Taylor, Bron, "Diggers, Wolves, Ents, Elves and Expanding Universes: Global Bricolage and the Question of Violence within the Subcultures of Radical Environmentalism," in *The Cultic Milieu: Oppositional Subcultures in an Age of Globalization.* Jeffrey Kaplan and Heléne Lööw, eds. AltaMira Press: Walnut Creek, 2002. pp. 26-74.

Copyright © 2002
All Rights Reserved

CHAPTER 3

Diggers, Wolves, Ents, Elves and Expanding Universes

Bricolage, Religion, and Violence from Earth First! and the Earth Liberation Front to the Antiglobalization Resistance

Bron Taylor

Monkeywrenching or "ecotage" is a form of worship toward the earth. It's really a very spiritual thing to go out and do. You are doing sacred work and you should have to live up to that responsibility, to that sacredness. . . . Keep a pure heart and mind . . . You are a religious warrior for the Earth.

—Dave Foreman, co-founder of the Radical Environmental group "Earth First!" discussing the spirituality of direct action resistance.

ATWA—Air, Trees, Water, Animals. ATWA is your survival on earth. It's a revolution against pollution. ATWA is ATWAR with pollution—a holy war. You are either working for ATWA—life—or you're working for death. Fix it and live or run from it and die.

—Charles Manson, from the ATWA Internet site

Anyone who will read the anarchist and radical environmentalist journals will see that opposition to the industrial-technological system is widespread and growing.

—Ted Kaczynski (also known as the Unabomber) in his manifesto, "Industrial Society and Its Future"

Global Bricolage and Interpretive Issues in the Cultic Milieu

As environmental degradation intensifies, so do environment-related conflicts fueled by competing economic interests and divergent religious worldviews. The preceding epigraphs pose more questions than they answer but illustrate the potential for violence in contemporary environmental disputes.

What are we to make of such diverse rhetoric: justifying by Christian principle and religious vision the bombing of a "pro-choice" po-

litical activist who had been defending ancient forests; viewing earth as a sacred being and sabotage as a venerating act; urging widespread arson and other attacks to bring down Western industrial civilization; labeling the war against pollution as a holy war. What are we to make of the similar martial, revolutionary, and misanthropic rhetoric expressed by self-identified radical environmentalists, on the one hand, and racist visionaries like Charles Manson, on the other? Are these kindred movements?

Charles Manson apparently thinks so. When asked, "Are you familiar with, or in contact with the more radical environmental groups [such as] Earth First!, Sea Shepherds, ALF [the Animal Liberation Front], etc.?" he answered in his usual cryptic manner, "We started the root thoughts for most or a lot."[1] Perhaps, if Manson is right, we should expect a proliferation of "Helter-Skelter" like terror in proportion to growth of such movements. Apart from the link claimed by Manson, many others are fanning such fears. Charles Cushman, for example, of the pro-development Multiple Use Land Alliance, thinks that forest defenders, by promoting "a new pagan religion, worshiping trees and animals and sacrificing people" have initiated "a holy war between fundamentally different religions."[2]

Such fears are lent credence by scholars who warn that radical environmentalism promotes an atavistic primitivism reminiscent of Nazi preoccupations with blood and soil,[3] or who criticize the irrationality they believe characterizes radical environmental spirituality.[4] Even Michael Zimmerman, an early and prominent proponent of "deep ecology" (a philosophy developed by the Norwegian Arne Naess positing that nature has value apart from its usefulness to humans), who had been drawing on the anti-modernist and anti-technological writings of Martin Heidegger for his constructive efforts, dramatically reversed field, embracing enlightenment liberalism when confronted with Heidegger's Nazi past.[5]

Such concerns first confronted me when attending a workshop exploring deep ecology at a wilderness gathering of Earth First! activists in southeastern Oregon in 1991. The workshop was led by Bill Devall, who co-authored the book *Deep Ecology* (1985), an early and influential book that helped promote, popularize, and build the Earth First! movement in North America. During this small workshop with about a dozen participants, his protégée Kevin Browning, commenting on articles by Earth First! activists that had been denounced by other movement activists as racist, stated that he would take "even the KKK into the movement if they put earth first." No one challenged this statement, after which Devall denounced the "political correctness" of those placing a priority on cultural pluralism. During a later workshop on "ecotopia"—a popular movement term for the hopes of an ecological utopia coined by Ernest Callenbach with his 1975 novel *Ecotopia*—Devall's position became more clear when he got into a brief debate with other Earth First!ers who felt that movement people should promote and defend simultaneously both cultural and ecological diversity. Devall stressed that the movement's first priority must be the creation of a "bioregional community" whose identity is rooted in a place.

Perhaps Browning's statement was mere hyperbole—but its poignancy was underscored when I read a call on the Manson Internet site for all lovers of ATWA to rally to the defense of the Headwaters Redwood Forest in Northern California—thereby enlisting in a campaign initiated and

led by Earth First! activists. Is there fertile ground for an alliance between the racist right and radical environmentalists in the battle to save the planet?

Colin Campbell's discussion of the cultic milieu could be used to suggest the likelihood of such a possibility. He argues that a cultic milieu exists as a "constant feature of society" representing "the cultural underground of society" including "all deviant belief systems and their associated practices [including] unorthodox science, alien and heretical religion [and] deviant medicine."[6] He suggests that cultic groups "rarely engage in criticism of each other [and] display a marked tolerance and receptivity toward each others' beliefs"—especially because they share a "mystical tradition emphasiz[ing] that . . . unity with the divine can be attained by a diversity of paths."[7] Campbell also asserts that mysticism is "the most prominent part of the deviant religious component of the cultic world,"[8] and believes that consequently, cults tend "to be ecumenical . . . syncretistic, and tolerant in outlook," and moreover, that the fragmentation of ideas and groups that characterizes the cultic milieu is "*more than counteracted by the continuing pressure to syncretization*"[9] (my emphasis).

Since nature mysticism does permeate radical environmental subcultures,[10] and sometimes the racist right,[11] it does make sense to inquire about possible linkages and to wonder whether the cultural "tent" of the cultic milieu is pitched so broadly that radical environmentalists, and those from the racist right, might cross paths underneath it. Do they, or might they, reciprocally influence one another, even fusing syncretistically into new and more violent forms?

To address this question, we certainly must attend to countercultural processes of syncretism and bricolage within the cultic milieu. Bricolage (amalgamations of many bits and pieces of diverse cultural systems) is a better term than syncretism (the blending of elements of two traditions) to label the cultural processes analyzed by Campbell. Whatever the name for such processes, an analysis of "the cultural process of stealing back and forth sacred symbols"[12] is crucial for understanding both the religious and the political dimensions of the cultic milieu. Not only is it illuminating to examine the process of bricolage with regard to the production of religion and the related processes in which religion and its production is contested and negotiated,[13] an analysis of bricolage can be equally illuminating when analyzing the explicitly political dimensions of the diverse ideological streams floating within countercultures of resistance.

I emphasize the importance of political bricolage because Campbell asserted that cultic milieu mysticism led "to a depreciation of [and] a general indifference to all secular affairs except the most personal."[14] That may have been true when Campbell wrote it, but when exploring ethnographically the subcultures of radical environmentalism I have found that the mystical is political because the mundane (namely the Earth) is sacred.[15] Consequently, within these contemporary "subcultures of resistance," the bits and pieces thrown into the cultic melting pot include a wide range of deviant political ideas and ideologies, from well-known leftist ones, to forms of green anarchism, and most importantly, to an anti-modernist (and sometimes anti-humanist) ideology, amalgamated from many streams of religious and political thought, fundamentally hostile to and challenging of all industrial societies, whether organized along capitalist or socialist lines.

These subcultural enclaves and worldviews were largely unknown before mass antiglobalization protests erupted in the United States and Europe.

Stirring in diverse political bits with the eclectic religious pieces leads to a very interesting and sometimes confusing subcultural stew. Certainly radical environmental subcultures include "unorthodox science, alien and heretical religion, [and] deviant medicine."[16] The subcultures of radical environmentalism also include at least as hefty a dose of orthodox science (indeed, radical environmentalists claim that their views of science cohere better with contemporary scientific understandings than the more prevalent, theistic views dominant in Western societies). The participants in these subcultures also appropriate from and express solidarity with almost every resistance or revolutionary movement believed to have an ecological dimension.[17]

It is important to emphasize at the outset the global flavor of this radical environmental, countercultural stew. Its ingredients—religious and political beliefs, strategies and tactics; theories and perceptions; myths and heroes; rituals and mysticism—are cultivated and gathered from many places and peoples, increasingly spread via the Internet. Certainly the global bricolage that characterizes radical environmentalism today demands a careful empirical analysis, untainted by the views of anti-cult groups or law enforcement adversaries.[18] The best way to approach the questions posed by the emergence and proliferation of radical environmental subcultures is to fuse textual and archival research with the kind of experience and intuitive knowledge that can only come from extended and extensive qualitative field work. This is the kind of research I have conducted since 1990 and am drawing upon in these pages.

Radical Environmentalism from Earth First! to the Earth Liberation Front

Wolves, Roadshows, and *The Monkey Wrench Gang*

Earth First!, with its slogan "no compromise in defense of mother earth," was founded in 1980. According to Dave Foreman, the most charismatic leader among its co-founders, a strategic rationale undergirded this decision to create a *radical* environmental movement: (1) to introduce and promote sabotage as well as civil disobedience as a means of environmental struggle; (2) to shame mainstream environmentalists into taking stronger stands through brutal criticism of them; and (3) by taking on the mantle of "environmental extremism," mainstream groups might appear more reasonable by comparison, thereby gaining influence and effectiveness (the "good-cop—bad-cop" strategy). As importantly, Foreman wanted to attack anthropocentric attitudes and argue instead that the natural world has value in itself, not only when useful to humans. He felt he was not allowed to speak passionately for such values while working for mainstream environmental organizations.

In the United States, Earth First! rapidly become known for its dramatic civil disobedience campaigns, and the occasional use of sabotage, in its efforts to thwart commercial incursions into the planet's few remaining

roadless areas.[19] Many if not most Earth First! activists ground this conviction in mystical experiences in the natural world. I have previously labeled Earth First!'s religious orientation "primal spirituality" because many within this subculture venerate and seek to learn from and emulate the world's remaining indigenous cultures, especially those cultures unassimilated into the global market economy. They generally consider such cultures to be spiritually and ecologically wise, and wish to be in solidarity with them against what they perceive to be the voracious appetite of industrial civilization.

Throughout the 1980s, the entree to Earth First! for many was one or more of its many touring "roadshows," where typically, through music, photographs, and speeches, activists promoted eco-defense actions. I attended perhaps the movement's archetypal rally when Dave Foreman himself gave an April 1990 presentation in Wisconsin. The crowd that evening was large, no doubt swelled by Foreman's growing infamy as a leader of an "outlaw" organization, fueled further by his arrest the previous year for allegedly funding efforts to sabotage power lines associated with a nuclear power plant in Arizona, a crime for which he eventually pled guilty.

Foreman gave a spellbinding, Mark Twain-style rave. He began by spinning a yarn about an encounter on the Colorado River with Interior Department Secretary James Watt, the Reagan-era demon of environmental calamity. In theatrical style, he recalled regaling and threatening Watt, only to suffer an equally vituperative attack. Foreman then quietly offered the story's lesson, that "rhetoric is not enough"; rather, in this very moment, characterized by the greatest anthropogenic (human-caused) extinction crisis in evolutionary history, it is time to act.

Throughout his performance, Foreman worked the crowd, weaving loud cascades of rhetoric with quieter moments, evoking reflection. After recounting several recent extinctions and reviewing dynamics threatening many more, he urged moral introspection, identifying the roots of environmental degradation in the anthropocentric (human-centered) idea that the land and its inhabitants are mere commodities for human consumption. He urged instead that we appropriate John Muir's[20] perception that everything in the universe is connected, and articulated what I would call an ethics of *evolutionary kinship*, a perspective increasingly articulated by environmentalists and eco-philosophers alike: Since all species have evolved through the same evolutionary process, they are kin and deserve treatment that respects their own evolution-derived lifeways.[21]

It is such a perspective that led Foreman, with other radical environmental activists and many contemporary environmental philosophers,[22] to conclude that *all life has value, apart from its usefulness to human beings, and thus, all life ought be allowed to continue its evolutionary unfolding.*[23] Despite disagreements about many things, this simple proposition captures the central, moral claim of participants in radical environmental and deep ecology subcultures.[24] In the parlance of contemporary environmental philosophy, this is biocentric (life-centered) ethics, and its ubiquity within deep ecology and radical environmental subcultures expresses a common-denominator value that allows us to refer accurately to all of them as "movement" and "emerging tradition"—even while recognizing great diversity within these subcultures in the ways their adherents conceive of, arrive at, and act upon such values.[25]

Toward the end of his rabble-rousing speech, Foreman gave the crowd various examples of environmental action to consider, both legal and illegal. He then built to his finale, referring to Aldo Leopold's book, *A Sand County Almanac*, calling it "the most beautiful and important book written in this [the twentieth] century." In this posthumously published volume, Leopold articulated a novel, biocentric "Land Ethic": An action "is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community . . . [which includes] soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land. . . . It is wrong when it tends otherwise." This perspective, Leopold wrote, "changes the role of *Homo sapiens* from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it."[26] Foreman recounted how this ethic was born in a wilderness epiphany Leopold had as a young man working for the newly formed U.S. Forest Service. While conducting a timber inventory, Leopold and his co-workers thoughtlessly killed a wolf. Decades later, Leopold wrote of this incident in words reminiscent of the Apostle Paul's conversion on the Damascus road. Foreman recounted Leopold's words from memory,

> We reached the old wolf in time to watch a fierce green fire dying in her eyes. I realized then, and I've realized ever since, there was something new to me in those eyes, something known only to the wolf and to the mountain. I was young then and full of trigger itch. Because fewer wolves meant more deer, I believed no wolves would mean hunter's paradise, but after watching the green fire die I realized that neither wolf nor mountain agreed with such a view.[27]

For Foreman, Leopold's story provides more than a land ethic. It also offers redemption: "What we need to do is remember how to think like a mountain. We need the green fire in the wolf's eyes. We need the green fire in our own eyes. . . . We need the cry of the wolf, the spirit of joy . . . defiance . . . and love that it can bring." Foreman was exhorting the assembly members to rediscover their own wild animal selves, believing that were they to do so, they would defend wildlands with passion and commitment.

To celebrate and symbolize this passion for the wild in the world—to connect with it and with the green fire encrusted within all humans—Foreman apparently borrowed a scene right out of *The Monkey Wrench Gang*.[28] This Edward Abbey novel celebrated the exploits of a band of ecoteurs intent on dynamiting the Glen Canyon Dam—which activists decry for desecrating Glen Canyon and enslaving the Colorado. It would be difficult to underestimate the importance of this "fictional" narrative on the radical environmental movement. Inspired by an already existing guerilla movement emerging in the southwestern United States, *The Monkey Wrench Gang* struck a chord, contributing to the proliferation of various monkey-wrench gangs after 1980, and as importantly for the present purposes, this book became a primary source for appropriation by movement activists. That night, Foreman borrowed from a grizzled character in the novel, George Washington Hayduke, who at one point let out a "long and prolonged, deep and dangerous, wild archaic howl" from the edge of a desert canyon.[29] In Hayduke's footsteps, Foreman exhorted the assembly:

> Howl with me tonight! Howl with defiance! Robots don't howl. Computers don't howl. But animals do. And free women and men who love the earth howl. Don't ever let them take that from you! Howl with me tonight! Howl!

Two-thirds of the congregants did, rising in a standing ovation. The rest looked furtively askance at the wilder ones in their midst.[30]

This event suggested to me that Foreman and the movement he was promoting were engaged in new religious production, developing powerful myths and ritual forms, and prescribing ethical actions in defense of a nature considered sacred. In the subsequent years, as I studied intensively this movement, its religious dimensions and the ways it precipitated environment-related social conflict would become all the more clear.

The most common perception animating the movement can accurately be labeled "pagan," namely, a spirituality involving one or more of two perceptions: (1) the Earth itself is alive and sacred, a perception that for many could properly be labeled Pantheism (a word derived by conflating the Greek word *pan* meaning "all" and *theos* meaning "god," or "all is god."); and (2) that the world is filled with non-human intelligences—often thought to be capable of communicating and communing with humans—who are worthy of reverence. These perceptions, often labeled "animism" (from the Latin for "soul"), describe the belief that various entities in nature have souls or spirits.[31]

And the most common way the movement has precipitated environment-related social conflict is through "direct action," movement parlance for everything from traditional civil disobedience (conscientious lawbreaking and passive submittal to arrest in an effort to arose the conscience of the community and foster social change thereby, often related to boycotting of companies or industries engaged in destructive practices) to more aggressive efforts to physically stop such practices, for example, through sophisticated blockades and deconstruction of logging roads, as well as by clandestine sabotage and arson.[32]

Elvish Mischief and Wilderness 'Rendezvous'

The spirituality and politics of Earth First! are developed and contested at wilderness rendezvous, where activists gather in remote places to conduct workshops, bond, and engage in revelry and ritual.

At the first such gathering I attended, held in a northern Wisconsin forest during the summer of 1990, the workshop discussions began as people recalled their paths to Earth First!. During a subsequent strategy session, the discussion turned to monkeywrenching (movement parlance for ecological sabotage, or "ecotage"). This was unsurprising, since Earth First! was founded in part to provide a forum for such discussions and because ecotage, especially the forms that might risk harm to humans, had always been controversial.

The discussion began as two individuals expressed support for civil disobedience but discomfort with monkeywrenching, specifically mentioning tree spiking, the most widely known and controversial form of ecotage. (Tree spiking involves inserting metal, ceramic, or stone spikes into trees in an effort to prevent logging.) *Ecodefense* recommended against putting spikes "in the lower three feet of the tree, where they can cause chainsaw kickback and a remote but real possibility of injury to the feller." The primer continued, "We're in it to save trees, not hurt people . . . the object . . . is to destroy the blades in the sawmill . . . [creating a] long-term deterrent effect," namely, the scuttling of logging plans.[33]

That warm summer day a shaggy young man from northern Wisconsin volunteered that, with 100 dollars and two days, one could spike 100 wooded acres. He added that ecotage is a good antidote to depression. A few years later in the spring of 1993 his therapy was suspended when, for the first time in U.S. history, he and two others were arrested and thereafter convicted for a 1989 tree spiking incident in Idaho's Clearwater National Forest.[34]

After he expressed enthusiasm for tree spiking, however, others expressed reservations. One woman worried about the resulting bad publicity and that "it might not hurt the right person." She was unaware, apparently, that the tactic was not designed to hurt anybody. Another woman agonized about how their tactics sometimes made her feel like a religious fundamentalist. A young man in a tie-dyed shirt said he opposed monkeywrenching "both spiritually and practically—I don't think it will work, especially if it endangers someone."

In the ensuing discussion, one long-term activist stressed that ecotage need not endanger anyone; another urged that it be broadly construed to include "paper" monkeywrenching, namely lawsuits and writing.[35] "Violence has always been central to social change," countered another voice, suggesting that it has its time and place.

Another long-term activist tried to bridge the apparent gap, arguing that both civil disobedience and monkeywrenching were needed to promote the desired changes and that monkeywrenching is the only way some activists can make a difference because they are poor and could not afford to get arrested or file lawsuits. He then repeated the "economic warfare" justification for the tactic, arguing that Chris Manes in *Green Rage* proved that direct action can bankrupt the perpetrators of destruction, or buy time other activists need to file and win lawsuits.

Dave Foreman in *Ecodefense*, repeatedly described precautions to ensure "nobody gets hurt." The volume is periodically naive in this regard, however, and not only about tree spiking. It discusses various ways to flatten tires, for example, acknowledging that injuries to a "vehicle operator" might result. One might expect, consequently, a prescription to flatten the tires only of parked vehicles or those certain to be moving slowly. But soon afterward the book suggests that "perhaps the best use of caltrops [sharpened metal spikes fashioned like a child's jacks] is for security in the event you are being chased, a use well-illustrated in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*."[36] It is hard to imagine a more dangerous scenario than one where caltrops are dropped in front of pursuing vehicles, yet safety precautions about flattening tires were reserved for other situations.[37] A later article in *Earth First!* (Anonymous 2 February 1988) explicitly acknowledged a risk of injury from using road spikes, urging caution about their placement. Yet Bill Wood in *American Motorcyclist* asserted that a motorcyclist was injured when he swerved to avoid 200 caltrops placed in a high-speed area of the Barstow to

Las Vegas desert race. Ironically adopting rhetoric of the sacred to make his case, Wood concluded, "The other amazing thing about this act of terrorism is that it desecrated the very desert that the members of Earth First! pretend to be protecting."[38]

Whatever the facts of the case that Wood describes (which I could not independently verify), the discussions of tree spiking and tire flattening in *Ecodefense* illustrate the danger that when consequences are unforeseen violence can occur despite nonviolent intentions. (The issue of road spiking precipitated an early watershed in Earth First! history, when Pete Dustrud, the editor of *Earth First!*, was forced out of this position due to his discomfort with discussion of tactics that came to "border on outright violence," including a discussion of spiking roads with metal stakes.)[39]

It is not uncommon to hear naïve and romanticized exhortations regarding monkeywrenching at Earth First! gatherings. During my first wilderness rendezvous in Wisconsin, for example, while discussing the U.S. Forest Service's deforestation agenda, someone suggested "a national coordinated effort to firebomb, at the same time, all forest service offices." Another voice cautioned, "We're supposed to be nonviolent. Do it when there is nobody there." Arson has been increasingly deployed as a tactic, especially since the late 1990s by activists operating under the monikers Earth Liberation Front and Animal Liberation Front, and it continues to be described and defended as a nonviolent tactic.

For his part, despite his insistence that "Monkeywrenchers—although non-violent—are warriors,"[40] and despite the many safety precautions he urged activists to scrupulously apply, Foreman periodically engaged in inflammatory rhetoric that defended, at least, defensive violence. In 1982 he wrote, "We've been nice for too long. . . . I don't know about you, but I don't plan to fight with one hand tied behind my back. I might even have a shiv or some brass nucks in my boot."[41] He also likened the rape of the earth to attacks on one's family, "If you come home and find a bunch of Hell's Angels raping your wife, old mother, and eleven-year-old daughter, you don't sit down and talk balance with them and suggest compromise. You get your twelve-gauge shotgun and blow them to hell." Although he admires nonviolent approaches such as "advocated by Gandhi and Martin Luther King," he concluded, "unfortunately, I am still an animal. . . . I can not turn the other cheek."[42] He claimed in this article that "EARTH FIRST! does not advocate violence or monkeywrenching. That is an individual choice," but concluded that he would, nevertheless, discuss such tactics in the journal.

Unsurprisingly, this editorial engendered some strong disagreement, including from two prominent Buddhists, Robert Aitken and Gary Snyder.[43] Foreman responded to Aitken in a way similar to what I have heard other Earth First!ers say on several occasions since then, "Any creature, no matter how seemingly meek, will fight back when threatened." He then asserted, "Eastern [religious] ideas of stepping out of the violent cycle are presumptuous and anthropocentric (by setting human beings apart from the semi-violent natural world)" and concluded, "I am entirely pragmatic about violence/nonviolence. We should use whichever we feel comfortable with and whichever is most appropriate to a particular situation . . . . There are many paths one can take to defend our Earth Mother. Including that of the warrior."[44]

Foreman's statements about violence have often been ambiguous or inconsistent.[45] In "Strategic Monkeywrenching,"[46] and in *Confessions of an Ecowarrior*[47] under the heading "Monkeywrenching Is Not Revolutionary," Foreman wrote in a way that seemed to allow some room for tactics certain to be painted as violent: "Explosives, firearms and other dangerous tools are *usually* avoided [My emphasis]. They invite greater scrutiny from law enforcement agencies, repression and loss of public support."[48] Such ambivalence and ambiguity is easy to find in individual Earth First!ers and in the movement itself.

Moreover, many activists scoff at Foreman's claim that ecotage is not revolutionary, including Earth First! co-founder Mike Roselle:

> What we want is nothing short of a revolution. Fuck that crap you read in *Wild Earth* or *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*. Monkeywrenching is more than just sabotage, and your (sic) goddamn right it's revolutionary! This is jihad, pal. There are no innocent bystanders, because in these desperate hours, bystanders are not innocent. We'll broaden our theater of conflict. What happens in Bangkok, Ho Chi Minh City, Rio de Janeiro, in the frozen and radioactive waters of Siberia does matter—even if it's not in our wilderness proposal. Everything, every assumption, every institution needs to be challenged. Now![49]

Another example of an overtly revolutionary understanding of ecotage can be found in a "Black Cat Sabotage Manual,"[50] which was advertised in *Earth First!* and quietly circulated in the mid 1990s. It was compiled as a supplement to *Ecodefense* and designed to be untethered to nonviolence principles it considered anthropocentric. It included firearms instruction reprinted from anarchist tabloids, and in one article, although demurring from offering instructions about making explosives, nevertheless passed on the availability of such recipes on the Internet's rec.arts.pyrotechnics Website. The manual also cited a 1985 arson attack to demonstrate the value of ecotage as a tactic of economic warfare: "Ecoteurs firebombed a $250,000 wood chipper in Hawaii which was grinding rainforest into fuel for sugar mills (without a permit and in violation of a court order). The company then went bankrupt."[51]

The possibility that movement activists might resort to life-threatening acts of arson was underscored when in the early morning hours of 31 October 1996, the Oakridge Ranger Station, located about 40 miles southeast of Eugene, Oregon—a U.S. Forest Service office at the epicenter of long and contentious battles over logging—was burned to the ground, causing an estimated 9 million dollars worth of damage. On the roof of the Detroit Ranger Station seventy miles to the north, another incendiary device had failed to ignite. Graffiti left by the arsonists suggested involvement by the Earth Liberation Front (known by the acronym ELF), an anarchistic offshoot from England's Earth First! that formed in 1992.[52] "Tara the Sea Elf" accounced in *Earth First!* that the elves had created twenty clandestine cells in England by 1993, subsequently coordinating numerous attacks (including arson) on corporations in Europe and North America.[53]

In the United States, many of the most radical of Earth First! and green anarchist activists quickly adopted the ELF moniker, seeming emboldened by it. By mid 1999, arson and ecotage conducted by those operat-

ing mostly under the ELF or Animal Liberation Front (ALF) monikers was estimated at over 40 million dollars in 11 western states alone, nearly 30 million of which occured since the Sea Elf's 1996 announcement.[54] Targets included automobile dealers selling gas-guzzling sport-utility vehicles, "trophy homes" being constructed in or near wildlands, and research facilities believed engaged in genetic engineering. In the most expensive single incident, with a loss estimated at 12 million dollars, a mountaintop lodge at the Vail, Colorado, ski resort was burned in an act of resistance to its plans to expand into a forest designated by some biologists as "critical habitat" for the endangered lynx.

The ELF also provided a tent under which the increasingly plural bricolage of radical environmentalism could continue to evolve, one in which diverse revolutionary ideologies would cross-fertilize with various understandings of deep ecology and animal liberation. The ELF moniker caught on rapidly partly because it provided a rubric for putting a positive spin on the most radical of actions (elves are viewed positively in western literature as playfully mischievous, not malicious), and partly because the idea of elves in the woods cohered with the pagan spiritualities of many of these activists. Indeed, the ELF "perpetuates the legends of the 'Little People,' which in most European countries have a history of causing trouble, being mischievously always heard, but never seen. These 'mythical creatures' lived close to the earth in most legends," according to Sea Elf Tara.[55] These elves function as fairies do for other radical environmental activists—they are appropriated as symbolic earth warriors—conjuring images that resonate with the pagan spirituality animating many activists. All such groups, Tara concluded, both radical environmental ones and groups like the militant American Indian Movement "reflect the philosophy of many First Nations [indigenous peoples] across the world, that you have to show your enemy how serious you are in defending what you regard as sacred."[56] Nevertheless, Elves and their sympathizers usually emphasize nonviolence but do not consider property damage violent: "As always, ELF calls for no injury to life, only to profit and property."[57] Given the revolutionary rhetoric, this may seem an odd injunction, but most radical environmentalists believe that they cannot directly confront industrial nation states by force of arms. The apparent contradiction suggests that it is difficult for radical environmentalists to resolve their feelings about violence or achieve consensus about it.

After the Oakridge arson, for example, I heard several Earth First!ers express anger and dismay, acknowledging that one of the more anarchistic Earth First! brethren could well be responsible. I also heard several voices privately expressing approval of the action, or less strongly, stating they were not going to lose any sleep over it. Meanwhile, others wondered privately, and suggested to the media, that movement enemies could be responsible, trying to discredit the nonviolent resistance.[58]

Over the years I have heard many different voices on strategy and tactics, occasionally including the kind of martial rhetoric sometimes voiced by the elves. Yet in such cases, like that first weekend in Wisconsin when one activist blurted out, "We are at war—we can't refrain from anything," moderating voices often respond. On that occasion, one of the long-term Earth First! activists cautioned, "We need to distinguish monkeywrenching from war. In war or terrorism you kill a person. With monkeywrenching, you try to stop the unconscionable activity. We don't want to kill the logger [or] capitalist."

The preceding analysis suggests that in movement debates and history, there are many differences regarding strategic priorities and tactics. Yet there are significant agreements too, which make it possible to speak about radical environmentalism in the singular tense, as *a* movement with *a* worldview—despite its diverse factions, power struggles, and contested issues. In radical environmental subcultures, a process of global bricolage is at work—the borrowing and amalgamation (combined with creative invention) of bits and pieces of largely deviant (or alternative) religious and political ideas and practices. I will now examine in more detail first the religious and then the political dimensions of this global bricolage process, and how these shape tactical decisions.

The Bricolage of Radical Environmental Religion

Put briefly, religion is the human cultural process by which people orient themselves to that which they consider sacred.[59] To understand the religious dimensions of radical environmentalism we must understand what its participants consider sacred, and examine ways its myths, symbols, rites and ethics are being invented and prescribed, borrowed and creatively amalgamated. This reveals that, with sufficient creativity, almost anything is ripe for appropriation into the amalgamated and fluid religion of radical environmentalism. By examining the wild process of bricolage within radical environmentalism, I will illuminate further its *worldview*.

Myths, of course, provide narratives about how the world came to be (a cosmogony), what it is like (a cosmology), what people are like and capable or incapable of achieving (a moral anthropology), and what the future holds (an eschatology). Ethical norms are deduced from these narrative elements or presented forthrightly in them. It is important also to remember that religious traditions are plural, they are neither monolithic nor static, they are characterized by ongoing controversies over who owns, interprets and performs the myths, rituals, and rites.[60] This characteristic makes it possible—even given great internal plurality, for certain core beliefs, behaviors, and values to sufficiently unify a disparate group so as to make it possible to speak of its members as participating in a tradition.[61]

Such unifying themes can be found in Earth First!,[62] but a question arises whether this holds true as green anarchists increased their representation in the movement, beginning in the mid 1980s, and even more since then, to where by the summer of 2001, it was widely noticed that the anarchist contingent seemed on the verge of constituting a new majority within the movement. This transpired as their influence increased as a result of long and wrenching power struggles, which I cannot detail here, but that had the effect of driving many non-anarchists out of Earth First! and creating the conditions for more anarchists to immigrate to Earth First!, finding it an increasingly hospitable habitat for their activism.

The earliest such power struggles precipitated the 1990 resignations of the entire staff of the *Earth First!* journal and the withdrawal of Dave Foreman from the movement he, more than any other individual, helped to instigate. Foreman and John Davis (who he had installed as editor

of the journal several years before these resignations) went on to found *Wild Earth,* drawing most movement intellectuals with them. Foreman, Reed Noss, Rod Mondt, David Johns, and others soon created the Wildlands Project, a long-term endeavor to create connected wilderness areas large enough to sustain viable populations of all native species.

There were various dimensions to the 1990 schism,[63] the most important of which was the influx of anarchists who harshly criticized Edward Abbey, Dave Foreman, and others whom they perceived to be insensitive to social justice issues. Some of the disputes were grounded on differing perceptions about the United States and Western civilization, both of which the anarchists wished to dismantle. Dave Foreman, however, despite sometimes expressing rhetoric that seemed to share such a view, and despite being (ironically) responsible for drawing anarchists to Earth First!, never demonized the government or Western civilization in as comprehensive a fashion as did the anarchists.

He recently stated, for example, "Western civilization (imperialism) and the United States of America deserve plenty of criticism. . . . But the United States is not wholly evil. No other nation can come close to the United States on protection of civil liberties. The Bill of Rights is recognized as the United States' great gift to the world. And we have given the world an even greater gift: the idea of National Parks and Wilderness Areas."[64]

Most green anarchists would scoff at such statements and one indicator of this is their pejorative label for his new journal, "mild earth." Many of these anarchist Earth First!ers disavow Dave Foreman, as he does them: "The group calling itself Earth First! today is not the group Howie Wolke and I started. Earth First! ended in the late 80s. The name and some of the assets were appropriated by people with an entirely different perspective and approach."[65]

What both parties to this dispute tend to downplay is their fundamental agreement about the intrinsic (or inherent) value of the non-human world and the need to defend it aggressively. Foreman and his allies often feel that those who are engaged in various social justice campaigns are not *really* biocentric. Often this is true of newcomers and those anarchists who have not jettisoned the anthropocentrism that until recently has characterized most anarchist thought. On the other hand, many green anarchists consistently advocate a world transformed by biocentric values, believing species can only be saved by comprehensively reordering human society along egalitarian lines. If there is a marker identifying a place where biocentric anarchists and deep ecologists agree, it may be in their nature-related epistemology, their view of how one comes to know spiritual truth and the ultimate value of life on Earth.

Natural Epistemology and Listening to the Land

We can again start with Dave Foreman's views, which express this epistemological premise. Basing his views in part on influential historians who trace anti-wilderness attitudes to Christianity,[66] Foreman once argued:

> Our problem is a spiritual crisis. The Puritans brought with them a theology that saw the wilderness of North America as a haunt of Satan, with savages as his disciples and wild animals as his demons—all of which had to be cleared, defeated, tamed, or killed. Opening up the dark forests became a spiritual mission: to flush evil out of hiding. If we are going to survive in North America, we have to go back, metaphorically, to that pilgrim shore again. Let's seek to learn from the land this time.[67]

Foreman believes that if we are to reharmonize our lifeways within nature we must "learn from the land" herself. This epistemological premise signals an animistic or pantheistic spiritual perception.

The key to the puzzle of people like Foreman who regularly express religious views while not feeling particularly religious *may* be found in beliefs like Foreman's: that cultivating a proper spiritual perception requires "personal relationship to the natural world" which in turn requires time spent outdoors.[68] This does not seem to fit what many people would label "religion," yet there is a near-consensus about this within radical environmental subcultures. Dolores LaChapelle, for example, who was influential early in the evolution of deep ecology, includes in her books instructions about "how to set up structures so that nature herself . . . can once again begin to teach you."[69] Many other books, such as *Deep Ecology,*[70] *Green Rage,*[71] and *The Spell of the Sensuous*[72] similarly urge people to learn to listen to the land itself. It is hard to miss the paganism in such "listen to the land" epistemologies.

If time spent in wild places is the most powerful means of connecting to a sacred, natural world, this poses a problem for the movement: How can citified humans break through to such perceptions? This is an important *strategic* question for movement activists. One partial answer is that people have within their own bodies sufficient evidence of wildness and its value: so for some, promoting wildness among urban people "by all possible means," from anarchist rebellion to the radical sex community—might contribute to the arousal of the wild, ecological self.

Roadshows, the Arts, and Green Fire

A more prevalent and typical answer, however, is that many types of music and drama, poetry and prose, and visual art can reach people on an emotional and spiritual level when rational argument cannot. Like wilderness itself, such art can evoke in receptive humans the affective, intuitively available knowledge of the true, wild self that is deeply rooted in the sacred natural world in all her diverse forms. Such a moral anthropology undergirds the evangelical strategy of much deep ecological activism, including the roadshows.

We earlier saw the importance of Leopold's story of the wolf's dying green fire in Dave Foreman's roadshow performance. This narrative urges us to "think like a mountain," another way of exhorting, "listen to the land." Such a message I have seen on movement bumper stickers, and it was consistently conveyed by various performers in roadshows across America since 1981. When viewing these roadshows through the lenses of the study of religion, such performances appear as ritual.

Ritual focuses attention on the sacred and corresponding moral duties—and roadshows are an important form of movement ritualizing. They attempt, for example, to address the movement's epistemological presuppositions by bringing an experience of the wild right to urban humans,

both through photographic-transparency presentations of pristine wilderness and through music. The implicit belief is that, even through these photographic proxies, the land itself can speak to us—receptive humans recognize the value of pristine places when we see them. Sometimes these photographs are juxtaposed with photographs of landscapes devastated by logging. Many activists believe that even damaged landscapes can speak to the heart, that people intuitively know, when they see it, that clearcut logging is wrong.[73] Receptive humans immediately and intuitively recognize destroyed wildlands as desecrated places.

Perhaps the central mythic narrative at these roadshows is Leopold's epiphany with the wolf. The wolf's "green fire" was appropriated not only by Dave Foreman, but in various ways in each of a series of Earth First! performers throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Some of these were even called "green fire" roadshows, including a tour in 1989 and 1990 performed by Roger Featherstone and Earth First! balladeer "Dakota" Sid Clifford. Clifford's own "green fire" ballad provided the musical climax for these roadshows, which he later labeled "ecovangelism."[74] Featherstone enlisted green fire in an effort to ameliorate mounting internal tensions that had accompanied the growth and growing diversity of Earth First! Such growth is fine as long as it is of passionate wildness and green fire, Featherstone admonished. In a cheerleading-like cadence, he then asked rhetorically, "WHAT MAKES THE EARTH FIRST! MOVEMENT? Green Fire! WHAT SETS US APART? Green Fire! WHAT IS OUR GREATEST STRENGTH? Green Fire! WHAT IS OUR MESSAGE? Green Fire!" Then addressing criticisms the male-dominated "old guard" of the movement had been facing, he continued, "What would the movement be without our 'drunk and ignorant' image, our 'fuck the human race' chanters, our misanthropy?" Nowhere, he replied, because "we need our wild side as surely as we need our brains." So, "Viva the revolution" and "burn those dozers."[75]

To summarize, although a central component of Earth First! roadshows has been to impart the central cognitive claims of the movement regarding the ecological crisis and the political and economic obstacles preventing effective responses to it, there is an abiding epistemological assumption undergirding all of them. Roadshows will fail unless they evoke our affective and spiritual connections to wild nature and thereby arouse to action the wild human believed to reside in each of us. Perhaps for this reason, all the roadshows I have witnessed appropriate Leopold's story. The wolf and its "green fire" has become a totemic symbol of life in the wild, about what life can and should be like, and this view is now deeply embedded in the ritual life of this emerging tradition. Moreover, by encouraging "thinking like a mountain" (at least metaphorically), this narrative represents an affinity with animistic and pantheistic beliefs: The wolf and other creatures, as well as the mountain itself, have their own points of view, which receptive humans can apprehend. It may be that the green fire narrative, adopted from a man who may be judged by history to be the twentieth century's most influential ecologist, is in the process of becoming the radical environmental movement's central mythic narrative, an animistic one expressing kinship among, and the possibility of communication among, humans and other natural entities.

Primal Spirituality and Shamanism

Of course, animal-human communication is a common concern of primal religions, and animal-human and human-animal transmogrification and communion are a part of shamanism. Many Earth First!ers report having had shamanistic experiences, which they generally believe to be available among a wide variety of primal peoples.

Some Earth First!ers have gained such experiences from various spiritual practitioners within the cultic milieu that is the New Age. Afterward, some of these Earth First!ers then have imported such practices into radical environmental venues. Moreover, since the New Age movement is involved in a widespread appropriation from Native American and other indigenous cultures, this movement is sometimes the vehicle by which bits of Native American ceremonies are brought into radical environmental subcultures. Despite this influence (about which many ordinary activists are probably unaware), many radical environmentalists express contempt for New Age religion. Nevertheless, this contempt inheres more to the political complacency and "flaky" otherworldliness of many New Agers, and to an utter contempt for any optimistic, golden "Age of Aquarius" eschatology, than to the affinity some New Agers have for primal cultures and religion.[76]

Michael Lewis provides a representative expression of the view that shamanism is an ecologically appropriate form of spirituality.

> Primitive humans knew that the world of dreams, myths, religion and imagination was as real as the "hard" world around them. It was important to be able to enlist the aid of the creatures of the mythic world in dealing with the everyday problems of the physical world. . . . The shaman travels to the other world, enlists the aid of the appropriate spirit and returns by the same path to bring the spirit to help the patient cure himself. . . . The shaman acts as a bridge between the two worlds, enlisting the aid of the spirit world to help solve problems in the physical, and carrying the expressions of appreciation from the physical to the spiritual. . . . Through shamanic journeys, vision quests, sweats, drumming and dancing, the shaman becomes as familiar with the spirit world as we are with our own . . . the important lesson in the shamanic approach to life is the view of the universe as an integrated, living whole. . . . If Mother Earth is indeed a living, breathing body of this Being, then we can communicate and cooperate with the Great Mother and with each part of the Mother Corpus. As we dream, hallucinate and create visions, so does Gaia, and these visions are . . . our means of communication with the Earth Mother and with her other co-inhabitants.[77]

Lewis concluded this article by encouraging people to seek shamanic experiences, such as those available from "several organized 'schools' of shamanism, such as the Sun Bear Tribe."[78]

The recommended shamanism schools fit well, for analytic purposes, under the New Age umbrella. And interestingly, several prominent activists who lead various types of spiritual workshops or movement ritualizing have been participants in the groups led by Native Americans, such as Sun Bear and Wallace Black Elk, who provide ritual experiences such as Sweat Lodge ceremonies and vision quests to non-Indians.[79]

A number of others have attended the workshops led by anthropologist turned neo-shamanist Michael Harner, who wrote the influential *Way of the Shaman* and created a Foundation for Shamanic Studies to promote shamanic journeying and healing. Still others have participated in various "breathwork" workshops, which are supposed to induce altered states of consciousness and promote "shamanic journeying" into spirit worlds and the acquisition of "power animals" and "spirit allies" in a quest to enhance the ability of participants to live properly on earth. A small number of radical environmental activists have, after participation in such workshops, taken it as their primary calling *and* ecological strategy to deepen their shamanic experience and promote widely this kind of experience among activists and non-activists alike.[80] Indeed, some radical environmentalists believe that the environmental crisis is so grave that the only chance to arrest the presently unfolding environmental catastrophe is by fostering a massive change in human consciousness through such spiritual practice.

John Seed, a prominent international Earth First! activist from Australia who has been active in Earth First! since the early 1980s, participating in many roadshows in Australia and the United States since that time, has helped construct and disseminate widely in the United States, Australia, and Europe the ritual process known as the "Council of All Beings."[81] No other ritual process invented since the emergence of the radical environmental and deep ecology movements has been more important than the Council of All Beings.

Reputedly most effective when conducted over an entire weekend, the Council is an eclectic "ritual of inclusion" designed to connect participants in a loving way with earth and all her species as well as to bond participants together and motivate them to engage in environmental defense. The ritual is also a perfect example of an eclectic global bricolage, appropriating elements from Native American spirituality (a brief, animistic vision quest, among other things); science-based scientific narratives about the unfolding universe and biological evolution of life on earth; and pagan songs including several celebrating Gaia or otherwise venerating earth itself. Perhaps because the process was developed primarily by Joanna Macy and John Seed, two practicing Buddhists, the majority of exercises were borrowed and adapted from Buddhism.

In one of the most amusing bits of movement bricolage, a song written by Monty Python humorist Erik Idle, "Expanding Universe," was stolen for the ritual (it is also sung on other movement occasions). Seed, however, did not like the nihilistic and disempowering ending: "So remember when you're feeling very small and insecure / How amazingly unlikely is your birth"—so he wrote four new stanzas—"So sink your roots deep into the galaxy / Dance your life, Planet Earth / Sink your roots deep into reality / Dance your life *for* Planet Earth." Thereby, Seed transformed the song into a celebration of the miracle of a life mystically embedded in this earthly spot in the universe—and lived out in defense of her. Certainly, here is creative myth-making, a fascinating adaptation of scientific narrative for religious purpose.[82]

"Ecopsychology" provides another ritual resource for radical environmentalism, and much of this can be viewed as another form of neo-shamanism growing under the New Age tent. An influential branch has been

pioneered by the psychiatrist Stanislov Grof, whose "holotropic breathwork workshops," induce altered states of consciousness "journeys" by combining a ritualized breathing practice influenced by and reminiscent of various Eastern meditative traditions, and blending this with the playing of sacred music from diverse cultures around the world. As the music is changed from that originating from primal cultures, to Bach and Mozart, to Gregorian chant, to the theme song from *The Mission* (a film depicting a tragic resistance by indigenous rainforest dwellers to Euroamerican conquistadors in what is now southern Brazil), these workshops and such music represent global bricolage. By likening these workshop processes to the shamanic practices of primal cultures, these workshops have drawn interest from some radical environmentalists.

Grof himself was one of the early experimenters with LSD and other hallucinogenic plants.[83] Interest in shamanism, "ethno-botany," and hallucinogens—as vehicles for altering consciousness and fostering proper and beneficent understandings of the human place on earth—is strong among some radical environmentalists and prevalent within the "ecopsychology" movement. Ecopsychology is an outgrowth of the spiritual streams of the human potential movement in the 1960s and 1970s and seems to be rapidly growing in the United States, largely within the spiritual-therapeutic sectors of the New Age movement.[84] A striking recent development is the growing cross-fertilization between deep ecology, even its politically radical streams, and this generally quiescent, middle-class subculture. Archetypal psychologist James Hillman, and a variety of ecopsychology-oriented institutes such as the Elmwood Institute, now express affinity with deep ecology. Of course, much of the ecopsychology movement has deep roots in the archetypal psychology of Carl Jung— providing thus another intriguing European piece to the bricolage process.

Despite all this, it should also be stressed that many Earth First! activists look down at organized workshops and overt ritualizing as unnecessary (and/or, contrived), again because all one must do is spend extended time in nature to encounter the sacred and its denizens. And many activists do report experiences and perceptions of interspecies communication independent of any orchestrated ritualizing, simply from spending time, attentively, in the wild; or while performing acts of civil disobedience, sitting on platforms in trees, or buried in logging roads for prolonged periods of time in efforts to prevent logging.[85]

Given their respect for and interest in primal cultures, however, there is a strong impulse for radical environmental activists to be drawn to Native American spiritualities. One such activist, Lou Gold, a former university professor who dropped out of mainstream society and eventually became a prominent member of Ancient Forest in Oregon, explained

> I don't consider myself a follower of Native American religion. . . . my spirituality is soup, it is stew . . . but when it's time to find the right metaphors, I find [Native American] metaphors come easily to me [and have become] a source of genuine religious experience. [And Native American cosmologies] give me an ability to access what I'm calling ecological consciousness . . . feeling the relationship to all this magnificent stuff we call the creation.[86]

Most activists interested in Native American spirituality, like Gold, do not claim to systematically practice Native American religion. They do, however, engage in processes and practices *inspired by and borrowed from* Native American traditions, generally in a piecemeal and unsystematic way, combining them freely with practices borrowed from neo-paganism, traditional religions (especially Buddhism, Taoism, and Hinduism), and even self-help groups and the human potential movement.

Among the practices borrowed (explicitly or implicitly) from Native American cultures are the sweat lodge, the burning of purifying sage, the passing of a talking stick during community meetings, ritual processes such as the Council of All Beings (which involve a solitary seeking of nature spirits in a way that resembles vision quests), the taking (or discovery) of "earth names," group and solitary wilderness experiences undertaken under the influence of peyote or hallucinogenic mushrooms, "tribal unity" and war dances characterized by ecstatic dancing and prolonged drumming (which bear no resemblance, as far as I can discern, to Native American dancing), neo-pagan ritualizing that sometimes borrows elements from Native American religion such as prayers to the Great Spirit in the four directions, a variety of rhetoric such as "ho" to express agreement during "tribal" meetings, and "hoka-hey," an exclamation sometimes spoken to register approval of expressions of militant defiance against the oppressors of nature, and even a willingness to die for the cause.[87] A small number of these activists live in tepees and do not cut their hair, expressing a conviction held by some Native Americans that their strength would be dissipated were they to cut it.

Yet Euro-American attraction to and borrowing from Native American and primal cultures is highly controversial, criticized as theft and even genocide both internally and by some Native Americans, and this has fostered ambivalence in the movement toward such borrowing. Such criticisms have complicated the process of bricolage and innovation, especially for radical environmentalists who strive to act in solidarity with Indians (especially traditional ones). Such criticisms have forced negotiations over the character and direction of religious production and innovation, dramatically illustrating that bricolage is often a contested process.[88]

Thus far I have focused on two major tributaries to radical environmentalism's religious bricolage: the green fire narrative and primal religion, represented by neo-shamanism and by the bits of Native American ceremony to which they have access. Yet this only has scratched the surface. It may be that with sufficient time I could find *somebody* importing into the movement *something* from each and every religion on the planet—even those extant only in the documentary record! The only prerequisite seems to be that the appropriated traditions—or the deviant (and usually mystical) streams within some broader tradition—be interpreted as earth-revering or potentially so.

The purportedly nature-sympathetic religious traditions appropriated or practiced by movement activists include Judaism, Taoism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, witchcraft, goddess and Gaia worship, Paganism, and even in a couple of cases, a flirtation with Satanism. (According to these activists, Satanism is attractive because it recognizes the dark side of nature, which like Shiva, the Hindu god of destruction, plays an

important, creative role.) From within each of these traditions, any number of sub-traditions, sects, or ideas might be tapped. I have met serious and not-so-serious students of Tibettan, Zen, and Tantric Budhism; practitioners of several different schools of yoga, meditation, massage, and the healing arts originating in India (as well as several New Age offshoots from these traditions), some of which are explicitly derived from Hinduism.

The movement has a number of martial artists (some of whom seem unusually willing to contemplate the possible necessity of violence) drawing from various traditions originating in India, Japan, and China. One activist and martial arts instructor, for example, drawing on the martial arts philosophy of the Shaolin monks for his strategic thinking and views about violence, fuses such a worldview with movement apocalypticism: "There is an old proverb from the Shaolin Temple of China: *Avoid, rather than check, Check rather than hurt, Hurt rather than Maim, Maim rather than kill, For all life is precious, and none can ever be replaced.*" He then suggested that Earth First!ers learn the art of appropriate escalation from the Shaolin monks: First, start with conversation, then use the courts and legislature, then obstruct your opponents peaceably, defending yourself if necessary, "and if they seek only your ill-being then, and only then, shall you inflict upon them the annihilation that they willingly embraced."[89]

The movement also has dancers practicing Tamil, Belly- and May-pole styles—each of whom sees dance as an earth-bonding practice. To these are added Christian anarchists and pacifists in the tradition of Tolstoy and Ellul, and even an evangelical Christian influenced by the traditional "peace" churches, for whom monkeywrenching is "turning the swords of those committing violence against nature into plowshares for them."[90] Meanwhile, a number of activists have been engaged in reinterpreting their own traditions in a more nature-friendly way than traditionally has been the case.[91]

Stirring Goddesses, Ents and Fairies into Cauldron of Pagan, Nature Religion

Despite such diversity, an increasingly common solution to the quest for an authentic but unproblematic earthen spirituality, especially for radical environmentalists with European roots, is to seek it in the pre-Christian folk religions of their ancestors. Trudy Frisk well explained the rationale for this turn in the pages of *Earth First!*,

> The resurgence of pagan spirituality, especially widespread reclamation of the Goddess in all her guises, is a glimmer of hope in our unprecedented planetary ecological crisis. Paganism restores women to positions of power. . . . It also allays our envy of Native spirituality; we are all descended from people who revered the earth. [92]

And for Frisk, the Goddess provides many reinforcements, for

> She is not one but many: beneficent Demeter, sensual Aphroditi, learned Sophia, loving Freya, wild huntress Artemis, benevolent Ameratsu, dark Kali, compassionate Tara of Tibet, feline Bast, Cerridwen, keeper of the cauldron of change. She is ancient: Danu, Mother of Celts, Isis, Sovereign of the Elements, Yemaya,

> Holy Mother of the West African Sea, Pacamamma of the Andes who pre-dates the Incas, triune Hecate, Spider Woman weaving the threads of Native American fate. She is Gaia. [93]

But radical environmental pagans are not all ecofeminist goddess worshippers. Some prefer more macho, Norse gods. Controversial Earth First! author Christopher Manes, for example, who studied in Iceland on a Fullbright fellowship, promoted the pagan and shamanic "indigenous religion of Northern Europe, Asatru." In this religion, which he wrote is still practiced in Iceland, "the cosmos was held together by a great ash tree. [This] world tree is a shamanistic symbol. It was called Yggdrasill." According to this myth, Manes summarized, "at the cost of great suffering [impalement on the tree] the shaman god Odin acquires [secret] knowledge . . . and bestows [it] on the inhabitants of Middle Earth in the form of runes. Thus the world tree establishes order and makes it comprehensible to humanity." Manes asserts that "these motifs [show that] trees do partake in the sky, Middle Earth and the underground; they do hold together the network of life as we know it." Logging, therefore, is "totalitarian," severing us from the world tree, from our connection to Earth, and logging companies "are not just cutting down trees; they're cutting us off from a meaningful [world]."[94] In an *Earth First!* column devoted to ecotage entitled "Even Thor Monkeywrenches," Manes writing under the pseudonym "Ned Ludd," insisted that the Norse god is active in the world; for example, he sent a lightning strike that burnt a trailer that had been desecrating a sacred mountain in Arizona.[95]

Wiccan forms of paganism have been more common in America's Earth First! movement, however, and there are a number of women witches involved in Earth First!. More often than men, they participate in constructing and leading rituals at Earth First! wilderness gatherings and demonstrations. (At least, women play a more prevalent role in ritual that is so recognized; men tend to dominate the evening musical jams and song fests, which also appear to an anthropologically informed observer to be a form of ritualizing). Oftentimes the ritualizing draws on the lifework of Starhawk, a contemporary witch, who through her many writings and long-term activist career has played an important role in creating a radical environmental branch of contemporary Wicca. A number of Earth First! activists have become ordained priestesses. One grew up in an intentional pagan community, for example, in northern California's Church of All Worlds, and with a number of the members from that community, became deeply involved in the radical environmental campaign to halt the logging of ancient redwoods in northern California during the 1990s.

Buck Young is a pagan Earth First!er who believes that modern people cannot experience the world as enchanted because they have paved over wilderness—thereby muting the earth's sacred voices. During a 1991 interview, he told me that Earth First!ers are among the few who can still perceive the earth's sacredness, and he credits experiences with hallucinogens (especially psychedelic mushrooms) with opening the faerie-world to him and setting him on his radical environmental path. He also explained that the enchanted other-world of J. R. R. Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy also resonated within him and facilitated his spiritual growth. Writing under a pseudonym because of his leading role in an effective environmental organization that uses litigation to fight deforestation, and fearing that being out of the "broom closet" would be counterproductive, Young wrote a fascinating and innovative account of the emergence of radical environmental activism, blurring the lines between the Earth of our everyday experience, the Middle Earth, and the Spirit World, while integrating characters from Tolkien novels, European faerie-tales, and contemporary Earth First! characters:

> Gnomes and elves, fauns and faeries, goblins and ogres, trolls and bogies . . . [must infiltrate our world to] effect change from the inside . . . [These nature-spirits are] running around in human bodies . . . working in co-ops . . . talking to themselves in the streets . . . spiking trees and blowing up tractors . . . starting revolutions . . . [and] making up religions. [96]

One thing that is particularly interesting about this statement, apart from the apparent appropriation of a revolutionary ideology from fairies and fairy friends before the creation of ELF, is Young's self-consciousness that he and his comrades are inventing religion. He is not alone in this awareness. A number of Earth First!ers are quietly aware of and unapologetic about their role as spiritual leaders, and they think carefully about the best ways to blend and invent a ritual life for their emerging tradition (although some of them think they are resurrecting old ways rather than inventing new ones). In Earth First!, however, leaders of any ilk are reluctant to acknowledge such a role publicly for fear of arousing the anti-leadership passions of the anarchists in their midst.

Such an awareness of the need to invent as well as borrow and pass on religious tradition is prevalent in the pagan community—and given the intersection between these subcultures within the cultic milieu—it is unsurprising that such an understanding would also be found among pagan Earth First!ers.[97] Some, like Young, have been involved in the creative appropriation of the elves, ents, wizards, dwarfs, men and hobbits of Middle Earth, again as something like radical environmental spirit-guides.

Indeed, shortly after Earth First! was founded, the movement received and published a letter purportedly from Aragorn, the leader of a mysterious group of noblemen deeply involved in a desperate and brutal defense of another sacred land—Tolkien's Middle Earth.[98] The letter expressed solidarity with the fledgling Earth First! movement, and interestingly, claimed some credit for its emergence. "Count on the cooperation and agitation of the Striders, obviously a progenitor of Earth First!" the letter entreated, and showing that borrowing and innovation can work in many strange ways and directions, the letter injected into Tolkien's narrative its own, neo-Luddite spin: "A Strider slogan is 'not blind opposition, but bare-fanged attack on progress.'" Aragorn signed his epistle after mentioning that the Striders had already been present at Earth First! gatherings![99]

Several other Earth First! activists have told me that the Tolkien novels have had a strong influence on their spiritual and activist paths. One Earth First! newsletter even borrowed its title, *Entmoot,* from the fabled Council of the Ents, explaining:

> The Ents are the ancient race of tree guardians whose physical bodies and nature are close to that of trees. They were taught the languages of "the speakers" by the Elves, who called them the Onodrim. Like the Elves, Ents flourished during the Elder Days of the Middle Earth but are still roaming the wild hills . . . . Ents like trees are not hasty, but when danger arises can rally their power to defend their forests. The ENTMOOT! is a ritual assembly of the Onodrim that occurs in time of great need.
>
> Now is such a time. Forests are falling across our lovely planet and the magic, strength, and power of Ents are needed in their defense.[100]

After an exhortation to involvement in forest defense, this newsletter introduction offered encouragement based on an animistic faith: "if you listen closely you will hear the trees speaking to you"—they will tell you what to do. The missive ended with the entish equivalent of Foreman's wolf howl/call to action: "HOOM! FROOM!"

Whatever radical environmentalists are moved by, borrow from, modify, or invent in their religious journeys, it is worth noting that few of them become radical environmentalists due to what sociologists of knowledge would call "primary socialization," or through a dramatic conversion to these traditions. My interviews, to the contrary, suggest that the "ecological consciousness" uniting most radical environmentalists usually begins early in life—in experiences I cannot here typify—long before exposure to nature-based-and-sympathetic religious traditions.[101] It is usually as young adults or later that many of the activists discover religious traditions sharing affinity with their religious sentiments. In other words, most Earth First!ers are first "generic" nature mystics. This helps account, of course, for the basic epistemological premise and exhortation to spend time in the wild. Although radical environmentalists appreciate all nature-grounded and sympathetic spiritual traditions, often borrowing freely from them, few if any individuals identify fully or dogmatically with any particular religious tradition.

The preceding discussion of traditions and tradition-bits appropriated and practiced could be misleading, however, were we to deduce from it that all traditions are of equal importance within the radical environmental cultic stew. Few radical environmental Christians and Jews, for example, find elements (or minority steams) within their traditions to draw on to reinforce their worldviews and inspire them to action. Most radical environmentalists of monotheist heritage end up concluding that such traditions are inherently anthropocentric, hierarchical, patriarchal, and perhaps as importantly, anti-erotic. Few Earth First!ers consider themselves Hindu, for example, even though many participate in one act or another of Hinduism-derived ritualizing. If I had to venture an opinion in this regard, I would probably say that, apart from time spent in wild nature, the most important resources for radical environmentalists these days are paganism (including pantheism, animism, and Wicca), Shamanism and Native American spiritualities, Taoism, and Buddhism. This must be qualified, however, with the recognition consistent with cultic milieu theory, that the borders between all of these diverse phenomena, including the New Age, remain fluid and permeable.

Apocalypticism

Apocalypticism is a critically important element of the radical environmental worldview. Radical environmentalists of all stripes, and even bioregionalists, their close cousins who tend to focus on developing environmentally sustainable lifestyles rather than on political and direct action resistance to environmental decline,[102] all share an overwhelmingly pessimistic and apocalyptic worldview. This apocalypticism fuels the sense of dire necessity and thus justifies lawbreaking. It also fosters solidarity among movement participants with the unique force that accompanies an expectation of the end of the world, and is expressed and reinforced in movement music and ritualizing. The critical thing to note in any examination of movement apocalypticism is that, here again, bricolage is at work; this time modern earth science is stirred into the worldview stew, for their belief in the end of the world as we have known it is grounded in credible scientific evidence. And this is an especially noteworthy innovation, for this may be the first time in the history of religion that modern scientific understandings of environmental degradation have become a pillar of an apocalyptic religious worldview.

I will not, however, discuss green apocalypticism in detail here, for I have done so previously,[103] except to note that some observers have mistaken the hope that some activists retain for a green future and a peaceful transition to it, with an optimistic millennialism.[104] Few if any radical environmentalists, however, believe humans will re-harmonize their lives with the earth's living systems without first experiencing the collapse of industrial civilization, which will result either from its own unsustainable weight or through a radical environmental revolution. In either case, great suffering for the humans and other species is a clear and ubiquitous expectation. There is little hope to be found within these movements, except for after the collapse of industrial civilization, and the general expectation is that this world will be a greatly wounded one, with millions of its sacred voices silenced.

Thus far we have focused on the ecological, literary, spiritual, experiential, and overtly religious bits that make up the worldview of radical environmentalism, but we have only obliquely mentioned how diverse political ideas, ideologies, and causes are also stirred into the pot. Political attitudes and beliefs are critical, however, and call for more detailed analysis.

The Bricolage of Rebellion and Revolution

The central political beliefs typically shared by radical greens and the most militant members of the word's antiglobalization resistance include the following: a common perception of their predicament (environmental deterioration is threatening many species as well as human survival), a common understanding of the causes (local and international elites first stole the land and established significant political hegemony, and today, a cabal of elite corporate figures dominate nation-states and social life, pushing global capitalism into every corner of the planet, to the detriment of ordinary people and the environment), and *a common prescription* (the land and political power must be taken from the abusers and managed according to

traditional wisdom, supplemented judiciously by modern knowledge, while vigilance is maintained against those who would again usurp the commons for private gain.)[105]

There are many social critics and movements from which such convictions are derived. I mentioned in the introduction that radical environmentalists have a penchant to borrow from, express affinity with, and support, all sorts of rebellious groups whom they consider to be kindred movements. These include the American Indian Movement, the MOVE organization in Philadelphia, Mexico's indigenous Zapatista rebellion, the International Workers of the World, and pagan and anarchist activists resisting England's ongoing road-building projects. To illuminate how specific, far-flung movements and causes get drawn into the increasingly globalized radical environmental worldview, I will now discuss the Luddites and Diggers, Militant Autonomous Zones, and Native American sacred land conflicts.

Luddites, Diggers and Defending the Commons

Two short-lived resistance movements in England have been posthumously adopted by radical environmental subcultures. The Luddites, skilled weavers in the process of losing their livelihoods to mechanization early in the nineteenth century, symbolize felt hatred (or at least dislike and distrust) among movement activists for technology and its effects. The Diggers were seventeenth century pacifists influenced by the radical reformation in Switzerland and Germany who resisted the enclosure process in England (where lands previously had been held in common, with the resources shared by all and regulated by customs and mores, but through the process of enclosure, became the private property of an elite few). The Diggers were violently crushed, and evoke in radical greens outrage, for their suppression symbolizes the imperialism of modernizing and expansionist market societies which displace native peoples and destroy the land.

The Luddites are better known and far more revered among radical environmentalists. Edward Abbey dedicated *The Monkey Wrench Gang* to Ned Ludd (the boy who purportedly inspired the campaign to smash the machines threatening traditional pre-modern lifeways), and quoted Byron in an epigraph, "Down with all kings but King Ludd." Ned Ludd thus symbolized the early form of libertarian anarchism so prevalent in the movement. Dave Foreman created "Ned Ludd Books" to self-publish *Ecodefense* and other movement books, and created "Dear Ned Ludd" as a forum in *Earth First!* for the discussion of monkeywrenching as a tactic. Of course, these rebels have also been celebrated in movement music, poetry, and art.[106] Even if the most common interpretations of the Luddite rebellions are inaccurate, and the Luddites actually were engaged in class warfare or "collective bargaining by riot," in a colorful phrase coined by the famous British historian E. P. Thompson,[107] the rebellion will remain a popular one for adoption by the subcultures of radical environmentalism.

Although less well known, the Diggers are often memorialized in song at Earth First! rendezvous—and for good reason. Their story provides a powerful narrative that captures the political analysis common in much radical environmentalism and some antiglobalization resistance, a critique tracing social and environmental decline to the unceasing, voracious appetite of industrial-market capitalism for the land, everywhere, regardless of

the human or ecological costs. The "World Turned Upside Down," speaks for itself:

In 1649, to St. George's Hill
A ragged band they called the Diggers
Came to show the people's will
They defied the landlords
They defied the laws
They were the dispossessed
Reclaiming what was theirs

"We come in peace" they said
"To dig and sow
We come to work the land in common
And to make the waste land grow
This earth divided
We will make whole
So it can be a common treasury for all

"The sin of property, we do disdain
No one has any right to buy and sell
The earth for private gain
By theft and murder
They took the land
Now everywhere the walls
Rise up at their command

"They make the laws
To chain us well
The clergy dazzle us with heaven
Or they damn us into hell
We will not worship
The God they serve
The God of greed who feeds the rich
While poor men starve

"We work, we eat together
We need no swords
We will not bow to masters
Or pay rent to the lords
We are free men
Though we are poor"
You Diggers all stand up for glory
Stand up now

From the men of property
The orders came
They sent the hired men and troopers
To wipe out the Diggers' claim
Tear down their cottages
Destroy their corn

They were dispersed—
Only the vision lingers on

"You poor take courage
You rich take care
The earth was made a common treasury
For everyone to share
All things in common
All people one
We come in peace"—
The order came to cut them down.[108]

This song coheres with many movement ideas and contributes well to its bricolage of rebellion.

Live Wild or Die—in Militant Autonomous Zones

Since at least 1987, there have been "anarchist workshops" at most national Earth First! rendezvous—this sections describes a workshop at the 1995 National Round River Rendezvous in California focusing on Militant Autonomous Zones—a concept and strategy pioneered by European anarchists. Militant Autonomous Zones (MAZ) are usually in urban areas where anarchist squatters establish themselves and attempt to keep out what they consider to be the repressive authority of the nation state, employing sometimes elaborate and perhaps violent defensive measures. Green MAZ activists seek to establish nonhierarchal and environmentally sustainable ways of life within them.

This particular workshop leader explained that such anarchism need not be violent nor is it hostile to pacifism. But he also noted that, although he dislikes violence, sometimes MAZ defenders must hold their ground, and he suggested activists learn martial arts or consider arming themselves. He said that MAZ activists should be ready to flee on short notice, "except when working with indigenous cultures, which we also consider to be MAZ." In such cases, where indigenous cultures consider their places sacred, leaving is not an option. He mentioned as examples the Zapatista-held areas in Chiapas, and Mohawk Indian lands in northeastern America.

After this introduction, Mike Jakubal spoke. Jakubal, an important Earth First! activist, took an Australian tactic of tree climbing to thwart loggers and, with Ron Huber, turned it into long-term tree sitting. This became an important and successful way for activists to publicize their causes in the United States.[109] He is also an anarchist who had at several movement junctures became a polarizing figure, advocating tactics that led some pacifists and Christians to leave Earth First! to form a group committed to nonviolence called the Cathedral Forest Action Group.[110]

Jakubal was also largely responsible for the creation of the occasional green-black journal *Live Wild or Die,* which was first published in February 1989 and that, on anti-technology principles, continues to be produced without computers.[111] Its purpose was to provide a forum for voices left out of *Earth First!,* to celebrate wildness in all its forms, and to systematically subvert the system. The cover of its premier issue depicted a feral human climbing a power line tower while carrying a stick of dynamite. This

cover would remind the knowing reader of the Arizona power line caper and of other cases where power lines had been toppled by movement activists. In Santa Cruz, for example, power lines were toppled in an April 1990 "Earth Night" action, and *Live Wild or Die* has reported on efforts to explode such towers in Vermont as part of the campaign against Hydro-Quebec's incursions into indigenous land for their dam projects.[112]

Live Wild or Die also included discussion of tactics largely verboten in *Earth First!,* such as the construction and use of incendiary devices, until this taboo was broken in the fall of 1999. The back cover of its initial issue depicted a factory over the inscription, "Factories Don't Burn Down by Themselves. . . . They Need Help From You."[113] These graphics illustrate that *Live Wild or Die* conveys an attitude far more inflammatory, subversive, and violence-sympathetic than *Earth First!* did, at least until the turn of the centrury or so. Consequently, the anonymously edited "Black Cat" sabotage reader entitled *Beware! Sabotage!,* quietly distributed within radical environmental subcultures in the mid 1990s, drew a substantial proportion of its articles and graphics from it.[114]

Various articles in the "Black Cat" collection argued that violence is more powerful than non-violence and that violent strategies have "cycled several times before in American history [including] anarchist bombthrowers around the turn of the century [and] the Weathermen of the 1960s [but] in each case, America overwhelmingly rejected minority efforts to force change through violence."[115] Revisiting the 1982 Earth First! dispute about tactics crossing the line into violence discussed previously, sounding like Gary Snyder and Robert Aitken did then, this article insisted, "The violence professionals in the police and armed forces of the U.S. will prevail over a few Earth First! violence amateurs. You will never stop the machine by force, you will only justify it and strengthen it." This kind of caution, however, appears to be an increasingly marginal view within radical environmental subcultures.

During the MAZ workshop, Jakubal, obviously familiar with the concept, provided a rationale for the militant and even violent defense of autonomous zones. He argued that in such zones, "defending yourselves is an act of love" for what had been created. He warned that the authorities "will saturate bomb you"—so "you might as well take a few with you." They will kill you, at least until you have developed a mass movement, he concluded.

Another activist familiar with such zones asserted that "militant" means a strong resistance, not necessarily an armed one. A discussion ensued with the usual diversity of opinions, including ones drawing on Gandhi urging nonviolence as the most powerful strategy of all, even for defending such zones, while another activist mentioned the hundreth monkey idea, suggesting that a critical mass must be built for such zones to have a chance.[116]

Despite occasional disclaimers, however, pacifist ideas are often ridiculed by green-anarchists. Many such activists view pacifism as unnatural—since wild animals defend themselves when attacked, so ought humans. *Live Wild or Die* republished an article by American Indian Activist Ward Churchill under the heading "Pacifism as Pathology."[117] Pacifism is a luxury only First World activists take seriously, many radical environmental

activists believe, one that inappropriately ties the hands of activists around the world who are engaged in life-and-death struggles.

The MAZ workshop also included expressions of support for the radical African-American group MOVE and for Mumia Abu-Jamal, whose execution was scheduled that summer. One activist promised, "If Mumia is executed, many places will be burning."

The wrap-up to the workshop returned to theme of love and resistance: "Our hope is to build a society based on nonviolence and cooperation." Followed by "Our hope is in mass refusal against the government, like in the Philippines and the Soviet Union." The workshop leader summed up, "Anarchy is centered on love—but this has been lost. Its about mutual aid and cooperation and self-defense, but not necessarily by arms," while another concluded, "All we were told in school about anarchism was Bakunin and bomb throwing; this is totally bull shit! We need to de-program people."

American Indians and Defending Sacred Ground

> My Heroes Have Always Killed Cowboys
> —Earth First! t-shirt, bumper sticker, and graphic, depicting a group of American Indians with rifles.[118]

Efforts within radical environmental subcultures to express solidarity and build alliances with Native Americans did not begin with the arrival of green-anarchists. In April 1981, in their first official act, Earth First!ers musingly erected a historical "monument" to Victorio, an Apache chief who, their inscription explained, "strove to protect these mountains from mining and other destructive activities of the white race."[119] This incident again illustrates the affinity of movement activists for Native Americans and other primal cultures, and shows how such affinity bleeds over into ideology and activism.

As Zakin well demonstrates, both before and after the formation of Earth First!, "longhairs" and other participants in the counterculture, and even a number of western rednecks, became involved in political struggles in solidarity with various Native American groups.[120] These early alliances resisted incursions by the dominant society into areas where Native peoples still retained access—places traditional Indians considered sacred and essential to their ceremonial life, and even to the preservation of the world.

In the American southwest, for example, beginning in the late 1960s, connections were begun between certain groups and individuals within the Hopi and Navajo nations as well as with the American Indian Movement and a growing number of environmentalists and countercultural types. Edward Abbey would later use several of the Euro-Americans who were involved as templates for characters in his novels. Much of this collaborative energy went into saving the Black Mesa in Arizona, which Zakin accurately notes was of great "mystical significance" to its defenders, including the Navajo, but especially "traditional Hopis [who] believed that Black Mesa was the final refuge on earth [and that] its destruction would signal the coming environmental Armageddon."[121] Such apocalypticism fit well with the mood of many within the emerging radical environmental subcultures. This helped fuel a substantial amount of monkeywrenching against Peabody Coal's mining plans.[122]

Since Earth First!'s founding, many of its campaigns have been centered around saving places considered sacred by Native Americans. Indeed, anyplace considered sacred by Indians is certain to be considered sacred by Earth First!ers, for who could better identify sacred land than those still closely tied to it and struggling against Euro-American civilization to practice and defend their earth-based religions?

Defending the Sacred and the Potential for Violence

Of course, violence has sometimes been used to defend or reclaim places considered sacred and therefore it is reasonable to wonder if this is a dynamic likely to emerge from radical environmentalism. I argued recently in *Terrorism and Political Violence* that there are a number of factors, both internal and external, to radical environmentalism that make it unlikely that its activists will try to kill or maim as they pursue their objectives.[123] Although I will not repeat that analysis here, I will describe incidents relevant to it. The readers may use this information to draw their own inferences, perhaps in the light of my previous argument.

During one incident of direct-action resistance against logging on Arizona's Mt. Graham—which is considered sacred by many southwestern Indians, and also by Earth First!ers for harboring the endangered red squirrel—wrestling and fistfights broke out between loggers and police on the one side, and university students who had come to support two activists perched overhead in trees. As described in *Earth First!* by Erik Ryberg, the chaos occurred because, as trees began to fall, the students simply could not bear it, so they emerged from the trees, screaming, running from one tree to another, grabbing them to prevent the loggers from cutting them. When pulled to the ground, one student "proceeded to attack the logger" and the other students joined in, fighting with loggers and police in an effort to "unarrest" their comrades, and otherwise "doing everything in their power to stop this logging." Ryberg commented,

> I have never been so proud to be a part of this movement as I was on that day. Those students, apparently prepared to die, showed me a dignity and courage and respect for this planet that does not occur outside Earth First! They turned the top of Mt. Graham not into a protest site but a battlefield, and although they were outnumbered forty to one they could not find inside themselves the will to sit and watch a species go extinct, evaporate off this planet forever.[124]

Ryberg is a long-term Earth First! activist who periodically has "pushed the envelope" on the question of violence by asking whether the time has come for the movement to abandon its commitment to nonviolence. He was "disgusted" by the hippies and layabouts he witnessed during the Redwood Summer campaign and with the focus on civil disobedience (CD), later arguing in *Earth First!* that "CD is a tool." Later, an even more controversial article entitled, "Bombthrowing: A Brief Treatise" (writing as "Pajama" 1993), which was republished in the mid 1990s in the Black Cat Sabotage manual, Ryberg wondered, "When will it be time to throw

bombs?"[125] The discussion implied that, because of the imminent peril facing many species, that time might well be at hand.

In describing the melee at Mt. Graham, Ryberg had been responding to an accusation by Sea Shephard Captain Paul Watson that Earth First! had become a group of "lily livered wimps"—Greenpeace-like "bannerhangers."[126] After describing the Mt. Graham battle, Ryberg mentioned that the campaign defending Cove Mallard had developed a similar atmosphere. He then rejoindered, "If we hang a banner once in awhile, it should be considered a warning: one day soon, there might be war in those woods."[127]

When Ryberg was arrested in 1993 while attempting to lock down under a law enforcement vehicle during a raid at a movement camp, another melee erupted. Some activists threw rocks until one of the "freddies" (disparaging movement parlance for Forest Service employees, meaning "forest rape eagerly done and done in endless succession") ratcheted a shell into the chamber of his shotgun and leveled it at the activists. "I really think they'll shoot us if we get strong enough to actually stop them," Ryberg told me later, "but this doesn't mean we shouldn't try."

Try they did—perhaps especially during the summer of 1993 at Cove Mallard—where the battle for the woods became a low-intensity conflict.[128] Earth First! fielded several small groups of environmental guerrillas who were, in turn, supported by several back country camps, well equipped including full-time cooks. One small affinity group calling itself "the grundles" was particularly aggressive, experimenting with ways to ambush the "Freddies" and damage their vehicles. Sometimes they would build barricades in roads and when the Freddies got out of their trucks to remove debris, these masked and camouflaged activists would leap out and slash their tires. On another occasion, they threw a smoke bomb under a Freddie truck, and when the Freddies "ran like hell," the grundles sprang forward and "trashed" the vehicles with pulaskis (a firefighting tool with an axe at one end and pick on the other). Their objective was not merely to slow down their adversaries but to make them fight for "every single inch" of the planned logging road. The strategy was devised by activists who "understood guerilla warfare" and it included a plan to "hit the Freddies anywhere within a 30 mile radius around Cove Mallard." They wanted the Freddies to know that any truck or bulldozer that they put in the field would be at risk.

These tactics proved controversial and a few activists left the campaign as a result. Jake Krielick and others who had been organizing a civil disobedience campaign publicly distanced themselves and withdrew support for the backcountry camps, arguing that monkeywrenching and civil disobedience campaigns should not be mixed.[129] The grundles and their sympathizers, however, criticized Krielick and the other civil disobedience campaigners for misleading activists that they had invited to Cove Mallard by downplaying the dangers involved, pointing to incidents when activists were beaten or threatened with violence.

The next two logging seasons were less intense at Cove Mallard—there were fewer activists in the field, and logging had been slowed, partly by lawsuits. In 1996, however, borrowing the anti-road-building tactics being pioneered in England in the early 1990s and imported the previous year at Warner Creek in Oregon, the Cove Mallard activists, reinforced by the Earth First! forces gathered there for their national rendezvous, captured and energetically dismantled and blockaded a logging road under construction leading into the next set of logging sites.[130] (There is a transoceanic shuttling, especially between Australia-United States-United Kingdom, of radical environmental activists who study each other's movements and tactics, and radical environmental journals report on the global evolution of tactics.)

Despite all these efforts, these blockades were easily dismantled by heavy equipment during a two-day period in 1996, and for a time, the logging continued. This would not be the last word, however, for the outgoing Clinton administration established in late 2000 a new policy protecting approximately 60 million acres of America's remaining "roadless" public lands. This put at least a temporary halt to further logging at Cove Mallard. (Only time will tell whether subsequent administrations overturn the Clinton roadless policy.)

Until the increase in arson attacks by the Earth Liberation Front in the late 1990s, the Cove Mallard resistance represented the most aggressive environmental campaign in North America. It provides important, on-the-ground data for grappling with the prospect for violence emerging from radical environmental subcultures. Although I have heard of one melee occurring during this multi-year campaign, I have also witnessed activists carefully diffusing tense situations when threatened by angry (and sometimes inebriated) loggers. The reality on the ground is complex, just as are the more theoretical debates about strategies and tactics in movement literature.

It is critical to remember that disputes over monkeywrenching and violence—indeed, over whether certain tactics even *are* violent and over whether even discussing such tactics violates the predominant nonviolence principles of the movement—have occurred regularly since the formation of Earth First! An early editor resigned over the introduction of the "Ned Ludd" column in the journal and the elder poet of the movement, Gary Snyder, wrote to criticize monkeywrenching, arguing that it provided bad and counterproductive political theater. Moreover, every time over the years that Earth First! has published articles or letters to the editor suggesting that nonviolence was an inadequate strategy, a flurry of rejoinders, as well as supportive comments, generally followed. Radical environmentalists love to argue.

After the 1990 schism temporarily resolved one power struggle, another produced equally wrenching discord, consuming enormous energy over several years; it was substantially over the issue of violence. More precisely and importantly, the dispute centered on whether to establish an *Earth First!* editorial policy against publishing materials promoting (or considering) violence, or if such a policy constituted inappropriate and authoritarian censorship and the imposition of a dreaded "party line." Advocates of the policy argued that having such a policy was simply a prudent and strategic movement-building decision that well reflected the majority's strong commitment to nonviolence. Opponents argued that there was no such consensus about violence and the journal ought to reflect that diversity, and moreover, a central purpose of the journal was to provide a space where there could be no-holds-barred debates about what could and should be done to save the planet.

This debate over editorial policy regarding violence was reminiscent of the one that precipitated Pete Dustrud's departure from the journal a decade earlier, and it began when the journal published a Robert Martin article entitled "A Hunting We Will Go"[131] that some activists read as advocating murder. Actually, it explained firearms safety and ballistics, described how to enter wildlands as a hunter, suggested shooting *near* wild animals to condition them to fear humans, and detailed how to safely damage all-terrain vehicles and "muscle" trucks. The article also explained how to shoot domestic livestock without causing the animals needless pain. (Such animals, and of course, the humans who "manage" them, are blamed for causing serious environmental damage by overgrazing. A number of Earth First!ers advocate shooting domestic animals to reduce such damage, and there are now many incidents where they have apparently done so).[132] What most likely led to the charge that the article actually advocated shooting humans was the author's insertion of the lyrics of a typically sarcastic Tom Lehrer song, the chorus of which celebrates shooting "Two game wardens, seven hunters, and a cow." Martin concluded his article, "and for heavens sake, don't shoot any game wardens or hunters!" The sick humor, however, was lost on many activists (including the animal rights activists), some of whom misread the article and claimed it advocated shooting people, others who, in the wake of the bombing of Judi Bari, thought any such language, even if intended as humor, could be used against movement activists to brand them as terrorists.

In the next issue, however, two editorials further inflamed the debate. In one, Allison Slater viewed opposition to discussion of violence as inappropriately anthropocentric and discounting of human "wildness." An activist writing under the name "Sprout" asserted that "Support within our movement for shooting humans is nothing new. I doubt there is any opposition to anti-poaching patrols in Africa shooting poachers to protect non-human animals." The article ended accusing Martin's critics of "specieism."[133]

The debate raged on as well in many letters to the editors, but a third incident especially inflamed passions. Jim Flynn, an editor in the "collective" publishing *Earth First!,* ignoring a decision by his co-workers not to publish it, at the last minute inserted a cartoon depicting a hanging with the caption, "Trees Are for Hanging: Kill a Developer."[134] In the next issue, with the exception of Flynn, the collective apologized for printing it.[135] In the minds of some, this was too late, the damage had been done—such graphics could be used to portray the movement as terrorist.

The long battle over the journal's editorial policy eventuated in no official policy. One was briefly established at an activist conference in 1992, but it was quickly sabotaged, disappearing within two journal issues because certain anarchists involved in the dispute simply refused to honor any policy arrived at through consensus, viewing any "governing" body and any imposed point of view as illegitimate. This is one of many examples of the difficulty of establishing and honoring an editorial policy within such anarchistic subcultures, a tendency that led Orin Langelle, a long-term anarchist Earth First!er to complain in *Earth First!* that anarchists who sabotage consensus agreements do not understand anarchism, and to argue that when one belongs to an "autonomous collective," one must honor its decisions, even if one is absent when the consensus is reached.[136]

What the proponents of an editorial nonviolence code may not have realized at the time is that there had already been arguments in *Earth First!* suggesting that murder could be an acceptable tactic. In 1986, for example, Tom Stoddard, one of the most controversial early contributors to *Earth First!*, argued that to stop the endangered species trade, activists must

> poach the poacher [and] eliminate . . . traffickers [and] distributors . . . by whatever means it takes. . . . We must consider endangerment and extinction of our fellow species as serious as killing of a human and expect roughly the same from the guilty: death. . . . Declaring guerrilla war on the thieves of our wildlife heritage is the only method of stopping them. I do not expect a bloodbath either, because a few summary executions will frighten cowardly poachers toward honest work.[137]

Beliefs that the resistance may or must eventually become violent are not uncommon, although they are seldom published. In 1991 I received an anonymous letter from an environmental saboteur who described precautions taken to reduce the risk of injuries to loggers when spiking trees. Also included, however, was another Tom Stoddard article that apparently had fewer activists advocating an even more aggressive form of ecodefense.

> Some environmentalists say Earth First!ers are saboteurs, destroyers and even terrorists. . . . They want to save the Earth provided it is no more difficult and dangerous than walking to the corner for their newspaper. [But] The humans trying to destroy Earth have passionate determination . . . motivated by that magic elixir, greed, and its first cousin, power. Using the destroyers' gauge, Earth First!ers look as pastoral as a mountain meadow. How far should Earth First!ers go to save this battered orb? . . .
>
> Certainly as far as [timber companies] destroying our old growth forests. But probably not as far as the Catholic and fundamentalist crazies bombing Planned Parenthood Centers. . . . Assuredly as far as dedicated litterers desecrating every stream and seaside. . . . Certainly as far as the . . . fanatics wanting to waste Earth's resources keeping every misbegotten human alive at any cost. Undoubtedly as far as the Vicar of Christ and other religious ostriches who encourage every human to breed us into SRO (sic) population crises causing deforestation, drought, and desertification. . . .
>
> Defenders have too long been too tepid and too slow. Maybe that is why we are losing the race to save our planet. If we resolve to go as far as the destroyers, it would leave damn little we can't do. If we want to save Earth we had better quit taking our marching orders from our friends and start taking them from our enemies. That is how far we should go![138]

Two years after Stoddard penned those words, at the 1990 Earth First! rendezvous, Richard Bowers announced a workshop on "political assassinations." After an outcry including accusations that Bowers must himself be an infiltrator or "wing nut" (a common term used to label as crazy those advocating violence or otherwise being disruptive), he agreed to change the workshop title to "How much violence might be needed to save

Gaia?" Commenting afterward that even this concession was insufficient for the "declawed pussyfooters" who dominated the gathering, he argued that no compromise in defense of Mother Earth "might well mean more than blockades without violence."[139]

There are also some who, more intellectually, and in trusted circles, suggest that they can imagine situations in which assassinations might be morally permissible and politically necessary. In 1995, for example, after hearing one activist state he could not imagine how anyone could think a bombing campaign would promote the desired transformations, another offered a historical rejoinder. He pointed out how assassinations sometimes do alter history, musing "What would have happened if somebody took out Hitler in 1939?" He then mentioned a famed ornithologist in Brazil who was murdered, destroying a wealth of biological knowledge essential to the preservation of (literally) untold species, commenting, if assassinations can hurt *us* so badly, can you at least imagine the possibility of such violence having an important positive impact?

This was a casual theoretical discussion on a warm, pleasant day, as activists were sitting in a northern California creek in a remote wilderness area. From what I know of the activist expressing it, I doubt he would himself employ such a tactic, for he has been quite effective using legal tactics in his own region. Moreover, despite the occasional pro-assassination rhetoric expressed within radical environmental subcultures, I know of no pro-environment assassination or attempted murder. Yet such ruminations, including the rare but extreme rhetoric deployed by Stoddard and a few others, does raise the possibility that individuals, or even a small group, might one day conclude that the time for such violence has come.

A 1992 letter from an anonymous green-anarchist announcing the spiking of old-growth trees in Oregon's ancient forests and complaining about wimpy Earth First!ers who had renounced this tactic could be used as evidence that some have reached this conclusion:

> The struggle for all that is wild must . . . attack the root cause of the problem—to capitalist society itself. . . . By all and any means necessary!! THIS IS A REVOLUTION. . . THERE IS NO MIDDLE GROUND OF THIS STRUGGLE! FOR ALL THAT IS WILD WE BEG YOU TO PUT DOWN YOUR PENS AND PICK UP YOUR WRENCHES!! Look where the legal system has gotten the ancient forest: near extinction! WAKE UP! FUCK 'EM UP, HIT THEM HARD. FIGHT BACK!!!!!

By the end of the decade, articles appeared in the journal applauding arson as a tactic, and describing how to create incendiary devices; after an intense internal debate, even a short interview with Ted Kaczynski, the infamous "Unabomber," was published, a figure who some Earth First!ers consider a folk hero.[140] Shortly thereafter, in 2001, an issue entitled "What Would Geronimo Do" was published, with Geronimo's angry image, armed with a rifle, adorning the cover.[141] It included several articles promoting anarchism and superimposed an anarchist "A" over its editorial and contacts page.[142] This issue seems to symbolize the increasingly anarchist identity of the current Earth First! movement, which has also been obvious to all at recent Earth First! wilderness gatherings.

Despite these developments and the sometimes martial and violent rhetoric expressed by radical environmentalists, nobody (with the possible exception of Theodore Kaczynski, depending on whether one includes him under the radical environmental umbrella) has been convicted of crimes that have intended to kill or maim anyone. Nor, to my knowledge, have there been serious, inadvertent injuries. Nevertheless, the media and law enforcement authorities routinely label radical environmentalists "terrorists," linguistically likening their direct action campaigns and sabotage by arson with the explosive tactics of the Weathermen, Red Brigades, and figures like Timothy McVeigh. Movement activists, however, generally deny the "terrorist" appellation and some find it laughable. One anarchistic hobo, who participated in some of the earliest campaigns (in the mid 1980s) to sabotage the hunting of threatened species, and who was once arrested and convicted for an assault during an effort to prevent officials from killing American bison (although he caused no injuries), once told me, "It is a laugh to me when they call us violent or terrorists. I say, if we were, don't you think we'd have killed people by now?"[143] In my view, his point is well taken, if we conclude from it that before evaluating whether a group is violent or terrorist, or likely to be, we should consider as our best evidence that which has occurred already.

Manson, Militia— and Radical Environmentalists?

Finally, I return to the question raised at the beginning of this exploration of radical environmentalism: whether there is a cultic milieu such activists share with participants in the racist right that might facilitate a syncretistic alliance between them, and in that way, lead to a violence-prone faction that would mimic the tactics of the far right.

Given the statements by Manson and his followers, some of which could be inserted within the *Earth First!* journal without raising eyebrows (if done without attribution!), it is reasonable to wonder if there is or could be another way terrorist violence might emerge from radical environmental subcultures. Perhaps radical environmentalists and members of the racist right (perhaps especially the ones appropriating Nordic narratives and cultural bits to construct their identities and movements) could cross paths in the cultic milieu, cross-fertilizing green and racist ideologies. Perhaps this will occur by first working in common cause on specific nature protection campaigns. Perhaps Manson cultists following the exhortation on his Internet site to defend Headwaters forest will meet the young Earth First!er who declared he would work with anyone willing to put the earth first. Perhaps the Unabomber was influenced by the racist right, or the "Environmental Rangers," a small Montana group that warned it would take up arms if necessary to prevent a proposed mine threatening the Blackfoot River, represent such a development.

Such questions are raised, and in a way answered as well, by Colin Campbell's assertion that within the cultic milieu,

> Syncretization is . . . further facilitated and re-enforced by the over-lapping communication structures which prevail within the milieu. More than anything else, the cultic world is kept alive by the magazines, periodicals, books, pamphlets, lectures, demon-

strations and informal meetings through which its beliefs and practices are discussed and disseminated.[144]

This insight suggests that we might well wonder whether, how, and to what extent radical environmental subcultures, and those of the racist right, might come to influence each other. If they share, to any significant extent, the same cultic milieu, it might become possible, or even likely, for a process of bricolage, back and forth, between them. Perhaps they would swap pagan narratives, unify around the desire to keep nature and nature-people pure,[145] adopting initially a common cause in an anti-immigrant campaign that is not obviously racist.

As interesting as such a possibility might be, based on my fieldwork, I think it unlikely. I can see almost no place on the subcultural maps within America where individuals from these two clusters of subcultures cross paths and communicate; if placed in proximity, fistfights would be more likely than tabloid trading.

To my knowledge there is *no* overlap in the kinds of journals, novels, and even spiritual literature participants in these different subculture clusters read (although I concede there may be some overlap in the area of pagan spirituality, but again, the specific pagan literature radical environmentalists read generally tends to have a politically progressive edge). Put more carefully, I have never encountered neo-Nazi or other overtly racist literature within radical environmental subcultures. Moreover, despite their defacto anti-censorship consensus, Earth First!ers stridently criticize any article that is even remotely "politically incorrect" with regard to race and gender bias, as well as the editors who would be so unfortunate as to publish it.

That racist and radical environmental subcultures do not overlap is due to firm border defenses. For example, after the editors of *Earth First!* ran an advertisement for a book entitled *Anglo-American Biocentric Tribalism* by Thorz Hammer (circa 1992), they discovered to their dismay that it was "nothing but entry-level neo-Nazi racist propaganda." The journal editors denounced the book as "trash" and published an apology for running the advertisement, promising to change their advertising policy, insisting on viewing sample copies before publishing book advertisements.[146]

Radical environmental subcultures are the most militantly egalitarian, anti-hierarchial and feminist I have ever encountered (at least their rhetoric is, most acknowledge there remain various "hidden hierarchies" within these groups). As these pages have shown, moreover, their general orientation has been to express solidarity with colonized peoples (who, not coincidentally, usually have dark skin). Taken together, these dynamics strongly militate against any cross-fertilization between radical environmentalists and even the green-racist-right. Earth First! simply does not provide suitable habitat for racist (or sexist) ideologies. This is in no small measure because many of its participants cut their activist teeth in civil rights, anti-nuclear, and social justice campaigns. I should add one ironic qualification: If there are radical environmentalists whose worldviews are racist, they are far more likely to be biased against persons with European ancestry for presumed imperialist predispositions.

Whither the Cultic Milieu of Radical Environmentalism

I have tried in these pages to illuminate the central characteristics of radical environmentalism and related branches of antiglobalization resistance, focusing especially on their religious and political dimensions, and showing various ways that Colin Campbell's theory of the cultic milieu has explanatory power with regard to radical environmentalism. I have shown that diverse new and alternative religious ideas, rites, values, and actions, newly invented or borrowed from diverse traditions, places, and times, cross-fertilize with modern ecological understandings and a host of anti-establishment causes and ideologies. The result is a melting pot of green radicalism. Although the recipe for the stew is contested and strenuous disagreements abound, and each ladle spooned from it has some unique ingredients and flavors, it is a pot to which increasing numbers of activists are drawn. As it boils over the edge of the cauldron and onto the streets of our increasingly homogenous world in acts of resistance, its aroma both repels and attracts. Only time will tell what the next ingredients will be—will the resistance turn to targeting people, not property?—and how far will the nation states and law enforcement authorities go to overturn the pot and put an end to what is cooking?

Notes

[1] From the now defunct ATWA Internet home page <http://www.atwa.com/atwa.htm>, which was pointed out to me by Jeffery Kaplan.

[2] M. Satchell, "Any Color But Green: A New Political Alliance Is Battling the Environmental Movement," *U.S. News and World Report* 111:17, (1991), 76.

[3] Luc Ferry, *The New Ecological Order*, (Paris: 1992; repr. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1995). In various works animal rights theorist Tom Regan has leveled a related attack on the environmental fascism of all "holistic" environmental ethics. See John Clark's telling critique of Ferry's work which, he claims, provides "absolutely no support to his thesis that authoritarianism is implicit in the ecology movement." Ferry's central failure, Clark says, was failing to observe that the Nazi view of nature was thoroughly anthropocentric and instrumental, never suggesting that nature and non-human creatures have interests or rights deserving respect. (John Clark, "The French Take on Environmentalism" *Terra Nova* 1:1 (1996), 112-19.)

[4] Martin W. Lewis, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992); George Bradford, *How Deep Is Deep Ecology? With an Essay-Review on Women's Freedom* (Ojai, California: Times Change Press, 1989); Jerry Stark, "Postmodern Environmentalism: A Critique of Deep Ecology," in Bron Taylor, ed., *Ecological Resistance Movements: The Global Emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism*, (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1995), 259-81.

[5] Michael E. Zimmerman, *Contesting Earth's Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Michael E. Zimmerman, "Ecofascism: Threat to American Environmentalism?," in Roger Gottlieb, ed., *The Ecological Community*, (New York & London: Routledge, 1996), 229-54.

[6] Colin Campbell, "The Cult, the Cultic Milieu and Secularization," *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, 5 (1972), 122.

[7] *Ibid.*, 122-23.

[8] *Ibid.*, 124.
[9] *Ibid.*, 122-23.
[10] Bron Taylor, "The Religion and Politics of Earth First!," *The Ecologist*, 21:6 ([November/December] 1991), 258-66; *idem*, "Earth First!'s Religious Radicalism," in *Ecological Prospects: Scientific, Religious, and Aesthetic Perspectives*, Christopher Key Chapple, ed., (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), 185-209; *idem., ed., Ecological Resistance Movements: The Global Emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1995); *idem.*, "Resacralizing Earth: Pagan Environmentalism and the Restoration of Turtle Island," in *American Sacred Space*, David Chidester and Edward T. Linenthal, eds., (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 97-151; *idem.*, Bioregionalism: An Ethics of Loyalty to Place," *Landscape Journal*, 19:1&2 (2000), 50-72; *idem.*, "Deep Ecology and Its Social Philosophy: A Critique," in *Beneath the Surface: Critical Essays on Deep Ecology*, Eric Katz, Andrew Light and David Rothenberg, eds., (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2000), 269-299; *idem.*, "Earth and Nature-Based Spirituality (Part I): From Deep Ecology to Radical Environmentalism," *Religion*, 31:2 (2001), 175-93; and *idem.*, "Earth and Nature-Based Spirituality (Part II): From Deep Ecology to Scientific Paganism," *Religion*, 30:3 (2001), 225-45.
[11] Jeffrey Kaplan, "The Anti-Cult Movement in America: A History of Culture Perspective," *Syzygy: Journal of Alternative Religion and Culture*, 2:3-4 (1993), 267-96.
[12] David Chidester, "Stealing the Sacred Symbols: Biblical Interpretation in the People's Temple and the Unification Church," *Religion*, 18 (1988), 157. Chidester uses the word "stealing" as a "shorthand designation for complex negotiations over the ownership of symbols."
[13] *Ibid.*; Sidney M. Greenfield and Andre Droogers, eds., *Reinventing Religions: Syncretism and Transformation in Africa and the Americas* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001).
[14] Colin Campbell, "The Cult, the Cultic Milieu and Secularization," 125.
[15] Bron Taylor, "Resacralizing Earth: Pagan Environmentalism and the Restoration of Turtle Island."
[16] Colin Campbell, "The Cult, the Cultic Milieu and Secularization," 122.
[17] Bron Taylor, ed., *Ecological Resistance Movements: The Global Emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism*, 18-25.
[18] Jeffrey Kaplan, "The Anti-Cult Movement in America: A History of Culture Perspective," *Syzygy: Journal of Alternative Religion and Culture*, 2:3-4 (1993), 267-96.
[19] Although originating in North America, Earth First! is now international. Bron Taylor, ed., *Ecological Resistance Movements: The Global Emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism.*
[20] Muir (1838-1914) was a pioneer of the American conservation movement whose preservationist philosophy shaped the mission of the National Parks System in the United States. Although the term deep ecology was not coined until 1973, Muir is considered by deep ecologists as one of their central "elders."
[21] E.g., Earth First! writer Chrisopher Manes argues that "Evolutionary theory denies the existence of a hierarchy of beings, declaring that there is only genealogy, similarities and differences arising out of a three-and-a-half-billion-year saga of organic inheritance." Christopher Manes, *Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 142.
[22] For recent efforts to develop environmental ethics based on genetic-kinship, see Michael Soulé, "The Social Siege of Nature," in M. Soulé and G. Lease, eds., *Reinventing Nature? Responses to Postmodern Deconstruction*, (San Francisco: Island Press, 1995), 137-70; J. Baird Callicott, "A Critique and an Alternative to the Wilderness Idea," *Wild Earth*, 4:4 (1994), 54-59; Stephen R. Kellert and E.O. Wilson, eds., *The Biophilia Hypothesis* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1993).

[23] In response to a letter expressing confusion about deep ecology (after the letter writer read an article about it by Bill Devall), Dave Foreman (21 December 1986) replied, "The central idea of Deep Ecology is that all things—animals, plants, rocks, rivers, clouds, etc.—have a right to exist for their own sake, without needing to justify their existence by some real or imagined value to human beings. This is the concept of 'intrinsic value.' In other words, a Grizzly Bear or a Snail Darter has traveled the same three and a half billion years of evolution we have and has just as much right to be here as we do. We have no right to consider them or anything else on Earth as mere resources for our use or abuse." This simple formulation is an excellent example of the popular definition of deep ecology that Foreman promoted and that gained widespread acceptance within the movement.
[24] This formulation has been synthesized from dozens of similar articulations heard within radical environmental subcultures, showing that it has broken out of the philosophic literature, becoming deeply rooted within such subcultures.
[25] For example, some within these movements prefer the term "ecocentrism" or "ecocentric ethics" to biocentrism, based on a concern for entire ecosystems, many parts of which are not "alive." I will generally use biocentrism as shorthand for the key moral premise just stated, for it is a term that most of those involved in radical environmental and deep ecology movements know and would endorse. For a second example, although many radical environmentalists would resonate with the "core value" as I have synthesized it, they would not all agree about whether an absolute moral "species egalitarianism" is implied by it. In other words, there remains disagreement about whether all species have *equal* moral worth, and whether a notion of *equal* moral worth applies to each individual member of every species.
[26] These quotes are amalgamated from Aldo Leopold, *The Sand County Almanac with Essays From Round River* (Oxford: 1949; repr. New York: Sierra Club and Balentine Books, 1971), 239, 240, 262.
[27] For the complete story, see *Ibid.*, 137-39.
[28] Edward Abbey, *The Monkey Wrench Gang* (New York: Avon, 1975), 24.
[29] Since Abbey helped Foreman develop his oration, its howling end was clearly borrowed from him and the style of the rave was self-consciously borrowed from the great American writer Samuel Clemens, best known as Mark Twain. Susan Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs: Earth First! and the Environmental Movement* (New York: Viking, 1993), 195.
[30] For detailed descriptions of the talk see *Ibid.*, 195-99 and 292-94; Charles Bowden, *Blue Desert* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986), 95-97, describes the speech in 1983, showing that its basic outline remained the same for nearly ten years. Although Zakin perceived the influence of Foreman's Church of Christ background on his presentation style, she makes no comment on the ethical and metaphysical implications of his stump speech. She recognized that with the Watt story, Foreman was myth making, yet she missed how this myth, and *much* more importantly, the ritual repetition of the Leopold story by Foreman and many others in movement poetry and song, represented a fundamentally religious appeal. Perhaps this was because of her desire to ridicule the overtly "spiritual" among the Earth First! activists, including Cecelia Ostrow, for speaking with trees. See Susan Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs: Earth First! and the Environmental Movement*, 237; cf. 322-24, 326, 328.
[31] Some scholars now eschew the term animism due to its origins as a pejorative devised to contrast "primitive" tribal religions with "higher" monotheistic ones. E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture: Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art and Custom* (London: J. Murray, 1871). But this term has been adopted by many radical environmentalists, as well as by many involved in new and emergent religious movements, to describe their own spiritual perceptions. Severed from the pejorative implications, I will employ the term as shorthand for the percep-

tion that the world is inspirited and that interspecies communication may be possible.
[32] Bron Taylor, "Earth First! Fights Back," *Terra Nova*, 2:2 ([Spring] 1997), 29-43.
[33] Dave Foreman and Bill Haywood, eds., *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, trans. by Haywood is pseudonym, 2 edn (Ned Ludd: 1985; repr. Tucson, Arizona: Ned Ludd, 1987). Logger Tom Hirons explained in an interview that a "stumping" regulation requires that trees be cut within 12 inches of the ground, which explains why spiking above the three feet level would not involve risks to the tree feller. He said no one had yet been injured by tree spiking, but that there had been close calls. Hirons complained bitterly, however, that saw blades that hit spikes in a mill shatter and ricochet and that when Earth First!ers dump silicone in a crankcase, the engine can explode, concluding "I consider Earth First! nothing more than a terrorist group." Hirons also confirmed that the prevalence of monkeywrenching was costing him dearly for security ($1,000 a month), and that even hiring watchmen does not guarantee the protection of one's equipment (3 March 1992, Portland, Oregon).
[34] They were arrested because the ex-partner of one of those arrested gave information to the authorities, fearing for her safety if he were released from jail, as he awaited trial for previously attacking her (Anonymous 1 May 1993).
[35] During a similar strategy session a year later at the national rendezvous in Vermont, a veteran Earth First!er gently said, after listening to people fret about whether their actions might hurt somebody, "I sense a lot of people are still tethered to humanism." We shouldn't focus only on the suffering of a single individual, "it's more important to look out for the next Seven Generations, and earth herself."
[36] Dave Foreman and Bill Haywood, eds., *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, 101.
[37] *Ibid.*, 102, 106.
[38] Bill Wood, "Terrorizing the Desert," *American Motorcyclist* (April 1989), 46.
[39] See Pete Dustrud, "Dear Readers, You Now Have a New Editor," *Earth First!*, 1 August 1982, 2. for his resignation statement and Hank Fonda, "Road Spiking," *Earth First!*, 2:8 (21 September 1982), 6, for the article about road spiking in the next issue, which includes no expressed concern or caution about the safety of those in the vehicles that are to be damaged.
[40] Dave Foreman and Bill Haywood, eds., *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, 17.
[41] Dave Foreman, "An Environmental Strategy for the 80s," *Earth First!*, 2:8 (21 September 1982), 7.
[42] Dave Foreman, "Violence and Earth First!," *Earth First!* (20 March 1982) 4.
[43] Robert Aitken, "Dear Earth First!," *Earth First!*, 2:5 (1 May 1982), 2; Gary Snyder, "Dear Dave," *Earth First!*, 2:7 (1 August 1982), 2-3.
[44] Dave Foreman, "Foreman Replies (to Robert Aitken)," *Earth First!*, 2:5 (1 May 1982), 2.
[45] Foreman recognizes his own inconsistencies, quoting Ralph Waldo Emerson, "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds," to justify them. Dave Foreman, *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior* (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), vii; Dave Foreman, "Earth First! and Non-Violence," *Earth First!*, 3:7 (1 August 1983), 11.
[46] Dave Foreman, "Strategic Monkeywrenching," *Earth First!*, 5:6 (21 June 1985), 22-23; Dave Foreman and Bill Haywood, eds., *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, 10-17.
[47] Dave Foreman, *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*, 161-66.
[48] Dave Foreman and Bill Haywood, eds., *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, 16. See Anonymous graphic (1993) illustrating movement desires to burn bulldozers.
[49] Mike Roselle, "Forest Grump," *Earth First!*, 15:2 (21 December 1994), 23.
[50] Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage!*, second edn (Eugene, Oregon: Unknown, 1996).

[51] *Ibid.*, 81.
[52] ELF (Earth Liberation Front), "Earth Liberation Front Ignites Britain," *Earth First!*, 13:8 (1993), 34.
[53] Tara the Sea Elf, "The Earth Liberation Front," *Earth First!*, 16:7 (September-October 1996), 18.
[54] *The Oregonian* conducted the most comprehensive publicly available study in 1999, conservatively estimating that at least "100 major acts of such destruction . . . occurred since 1980, causing $42.8 million in damages . . . in 11 contiguous Western states [and] in the last four years alone, the West has been rocked by 33 substantial incidents, with damages reaching $28.8 million." Bryan Denson and James Long, "Can Sabotage Have a Place in a Democratic Community?," *Oregonian*, 29 September 1999, Online. For the series see also *idem.*, "Eco-Terrorism Sweeps the American West," *Oregonian*, 26 September; *idem.*, "Ideologues Drive the Violence," *Oregonian*, 27 September 1999; and *idem.*, "Terrorist Acts Provoke Change in Research, Business, Society," *Oregonian*, 28 September 1999, or *http://www.oregonlive.com/news/99/09/st092620.html* (accessed August 2001). Although empirical data are currently unavailable, the rate of such crimes appears to be undiminished since this four-part report.
[55] Tara the Sea Elf, "The Earth Liberation Front."
[56] *Ibid.*
[57] *Ibid.*
[58] People in radical subcultures commonly suspect industry or governmental agent provocateurs are responsible for promoting or precipitating violence from within the ranks of the resistance, as well as conflict within it; a rational fear given the record of law enforcement infiltration and misconduct toward radical political movements, see Judi Bari, *Timber Wars* (Monroe, Maine: Common Courage, 1994). For general background Brian Glick's *The War at Home* and Ward Churchill's 1988 *Agents of Repression.* The FBI's three million dollar infiltration and arrests of Earth First! in the southwestern United States, leading to convictions against the Arizona Five, is well known and fuels such fears.
[59] My understanding of religion has been influenced by many scholars, but none more than David Chidester, who holds that "a descriptive approach to the study of religion *requires* a circular definition of the sacred: Whatever someone holds to be sacred is sacred. Our task [in studying religion] is to describe and interpret the sacred norms that are actually held by individuals, communities, and historical traditions." David Chidester, *Patterns of Action: Religion and Ethics in a Comparative Perspective* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1987), 4. Chidester helpfully adds that, "what people hold to be sacred tends to have two important characteristics: ultimate meaning and transcendent power. . . . Religion is not simply a concern with the meaning of human life, but it is also an engagement with the transcendent powers, forces, and processes that human beings have perceived to impinge on their lives." *Ibid.* Such an understanding of religion is adequate even if problematic. For a study of nature-based religion that wrestles with various scholarly definitions of religion in the context of an examination of diverse forms of nature-based spirituality, see Bron Taylor, "Earth and Nature-Based Spirituality (Part I): From Deep Ecology to Radical Environmentalism," *Religion*, 31:2 (2001), 175-93; and Bron Taylor, "Earth and Nature-Based Spirituality (Part II): From Deep Ecology to Scientific Paganism," *Religion*, 30:3 (2001), 225-45.
[60] David Chidester, *Shots in the Streets: Violence and Religion in South Africa* (Boson: Beacon, 1991).
[61] Such an understanding is especially helpful when thinking about emergent religions, namely, those within the cultic milieu which are the sites of religious creative invention and innovation, of new religious production—usually through eclectic borrowing and amalgamation, or bricolage. Individuals in such groups are free to

innovate because they have in one way or another become unshackled from the authorities of church or sect who would normally control religious production.

[62] Bron Taylor, "The Religion and Politics of Earth First!"; Bron Taylor, "Earth First!'s Religious Radicalism," in Christopher Key Chapple, ed., *Ecological Prospects: Scientific, Religious, and Aesthetic Perspectives*, (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), 185-209.

[63] Bron Taylor, "The Religion and Politics of Earth First!"; Rik Scarce, *Ecowarriors: Understanding the Radical Environmental Movement* (Chicago: Noble, 1990); and Martha F. Lee, *Earth First!: Environmental Apocalypse* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1995).

[64] David Clarke Burks, ed., *Place of the Wild: A Wildlands Anthology* (Washington D.C.: Island Press, 1994), 229.

[65] E-mail correspondence, January 1996. After I suggested to him, in response, that this perspective unduly downplayed continuities between the pre- and post-schism Earth First! (he does not even mention the involvement of co-founder Mike Roselle who had been involved from the beginning but with whom he had severed relations) Foreman replied, "While the group calling itself Earth First! today has some good people and does some good work, it is an entirely different organization than the Earth First! I was involved in. And the newspaper calling itself *The Earth First! Journal* has absolutely nothing to do with the newspaper I edited" (Email, January 1996).

[66] Roderick Frazier Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 2nd edn, (1967; repr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973); Lynn White, "The Historic Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis," *Science*, 155 (1967), 1203-7.

[67] Harpers Forum, "Only Man's Presence Can Save Nature," *Harpers Magazine*, April 1990, 37-48.

[68] Foreman introduces his 1994 book catalogue, "I've often argued that real understanding is out there—in the Big Outside, in the great loneliness; that wisdom is more likely to be encountered listening to goose music or watching the flow of a river than in books or libraries. I believe that individuals have a direct and personal relationship to the natural world, to Aldo Leopold's 'wild things and sunsets,' and need no intermediaries." He also tends to suggest that those with whom he disagrees about things are spending inadequate time cultivating that relationship with the wild earth. For example, in his Fall/Winter 1992-93 book catalogue, puzzled by what he saw as Leopold scholar Baird Callicott's attack on the idea of wilderness, he suggested that "his interest in Leopold and the land ethic is an abstract, academic one [i.e., not grounded in experience in wilderness and] he lacks green fire in his eyes." See the debate on the wilderness idea between Callicott, Noss, and Foreman in J. Baird Callicott, "A Critique and an Alternative to the Wilderness Idea," *Wild Earth*, 4:4 (1994), 54-9; Reed F. Noss, "Wilderness—Now More Than Ever: A Response to Callicott," *Wild Earth*, 4 (4 1994), 60-63; Dave Foreman, "Where Man Is a Visitor," in David Clarke Burks, ed., *Place of the Wild* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1994), 225-35; and *idem.*, Dave Foreman, "Wilderness Areas Are Vital," *Wild Earth*, 4:4 (1994), 64-68.

[69] Dolores LaChapelle, *Sacred Land, Sacred Sex: Rapture of the Deep* (Silverton, Colorado: Finn Hill Arts, 1988), 18.

[70] Bill Devall and George Sessions, *Deep Ecology: Living As If Nature Mattered* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Peregrine Smith, 1985).

[71] Christopher Manes, *Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990). Manes traces the appeal of Deep Ecology "to the profound spiritual attachment people have to nature" (1990:149), and discussions on the deep ecology Internet group are often preoccupied with how to reconnect "civilized" humans to nature.

[72] David Abram, *Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-Than-Human World* (New York: Pantheon, 1996).

[73] In various interviews, Judi Bari and others have described their shock when they first saw the devastation of clearcut logging. Commenting afterward, they often express the conviction that it was just so obviously wrong.

[74] Interview with Sid Clifford, Nevada City, California, November 1992. Clifford was active in Earth First! from about 1986 until the bombing of Judi Bari in 1990.

[75] The greenfire myth is represented in umpteen ways—not only through such songs, but also in movement poetry, articles, and "greenfire"-named newsletters, bookstores and video-production companies. Robert Streeter, "Wolves and Green Fire," *Earth First!*, 5:7 (1985), 19; *idem.*, Robert Streeter, "Thinking Like a Mountain," *Earth First!*, 8:1 (1 November 1987); and Dave Foreman and Bill Haywood, eds., *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*.

[76] For a brief overview of primal religion contrasted with other types of religion, see David Chidester, *Patterns of Action: Religion and Ethics in a Comparative Perspective* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1987), 7-11.

[77] Martin W. Lewis, *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992).

[78] Lewis and other Earth First!ers endorse and practice other types of ritualizing as well, believing that eco-defense actions can themselves be ritual ceremonies bounding people to the earth.

[79] A wrenching controversy has emerged in recent years about the appropriation of Native American spirituality by New Agers and environmentalists; for a detailed case study of such a conflict within Earth First!, see Bron Taylor, "Earthen Spirituality or Cultural Genocide: Radical Environmentalism's Appropriation of Native American Spirituality," *Religion*, 17:2 (1997), 183-215. Part of what follows draws from this research.

[80] One group of such individuals founded "Earthlands," an intentional community in Maryland that regularly offers workshops fusing neo-shamanism with radical environmental activism.

[81] John Seed, and others, *Thinking Like a Mountain: Towards a Council of All Beings* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: New Society, 1988).

[82] For more analysis of the Council of All Beings and its function within Earth First!, see Bron Taylor, "Earth First!'s Religious Radicalism," 190-192.

[83] Stanislav Grof with the assistance of Marjorie Livingston Valier, *Human Survival and Consciousness Evolution* (Albany State University of New York Press,1988). Stanislav Grof with Hal Zina Bennett, *The Holotropic Mind: The Three Levels Of Human Consciousness And How They Shape Our Lives* (San Francisco, California : HarperSanFrancisco, 1992).

[84] For a recent work promoting such neo-animism, see Theodore Roszak, *The Voice of the Earth: An Exploration of Ecopsychology* (New York: Touchstone, 1992), and Theodore Roszak, Mary E. Gomes and Allen D. Kanner, eds., *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind* (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1995); and for a fascinating intellectual defense of animistic and pantheistic perception by a person who attended Earth First! gatherings in the late 1980s, see David Abram, *Spell of the Sensuous*.

[85] One Earth First!er, for example, described "a slow dawning of awareness of a hitherto unknown connection—Earth bonding" that occurred when he was buried up to his neck blockading a logging road. John Seed and others, *Thinking Like a Mountain*, 91-92. Others have described to me direct experiences of communion with the trees they have perched in for long periods to prevent their felling.

[86] Lou Gold, "Interview with Lou Gold," *Madison, Wisconsin*, (26 April 1992).

[87] This latter expression is, according to Earth First! and animal rights activist Rod Coronado (1992), taken from Crazy Horse, the icon of Native American resistance to Anglo-European imperialism. Coronado is of Native American heritage. Rod

Coronado, "Letter to Friends," *Earth First!*, 12:8 (22 September 1992), 17, 25. The expression also appears in Edward Abbey, *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, 166.

[88] For in-depth case studies of such complications emerging from a recent effort to forge an alliance among Earth First!ers, traditional Indians, and militant American Indian Movement activists, see Bron Taylor, "Earth First! Fights Back," and Bron Taylor, "Resacralizing Earth: Pagan Environmentalism and the Restoration of Turtle Island."

[89] Anonymous 21 June 1992. He concluded, arguing: "History shows that no government ever reforms quietly or peacefully. It has always taken either a natural calamity, a total economic collapse, a revolution or a war to make a government ripe for change and social reform. Nobody wants that, but we should be aware how resilient and oppressive a threatened regime can be, and I have no doubt that the U.S. government would turn its guns on its own citizenry. Have a care, and remember, Earth First! Live Wild or Die!"

[90] Two evangelical Christians I have interviewed who once belonged to Earth First! say they no longer attend gatherings or actions officially organized by Earth First! because its members refuse to renounce tactics risking injury to humans, and because of the prevalence of anti-theistic attitudes among its members. Nevertheless, they approve of civil disobedience and some forms of monkeywrenching deployed in anti-logging campaigns.

[91] For a fascinating fusion of Judaism with animist epistemology, see David Abram's *Spell of the Sensuous*.

[92] Trudy Frisk, "The Goddess Awakens," *Earth First!*, 13:3 (2 February 1993), 21.

[93] *Ibid.*

[94] Manes later explicitly linked deep ecology and paganism (23 September 1987), describing a sun-welcoming ritual from "Othinism or Asatru" and suggesting that activists consider enacting it. He argued that "as the thinking of Deep Ecology has grown and matured, its relationship with pagan tradition has become more evident. The affinity between the two invites us to give serious thought to the pagan world view. But if paganism. . . is to [help us] reestablish the natural life . . . then . . . it must be practiced." Manes then inaugurated a short-lived philosophy insert in *Earth First!*, which he called Nerthus, "the name under which the indigenous, pagan tribes of Central and Northern Europe worshiped Mother Earth." See Christopher Manes, "Paganism As Resistance," *Earth First!*, 8:5 (1 May 1988), 21-22. He also mentions that Ron Huber named a tree in which he perched to prevent its logging, "Yggdrasil [after] the Old Norse name for the mythical tree that held up the world." *Idem.*, *Green Rage*, 101.

[95] Ned Ludd, "Even Thor Monkeywrenches," *Earth First!*, 9:1 (1 November 1988), 32.

[96] Buck Young is a pseudonym designed to protect the safety of this activist who has received a number of death threats.

[97] Although pagan Earth First!ers have learned much from their experience with the pagan community, the lack of environmental activism emerging from the "mainstream" pagan community is a source of great frustration to them—and has resulted in some largely unsuccessful missionary efforts to radicalize the wider pagan subculture.

Most of the pagan subculture is not remotely radical, let alone revolutionary. One radical environmental pagan and male witch who is quite aware of this has accused the pagan community of "desecrating and misusing the divine energies" through a political apathy that allows "wilderness desecration [and] species extinction." He demanded pagan support for radical environmental actions including road blockading and tree spiking. This militant expression was followed immediately with an editorial statement that these views do not necessarily reflect the views of the neo-pagan journal which published it.

Although neo-pagan environmental radicals exist (see Margo Adler, *Drawing Down the Moon: Witches, Druids, Goddess-Worshipers, and Other Pagans in America Today*, Revised ed., [Boston: 1979; repr. Boston: Beacon, 1986], 149, 152, 238-50), the overwhelming majority of the neo-Pagan community is not environmentally militant (*ibid.*, 102, 392, 395, 399-405, 412). My own experience at a 1991 "Pagan Spirit Festival" in Wisconsin confirms Adler's impressions. At a "warrior path" workshop, no one among the 25 participants spoke about defending the Earth. (For the entire two-hour period, discussion was focused on defending the pagan community from external threats.) Assuming an Earth First! persona, I expressed frustration as to why nature mystics at such a workshop were not dealing with the militant defense of the planet. I received a chilly response, with a few individuals suggesting that they wanted nothing to do with "terrorism." Only afterward did two or three individuals seek me out to express appreciation and support for the sentiments.

[98] Aragorn, "Letter to Editor," *Earth First!*, 1:4 (20 March 1981), 5-6.

[99] Susan Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs*, 91, notes that "Dave Foreman fantasized about resurrecting the Striders" a group she said was "whimsically named after [Tolkien's] woodland scouts." A real group by this name, "organized by Bill Mounsey, a Denver-based outdoor guide. . . crashed a few hearings in the mid-seventies, making outlandish [wilderness] proposals." Zakin apparently did not apprehend that in pagan subcultures one person's whimsy might well become another person's spirituality. William Bird Mounsey, "Ent Lovers Arise!," *Earth First!*, 6:5 (1 May 1986), 7, would later urge "Ent Lovers Unite!" in the pages of *Earth First!*. See also K. Peterson, "Pause for Ent (Poem)," *Wild Rockies Review*, 6:1 (1993), 19, for an Ent-inspired poem.

[100] Washington Earth First!, 1994

[101] In her study of neo-paganism, Margo Adler found similarly that pagans rarely get "converted." Rather, they feel they simply "found" or "came home" to paganism (1986:14).

[102] Bron Taylor, "Bioregionalism: An Ethics of Loyalty to Place," *Landscape Journal*, 19:1&2 (2000), 50-72; Bron Taylor, "Deep Ecology and Its Social Philosophy: A Critique," in Eric Katz, Andrew Light and David Rothenberg, eds., *Beneath the Surface: Critical Essays on Deep Ecology* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2000), 269-99.

[103] Bron Taylor, "Religion, Violence, and Radical Environmentalism: From Earth First! to the Unabomber to the Earth Liberation Front," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 10:4 (Winter 1998), 10-42.

[104] Martha F. Lee, *Earth First!*

[105] Bron Taylor, ed., *Ecological Resistance Movements*, 342-43.

[106] Two songs praise Luddism in *The Earth First!. . . Songbook*. See Johnny Sagebrush, *The Earth First! Li'l Green Songbook* (Tucson, Arizona: Ned Ludd Books, 1986), 31, 99. The second song weaves Robin Hood into the rebellious lyrics.

[107] Robert Rossney, "The New Old Luddites: What's So Funny About Staying Alive," *Whole Earth Review*, 82 (Spring 1994), 9.

[108] "World Turned Upside Down," written by Leon Rosselson, has been recorded by a number of artists including Dick Gaughan on *Handful of Earth* (Green Linnet Records).

[109] Susan Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs*, 260-61.

[110] Based on anonymous interviews.

[111] Martha F. Lee, *Earth First!*, 123, incorrectly states that *Live Wild or Die* "disappeared" after a "brief existence." The latest issue, labeled "Grow Food or Die," appeared in the summer of 1996. *Live Wild or Die* was never intended to be published regularly.

[112] This article reports on a bomb that exploded at a Hydro-Quebec transmission

tower and that dynamite that had failed to detonate was removed by authorities from two other towers (Anonymous 1995:21).

[113] Republished in Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage!*, 102.

[114] This manual begins: "Corporations and consumer culture are waging an all out war against everything that lives on this planet. . . . This book is about economic sabotage [and] fighting back by throwing a wrench into the greedy gears of the corporate mega-machine. Many of the techniques of sabotage have already been published in *Ecodefense.* This book [is] broader and more militant in approach. But . . . I feel it is not radical enough. How can anything be too radical when everything you love—absolutely everything—is being threatened with extermination." *Ibid,* 2.

The manual seems protective of other radical groups, asserting that it "does not represent the views of any established group or movement." Specifically mentioning Earth First! and the Animal Liberation Front, its editor claims these groups "have a strict nonviolence code which abhors the taking of any life even humans." This manual promises, in contrast, to "take the reader past such anthropocentric taboos." The manual also stresses that, although instructions for firebombs are provided, "no bomb-making instructions are included" explaining for the weak of heart the relevant difference, "incendiaries start fires, explosives blow things apart."

For the editor of this manual, however, such scruples apparently are compatible with the publication of firearms education, see "A firearms primer for anarchists and punks." Felix Von Havoc, "Turn Up the Heat: A Firearms Primer for Anarchists and Punks," in Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage* (Eugene, Oregon: Unknown, 1996). Such scruples also coexist with romantic discussions of bombs and dynamite, including a column describing dynamite as a tool of the downtrodden and how it is better to use it against people than masonry (p. 99), and with a photograph of a woman thinking, "if you can bake a cake, you can make a bomb" (p. 101). Not publishing bomb-making instructions is apparently compatible as well with the reprinting of an article implying that it is time to start throwing bombs (Ryberg as Pajama 1993, 1996) and with another reprinted article criticizing efforts to impose a Gandhian nonviolence code as incompatible with an appropriately "out of control" movement animated by "wild spirit[s] unchained." (Lone Wolf Circles 1990 & reprinted in Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage!*, 21).

[115] Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage!*, 20.

[116] See Jeff Juel, "Building Bridges," *Wild Rockies Review*, 5:1 (1992), 2,6, for an article by a highly respected Earth First! activist from the Northern Rockies criticizing the misanthropy he sees in the movement and stressing a love ethic.

[117] Anonymous Graphic 1994, republished in Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage!*, 61; and for a similar argument, see Bats in the Rafters Affinity Group, "Nonviolent Direct Action Training: Our Tactic Vs. Their Interiority of Pacifism," *Earth First!*, 9:7 (1 August 1989), 29. The view of nonviolence as unnatural is very close to the views about violence expressed by Dave Foreman, discussed previously.

[118] Anonymous graphic 1994; see also "Children of the Earth, are you listening?" from the sabotage manual (Anonymous graphic 1996).

[119] Susan Zakin, *Coyotes and Town Dogs*, 146.

[120] *Ibid.*, 62.

[121] *Ibid.*, 54.

[122] *Ibid.*, 56-57.

[123] Bron Taylor, "Religion, Violence, and Radical Environmentalism."

[124] Erik Ryberg, "Are We Mere Banner-Hangers?," *Earth First!*, 13:3 (2 February 1993), 3.

[125] Pajama, "Bombthrowing: A Brief Treatise," *Wild Rockies Review*, 6:1 (1993), 9. Republished in Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage!*.

[126] Paul Watson, "Letter From a Friend," *Earth First!*, 13:2 (21 December 1992), 3. Contrasting his impressions of the current Earth First! with his Sea Shepherd crew, Watson continued, "Thank Gaia that I still have a crew of passionate and ass-kicking eco-buccaneers who ain't afraid to ram and sink ocean raping pirates" and who don't worry about "some politically correct agenda that defines radical environmentalism by socialist or anarchist criteria." He added, "This planet is under siege. . . . This ain't fun and games, this war [of] survival against a violent, greedy, hell-bent-on-collective-suicide enemy. Did Washington hang banners at Valley Forge to stop the British?" (Watson was arrested 2 April 1997 and slated for extradition by authorities in the Netherlands acting on behalf of Norway. Norway cited his conviction in absentia for anti-whaling efforts and an intention to try him on additional charges, possibly including those related to the scuttling of a whaling ship in a Lofoten Island port in 1992.) For updates see <http://www.seashepherd.org/>.

[127] Erik Ryberg, "Are We Mere Banner-Hangers?" Republished in Graybill, ed., *Beware! Sabotage!*

[128] The following descriptions are based on an anonymous interview.

[129] Based on interviews with Jake Krielick in Oshkosh, Wisconsin, various dates.

[130] In 1996 Earth First! demonstrated new capabilities both to mount massive civil disobedience campaigns, for example, in defense of the Headwaters Redwoods in northern California, where over 1,200 were arrested in the fall; and to blockade and monkeywrench logging roads for extended periods of time. For a more detailed discussion, see Bron Taylor, "Earth First! Fights Back."

[131] Robert Marten, "A Hunting We Will Go" *Earth First!:* 12:1 (1 Nov. 1991)

[132] Barry Clausen and DanaRae Pomeroy, *Walking on the Edge: How I Infiltrated Earth First!* (Olympia, Washington: Washington Contract Loggers Association, 1994).

[133] Sprout, "Earth First?" Earth First! 12:2 (1991), 2

[134] Anonymous graphic, 2 February 1992, 12:3, 34.

[135] *Earth First!*, 21 March 1992, 12:4, 14.

[136] Orin Langelle, "The Autonomous Collective Process," *Native Forest News International* 5 (1995), 11-12. Langelle's analysis of the power struggle over the *Earth First!*, journal's editorial policy significantly parallels my own.

[137] Tom Stoddard, "Wilderness and Wildlife (Part II)," *Earth First!*, 4:3 (2 February 1984), 4. Stoddard's rationale sounds similar to the most extreme written expression from an animal liberation perspective contained in a book entitled *A Declaration of War: Killing People to Save Animals and the Environment.* I have been unable to obtain a copy, but according to Barry Clausen and DanaRae Pomeroy, *Walking on the Edge*, 270-72, the book (Screaming Wolf 1991) was published by self-described animal rights advocates who, although uncomfortable with its advocacy of violence, thought the public should be aware of such views. Clausen says the book was purportedly written by a splinter faction of the Animal Liberation Front activists that decided their effectiveness depended on making animal oppressors fear violent reprisal. It is possible that such thinking inspired "militant vegans" in Sweden who apparently stabbed a fur-wearing woman (Heléne Lööw, personal communication, February 1997).

[138] Tom Stoddard, "How Far Should We Go?," *Earth First!*, 9:2 (21 December 1988), 27.

[139] Richard Bowers, "To Readers of Our EF! Journal," *Earth First!*, 11:1 (1 November 1990), 3-4.

[140] For an extended discussion of the Unabomber and his putative relationship to radical environmentalism, see Bron Taylor, "Religion, Violence, and Radical Environmentalism: From Earth First! to the Unabomber to the Earth Liberation Front."

[141] *Earth First!*, 21:7, (1 August 2001).

[142] For a good example of them, see David Orton, "Deep Ecology, Earth First! and Anarchism," *Earth First!*, 21:7 (1 August 2001), 18, 44-45; and Michael Lewis, "Following the Heart of the Ecowarrior," *Earth First!*, 21:7 (1 August 2001), 15-41.

[143] July 4 1997 interview with Lee Dessaux, Nicolet National Forest (Wisconsin).
[144] Colin Campbell, "The Cult, the Cultic Milieu and Secularization," 123.
[145] John Clark, in a scathing review of Ferry's 1995 claims about fascist tendencies and antecedents in environmentalism writes, "Although the Nazis appealed to such feelings as love of nature and nostalgia for a lost 'primitive' freedom, this was allied with the glorification of the state, technology, and human power over nature." John Clark, "The French Take on Environmentalism," *Terra Nova*, 1:1 (1996), 116. Such characteristics are obviously anathema to radical environmentalism. Geographer Dr. Jonathan Olsen, on the other hand, presented a paper during a panel on bioregionalism at Dumbarton Oaks in April 1997 that suggested greater affinities between Nazi ideology and environmental thought than Clark believes.
[146] The 1992 advertisement ran under the heading "Now white boys can be tribal too!" in *Earth First!* 13:2, 32, and the letter and apology ran in *Earth First!*, 13:3 (2 February 1993).

CHAPTER 4

The Historical Communal Roots of Ultraconservative Groups

Earlier American Communes That Have Helped Shape Today's Far Right

Timothy Miller

A fundamental premise of historical and social scientific scholarship is that no social phenomenon emerges from a vacuum. While movements and organizations can and do have lives of their own and may well have distinctive and original features about them, they are rooted to a substantial degree in certain social and historical milieus. Several scholars have already addressed the social milieu from which far right groups and movements emerge; this chapter addresses the historical roots of such groups. Like other human social movements, the ultraconservative groups of the late twentieth century have origins in predecessor movements, origins that are often fairly easy to detect but infrequently examined in any detail.

Ignorance of the historical and cultural roots of nonmainstream religious and social groups can lead to disaster. Such ignorance led directly to the Branch Davidian catastrophe in Waco, in which U. S. government agencies presumed that they were dealing with hostage-taking terrorists and developed their strategy from that presumption, whereas some knowledge of the social and historical context from which the Branch Davidians had arisen would have helped them understand the group much more fully than they did. Fuller understanding might very well have averted the terrible tragedy that constituted the climax of the episode. More recently, scholars who wanted to avoid another Waco-style disaster intervened aggressively in the Freemen standoff in Montana in 1996, providing government agents with the social and historical perspective that had been so absent from the government's analysis of the Waco situation, and I believe that the fact that the Montana standoff ended nonviolently was due in large part to the stream of scholarly information that reached those conducting the siege.[1] In future confrontations such information may similarly have great and direct value in helping government and law enforcement officials avoid disaster.

This essay examines the communal groups of the past that constitute one of the strands of the background fabric that has given us the ultraconservative groups of today. As Jeffrey Kaplan and Leonard Weinberg have observed, "The annals of the far right wing are filled with utopian attempts at building