrote, since it provided excellent

guerilla habitat,⁴⁵ and it was the desired end that would eventually supplant industrial society. Shortly before his death, Abbey expressed in the *Earth First!* journal his eschatological hopes (shared by many radical environmentalists) for the collapse of industrial society and a concomitant “restoration of higher civilization,” namely, for an earthly paradise of

scattered human populations modest in number that live by fishing, hunting, food-gathering, small-scale farming and ranching, that assemble once a year in the ruins of abandoned cities for great festivals of moral, spiritual, artistic and intellectual renewal—a people for whom wilderness is not a playground but their natural and native home.⁴⁶

In an assertion common to radical environmental subcultures, Abbey traced environmental decline to twin roots, the advent of monotheism and agriculture, while also expressing appreciation for primal spiritualities:

Like many other people, I regard the invention of monotheism and the otherworldly God as a great setback for human life. Maybe even worse than the invention of agriculture . . . I think the Indians and most traditional cultures had a much wiser world view, in that they invested every aspect of the world around them—all of nature—animal life, plant life, the landscape itself, with gods, with deity. In other words, everything was divine in some way or another . . . [Such] pantheism probably led to a much wiser way of life, more capable of surviving over long periods of time.⁴⁷

This statement, spoken to his best friend Jack Loeffler in the 1980s, led to his clearest published assertion of pantheism—one that remains fused to skepticism about metaphysical truth claims:

Call me a pantheist. If there is such a thing as divinity, and the holiness is all, then it must exist in everything, and not simply be localized in one supernatural figure beyond time and space. Either everything is divine, or nothing is. All partake of the universal divinity—the scorpion and the packrat, the Junebug and the pismire, and even human beings. All or nothing, now or never, here and now.⁴⁸

With such statements Abbey well represents those radical environmentalists who mistrust religious claims but who nevertheless express a pantheistic worldview.

Gary Snyder: *From Turtle Island to Practice of the Wild*

In Pueblo societies a kind of ultimate democracy is practiced. Plants and animals are also people, and through certain rituals and dances, are given a place in the political discussions of the humans. They are “represented.” On Hopi and Navajo land, at Black Mesa . . . the cancer [of industrial civilization] is eating away at the breast of Mother Earth in the form of strip mining . . . The defense of Black Mesa is being sustained by traditional Indians, young Indian militants, and longhairs [hippies]. Black Mesa . . . is sacred territory. To hear her voice is to give up the European word “America” and accept the new-old name for the continent, “Turtle Island.”⁴⁹

For a people of an old culture, *all* their mutually owned territory holds numinous life and spirit. Certain places are perceived to be of high spiritual density . . . These places are gates through which one can—it would be said—more easily be touched by a larger-than-human, larger-than-personal view . . . The temples of our hemisphere [are] . . . the planet’s remaining wilderness areas. When we enter them on foot we can sense the *kami* or (Maidu) *kukini* are still in force there.⁵⁰

These passages by Gary Snyder, including the initial one from *Turtle Island*, his Pulitzer prize-winning book of poetry and prose, provide a representative introduction to this seminal contributor to radical environmental subcultures. Born in San Francisco in 1930 and raised in the Pacific Northwest, Snyder first emerged as an important counterculture figure during the 1950s “beat” literary movement when a group of poets and artists, often inspired by religions originating in the Far East, issued a fundamental challenge to the dominant values of the post-War generation.

In his youth Snyder was influenced both by a love for the woods and by an early dose of anti-industrial lore gleaned from the Wobblies, the radical union of the Industrial Workers of the World. Beginning in the mid-1950s, he spent a dozen years studying Buddhism in Japan and traveling widely in Asia, eventually taking vows as a monk. He introduced anti-anthropocentric ideas through his poetry into the beat milieu and, in the 1960s and 70s, fostered appreciation of and experimentation with back-to-land communities.⁵¹ It may be his role in such countercultures, which in turn became the breeding grounds for the radical environmental movement, that will be his most enduring legacy.

America is a sacred place to Snyder—especially its wild lands and places inhabited by Indians and others who practice “the old ways,” namely,

nature-based religious and cultural practices, including shamanism. Renaming America “Turtle Island” was, for Snyder, an act of veneration acknowledging the sacrality of the land by linking it to sacred people—those still able to perceive its sacred voices and live respectfully upon it. Such renaming was an act of subversion, simultaneously questioning and repudiating any view that links the sacredness of the continent to a presumed beneficent and divine mission carried forward by the U.S. nation-state. As with Abbey, Snyder’s perception of the state as an agent of desecration is tied to his religious perception of the land as sacred.

Although in *The Practice of the Wild* Snyder stated that nation-states “have their legitimacies,” he nevertheless viewed them as “passing political entities” that “will lose their mandate if they continue to abuse the land.”⁵² Clearly he thought they already had, implying that at least eventually the state must be abolished, for it “is inherently greedy . . . entropic, disorderly, and illegitimate,”⁵³ and because “the *region* is against the *regime*—any Regime. Regions are anarchic.”⁵⁴

Snyder’s subversive prose has been grounded in his animistic critique of monotheistic nationalism. All children are “natural animists,” Snyder believes, and he considers himself one as well. Moreover, because children are “so open to other creatures,” Snyder considers animism and pantheism more prevalent religious perceptions than monotheism,⁵⁵ and argues that monotheistic perceptions must be subverted, because they promote and benefit from ecologically destructive nationalistic ideologies.

In place of monotheistic religious nationalism and in preference for the region over the regime, Snyder, Peter Berg, Raymond F. Dasmann, and Freeman House were largely responsible for developing, beginning in the early 1970s, the utopian eco-political philosophy now called bioregionalism.⁵⁶ Seeking ultimately to replace nation-state governance with an “ecological anarchism” characterized by widespread liberty, mutual aid, and collective self-rule, bioregionalists contend that governance systems should be limited in size to specific ecosystem types.⁵⁷ Most bioregionalists also believe that by “reinhabiting” and defending a specific region, one can eventually discern its sacred voices and learn appropriate lifeways from them.

Such a bioregional episteme—one must dwell for significant lengths of time in a place in order to learn about the area’s birds, plants, weather, and eventually its sacrality—parallels that of Muir, Abbey, and other radical environmentalists. Snyder put it succinctly when he quoted a Crow Elder: “If people stay somewhere long enough—even white people—the spirits will begin to speak to them . . . coming up from the land. The spirits and the old

powers aren't lost, [people] just need . . . to be around long enough and the spirits will begin to influence them."⁵⁸

In bioregional thought, political philosophy, paganism, and ecological resistance converge. Often Snyder has alluded to wilderness epiphanies during which animistic experiences of interspecies communication occur, or during which one experiences a pantheistic sense that the entire earth is alive. Although reluctant to discuss such experiences for fear of trivializing them, Snyder insists that "you can hear voices from trees" and recalls "I have had a very moving, profound perception a few times that everything was alive (the basic perception of animism) and that on one level there is no hierarchy of qualities in life—that the life of a stone or a weed is as completely beautiful and authentic, wise and valuable as the life of, say, an Einstein."⁵⁹ During a 1993 interview, Snyder expanded on such statements, explaining how animistic perception unfolds.

Do you know how things communicate with you? They don't talk to you directly, but you hear a different song in your head . . . It's not that animals come up and say something in English in your ear. You know, it's that things come into your mind . . . Most people think that everything that comes into their mind is their own . . . Well, some of those things that you think are from within are given to you from outside, and part of the trick is knowing which was which.⁶⁰

Snyder thinks such experiences are widely available if actively pursued.⁶¹

Muir, Abbey, and Snyder are united by the conviction that wilderness is sacred, at least partly because it can be the locus of such experiences. Snyder believes, for example, that wilderness pilgrimages and backpacking are especially good rituals of transformation. They "bring a profound sense of body-mind joy," he writes, that "take us . . . out of our little selves into the whole mountains-and-rivers mandala universe." But private wilderness experiences are not enough. Because the natural world is "never totally ruined", resistance and restoration are morally obligatory, reconsecrating acts.⁶²

Such beliefs yield a view of most extractive industries as desecrations demanding resistance. Snyder may have been the first to term industrial civilization a "cancer" on earth,⁶³ and in his praise of ecological resistance movements, Snyder joined Abbey in providing an early published endorsement of extra-legal ecological resistance. Unlike Abbey, however, Snyder was not enthusiastic about monkeywrenching and cautioned Earth First!ers about its perils.⁶⁴

Snyder also deviated from Abbey's reluctance to engage in metaphysical speculation: "the world is nature, and in the long run inevitably wild, because the wild, as the process and essence of nature, is also an ordering of impermanence."⁶⁵ Although inspired by cross-cultural expressions of shamanism as well as by animistic and pantheistic religious experiences, Snyder's primary spiritual home remains Zen Buddhism, partly because he thinks ancient Zen teachings express deep ecological ethics with unsurpassed sophistication.⁶⁶ He thus calls himself a Buddhist-Animist.⁶⁷

Although they never met, Abbey and Snyder did correspond in writing (a planned river trip together fell through due to a family illness). Despite disagreeing about the value of thinking about ultimate metaphysical questions—Abbey once told Snyder that he liked everything in *Turtle Island's* "Four Changes" essay "except the Buddhist bullshit"—they both agreed that wilderness and wildness are essential if people are to gain "larger-than-personal" insights. "Only the early Daoists [*sic*]," Snyder wrote approvingly, recognized "that wisdom could come of wildness."⁶⁸ This epistemology of wildness is reminiscent not only of the thinking of Thoreau and Muir, and of the speeches of Earth First!'s charismatic cofounder, Dave Foreman, but also of the sense among many environmental pagans that eating and being eaten is a sacred process.⁶⁹ Snyder's own spiritual perceptions parallel Abbey's in this regard:

Eating is a sacrament . . . If we do eat meat it is the life, the bounce, the swish, of a great alert being with keen ears and lovely eyes, with foursquare feet and a huge beating heart that we eat, let us not deceive ourselves.⁷⁰

To acknowledge that each of us at the table will eventually be part of the meal is . . . allowing the sacred to enter and accepting the sacramental aspect of our shaky temporary personal being.⁷¹

Such passages illustrate how a vision of an authentic death can be linked to an understanding of the life cycle as sacramental—including eating and being eaten.

Another important theme that Snyder articulated and promoted is that of the arts as a spiritual tool and ecological tactic. Poetry and song are among "the few modes of speech that [provide] access to that other yogic or shamanistic view," Snyder averred, "in which all is one and all is many, and the many are all precious."⁷² Many radical environmentalists have been influenced by and share this view of the arts as a strategic weapon, one uniquely able to evoke in humans their connections to nature that, all too often, have been severed by the destructive weight of industrialism.

One way such sentiments are expressed among Earth First!ers is through the slogan “Back to the Pleistocene!,” a phrase that may have been first spoken by Gary Snyder. This rallying cry reflects the common radical environmental perception that preagricultural, foraging societies were superior, ecologically appropriate, and socially egalitarian. Although Snyder later clarified his reflections in this regard, speculating that people lived most harmoniously with nature during the Upper Paleolithic era, his nostalgia for an earlier, undefiled natural paradise parallels Muir’s and Abbey’s metaphorical references to Eden as a sacred place.⁷³

If paradise is a long-lost age, one naturally wonders how then should we live *now*? Snyder acknowledges that we cannot go backward in time. So did his bioregional collaborators Jeremiah Gorsline and Freeman House, who penned a 1974 essay “future primitive” for an early bioregional tabloid (republished in 1990), but they nevertheless recommended a back-to-the-land vision of restoring more “primitive” lifeways.⁷⁴ Caught between a sacred past and a desecrated present, the religious vision of pagan environmentalism is to heal and thus reconsecrate the land, while venerating it by preventing further desecrating acts. Whatever the specific efforts taken by them after the movement congealed in 1980, and whatever the particular diagnosis may be about how humans abandoned their natural paradise, clearly Muir, Abbey, and Snyder (with a few others) set the stage and introduced the key themes for the emergence of a militant, pagan environmentalism in the waning decades of the twentieth century.

For over a century the most prominent wilderness and wildlife defenders, those who valued these places and life forms “for their own sake,” have been animated by religious perceptions of the sacredness of life. They believed that proper spiritual perception depended on undefiled landscapes—as does human physical and emotional well being. They also were convinced that the well being of people and places was jeopardized by many desecrating agents, foremost among them the industrial nation-state, but also defiled animals (including humans) who, no longer wild and free, wreaked havoc wherever they went. Thus, defending and restoring a sacred world required more than the abolition of nation-state governance in favor of tribal and bioregional models. It also depended upon a dramatic reduction or elimination of domestic animals who polluted the land, while replacing them with animals still sacred and wild; and it required that sacred places be purified of human despoilers, whether developer, government lackey, off-road vehicle fanatic, religious fundamentalist, pro-natalist breeder, or (for a few of the most misanthropic Earth First!ers including Edward Abbey) hungry immigrants seeking affluent consumer lifestyles.

Not every radical environmentalist shares all of the above perceptions—many would object strenuously to domestic animals or immigrants being viewed and targeted as agents of pollution, arguing to the contrary that such a view unfairly blames the victims. It should also be clear that perceiving land as sacred does not depend on a supernaturalistic metaphysics. Dave Foreman, the most charismatic of Earth First!’s co-founders and the individual who more than any other figure shaped radical environmentalism during its initial decade, once responded more like Abbey than the more mystical Muir when he was asked what he meant when using the term sacred:

It’s very difficult in our society to discuss the notion of sacred apart from the supernatural. I think that’s something that we need to work on is a nonsupernatural concept of sacred. A nontheistic basis of sacred. When I say I’m a nontheistic pantheist, it’s a recognition that what’s really important is the flow of life, the process of life . . . [So] the idea is not to protect ecosystems frozen in time . . . but [rather] the grand process . . . of evolution . . . We’re just blips in this vast energy field . . . , just temporary manifestations of this life force, which is blind and nonteleological. And so I guess what is sacred is what’s in harmony with that flow.⁷⁵

So whether supernaturalistic and mystical or utterly this-worldly, radical environmentalists draw on experiences of the transforming power of the wild and rely on metaphors of the sacred to articulate their experiential grounds for valuing a wild earth.

My first task has been to spotlight those movement elders who have been most influential in evoking and reinforcing the perception that the land and its denizens are sacred—and worthy of defense. To account more fully for the emergence of radical environmentalism, however, several additional tributaries need exposition.

Deep Ecology and Environmental Ethics

The impact of Earth First! would have been far less significant without a stunning revolution in environmental philosophy that burst forth in the 1970s. A good part of this was triggered by Lynn White’s 1967 argument blaming monotheistic religion for the modern war against the earth.⁷⁶ Deep ecologists readily accepted the central premises of White’s critique, and though White did not counsel it, many rejected Christianity, concluding that it was too deeply anthropocentric to be salvaged.

The Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess is properly credited with coining the term “deep ecology,” contrasting it by criticizing anthropocentric “shallow ecology,” first at a 1972 conference in Bucharest⁷⁷ and shortly thereafter in print.⁷⁸ Naess would later accurately observe, and complain, that deep ecology caught on as a vague umbrella term for all nonanthropocentric environmental ethics,⁷⁹ and it would be a mistake to credit Naess with originating the critique of anthropocentric ethics, since a number of figures began advancing similar critiques at about the same time.

One event crucial to the development of deep ecology philosophy was the 1974 “Rights of Non-Human Nature” conference sponsored by John Rodman (a political theorist from California’s Claremont Graduate University) and inspired in part by Christopher Stone’s seminal article “Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects.”⁸⁰ The conference drew scholars who were emerging as key intellectual architects of the nonanthropocentric environmental movement: George Sessions and Gary Snyder, who (with Bill Devall) would become the most influential proponents of deep ecology in the United States; ecologist Garrett Hardin, who persuaded many to a neo-Malthusian apocalypticism; ecopsychology pioneer Paul Shepard, who believed that people in the world’s remnant foraging societies were ecologically superior and emotionally healthier than those living in agri-cultures;⁸¹ Native American scholar-activist Vine Deloria, who had just published *God is Red*,⁸² accusing Christianity of waging a genocidal war against Indians and nature, and arguing that only indigenous wisdom could save the planet; and environmental historian Roderick Nash, whose early work buttressed White’s thesis about the ecological calamities brought on by Christianity,⁸³ and who would argue in *The Rights of Nature*⁸⁴ that western society was and could extend its tradition of rights to nonhuman nature. Conference convener Rodman would soon articulate his own intrinsic value theory, arguing that all things with ends (namely purposes) of their own have a right to exist.⁸⁵

Also in 1974, George Sessions began publishing articles blaming anthropocentrism and its most forceful bearer, Christianity, for repressing the ecologically sustainable lifeways and spiritualities of the world’s indigenous, foraging peoples. Among other things, Sessions suggested western humans could grope their way back to a proper understanding of the “God/Nature/Man relationship” via the pantheism of the seventeenth-century philosopher Baruch Spinoza.⁸⁶ Interestingly, Sessions credited Aldous Huxley⁸⁷ and Loren Eiseley⁸⁸ for recognizing the ecological sensitivity of “primitive man,”⁸⁹ and lauded Robinson Jeffers as “Spinoza’s twentieth-century evangelist.”⁹⁰ Significantly, Naess was also heavily influenced by Spinoza,⁹¹ which helps account for the important affinity and collaboration between Naess and

Sessions, which in turn led to their articulation of the deep ecology platform that has been widely published and debated, effectively and widely conveying the basic approach of deep ecology.⁹²

Even more remarkable, given U.S. culture at the time, was Sessions's 1974 article "Anthropocentrism and the Environmental Crisis," which ended with a quote from an innovative 1970 essay by Gary Snyder that had, in turn, articulated an ethic of respect for the evolutionary destinies of all species.

In 1975, Sessions began offering the first course in deep ecology in the United States, at Sierra College in California's goldrush country, entitled "Rationality, Mysticism, and Ecology."⁹³ The next year, in April 1976, he published the first of six issues (the last in January 1983) of *Ecophilosophy*, an irregular newsletter distributed to about 150 scholars around the world.⁹⁴ This led to a 1980 Earth Day colloquium on environmental ethics at the University of Denver, organized by J. Donald Hughes, who had, in a 1975 article, helped extend the now-widespread green belief that western philosophy promoted environmentally destructive behavior.

The explosion of ecological philosophizing during the 1970s, barely introduced here, played an important role in the creation of environmental ethics as a new subfield in moral philosophy. The discipline became part of the academic landscape in 1971 when philosopher Baird Callicott taught the world's first course in environmental ethics at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. By the end of the decade, under Eugene Hargrove's leadership, the flagship journal of the field, *Environmental Ethics*, began publishing.

Callicott, who by 1977 had begun expounding a holistic, ecosystem-centered (or "ecocentric") environmental ethics based upon the foundation of Aldo Leopold's land ethic and subsequent scientific ecology, contributed the first of many articles to volume one of this new journal.⁹⁵ Although certain disagreements would emerge between Callicott and some deep ecology philosophers, his affinity with Leopold and his effort to develop a theoretical basis for the intrinsic value of nature put him squarely in the more radical, nonanthropocentric camp.

By the mid-1970s, Bill Devall, a professor at California's Humboldt State University, had read Arne Naess's article introducing the term "deep ecology."⁹⁶ He promoted discussion of it, and by the end of the decade, a number of additional scholars who joined in the critique of anthropocentrism had become personally acquainted, including Michael Zimmerman and Dolores LaChapelle. These scholars were unwittingly setting the stage for the appropriation of deep ecology by Earth First! in the early 1980s.

Given suspicions of rationality—as opposed to instinctive or intuitive perceptions—common in the radical environmental movement (a number of

activists blame rationality for environmental destruction, sometimes confusing instrumental rationality with rationality itself), one might wonder whether this treatment of the development of deep ecology and environmental ethics is relevant to understanding the emergence of radical environmentalism. For his part, by 1991, Foreman had concluded that indeed nothing had been more important than “academic philosophy” in the creation of the biocentric “new conservation movement”: “By end of the 1980s, few conservation group staff members or volunteer activists were unaware of the Deep Ecology-Shallow environmentalism distinction, or of the general discussion about ethics and ecology, at the heart of this discussion was the question of whether other species possessed intrinsic value.”⁹⁷

As environmental studies and ethics courses proliferated on college campuses, students who resonated with biocentric or ecocentric ethics were often drawn to radical environmental activism. Deep ecology thus contributed significantly to the development and strength of radical environmental ideas and groups, providing activists with historical and philosophical foundations for their on-the-ground actions and an alternative lineage of thought to counter the more predominant, culturally acceptable ideologies.

Monkeywrenching before Earth First!

Although deep ecology contributed significantly to radical environmentalism, providing it with a coherent if controversial philosophical rationale, these movements would likely never have emerged at all without the eruption of ecotage (sabotage to save ecosystems and/or species). Such sabotage began in the late 1950s when people began toppling advertising billboards in New Mexico and Arizona. By his own account Edward Abbey (with a few friends) aggressively engaged in such activities near Taos, New Mexico, beginning in 1958.⁹⁸

By 1959 the practice spread as a dozen or more activists, over several years, toppled dozens of billboards in Arizona between Flagstaff and the Grand Canyon. During the following decade a few individuals and groups began to sabotage machinery in efforts to thwart development. All of this was a harbinger of the more deliberate monkeywrenching campaigns that would unfold in the 1970s, a decade before the formation of Earth First!.⁹⁹

The most important among these campaigns was in response to a strip mine that had been approved for Arizona’s Black Mesa. The coal was to fuel part of the Central Arizona Project (CAP)—a huge planned water diversion to feed the cities of the desert southwest that was widely denounced by green

activists as precipitating an environmental calamity.¹⁰⁰ One of the most egregious features of this mine and the related CAP, according to its opponents, was its desecration of a mesa sacred to Navajo and Hopi traditionalists. Traditional Hopi, for example, believed the mesa's integrity was critical to the harmony of the world and that its desecration could trigger great suffering.¹⁰¹

One Anglo ally in the struggle was Gary Snyder, who in 1969 praised the defense of the "sacred territory" of Black Mesa (see the epigraph at the outset of the section devoted to Snyder). One such activist was Jack Loeffler, a former soldier radicalized by witnessing nuclear weapons tests as a young man. Loeffler drifted into the beat culture, meeting and becoming friends with many counterculture luminaries of the day, including Snyder and Allen Ginsberg in 1964, while attending a Zendo at Esalen, a counterculture retreat nestled along the remote central California coast known as Big Sur. During this time he was inspired by Snyder's biocentric poetry and Kropotkin's anarchism, eventually coming to believe that the Native American and Hispanic cultures of the southwest "exemplified Kropotkin's anarchist ideal"¹⁰² and were worthy of defense.

Loeffler's most formative spiritual experiences were gained through his participation (from about 1960) in Native American Church ceremonies, a pan-Indian religion that fuses Christian and Indian ideas and involves the ritual eating of peyote. The peyote ritual, Loeffler explained, "connects people to the earth" and through it "one becomes so sensitized to other life forms and even to rock forms, to the entire sphere of life, that one is forever moved."¹⁰³ This sacred plant, Loeffler believed, "sets one up spiritually to understand the sacred quality of this planet and fosters the intuition that the entire planet is the living organism in which we are members."¹⁰⁴

Based in part on such experiences among Native Americans, Loeffler became deeply involved in the Black Mesa campaign, which fueled as it was by the anarchism of most of those involved with the Black Mesa Defense Fund, went far beyond clever publicity and litigation.¹⁰⁵ Between 1970 and 1974, Loeffler, Abbey, and others began a monkeywrenching campaign against the mine's growing infrastructure—and around 1971 they started experimenting with sabotage techniques found in *The Anarchist Cookbook*.

Also in 1971, in what was probably the first radical environmental roadshow, Loeffler traveled widely denouncing the mine at universities and other venues, even forthrightly advocating sabotage against such sacrilege. Indeed, he regularly made similar suggestions to sympathizers closer to home, pointing out where they might go "bird watching" or do "research"—amusing euphemisms for sabotage. A young Dave Foreman volunteered with the group

in the early 1970s, which likely planted seeds of anarchism and sabotage that would sprout a decade later.

At about the same time as the Black Mesa ecoteurs were becoming active (in 1970), a man calling himself the Fox began plugging drains and chimneys in Chicago as a dramatic protest of industrial pollution. He disappeared from public view after nearly being apprehended¹⁰⁶ but not before inspiring similar actions elsewhere. Soon after, a short how-to book entitled *Ecotage* was published lauding the Fox and describing how to sabotage equipment and otherwise thwart environmental destruction.¹⁰⁷

Revealing how such actions of ecotage can influence others in different bioregions, the Fox inspired a teenaged Ed Abbey fan named John Walker to develop his own campaign of “nightwork.” Walker organized a small group of friends into “the Tucson Eco-Raiders” and launched a sabotage campaign against urban sprawl. The campaign began in 1971 and ended in 1973 with Walker’s conviction and that of his three accomplices.¹⁰⁸ At the time of their arrest, the raiders had caused nearly 2 million dollars in damage by vandalizing equipment and homes that were under construction.

Later in the decade a group of Minnesota farmers, after litigation failed to prevent high-voltage power lines from being erected across their land, began a direct action campaign to foil this enterprise. Deploying both civil disobedience and sabotage between 1977 and 1979, the farmer’s campaign was aided by young activists from the anti-nuclear group Northern Thunder, including Roger Featherstone, a young activist who would subsequently become an important Earth First!er in the 1980s, and who in the 1990s continued working with both independent grassroots and mainstream environmental organizations in defense of biodiversity.¹⁰⁹ The farmers became known as “bolt weevils”—so named from their penchant for toppling the offending towers by loosening their bolts. Within Earth First! they are well known, largely because of a song extolling their exploits and justifying the sabotage by likening it to a defense of homeland.

Also near the end of the decade, in May 1979, wild river guide Mark Dubois resisted the construction of a dam on California’s Stanislaus River by risking his own life. He hid in the brush, chaining himself in an area about to be flooded, thereby drawing national media attention and a brief concession from the authorities. Dubois was motivated, as were many Earth First! activists who followed him, by an abiding love for a specific place. He referred to the river as his “spiritual teacher, guru” and even “almost [as a] lover.”¹¹⁰

Conservation Biology

During the late 1970s and 1980s, amidst the advent of radical environmentalism as a recognizable movement, a number of scientists began to shape a new subspecialization of ecology that became known as conservation biology, a discipline that attempts to apply ecological knowledge to the conservation of biodiversity. The mutual concern for biodiversity conservation led a number of conservation biology's most important visionaries to develop ties and became engaged with one branch or another of the radical environmental movement. Although not embraced by all radical environmentalists, conservation biology would have had less of an impact had there been no such liaison. Three of the principle architects of this nascent discipline deserve special attention, for they have served as bridges between scientists and the deep ecology and radical environmental groups who have sometimes helped promote their ideas.

In 1978 biologist Michael Soulé organized the First International Conference on Conservation Biology at the San Diego campus of the University of California, subsequently publishing an anthology that functionally heralded the emergence of this "new" discipline.¹¹¹ Soulé organized a second conference at the University of Michigan in 1985 and edited another book further advancing the discipline.¹¹² These collaborative efforts led to the formation of the Society for Conservation Biology in 1986 and the inaugural publication of its journal in 1987.

Interestingly, in between these first two conservation biology conferences (in 1981), Soulé organized another conference, this time in Los Angeles, to explore the relationships between religion and ecology. As it happened, Arne Naess was in the country, and Soulé invited Naess to the conference. This spurred a long and close friendship in which Naess became "a major influence" in Soulé's life. Soulé subsequently invited Naess to give the keynote address at the second conservation biology conference, he explained later, "because I felt he provided a better philosophical foundation for conservation and biodiversity than anybody since Leopold."¹¹³

David Ehrenfeld, appointed the first editor of *Conservation Biology*, is another person of importance in linking conservation biology to deep ecology philosophies. His role as the editor of *Conservation Biology* is particularly interesting because his book, *The Arrogance of Humanism*,¹¹⁴ remains a landmark in the emergence of nonanthropocentric environmental ethics and is considered a classic by many radical environmentalists. It elegantly expressed their melancholy over the extinction crisis and their perception of a defiled world:

We must live in our century and wait, enduring somehow the unavoidable sadness . . . nothing is free of the taint of our arrogance. We have defiled everything, much of it forever, even the farthest jungles of the Amazon and the air above the mountains, even the everlasting sea which gave us birth.¹⁵

Like Abbey and many radical environmentalists, Ehrenfeld could find no other place than upon sacred ground to ground his valuing of the world's natural heritage and his indignation at human arrogance. It is unsurprising, then, that his book became a radical environmental classic.

The third conservation biologist who is equally interesting because of his relationship with radical environmentalism is Reed Noss, who eventually became the second editor of *Conservation Biology*. Noss was an early and regular contributor to *Earth First!* in the 1980s. He learned about and contacted the movement after hearing a news report of the 1981 “cracking” of Glen Canyon Dam. His enthusiasm for the movement was evident in an early article he wrote from a “Taoist perspective” claiming that “ecological resistance (including sabotage) is to the ecocentric [person] an extended form of self-defense: regrettable but necessary.”¹⁶ Fusing such militancy with deep ecology, Noss also asserted that *Earth First!* is “the ecological resistance embodiment of Deep Ecology.”¹⁷

Most of his contributions to *Earth First!* and other movement publications, however, involved advocating principles of conservation biology while advancing wilderness and restoration projects and urging that activist's priorities be set by ecological criteria.¹⁸ Although by 1990 he withdrew from *Earth First!* in an exodus led by Foreman himself, Noss continued to promote deep ecology and the notion of an “ecological self”—a wider-than-human identity that extends the center of moral concern beyond humans to all species. He has articulated such views even in his more scientific writings¹⁹ and has retained his association with Dave Foreman and other movement activists friendly to conservation biology, subsequently working with them on diverse projects.

It was Noss's research, however, not his grassroots environmental activism, that led to his becoming the second editor of *Conservation Biology*. This prestigious position was offered in part because, in numerous journal articles, he had advanced significantly the conceptual foundations of the discipline.

Although conservation biology has influenced and has been increasingly used by radical environmentalists in their environmental campaigns—and some of the leading luminaries of this discipline have connections to ecocentric philosophers, spiritualities, and movements—one should not conflate all

these cultural streams nor view them as a single phenomenon. Conservation biology is grounded in a value commitment to biological diversity and ecological integrity, but it is not dependent on either deep ecology, eastern spirituality, or any other specific axiology (value theory).

More Tributaries—But One Watershed

A number of lesser tributaries need at least brief mention to underscore both the diversity of streams flowing into radical environmental subcultures and the synergistic relationships among countercultural idea complexes. These tributaries cross-fertilize and reinforce each other, and this occurs even though incompatible ideas are sometimes embedded within the different streams. Nevertheless, with the preceding discussion and this caution presented, I will survey and summarize other important streams flowing into the radical environmental watershed.

Most radical environmentalists have been influenced by one or more of the following radical perspectives:

- the *anarchistic critics*—such as Lewis Mumford, Murray Bookchin, John Clark, Brian Tokar, and Janet Biehl
- The *social ecologists* and *bioregionalists* (who are often both)¹²⁰
- the *critics of technology*—such as Friedrich Georg Jünger, Martin Heidegger, Jacques Ellul, Langdon Winner, Jeremy Rifkin, and Jerry Mander¹²¹
- the *ecofeminists*—such as Susan Griffin, Carolyn Merchant, Riane Eisler, Marija Gimbutas, Vandana Shiva, Janet Biehl, and Carol Warren—who generally view the domination of women and nature as linked but who otherwise are diverse, some participating in the feminist spirituality movement and promoting goddess-spirituality, others contributing to or drawing on the other critical approaches cited in this paragraph¹²²
- the *anthropologists*—such as Marshall Sahlins, Loren Eiseley, and Stanley Diamond—who have influenced many movement intellectuals by urging a positive appraisal of “primitive” cultures and by arguing that foraging and small-scale societies are morally, ecologically, and even psychologically superior to modern ones¹²³
- the *ecopsychologists*—such as Paul Shepard, Theodore Roszak, Roger Walsh, Joanna Macy, Warwick Fox, and Chellis Glendinning—some of whom have been influenced by the above anthropologists and all of whom trace environmental degradation to unhealthy and unfulfilled mental

states, while many emphasize the importance of ritual and earth-based spiritualities to earth healing¹²⁴

- the *new science* theorists and religionists (alternately referred to as “new physics,” “new paradigm,” “systems theory,” “gaia theorists,” or “complexity” theorists), represented by diverse schools of thought that nevertheless in their own ways promote metaphysics of interrelatedness, and which have been pioneered or promoted by notables such as Alfred North Whitehead, Werner Heisenberg, Thomas Kuhn, Gregory Bateson, James Lovelock, Morris Berman, Ilya Prigogine, Fritjof Capra, David Steindl-Rast, Thomas Berry, Joanna Macy, Charlene Spretnak, and many others. Such science-infused metaphysics has often been borrowed by ecocentric environmental ethicists, ecofeminists, ecopsychologists, and deep ecology proponents as they seek to correct the errors of mechanistic and dualistic western science, supplanting such a worldview with one that recognizes the interrelatedness of reality and nature as a process or cybernetic system—a perspective said to root humans in nature rather than place them above it.¹²⁵

Also noteworthy is the adoption of the deep ecology rubric by a number of counterculture gurus and theorists who have led the way in fusing “new science” with earth-friendly spiritualities. Many of these individuals were involved in early experimentation with hallucinogens and other ritual processes designed to create transpersonal religious experiences, and most of these before the 1990s were more involved in New Age rather than environmentalist subcultures, but are now reaching out to radical greens. These figures include Fritjof Capra and his Elmwood Institute, Stanislov Grof,¹²⁶ James Hillman,¹²⁷ Ralph Metzner,¹²⁸ the Institute for Noetic Sciences, and more recently Andy Fisher¹²⁹ and Naropa University (formerly Institute).

These additional streams of thought, because they have all played significant roles, influence radical environmentalists more than is commonly recognized and contribute to the diversity of the movement. Moreover, many of the theorists mentioned above contribute to more than one of these schools of thought, and therefore, a number of these additional influences can be understood as enlarging other streams within the broader radical environmental watershed.

Summary

The 1970s was a harbinger decade in which deep ecology emerged, drawing widely from John Muir, Edward Abbey, Gary Snyder, and other environmental writers, and it was a decade in which monkeywrenching, although not entirely new, began to emerge in more focused, concerted campaigns. The 1980s saw the newly formed Earth First! movement infused with and strengthened by the applied science of conservation biology as well as the other tributaries noted previously.

Although I have not fully conveyed the diverse ideas and subcultures upon which radical environmentalism drew, I have labored to illuminate little-understood and neglected dynamics that have inspired and animated radical environmentalists. Deep ecology philosophy, the emergence of monkeywrenching, and conservation biology have clearly played key roles. But so have the other streams of thought I have described, especially those promoting or reinforcing perceptions of the sacredness of life, which animates most radical environmentalists. This sensibility not only provides a life purpose, it also drives their activist passions. This is the main stream coursing through the watershed of radical environmentalism.

NOTES

1. Gary Ackerman, "Beyond Arson? A Threat Assessment of the Earth Liberation Front," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 15, no. 4 (2004). But for a different view, see Bron Taylor, "Religion, Violence, and Radical Environmentalism: From Earth First! to the Unabomber to the Earth Liberation Front," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 10, no. 4 (1998); and Bron Taylor, "Threat Assessments and Radical Environmentalism," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 15, no. 4 (2004).
2. A completed and continually updated list of publications on radical environmentalism, nature religions, and other themes can be found at www.religionandnature.com/bron.
3. Radical environmentalism includes not only groups like Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front but also bioregionalists and green anarchists, deep ecologists and ecopsychologists, ecofeminists and participants in the feminist spirituality movement, pagans and wiccans, anti-globalization protestors, and some animal liberation activists.
4. The full quote ran "Like Pallas Athena springing fully armed from the brow of Zeus, Earth First enters the wilderness fray . . ." and appeared in what was actually the second newsletter but was labeled number 1, volume 1 (the first newsletter was labeled "0"). See Susan Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs: Earth First! and the Environmental Movement* (New York: Viking, 1993), 142–44.

5. Related to the word “epistemology,” an episteme is one’s assumption about how knowledge is acquired.
6. For a good overview of what can be called a typical, radical environmental worldview, see Bron Taylor, “Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front” and “Radical Environmentalism,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, ed. Bron Taylor (London and New York: Continuum International, 2005). On ritual and spiritual perception, see Bron Taylor, “Evoking the Ecological Self: Art as Resistance to the War on Nature,” *Peace Review* 5, no. 2 (1993); and Bron Taylor, “A Green Future for Religion?” *Futures Journal* 36, no. 9 (2004).
7. See Kera Abraham, “Flames of Dissent,” a five-part series in *Eugene Weekly*, 2 November–21 December 2006, www.EugeneWeekly.com/2006/index.html (accessed July 2007); Vanessa Grigoriadis, “The Rise and Fall of the Eco-Radical Underground,” in *Rolling Stone*, 28 July 2006, www.RollingStone.com/news/story/11035255/the_rise_fall_of_the_ecoradical_underground (accessed July 2007); Matt Rasmussen, “Green Rage,” in *Orion Magazine*, January–February 2007, www.OrionMagazine.org/index.php/articles/article/6/ (accessed July 2007). Some of those aligning themselves with the Animal Liberation Front consider themselves radical environmentalists. The label is apt, in my view, if they think it is a higher priority to save endangered, nonsentient species (e.g., flora and some invertebrate fauna) over sentient members of species not facing extinction.
8. I have argued in a number of articles that it is heuristically valuable to analyze the religious dimensions of radical environmentalism; see especially Bron Taylor, “The Religion and Politics of Earth First!” *The Ecologist* 21, no. 6 (November/December, 1991); Bron Taylor, “Resacralizing Earth: Pagan Environmentalism and the Restoration of Turtle Island,” in *American Sacred Space*, ed. David Chidester and Edward T. Linenthal (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); Bron Taylor, “Earthen Spirituality or Cultural Genocide: Radical Environmentalism’s Appropriation of Native American Spirituality,” *Religion* 17, no. 2 (1997); Bron Taylor, “Earth and Nature-Based Spirituality (Part I): From Deep Ecology to Radical Environmentalism,” *Religion* 31, no. 2 (2001); Bron Taylor, “Earth and Nature-Based Spirituality (Part II): From Deep Ecology and Bioregionalism to Scientific Paganism and the New Age,” *Religion* 31, no. 3 (2001); Bron Taylor, “Diggers, Wolves, Ents, Elves and Expanding Universes: Bricolage, Religion, and Violence from Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front to the Antiglobalization Resistance,” in *The Cultic Milieu: Oppositional Subcultures in an Age of Globalization*, ed. Jeffrey Kaplan and Heléne Löföw (Lanham, MD: Altamira/Rowman and Littlefield, 2002); Bron Taylor, “Earth First!” and “Radical Environmentalism,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, ed. Bron Taylor (London and New York: Continuum, 2005). These articles take time that cannot be taken here to wrestle with problematic terms such as “religion” and “animism.” On these terms, see Bron Taylor, “Exploring Religion, Nature, and Culture,” *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture* 1, no. 1 (2007); David Chidester, “Animism,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, ed. Bron Taylor (London and New York: Continuum, 2005); Graham Harvey, *Animism: A Contemporary Perspective* (London and New York: Continuum, 2005); and Mark C. Taylor, ed., *Critical Terms for Religious Studies* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998), for starters. The term “sacred” is likewise problematic, conjuring many images. Some radical environmentalists seem to mean simply “ultimately real” and “ultimately valuable” when they use the term. Yet deeper examination suggests that the term is used to express some explicitly religious dimension akin to “holiness”—a perception that earthly nature is part of an all-encompassing divine reality.
9. Quoted in Stephen Fox, *The American Conservation Movement: John Muir and His Legacy* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981), 291, which quotes Muir’s *Journal*, 27 July 1869 (<http://cellarius.net/Muir.html>).

10. From Muir's journals; see John Muir, "John of the Mountains: The Unpublished Journals of John Muir," in *John of the Mountains*, ed. Linnie Marsh Wolfe (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1938), 313. Also quoted in Max Oelschlaeger, *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 177, who cited John Muir, ed., *The Wilderness World of John Muir* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954), 312.
11. Muir was raised on a Wisconsin homestead by a strict Scotch Calvinist father, against whom he rebelled, and a mother who sang him old Celtic songs, perhaps shaping his love of nature.
12. Michael P. Cohen, *The Pathless Way: John Muir and American Wilderness* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984); Fox, *The American Conservation Movement*, 80; Oelschlaeger, *The Idea of Wilderness*, 172–204; Holmes Rolston III, *Genes, Genesis and God: Values and Their Origins in Natural Human History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
13. Quoted in Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 65.
14. Quoted in Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 289–90. See also Carolyn Merchant, *Reinventing Eden: The Fate of Nature in Western Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003).
15. Quoted in Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 330.
16. Quoted in Fox, *The American Conservation Movement*, 43.
17. Quoted in Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 359.
18. Quoted in Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 359–60.
19. Quoted in Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 192; cf. Oelschlaeger, *The Idea of Wilderness*, 197.
20. Fox, *The American Conservation Movement*, 13–14.
21. Henry David Thoreau, ed., *Walden and Other Writings* (New York: The Modern Library, 1981), 613.
22. Henry David Thoreau, ed., *The Annotated Walden* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970), 433.
23. John Muir, ed., *Nature Writings: The Story of by Boyhood and Youth; My First Summer in the Sierra; the Mountains of California; Stickeen; Essays* (New York: Library of America, 1997 [orig. 1874]), 606.
24. Oelschlaeger correctly notes, "virtually all of Muir's later works (beginning in 1868, during his first summer in the Sierras) manifest [an] animistic vision" (*The Idea of Wilderness*, 185).
25. Ralph Waldo Emerson, ed., *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Volume 6* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), 154–5. Fox found this quote in the Ralph Waldo Emerson Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University (Fox, *The American Conservation Movement*, 5). On Muir's encounter with Emerson, see also Oelschlaeger, *The Idea of Wilderness*, 181.
26. In Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 303.
27. See Fox, *The American Conservation Movement*, 318; Linda Graber, *Wilderness as Sacred Space* (Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers, 1976), 58–67; Cohen, *The Pathless Way*, 236–52; and for a recent example of such use, see John Thaxton, ed.,

The American Wilderness: Essays by John Muir; Photographs by Ansel Adams (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993), which unites the photography of Ansel Adams (a pantheist conservationist and the twentieth century's premier nature photographer) with essays by Muir. Adams described his faith as "a vast, impersonal pantheism" in Alston Chase, *Playing God in Yellowstone: The Destruction of America's First National Park* (San Diego: A Harvest/HBJ Book, 1986), 304, cf. 295–310.

28. See the biographies of these figures in Bron Taylor, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*. Environmental historians typically consider "conservationists" to be those promoting the protection of wild lands for human use and future generations, whereas "preservationists" seek to prevent the alteration of those same lands, even if it can be done with minimal impact.
29. Fox, *The American Conservation Movement*, 80.
30. Fox, *The American Conservation Movement*, 371–3. For an example, see Alston Chase's polemic against the "superstitions" of the environmental pantheists that he believes leads to insufficient environmental management in *Playing God in Yellowstone*.
31. The works of Dolores LaChapelle expressed sentiments akin to Snyder but have been less influential, not winning a significant readership until after Earth First!'s founding. Dolores LaChapelle, *Earth Wisdom* (Silverton, CO: Finn Hill Arts, 1978); Dolores LaChapelle, *Sacred Land, Sacred Sex: Rapture of the Deep* (Silverton, CO: Finn Hill Arts, 1988).
32. Edward Abbey, *Desert Solitaire* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988).
33. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 47.
34. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 50.
35. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 135.
36. Edward Abbey, *The Monkeywrench Gang* (New York: Avon, 1975).
37. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 176.
38. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 209–10.
39. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, xii.
40. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 213.
41. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 135.
42. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 50.
43. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 205.
44. Edward Abbey, *Hayduke Lives!* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1990).
45. Abbey, *Desert Solitaire*, 117, 37–38.
46. Edward Abbey, "A Response to Schmookler on Anarchy," *Earth First!* 6, no. 7 (1986).
47. Edward Abbey, "Interview with Edward Abbey," in *Headed Upstream: Interviews with Iconoclasts*, ed. Jack Loeffler (Tucson, AZ: Harbinger, 1989), 14–15.
48. Abbey, "Interview with Edward Abbey," 15–16.
49. Gary Snyder, *Turtle Island* (New York: New Directions, 1969), 104.
50. Gary Snyder, *Practice of the Wild* (San Francisco: North Point, 1990), 93.

51. For the influence of Snyder and the beats in American culture, see Michael Davidson, *The San Francisco Renaissance: Poetics and Community at Mid-Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
52. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 40.
53. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 41.
54. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 44, quoting Max Carfard, "The Surre(gion)alist Manifesto." *Mesechabe*, Autumn 1989.
55. Interview with Gary Snyder, Davis, California, 1 June 1993.
56. Bron Taylor, "Bioregionalism: An Ethics of Loyalty to Place," *Landscape Journal* 19, nos. 1 and 2 (2000); Bron Taylor, "Snyder, Gary—and the Invention of Bioregional Spirituality and Politics," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, ed. Bron Taylor (London and New York: Continuum International, 2005).
57. Peter Berg and Raymond Dasmann, "Reinhabiting California," *The Ecologist* 7, December (1977); Peter Berg, ed., *Reinhabiting a Separate Country: A Bioregional Anthology of Northern California* (San Francisco: Planet Drum, 1978); Freeman House, "Totem Salmon," in *North Pacific Rim Alive* (San Francisco: Planet Drum, Bundle No. 3, 1974) and in *Home! A Bioregional Reader*, ed. Van Andruss, et al. (Philadelphia: New Society, 1990); Kirkpatrick Sale, *Dwellers in the Land: The Bioregional Vision* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1991 [orig. 1985]); Van Andruss et al., eds., *Home! A Bioregional Reader* (Philadelphia: New Society, 1990); Christopher Plant and Judith Plant, *Turtle Talk: Voices for a Sustainable Future* (Santa Cruz, CA: New Society Publishers, 1990).
58. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 39.
59. Gary Snyder, *The Real Work: Interviews and Talks 1964–1976* (New York: New Directions, 1980), 17. Such allusions to the land as alive are common in Snyder's writings, e.g.: "Inhabitory peoples [namely bioregionalists] sometimes say 'this piece of land is sacred' or 'all the land is sacred.' This is an attitude that draws on an awareness of the mystery of life and death; of taking life to live; of giving life back—not only to your own children, but to the life of the whole land" (*The Old Ways* [San Francisco: City Lights, 1977], 59–60).
60. Interview with Gary Snyder, Davis, California, 1 June 1993.
61. Snyder, *The Real Work*, 67.
62. This experience is available not only to backpackers, but "the same happens to those who sail in the ocean, kayak fjords or rivers, tend a garden, peel garlic, even sit on a meditation cushion. The point is to make intimate contact with the real world, real self" (Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 94).
63. The earliest such use of the cancer metaphor I have found is in Snyder's *Turtle Island*, which was originally published in 1969.
64. Snyder believes that illegal sabotage ("ecotage" in movement parlance) counterproductively cedes the moral high ground and fails to recognize that all extralegal activism is theater and must play well to the public audience. Interview with Gary Snyder, Davis, California, 1 June 1993.
65. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 5.
66. Interview with Gary Snyder, Davis, California, 1 June 1993.
67. Personal correspondence, 29 December 1993.

68. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 6.
69. “The *real work* is eating each other, I suppose.” Snyder said in *The Real Work*, 82.
70. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 184.
71. Snyder, *Practice of the Wild*, 19.
72. Snyder, *The Old Ways*, 13–14.
73. On this, see the fascinating discussion in Paul Shepard, *Coming Home to the Pleistocene* (San Francisco: Island Press, 1998), 38.
74. Freeman House’s other remarkable essay “Totem Salmon” describes the historic significance, culturally, spiritually, and materially, of the salmon to human cultures in the Pacific Northwest, and reveals a more optimistic vision about human potential than is typically present in the most radical environmental subcultures.
75. Interview with Dave Foreman, Tucson, Arizona, 23 February 1993.
76. In a 2 June 1993 interview at his home near Auburn, California, George Sessions said that White, in turn, had been influenced by Aldous Huxley. Perhaps this is where White picked up his ideas about the need to resacralize nature—from Huxley’s experimentation with hallucinogens with their derivative lessons. Attributions to Sessions not otherwise cited are from this interview.
77. LaChapelle, *Sacred Land, Sacred Sex*, 11.
78. Arne Naess, “The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary,” *Inquiry* 16 (1973).
79. Naess’s feelings about this were conveyed to me by George Sessions (interview of 2 June 1993). In this work I am using the generic definition of “deep ecology” in part because that is the form most commonly found on the ground among radical environmentalists, and in part because a number of sources well articulate Naess’s own version. See especially Arne Naess, ed., *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue, eds., *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology* (Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic, 1995), 1–63; and Naess’s articles in George Sessions, ed., *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century* (Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1995).
80. Christopher D. Stone, “Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects,” *Southern California Law Review* 45, no. Spring (1972). For the background to the controversy that led to this article, see Christopher D. Stone, *Earth and Other Ethics: The Case for Moral Pluralism* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 3–14. Both Sessions and LaChapelle stressed the importance of this conference; see, e.g., LaChapelle, *Sacred Land, Sacred Sex*, 12. Roderick Frazier Nash shows that a number of other scholars and activists were talking about the rights of nature before Stone made his better known statement; see *The Rights of Nature: A History of Environmental Ethics* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 127.
81. For Shepard’s most influential works, see Paul Shepard, *Man in the Landscape: A Historic View of the Esthetics of Nature*, 2nd ed. (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991 [orig. 1967]); and Paul Shepard, *Nature and Madness* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1982). I do not know if Shepard (who died in 1996), a biologist turned human ecologist, would have considered himself an ecopsychology pioneer; the term came later. I believe that the term is apt, however. See also, under the in-text heading “More Tributaries—But

- One Watershed” (below), the discussion of the contributions by anthropologists and other ecopsychology pioneers.
82. Vine Deloria, *God Is Red: A Native View of Religion*, 2nd ed. (Golden, CO: Fulcrum, 1994).
 83. Roderick Frazier Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 4th ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).
 84. Nash, *The Rights of Nature*.
 85. John Rodman, “Four Forms of Ecological Consciousness,” in *Ethics and the Environment*, ed. Donald Scherer and Thomas Attig (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1983); cf. Nash, *The Rights of Nature*, 153–54.
 86. What I have dubbed “primal spirituality”—the presumed nature-beneficent spirituality of indigenous peoples—Sessions labeled the “perennial philosophy,” following Aldous Huxley (*The Perennial Philosophy* [New York: Harper & Row, 1945]), who in turn drew on the work of the 17th century German polymath Gottfried Leibnitz. Sessions’s 1974 paper on Spinoza was the further outworking of the paper presented at the 1974 conference.
 87. Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy*.
 88. Loren Eiseley, *The Invisible Pyramid* (New York: Scribners, 1970).
 89. George Sessions, “Spinoza and Jeffers on Man in Nature,” *Inquiry* 20, no. 4 (1977): 481–82.
 90. Sessions, “Spinoza and Jeffers,” 509.
 91. Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*.
 92. For the platform, see Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, 27–32, esp. 29; for recent reflections on it, see David Rothenberg, “A Platform of Deep Ecology,” in *The Deep Ecology Movement*, ed. Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue (Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic, 1995); Naess’s entries in Sessions, ed., *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century* (Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1995), 213–21; and Frederic L. Bender, *The Culture of Extinction: Toward a Philosophy of Deep Ecology* (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2003), 397–444.
 93. LaChapelle, *Sacred Land, Sacred Sex*, 12.
 94. LaChapelle, *Sacred Land, Sacred Sex*, 13.
 95. Much of this work is now available in J. Baird Callicott, *In Defense of the Land Ethic: Essays in Environmental Philosophy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989).
 96. LaChapelle, *Sacred Land, Sacred Sex*, 12.
 97. Dave Foreman, *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior* (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 8.
 98. According to Jack Loeffler (who indicated that he first met Abbey in 1962) during a 21 July 1997 telephone interview.
 99. This section on early monkeywrenching draws on Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs*, 41–62, who did a fine job uncovering some of this early history, as well as on Ron Arnold, *Ecoterror* (Bellview, WA: Free Enterprise, 1997), 123–27, 193–206. Many of these details were confirmed, and additional details provided, by Jack Loeffler (21 and 23 July 1997 telephone interviews).
 100. Large dams and water projects have generally proven to be environmental and social justice disasters; see Donald Worster, *Rivers of Empire: Water, Aridity, and the Growth*

of the American West (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Marc Reisner, *Cadillac Desert: The American West and Its Disappearing Water* (New York: Penguin/Viking, 1986); and Patrick McCully, *Silenced Rivers: The Ecology and Politics of Large Dams* (London: Zed, 1996).

101. Jack Loeffler, *Headed Upstream*, 95–99.
102. Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs*, 50.
103. Telephone interview with Jack Loeffler, 21 July 1997.
104. Telephone interview with Jack Loeffler, 21 July 1997.
105. Jack Loeffler, “Black Mesa,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, ed. Bron Taylor (London and New York: Continuum International, 2005).
106. Arnold, *Ecoterror*, 195–96.
107. Sam Love and David Obst, eds., *Ecotage!* (New York: Pocket Books, 1972). The Fox was identified as James Phillips after his death in 2001 at the age of 70; see Douglas Martin, “James Phillips, 70, Environmentalist Who Was Called the Fox,” *New York Times* 2001, online edition.
108. For details see Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs*, 59–60; and Arnold, *Ecoterror*, 125, 93–206.
109. Interview with Roger Featherstone, 4 July 1993, Mt. Graham, Arizona. Featherstone said his real activist “grounding [was in] the bolt weevils,” commenting that Foreman and Mike Roselle (another of Earth First!’s co-founders) had both heard about him by the time he first met them in the early 1980s. For a detailed study, see Barry M. Casper and Paul David Wellstone, *Powerline: The First Battle of America’s Energy War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981).
110. Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs*, 248; Nash, *The Rights of Nature*, 191–92.
111. Michael Soulé and Bruce A. Wilcox, eds., *Conservation Biology: An Evolutionary-Ecological Perspective* (Sunderland, MA: Sinauer, 1980). Wilcox was one of his graduate students who shared his conviction about the need for such an applied science (telephone interview with Michael Soulé, 15 July 1997).
112. Soulé and Wilcox, *Conservation Biology*.
113. This material, regarding Soulé’s role in the development of conservation biology and his connections to deep ecology movements, is drawn from a 26 February 1993 interview with him near Tucson, Arizona and from a telephone interview on 15 July 1997, as well as from LaChapelle, who documents the importance of the Los Angeles conference in facilitating connections between a number of other prominent Buddhists (such as Roshi Robert Aitkin and Gary Snyder) and deep ecology proponents such as Naess, Sessions, and herself (*Sacred Land, Sacred Sex*, 13).
114. David Ehrenfeld, *The Arrogance of Humanism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).
115. Ehrenfeld, *The Arrogance of Humanism*, 269.
116. Reed Noss, “A Taoist Reply (on Violence),” *Earth First!* 3, no. 7 (1983): 13.
117. Noss, “A Taoist Reply.”
118. For example, Reed Noss, “Wilderness Recovery and Ecological Restoration: An Example for Florida,” *Earth First!* 1985; cf. Reed Noss, “Choosing Targets for Earth First!,” *Wiregrass*

- 2, no. 5 (1988); and Reed F. Noss, "The Wildlands Project Land Conservation Strategy," *Wild Earth (Special Issue: The Wildlands Project)* (1992).
119. Reed F. Noss and Allen Y. Cooperrider, *Saving Nature's Legacy: Protecting and Restoring Biodiversity* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1994), 21–24.
120. For the key writings see Lewis Mumford, *The Myth of the Machine* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1966); Murray Bookchin, *The Ecology of Freedom*, rev. ed. (Montreal and New York: Black Rose, 1991); John Clark, "The Social Ecology of Murray Bookchin," in *The Anarchist Moment* (Montréal: Black Rose, 1984); Brian Tokar, *The Green Alternative: Creating an Ecological Future*, 2nd ed. (San Pedro, CA: R.E. Miles, 1992); Brian Tokar, *Earth for Sale: Reclaiming Ecology in the Age of Corporate Greenwash* (Boston: South End Press, 1997); and ecofeminist–social ecologist Janet Biehl, *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics* (Boston: South End Press, 1991).
121. For the key texts, see Friedrich Georg Jünger, *The Failure of Technology* (Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1949); Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977); Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society* (New York: Vintage, 1964); Langdon Winner, *Autonomous Technology: Techniques-out-of-Control as a Theme in Political Thought* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977); Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny* (New York: Viking, 1983); Jeremy Rifkin, *Biosphere Politics: A New Consciousness for a New Century* (New York: Crown, 1991); and Jerry Mander, *In the Absence of the Sacred: The Failure of Technology and the Survival of the Indian Nations* (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1991).
122. For the seminal book-length studies, see Susan Griffin, *Women and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978); Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980); Carolyn Merchant, *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992); Riane Eisler, *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987); Marija Gimbutas, *The Civilization of the Goddess* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1991); Vandana Shiva, *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development* (London: Zed, 1988); Biehl, *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics*; and Karen J. Warren, *Ecological Feminist Philosophies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996). For the explosion of ecofeminist anthologies that well introduce the diversity of ecofeminist thought, see Judith Plant, ed., *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1989); Karen J. Warren, "Ecological Feminism" (Special Issue), *Hypatia* 6, no. 1 (1991); Karen J. Warren, ed., *Ecological Feminism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994); Carol J. Adams, ed., *Ecofeminism and the Sacred* (New York: Continuum, 1993); Greta Gaard, *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993); Michael E. Zimmerman et al., eds., *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993), 251–41; and Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin, eds., *The Gendered New World Order: Militarism, Development, and the Environment* (New York and London: Routledge, 1996).
123. See Marshal Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago: Aldine, 1968); the anthology by Richard B. Lee and Irven Devore, eds., *Man the Hunter* (Chicago: Aldine, 1968); Eiseley, *The Invisible Pyramid*; and Stanley Diamond, *In Search of the Primitive: A Critique of Civilization* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1974) for such positive appraisals, as well as the discussion of similar views expressed by Huxley, Eiseley, and Sessions and summarized above. Such anthropology has influenced many radical environmentalists (often through its popular literature and key proponents, such as Snyder, other bioregionalists, and Devall and Sessions). See John H. Bodley, *Anthropology and Contemporary Human*

Problems, 2nd ed. (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1983), 1–22, 42–58, for a good overview of anthropological debates about “primitive” cultures, combined with a representative argument that Rousseau and his progeny are not naive, but merely observant, with regard to such cultures.

124. See especially Shepard, *Man in the Landscape*; Shepard, *Nature and Madness*; Paul Shepard, *The Tender Carnivore and the Sacred Game* (New York: Scribners, 1973); Theodore Roszak, *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972); Theodore Roszak, *Person/Planet: The Creative Disintegration of Industrial Society* (New York: Anchor, 1978); Theodore Roszak, *The Voice of the Earth: An Exploration of Ecopsychology* (New York: Touchstone, 1992); Roger Walsh, *Staying Alive: The Psychology of Human Survival* (Boston and London: Shambhala, 1984); Joanna Macy, *World as Lover, World as Self* (Berkeley, CA: Parallax Press, 1991); Warwick Fox, *Toward a Transpersonal Ecology* (Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1991); Warwick Fox, ed., *Toward a Transpersonal Psychology* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996); Chellis Glendinning, *My Name Is Chellis and I'm in Recovery from Western Civilization* (Boston and London: Shambhala, 1994); and the anthologies by Roger Walsh and Francis Vaughan, *Paths Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision* (Los Angeles: Tarcher/Perigee, 1993); and by Theodore Roszak et al., eds., *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind* (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1995).
125. See Alfred North Whitehead, ed., *Process and Reality*, corrected ed. (New York: Free Press, 1978 [orig. 1929]); Werner Heisenberg, *Physics and Philosophy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962); Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962); Gregory Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* (New York: Ballantine, 1972); Gregory Bateson, *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity* (New York: Dutton, 1979); James Lovelock, *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth*, rev. ed. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Morris Berman, *The Reenchantment of the World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981); Walsh, *Staying Alive*; Fritjof Capra, *The Tao of Physics*, 4th ed. (Boston: Shambhala, 2000 [orig. 1975]); and Fritjof Capra and David Steindl-Rast, *Belonging to the Universe: Explorations on the Frontiers of Science and Spirituality* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1991). See also Macy (whose work is as much in the ecopsychology genre as in the systems theory genre), *World as Lover, World as Self* and “Council of All Beings,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, ed. Bron Taylor (London and New York: Continuum International, 2005); and Charlene Spretnak (who promotes an ethics of evolutionary kinship grounded in religious mysticism and primal spiritualities, arguing such worldviews are now confirmed by science), *States of Grace: The Recovery of Meaning in the Postmodern Age* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), 17–19; and for a good introduction, Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers, *Order out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature* (Boulder, CO: Shambhala Publications, 1984).
126. Stanislav Grof, *The Adventure of Self-Discovery: Dimensions of Consciousness and New Perspectives in Psychotherapy and Inner Exploration* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988); and Stanislav Grof, *The Holotropic Mind* (San Francisco: Harper, 1992).
127. James Hillman and Michael Ventura, *We've Had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy and the World's Getting Worse* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993).
128. Ralph Metzner, *The Well of Remembrance: Rediscovering the Earth Wisdom Myths of Northern Europe* (Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1994).
129. Andy Fisher, *Radical Ecopsychology: Psychology in the Service of Life* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002).