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ABSTRACT

This dissertation identifies three major subcultures within the American Green movement. I call these three subcultures Neo-Primitivism, Mystical Deep Ecology and Social Ecology.

Chapter One introduces the scope of this project, the beginning assumptions, and the international Green movement. Chapter One further presents an historical overview of the Green movement and American Green roots. Theories concerning the rise of Green cultures in modern industrial societies (from sociological, historical, psychological, cultural and paradigm-oriented perspectives), are also featured.

Chapter Two depicts the field of American Green studies, describes the modern history of the American Green movement and explores the worldviews of the three American Green subcultures (Neo-Primitivism, Mystical Deep Ecology and Social Ecology).

Chapter Three details the vast differences in praxis orientations practiced by the three American Green subcultures. These praxis orientations should be of utmost interest to those involved in the study of political science, Green politics and the future. Green praxis orientations are transition strategies undertaken to attempt movement from the critiqued present to a better future.
Chapter Four illustrates the futuristic eutopian visions embraced by members of the three subcultures of the American Green movement. A scenario featuring a day in the life of a typical member of each subculture has been created. Each scenario has been evaluated to determine subculture adherence to the four primary values advocated by the Greens: ecology, social justice, nonviolence and democracy.

Chapter Five delves deeply into the "dark side" of the American Green movement subcultures. By projecting the dystopian potential inherent in the writing of major subculture theorists, it is hoped these dystopian possibilities can be guarded against. In each dystopian scenario presented in Chapter Five adherence to the four primary Green values has been subsumed by the more negative elements inherent in that subculture's worldview, praxis orientation or futuristic vision.

Chapter Six examines the areas discussed in this dissertation in a conclusionary manner. The relationship between each subculture and the four primary Green values is analyzed. The probable futures of each subculture is also explored. An analysis of the role which each subculture could play in future political change in America is presented.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

THESIS QUESTION

The Thesis Question used to frame this project can be stated as follows: How do the worldviews, praxis orientations, and preferred future visions differ among the three major subcultures (Neo-Primitivism, Mystical Deep Ecology and Social Ecology) within the American Green movement?

INTRODUCTION TO THE DISSERTATION

From my study of and participation with American Greens over the past eight years I have identified three major subcultures within the American Green movement. I classify these subcultures under the headings of Mystical Deep Ecology, Neo-Primitivism and Social Ecology. Members of these subcultures consider themselves a part of the larger American Green movement. The three subcultures accept the basic tenets and values of the movement. Members of each subculture actively participate in Green movement organizational activities, and they contribute greatly to movement debates.

Each subculture is also distinct from the larger Green movement in theoretical orientation, praxis strategy, and in preferred visions of future eutopias. These are differences which I will explore in detail in this project.
THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS

As a political scientist, a futurist, and a father, I am sensitive to the concerns raised by the Greens. Given the abundance of evidence supporting "Green" issues (environmental degradation, violence, alienation, and social inequality), a personal starting point for this dissertation is acceptance of the Green critique of modernity. I have outlined this critique in Table 1, "The Four Horsemen of the Green Apocalypse" for those readers not familiar with the basic Green worldview.

The second orientation which shapes my approach to this dissertation is the belief that the Green movement has the potential to become a significant political force in the near future. The Greens believe modern society follows cosmologies, ideologies, praxis orientations and visions of the future which perpetuate environmental and social dysfunctionalities. Greens search for alternatives to these dysfunctionalities, and they attempt to put those alternatives into practice. I believe this combination of radical critique coupled with an active orientation towards cultural change could make the Greens some of the most important political actors of the next century.

A third major element of relevance to this dissertation concerns the long-term significance of the Greens. I do not see the ultimate political significance of the Greens in their rapid formation as a new social movement or in the
immediate political successes and failures of Green political parties worldwide. Rather, I agree with Bramwell (1987), Dobson (1990), and Galtung (1986) that the Greens may be representative of a long-term shift in civilizational consciousness. Green alternative visions of reality, coupled with elements from the dominant worldview, could lead to the new cosmological underpinnings of the future. I find this possibility most interesting about the Greens. The long-term political significance these new orientations might hold for the future has drawn me to this project.

DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

This dissertation undertakes the critical exploration of an important new social movement on the global political scene. In order to narrow the focus of this project to a workable level and to make a substantive contribution to the field of Green Political Studies, I have organized the dissertation as follows.

Chapter One provides an overview of the dissertation itself and a discussion of why understanding of the Greens is essential to modern political study. This discussion includes the placement of the Greens into political and historical context, an introduction to the international Green movement, and an examination of the main theories relating to the origins of the Greens. Chapter One sets the stage and provides the necessary background for the more
focused discussion of the three subcultures of the American Green movement.

Chapter Two begins with an analysis of the American Green movement as a distinct social movement on the American political scene. Chapter Two then provides an introduction to the worldview orientations and cosmological beliefs of the three subcultures explored in this dissertation (Neo-Primitivism, Mystical Deep Ecology, and Social Ecology). This chapter provides the initial knowledge base for understanding the differences that the three subcultures of the American Green movement exhibit in their praxis orientations and visions of future eutopias.

Chapter Three presents the praxis orientations of the three major cosmological subcultures within the American Green movement. The focus is upon the relationship between the theoretical orientations of the three subcultures and their adoption of specific political change strategies.

In Chapter Four, I envision what a day in the life of a person living in the future eutopia of the three Green subcultures might actually be like. In this chapter, and the one following, I adopt a critical, seminormative approach, as I explore the "Greenness" of each subculture's future. I do this analyzing the relationship between subculture eutopias and the four major orientations towards desirability stressed by the Greens (ecological harmony, social justice, societal participation and nonviolence).
Chapter Five explores the dystopian possibilities inherent in the future visions of the three American Green movement subcultures. These subcultures present themselves as movements oriented towards a more ecological, socially just, nonviolent and democratic future. The two questions this chapter asks are: Do Green visions of preferable futures meet this standard? (and) Are there factors inherent in each subculture's theoretical underpinnings and praxis orientations that may turn their eutopia into nightmare?

Chapter Six is comprised of my conclusions about the futures of Neo-Primitivism, Mystical Deep Ecology, Social Ecology and the American Green movement as a whole.

THE GREEN PHENOMENON: ENVISIONING A NEW AMERICA

Long before the Western concept of progress came into existence there have been members of the human species who envisioned better futures for themselves and their kind. These visionaries, be they the shamans, early innovators, and leaders of an earlier age or the priests, scientists, and politicians of our own, shape the way the people of their time view the world surrounding themselves and internal to their selves. They transcend the day to day banalities of life to actively try to shape the long-term future of their cultures.

The United States of America has a long history of these visionaries. These were people who sought a new and better life. When frustrated by the chains which still bound them
to old world rulers, these visionaries cast off their old ways and sought to create a new country based on the ideals of equality, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Though a people may agree on societal values, clashing interpretations of goals and incompatible strategies for achieving aims often arise. In the United States, basic conflicts arose at our nation's birth. The vastly different images of preferable futures put forth by the Federalists and Antifederalists foreshadowed a struggle which has continued to this day. The stakes in this struggle are high, nothing less than the shaping of public policy for the future.

Today, the Greens are one of the primary candidates seeking to influence the creation of America's future. They follow the long lineage of those Americans who have struggled to expand social justice, democracy, nonviolence and ecological harmony. But like America's Federalist and Antifederalist ancestors, the Greens find that similar values do not necessarily translate into similar visions of preferable societies. It is the task of this dissertation to explore the American Green phenomenon in order to analyze and evaluate the similarities and differences Green subcultures embody.

The remainder of this chapter will place the American Green movement into an historical and global context. The domestic roots of the American Green movement will be discussed first. The general field of Green political thought will then be introduced and the argument that the
Greens represent a new ideological perspective, with the power to threaten the currently dominant ideological systems of the West, will be explored. The organization of Green ideology into political parties and social movements worldwide will be examined next. Chapter One concludes with a discussion of the major historical, cultural and psychological theories concerning the origins of the Greens as a global phenomenon.

THE ROOTS OF GREEN THOUGHT IN AMERICA

Brian Tokar (1987, 34-51) traces the roots of the Green movement in America to the social and political movements of the 1960’s. Tokar contends that the civil rights, peace, and student movements were the first signs of a new consciousness emerging, with the feminist and environmental movements soon adding necessary ingredients. By 1966 or 1967, Tokar argues, a genuine counterculture had been born. This counterculture flaunted the rejection of materialism, obedience to authority and traditional work and sexual roles. As a liberated alternative to the dominant culture, values very similar to those of the Greens (living simply in harmony with the environment, respect for personal choice and freedom, nonviolence, and a communitarian care for others) were evident.

Although Tokar concentrates upon the 1960s as the genesis of modern Green consciousness, America has a long and rich history of thought which has contributed to the contemporary
manifestation of these values. This history is older than the United States itself, and though it has suffered many setbacks, being stronger in some times and places and weaker in others, the history of American movements for positive social change have left a heritage that American Greens would be wise to exploit. Personal freedom and social justice were advanced by early colonists in Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania by their refusal to establish official state religions, as was the practice in Europe. And though the situation was later changed by more oppressive policies, the first colonists in Georgia forbade the importation of slaves (Eggelston 1888). In Pennsylvania, nonviolence was stressed and military conscription was not required. Many early Pennsylvanians, being members of the Society of Friends, were opposed to warfare of any kind. Virginia and North Carolina also exempted their citizens from military conscription, provided these citizens could produce a certificate of membership from a recognized peace church (Cooney and Michalowski 1987, 18).

Seeking self-government and freedom from oppression, early colonists formed the Committees of Correspondence as a nonviolent network organized to express their grievances (Resenbrink 1992, 28). Perhaps no individual of this time period more greatly personifies Green idealism than Thomas Jefferson, whose Antifederalist vision of America was one in which small farmers and small businessmen would govern themselves in a land where all men were created equal.
Although bound by the conventions of his day, many of Jefferson's words still ring true today.

Movements for the expansion of democracy and social justice have always been present in American history. Opponents of slavery were able to abolish its establishment in territory north of the Ohio River with the Ordinance of 1787. By 1808 abolitionists had outlawed the importation of slaves into the United States. By 1820 all states north of the southern border of Pennsylvania had freed their slaves. Although it would take a bloody civil war to end slavery in the rest of the United States (and acknowledging that the racism associated with such slavery has still not been eliminated), examples such as the early abolitionists, those involved with the underground railroad, and modern civil rights activists offer many examples for the Greens to emulate.

The struggle for women's rights in America is equally inspiring. Although the society envisioned by today's ecofeminists is still only a dream, the long journey from a past described as "civil death" by Eleanor Flexner (1974, 7) provides evidence of the radical changes which can occur in society. From Anne Hutchinson's challenge of the Puritan theocracy in Boston in the 1630s to the modern ecofeminism of Marti Kheel, one of the original founders of the cutting edge Feminists for Animal Rights, women have been major leaders in the fight for Green-related values. Prudence Crandall, a Quaker who ran a school for "select and
sheltered young misses," opted to close her school in 1833 when the community protested her acceptance of a Black girl. Crandall then promptly opened a school for Black students and became a leading abolitionist (Flexner 74, 38-40). Women like Crandall played major roles in every significant movement for social change in America. Frances Wright is typical in her wide-ranging activities. Wright's fights for women's equality, the advancement of free education for all, worker's rights, and the Socialist Utopian movement of the early nineteenth-century furthered several movements which have contributed to the consciousness Greens exhibit today.

Ecological connection is another major root of modern Green consciousness. From the writings of early colonists such as Robert Beverly's *History and Present State of Virginia* (1705) to the environmentalism of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962) to the poetry of contemporary Deep Ecologists, the natural environment as unspoiled by the trappings of man or civilization is presented as a paradisical utopia. Beverly equated the virgin purity of America with primitive ignorance of civilizational evils and put forth the idea of the free and noble Native American. With this idea, Beverly started a history of American pastoralism which persists in various forms to this day. Beverly's Native Americans are noble and free because they live in a noble, free and abundant Garden of Eden. Jefferson was later to adapt this argument into a political ideology putting forth the American farmer as the
backbone of democracy. This ideological theme was translated into practical politics in the Homestead Act of 1862 which gave frontier settlers 160 acres of free soil (Smith 1950, 190-200). The democratic potential of the yeoman farmer became self-evident in the Populist revolts of the late 1800's when those connected to the land rebelled against the exploitative practices of big business, big finance and corrupt politicians (Goodwyn 1976).

Movements such as transcendentalism followed the theme of nature as redemptive force. Thoreau's *Walden* (1854) is still the classic text in this genre. Muir's writing of the early 1900's and Leopold's *Sand County Almanac* (1949) are also major works. The advocates of wilderness (as opposed to agrarianism) as a liberating and restorative force were also instrumental in the establishment of state parks (the first were Yosemite and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove which were ceded to California by the Federal government in 1864 with the condition they be preserved for the public), national parks (the first was Yellowstone in 1872), and wilderness areas (in 1885 New York set aside 715,000 acres of the Adirondacks to be "forever kept as wild forest lands") (Allin 1982). The conservation movement was to change into active environmentalism in the 1960s. The publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962) awakened the general public to the hidden dangers inherent in technological society and sparked a massive wave of reform which continues to this day.
Communalist, back to the land, and utopian socialist movements have further contributed to modern Green consciousness. In the short history of the United States, several hundred of these communities have formed. Many of the early communes were organized around religious principles. These communities include the Shakers (1787–present), the Hutterian Brethren (1873–present), the Harmony Society (1804–1904), Oneida (1848–1881), Zoar (1817–1898), and Brook Farm (1841–1847). Later the utopian socialist communities such as New Harmony (1825–1827), North American Phalanx (1843–1856), Modern Times (1851–1866), and Utopia (1847–1851) were formed. Several of these communities were influential on the larger society. Halcyon was the site of the first x-ray machine. New Harmony was the home of the first kindergarten, as well as the first free public school system and trade school system in America. New Harmony also boasted of the first free public library and first geological survey in the United States (McLaughlin and Davidson 1986, pp. 86–87). Many of these societies encouraged nonmaterialism, nonviolence, social justice, ecological harmony, and democracy and thus can be seen as significant forebears of Green thought today.

GREEN IDEOLOGY

The values which the Greens seek to expand are expressed through Green ideology. Andrew Dobson, a primary theorist of Green ideology, has identified three main elements he views
as necessary in any ideology: a description of the political and social world, a program for political change and a vision of a preferable future.\(^8\) Table 2, "Summary of Key Areas in The Greens/Green Party USA National Program," in Appendix One, illustrates the American Greens fulfillment of Dobson’s three criteria. Analysis of several of the defined key policy areas in the Green Program show critical descriptions of the social environment, visions of alternative Green eutopias, and active plans for alleviating identified problems of the present (and moving towards more preferable futures). The Green Program category concerning social justice, for instance, paints the picture of a materialistic, consumerist culture which exploits nature and separates people into class, racial, gender and sexual categories. The eutopian alternative offered by the Greens is a society where these categories no longer separate people. Strategies to achieve such a future include active incorporation of Greens into community-based struggles against exploitation and oppression, increasing one’s education about one’s own and other cultures, applying feminist perspectives throughout society, ending advertising that objectifies or manipulates, and supporting of sexual diversity.\(^{10}\)

Green ideology poses a powerful challenge to status quo beliefs. In Table 3, "The Green Worldview and the Dominant Worldview: Three Levels of Difference," I have summarized the critique of modernity and the proposed alternatives
articulated by several of the major international Green theorists. One can see in the tripartite breakdown highlighting the perceptual, structural and value differences between the Green worldview and the dominant worldview that a significant ideological gap exists between the two. The dominant worldview is seen by the Greens as aggressive and individualistic, stressing competition and domination over communitarianism and harmony. The result of these traits, say the Greens, is a limited view of the world which is leading towards a future of increasing personal insecurity and environmental degradation. Greens propose that a change must be made away from the anthropocentrism which views mankind as rightful exploiter of the earth and the social hierarchies which give certain groups more social rights than others. The general or composite Green eutopia is one where decisions are made at the local level by those whom the decisions will impact, where disputes are solved in nonviolent and consensual ways, and where a communitarian mutualism exists between the human and nonhuman realm as well as in the social sphere.

Greens, in general, want to conserve the face-to-face relationships of the traditional Polis and to expand the environmental pastoralism found in rural areas. They also wish to liberally expand social rights and tolerance of otherness. Thus their ideological place on the traditional political spectrum is not clearly defined. The majority of Green voters and supporters come from the Left, but a number
of them have also come from the Right, as many as 24.7% in the 1989 election in Great Britain (Rudig and Franklin 1992, 42-43). Many early Green supporters were independent farmers displaying a rural bias, prejudice against large cities, and distrust of professional politicians. Other Green supporters, such as many anti-nuclear activists, are associated with the Left, but display the same sort of populist distrust of large corporations and large government that is also expressed by segments of the Right. This mixture of constituencies and issue orientations has led some Green supporters to adopt the slogan, "The Greens are neither Right nor Left, but in front" (Capra and Spretnak, 1984, xxi).

Anna Bramwell believes that the strength of the Green’s conservatively-oriented moral and cultural critiques coupled with the power of the critical reasoning and argumentation inherent in the Green’s use of the science of ecology has created an ideological force that has the power to directly challenge both liberalism and communism (Bramwell 1989, 4). The moral righteousness that many Greens feel certainly resembles the religious zealotry and patriotic nationalism found in many very effective movements today. As with fundamentalists of all varieties, some Greens feel their path is the one true way and are willing to go to extremes to express this.

The very presence of the Greens as an organized force threatens the status quo. Dobson places the Greens in a
position akin to that of the early liberals and the early socialists who self-consciously called an entire worldview into question (Dobson 1990, 8). It is an assumption of this dissertation that both Bramwell and Dobson are correct and that the Greens represent a force for change which could alter the very way our descendants will view reality. As environmental degradation continues to rise and standards of living continue to fall, it is possible more people will be attracted to the Green message. This possibility remains just that at the present time, a possibility. Whether the potential of the Greens is fulfilled in the future is a question which only time can answer.

There are many forces which shape our perceptions of the world around us. One of the most powerful, the mainstream media, has responded to the Green threat with attempts to delegitimize the Greens in the eyes of the public. The Economist ("Europe’s Choice," February 26, 1983) has gone so far as to suggest that the Greens represent a "more insidious" danger to the stability of the German political system than the rise of neo-nazism. The New York Times has repeatedly described German Green Party growth as "disruptive" and "unsettling" to old political alliances and describes the Greens themselves as "volatile." Kevin Carragee’s analysis of New York Times coverage of the Greens concluded that "through varied framing devices the Times denigrated and depoliticized the Greens by characterizing Green Party members as lost children, quasi-religious
zealots, idealists, and romantics" (Carragee 1991). John Ely notes that negative portrayal of the Greens in the dominant media is widespread and cites numerous examples including an article in *The London Times Magazine* ("Waif at the Heart of a Revolution," February 28, 1983) which began by comparing the nonviolent, German Green leader Petra Kelly with Adolf Hitler.11

Antonio Gramsci’s view that the dominant ruling classes seek to maintain hegemony of societal consensus (the meanings, values and beliefs held by a population) explains these attempts to delegitimize the Greens (Gramsci 1971). R. Williams (1977) contends that the hegemony of status quo elites must constantly be defended against challengers from outside. The status quo, seeking to maintain legitimacy, responds to the Greens by declaring them a threat. How this duel between competing ideologies will play out in the future is unknown, but it is likely we are now witnessing the beginning rather than the end.

The contrary theoretical orientations, praxis strategies, and future visions of the Greens are major threats to the status quo, but they are also the Movement’s greatest source of strength. For many people disillusioned by current ecological destruction, violence, alienation and social injustice, a counterideological, antisystemic movement may seem to be a rational political alternative. Johan Galtung (1986) hints at this possibility when he states that perhaps reliance on the old parties of the Right and the Left may
itself be irrational, with the answers to modern problems existing outside of the customary way of thinking of traditional ideologies. Under Galtung's way of thinking the Greens are not seen as a threat but as salvation.

THE INTERNATIONAL GREEN MOVEMENT

A further indication of the significance of the Green worldview can be found on the material level, where the impacts of Green ideological formulations have manifested themselves. Called by Sarah Parkin (1989), "the fastest growing political movement the world has ever seen," the Greens have become a global movement with organizations in over 47 countries. Table 4, "Countries With Green Parties or Organized Green Movements," in Appendix One, illustrates the widespread appeal of Green ideology.

The New Zealand Values Party was the first national Green party in the world. Formed in 1972 by a political science student, Tony Brunt, the Values Party made an important impact on the way the world looked at politics. The Values Party was successful because it put forth a cohesive set of quality of life and humanist positions which were underrepresented in the politics of modern industrial democracies (Rainbow 1992). Although the Values Party polled only 9% at their most successful national election in 1976, they sparked a worldwide movement for change.

In Europe, a variety of Green parties has successfully challenged the major parties in countries with parliamentary
systems. Green representatives now serve in the parliaments of Austria (10 seats in the 1990 elections), Belgium (35 seats between two Green parties in 1991), Finland (4 seats in 1987), Greece, (1 seat 1990), Italy (33 between two Green parties 1992), Germany (8 seats in 1990), Ireland (1 seat in 1989), Luxembourg (4 seats between two parties in 1989), the Netherlands (6 seats in 1989), Portugal (2 seats 1991), Sweden (20 seats in 1988), Switzerland (14 seats in 1991) and in the European Parliament (27 seats in the 1989 elections), (Feinstein 1992, 671-674; O’Connor 1989). In addition, there are hundreds of elected Greens in local and regional offices in the countries listed above as well as in Sweden (250 seats in local councils), Norway, the U.K., and France.13

Green activists in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany and Hungary were important in leading the fight for their countries’ freedom from domination by the former Soviet Union: Bulgaria now seats 10 Greens in their parliament (between 2 parties), Lithuania seats 8 (between two parties), Slovenia 14 (between two parties), and Latvia seats seven (Feinstein 1992, 673).

Greens have organized in countries as varied as India, Japan, Australia, and Brazil. In the USA, over 80 Greens from 13 states ran for political office in the 1992 elections. American Greens received 560,000 votes and polled an average of 16% nationwide. 56 American Greens now hold elective office in 14 states (Green Party USA News Release,
"Greens Win 560,000 Votes in 1992, Seat 11 Candidates," no date). The Greens/Green Party USA (formerly known as the Green Committees of Correspondence), the largest Green network in America, boasts over 400 local affiliates.

Chandler and Siaroff see this political activity, especially in the electoral arena, as posing "a fundamental challenge to the established structure of political elites" (Chandler and Siaroff 1986, 303). Even in cases where Greens do not receive direct electoral success they are often seen as strongly determining the outcome of elections and governing coalitions. Muller-Rommel cited evidence that the German Green Party's activities encouraging ecological consciousness, nuclear policy awareness and disarmament had a significant influence on public opinion as well as on policy decisions made by the major German political parties as early as 1985 (Muller-Rommel 1985, 484). Flynn and Lowe (1992) cite evidence that since 1988 "there has been a crescendo of interest" in Green issues in Great Britain. The two researchers give the examples of the mainstream parties' formation of caucuses such as the Green Democrats and the Green Tory Initiative in order to compete for Green Party voters. A sign that the Green impact on the more traditional parties in Europe has not faded was in evidence at the February 1994 national convention of the present ruling party in Germany, the conservative Christian Democratic Union (CDU). The CDU decided on a vote of 359 to 277 to amend the term describing the party's fundamental socio-economic
policies from "social market economics," which it had used for the past 45 years, to the more modern and Green-oriented, "ecological and social market economics" (This Week in Germany, "Kohl Calls For Party Unity and Fighting Spirit at the CDU National Convention," 2/25/94, 1).

ORIGINS OF THE GREENS

There are four main theories which observers use to explain the rise of the Green Movement on the world political scene. The first theory is utilized primarily by American theorists and posits the Greens as the political manifestation of a larger civilizational shift in consciousness. This theory of a "New Age" consciousness shift believes a change in perception has swept (and is still sweeping) first through the natural sciences and is now integrating its new interpretations of reality into the larger social arena. The second approach used in discussing the origins of the Greens has concentrated upon European manifestations of the Green movement and utilizes a socio-psychological theory of social change. This theoretical orientation involves viewing the Greens through the filter of their social backgrounds and individual value orientations to discover if a "new post-materialist class" has been created. The third theoretical approach is primarily European in origin and focus and concentrates upon the development of "new social movements." New social movements seek major systemic and cultural change, which
separates them from more traditional social movements which are viewed as primarily seekers of economic gain. The fourth theoretical perspective is one put forth by every subculture in the American Green movement. This theory sees the Greens as the modern manifestation of a dissident subculture or "minority tradition" which has existed throughout human history.

PARADIGM SHIFTS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

According to "New Age" political theorists, the rise of the Greens can be attributed to a civilizational shift in human consciousness. Many New Age theorists believe this shift is similar to the theory of paradigmatic change advocated by Thomas Kuhn. A paradigm, according to Kuhn, is a particular constellation of beliefs espoused by a given scientific community at a given time. From this constellation of beliefs scientists develop a view of what the world is and how the world works (Kuhn 1962, pp.1-9). A cosmology can be viewed as a similar device for society as a whole. It is a way to make sense out of chaos, to limit our sensory perceptions and to form a solid ground upon which to stand. Paradigms and cosmologies are important because they form the basic building blocks of our reality. As we go through life, we add evidence to support our culture's dominant paradigm and we suppress novel discoveries that contradict our formulated worldview. Brian Swimme illustrates this point when he argues that in the
paradigmatic sense, "scientists are fundamentalists." In the cosmological sense, most of the rest of us are fundamentalists as well. As Hazel Henderson has stated, "reality is what you pay attention to" (Henderson 1981, xiv). By paying attention only to that which supports our views concerning reality, we are not threatened. We feel secure. This is why the Greens are troublesome for many people. What the Greens are doing is trying to get us to pay attention to occurrences and realities which we now ignore, suppress and even deny.

Since paradigms are at least in part arbitrary, novel findings often threaten the paradigm by exposing different versions of reality. Many of these new theories about reality can be suppressed, but some cannot because they offer better explanations than the dominant paradigm. When science can no longer ignore the new hypotheses and accepts them as the dominant "truth," the basic paradigm shifts. Often these shifts entail not only a change in theories, but a change in perception as well. New Age theory holds that in this way paradigm shifts make themselves part of the thinking of the larger culture. As science changes its understanding of reality, it also changes society’s ways of understanding the world. Using political terminology, one can say that this shift in worldview is akin to a cosmological "revolution."

Many Green theorists believe we are now going through such a cosmological revolution. Fritjof Capra has used his background as a physicist to argue that a
perceptual change towards what might be called the "ecological worldview" has been evident since the beginning of this century. Capra posits that the shift which he believes is happening occurred first in the "hard" sciences, primarily physics. Capra argues that quantum research (Einstein's relativity theory, Bohr's notion of complementarity, and Heisenberg's uncertainty principle) has undermined Enlightenment-based, Newtonian-Cartesian physics. Capra sees a new physics emerging which offers a more "organic, holistic and ecological" view of the universe than the old physics did.\textsuperscript{16}

According to Capra the dominant culture refuses to let go of the old worldview and clings rigidly to outmoded conceptions of reality. New Age theory holds that these old concepts and the values attached to them are no longer relevant to the modern world, and are perhaps even dangerous. The Greens, seen as the political articulation of the new "ecological worldview," are viewed as what Arnold Toynbee calls, "a rising culture" (Toynbee 1972). According to this theory, the Green movement, representing a more "true" and rational view of reality, will continue to expand its following and will eventually assume the role of dominant worldview.

THE SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ROOTS OF THE GREENS

Socio-psychological studies relating to the class background and value orientations of the members of the Green
movement have primarily focused on the (West) German Greens. The pioneer in this field is Ronald Inglehart who, in the early seventies, predicted that a "silent revolution" oriented around value change was occurring in modern western democracies. Based on Daniel Bell's theory of post-industrialization, (Bell 1973) Inglehart theorized that the prolonged era of prosperity and affluence which typified the postwar generations and caused a growth in tertiary, service-based, white collar occupations encouraged a large segment of those generations to abandon materialist values (the search for security through the stockpiling of private possessions) and switch their orientations towards the postmaterialist values of inner growth, quality of life and environmental concern (Inglehart 1977). Inglehart's work spurred a burst of research into the value shift hypothesis, with results largely confirming his thesis. Hildebrandt and Dalton's (1978) follow-up research has shown that about 10% of the West German population meets these "new value" criteria. This is approximately the same proportion of votes which the Greens receive in national elections.

Membership demographics of the German Green movement seem consistent with Inglehart's new class arguments. Manuel Dittmers found that Green voters are primarily young with over 70% being under age 35 (Dittmers 1986). Chandler and Siaroff found similar findings along with strong support occurring among teachers and civil servants. Thirty-two
percent of all Green Bundestag members come from a teaching background, 14% from public service and 7% from journalism careers. Over 53% of Green Deputies were found to have occupations related to education, social science or communication (Chandler and Siaroff 1986). Chandler and Siaroff's research confirms that Green voters come primarily from middle and upper class, salaried, households. Poguntke's recent text on the German Greens, Alternative Politics- The German Green Party (1993) confirms the earlier research of Dittmers, Chandler and Siaroff and concludes that 70.2% of current Green Party supporters fall into the postmaterialist classification. A further 25.7 display mixed postmaterialist/materialist orientations (Poguntke 1993, 58-60).

There is evidence that Green consciousness or "new class mentality" exists in America. Recent polls of American attitudes towards the environment show that 78% of all Americans consider themselves environmentalists, more than the total of Democrats and Republicans combined. Eighty-six percent of all American households say they recycle and seven out of ten report that they favor protecting the environment, even at the risk of slowing economic growth. In a Gallup Poll Survey taken in April 1991, the question was asked, "Is drastic action needed to save the planet?" Fifty-seven percent favored immediate, drastic action. Those indicating that immediate, drastic action was necessary were predominantly female (61% of all females responding), 18-29
years old (60% of those responding, with 30-49 years old a close second with 58%), high school or college graduates (59% and 57% respectively), and liberal (62% of the Democrats and 64% of political independents). Those with middle class incomes $20,000-49,999 (62.5%) supported the question by 15% more than those making more money and 6% more than those making less money. 59% of Black respondents were likely to stress immediate, drastic action compared to 57% of White respondents (Hueber 1991).

A more specific poll of American new class prospects by one of the major supporters of the American Green movement shows results similar to those uncovered in Germany. More than 3,000 readers of the news journal Utne Reader, The Best of the Alternative Press replied to the poll. Utne Reader’s editors found that 72% of their respondents fit into the SRI International’s Values and Lifestyles typology (VALS) under the category of Societally Conscious.¹⁸ This compares to just 11% of the United States population as a whole. VALS categorizes the Societally Conscious as those who believe in social change, rebel against materialism and question a life dedicated to the traditional work ethic. When asked what issues are extremely important 87% of Utne Reader respondents said world peace, 82% said nuclear disarmament, 65% said ending world hunger, and 52% said improving race relations. Over 50% have contributed money to environmental protection and 49% to anti-nuclear causes. This differs greatly from the American public as a whole,
whose VALS profile for the large majority (70%) emphasizes belonging (38%), emulating (10%), and achieving material or status goals (21%) (Ogilvy, Utne and Edmonson 1987, 121).

As for new class demographics, 80% of the Utne Reader respondents were college graduates, 50% have attended graduate school. Most have professional or technical jobs in areas like accounting, art, computers, medicine, law, teaching and writing. Nine percent hold executive positions in management or administration. Sixty percent make more than $23,000 a year and 46% make more than $30,000. Eighty percent are between the ages 25 and 45 (Ogilvy, Utne and Edmondson 1987). This profile is very similar to the postmaterialist class posited by Inglehart.

There seems to be a ready constituency for Green politics in the United States. Many young, highly educated, professional, and secular citizens seem drawn to Green values. This fact may have serious implications for the future. New class members have a political impact far beyond that of their average cohorts. More than 83% of the Utne Reader respondents regularly vote compared to less than half of the American electorate as a whole. Ninety-five percent say it is important to make a contribution to society (Ogilvy, Utne and Edmondson 1987). As older generations pass the responsibilities of societal leadership on to younger generations (or as younger generations force the transfer of power), it is primarily the professional and highly educated who will assume leadership positions. As many Green-oriented
individuals are a part of this "leadership class," it is likely a small but significant percentage of the positions of societal responsibility will be filled by "socially conscious" individuals in the future.

NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Speculation upon the political implications of a new postmaterialist class has resulted in the theory of new social movements. According to Jurgen Habermas (1981 and 1982), new social movements arise in order to protect a social and cultural lifeworld from intrusion and colonization by the economic and political-bureaucratic subsystems of modern civilization. Habermas believes that traditional social movements such as the worker’s movement could be co-opted and rendered nonthreatening to the status quo through the reallocation of goods distribution. This assimilation into the social system is made possible because traditional movements saw the larger purpose of the system, the expansion of the industrial sector, as basically good. New social movements differ from older movements by rejecting reformism and demanding major social and cultural change. Ynestra King (1990, 106), illustrates this attitude by asking, "Who would want a larger piece of a pie that is rotten and carcinogenic to begin with?"

Habermas’s theory holds that since new social movements arise primarily around issues concerning quality of life, self-realization, political participation, and human rights,
rather than issues relating to economic distribution, conflict must necessarily occur between the instrumentally rationalized (utilitarian) cultures of the economic-administrative system (Big Business and Big Government) and the new social movements. This sets up a very dangerous situation for the future. If the subgroups of the economic-administrative system are stifled in their ability to respond to threats to their domains of power with material means, they will most likely be forced to rely upon the other element of their worldview: domination.

As the dominating subsystems increasingly repress and seek to block new social movements from legitimate political (change-oriented) activity, one can expect increasingly radical responses from new social movement members. David Foreman (1991) states that the reason he formed Earth First! as a response to the destruction of wilderness in the United States was because, as a traditional environmental lobbyist for several years, he saw the instrumentalist orientations of the economic-administrative system constantly thwart any legitimate attempt to limit its growth. Foreman’s response was expansion of the arena of political discourse to include extralegal tactics such as monkeywrenching or ecosabotage.20

The Utne Reader survey of Green-oriented individuals described above shows that new social movement members push against the boundaries of political discourse almost as often as they participate in traditional political activity.
One-third of Utne Reader respondents indicated they have organized a political protest. Sixteen percent have committed an act of civil disobedience while only 18% have worked for a political candidate or party (Ogilvy, Utne and Edmondson, 1987). This seems to indicate a desire to participate politically but also indicates alienation from the choices offered by the two major political parties.

THE MINORITY TRADITION

Several Green theorists, primarily Americans, trace the genealogy of Green cosmological orientations back to prehistory. Social Ecologist Murray Bookchin (1982) marks the beginning of the species itself and the origin of "mother love" as a starting point for the nondominating, nurturing attitude which the Greens seek to promote. Mystical Ecofeminist Riane Eisler (1987) believes the Paleolithic period, which marks the beginning of Western culture about 25,000 years ago, offers evidence of a more socially just, nonviolent, participatory and ecologically harmonious worldview where matriarchal, goddess-worshipping societies valued both women and nature. Neo-Primitivist Paul Shepard (1973) argues that hunting and gathering tribes were the "true humans" and that the advent of agriculture started a slow, degenerative slide to the present.

Devall and Sessions (1985) believe these diverse perspectives can be classified as a "minority tradition" which has consistently surfaced in the history of culture.
The distinctiveness of the minority tradition is illustrated in Table 5, "The Minority Tradition Versus The Dominant Worldview," in Appendix One. Devall and Sessions view the dominant worldview (underlying both liberalism and communism) as supportive of centralization, bureaucracy, and control. The dominant worldview, according to Devall and Sessions, sees nature as resource or data. The minority worldview they favor seeks decentralization, democracy and simplicity while living in an harmonious community of people, plants, animals, and nature as a whole.

Devall and Sessions believe that the minority tradition is essentially universal. They see evidence of this in Native American cultures, in Eastern philosophy including Taoism and some Buddhism, in events such as the Paris Commune of 1871, and in various utopian communities found throughout American history. Other theorists using the idea of a minority tradition are abundant in Green literature. George Woodcock (1990) cites the nonviolent anarchism, anti-industrialism and mutual aid of William Godwin, Proudhon, Tolstoy, Gandhi and Kropotkin as examples of the minority tradition. Ursula LeGuin (1989), Gwaganad (1989), and Marie Wilson (1990), give examples of this tradition in Native American cosmologies. Corinne Kumar D’Souza (1989), Anne Cameron (1989), and Pamela Philipose (1989), speak of the tradition in indigenous peoples worldwide. Kirkpatrick Sale believes the minority tradition manifests itself today in a variety of ways other than what people commonly think of
as "Green." Sale believes some subcultures of anarchism, witchcraft, communalism, feminism and "monkeywrenching" exhibit or lead to minority tradition consciousness (Sale 1990, ix-x).
CHAPTER ONE - NOTES

1. My background for this project includes extensive library and field research, writing several Green-oriented papers which have been presented at local, national and international conferences, and early coordination of the formation of the Hawaii Green Movement and the Hawaii Green Party.


3. Douglas’s description of subcultures is appropriate to this project. Douglas believes subcultures are typified by "a set of social meanings shared by a group which varies from the generally shared meanings of the larger group" (Jack Douglas, Introduction to Sociology, New York: Free Press, 1973). According to Douglas, members of subcultures have meanings in common which overlap with those of the larger group, but are in some significant ways different.

4. Unfortunately this dissertation is not the proper place to discuss in depth the rich history of social movements stressing Green-related values. This brief summary is merely meant to give the reader a feel for some of the major currents which have contributed to modern Green consciousness.

5. Flexner describes "civil death" as a past where women had no right to property, to legal existence outside their husband or father, and no right to vote. See Eleanor Flexner’s Century of Struggle (New York: Atheneum, 1974).


7. The difference between Beverly’s untouched landscape and Jefferson’s modified landscape can be seen throughout the history of ecophilosophy in America. In the modern American Green movement this difference is typified in the ideological split between the Deep and Social Ecologists.

8. Andrew Dobson’s Green Political Thought (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990), offers a view of ideology more specific than the traditional political science definition. For example, Plamenatz describes ideology as "a set of closely related
beliefs or ideas, or even attitudes characteristic of a group
or a community" (Plamenatz, John. Ideology [New York: 
Praeger], 1970, 15). Roy Macridis' Contemporary Political
of political ideologies from another perspective. According
to Macridis's definition, the Greens have developed a
counterideology rather than an ideology. This is due to the
Green questioning of the status quo and their attempts to
modify the dominant belief systems of society. In Macridis' 
view ideologies seek to rationalize the status quo, while
counterideologies challenge it.

9. The Greens/Green Party USA Platform document was created
and formalized in a committee process which stressed
consensus and stretched over several years and 2 national
conventions. Over 200 policy statements were analysed and
synthesized by 300 participants from 40 states at the first
conference in Eugene, Oregon. Comments were then solicited
from people unable to attend the Eugene conference and these
were incorporated into the final document which was ratified
by a similar gathering in Boulder, Colorado in September
1990.

10. "SPAKA: Green Program USA" (Green Letter/Greener Times,
Autumn 1989, 11-15) and The Greens/Green Party USA Program

11. See John Ely's "The Greens of West Germany" (presented
at the Annual Convention of the Midwest Political Science
Association, August 28, 1986), footnote 11, for a detailed
list of derogatory statements about the Greens in the
mainstream media.

12. The "47" countries is from Feinstein's Sixteen Weeks
with the European Greens (San Pedro, CA: R and E Miles, 1992)
and illustrated in Table Four. An article entitled
"International Greens" in the Green Party News (September
1993, 3), put out by the Hawaii Green Party, states that
Green Parties exist in 67 countries, but gives no actual
listing of which countries those might be.

13. These figures are from Feinstein (1992, 671-4).
Feinstein's Sixteen Weeks With the European Greens is a
collection of platforms, interviews and statements offering a
good overview of the European Green movement.

14. Swimme in "Paradigms and Paradigm Shifts" (ReVision, 9,
No. 1 [1986], 20). This entire issue of ReVision is devoted
to discussion between leading new paradigm thinkers. See The
Elmswood Newsletter published by the Elmswood Institute
(Berkley, CA) for ongoing new paradigm discussions.
15. Fritjov Capra, "The Turning Point: Crisis and Transformation in Science and Society" (presented at the University of Hawaii Political Science Colloquium, Honolulu, 1986). Ogilvy, Ersler, and Spretnak express similar views in "Paradigms and Paradigm Shifts" (ReVision, 9, No. 1 [1986]).

16. Dewitt and Graham concur, believing "no development of modern science has had a more profound impact on human thinking than the advent of quantum theory" (quoted in Nick Herbert's Quantum Reality [New York: Doubleday], 1985, 16). According to Capra's The Turning Point (New York: Bantam Books, 1983, 38-39), this new conception of the universe can correct "a profound cultural imbalance which lies at the very root of our current crisis." Capra maintains this imbalance, which is inherent "in our thoughts and feelings, our values and attitudes, and our social and political structures," is the result of a scientific paradigm and a society which has consistently favored a rationality which is fragmented, discriminating, and associated with masculinity, expansiveness, demand, aggression, competition, and analysis. Quantum physicist David Finkelstein agrees, "Our classical ideas of logic are simply wrong in a basic practical way. The next step is to learn to think in the right way, to learn to think quantum-logically" (Nick 1985, 21).

17. One popular reading of value change, Robert Reich's The Greening of America (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), foretold of a Green consciousness change in the USA, while Ernest Callenbach's Ecotopia (New York: Bantam Books, 1975) took such a change to its logical extreme with parts of the Pacific Northwest leaving the United States to form an independent Green state.

18. The VALS typology was developed by Arnold Mitchell who describes Americans as falling into three major categories—outer-directed, inner-directed, or need-driven. The need-driven are poor. Mitchell subdivides them into survivors and sustainers. The outer-oriented make up the majority and are belongers, emulators and achievers. The inner-directed types make up 20% of the American population and include the I-am-me, experientials and societally conscious subtypes. See Ogilvy, Utne and Edmondson, "Boom With a View," (Utne Reader, No. 21, [May-June 1987]) for more background on the VALS typology.

19. See Paul D'Anieri's "New Social Movements in Historical Perspective" (Comparative Politics, 22, No. 4 [July 1990]); Robin Eckersley's "Devining Evolution" (Environmental Ethics, 11, No. 2, [Summer 1989]); Klaus Elder's "A New Social Movement?" (Telos, No. 52 [Summer 1982]); Jurgen Habermas' "New Social Movements" (Telos, No. 49 [Fall 1981]); and Saral Sarkar's "The Green Movement in West Germany" (Alternatives,
April 1986), for an overview of new social movement theory in relationship to the Greens.

20. The ecodefensive actions of Earth First! fit into Bramwell's theory (explored in *Ecology in the Twentieth Century*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989, 18) that new social movements create new categories of political discourse by straining against the bounds of the ordinary and thus extend those boundaries.
CHAPTER TWO

THE AMERICAN GREEN MOVEMENT: SUBCULTURES AND WORLDVIEWS

THE STUDY OF GREEN POLITICS IN AMERICA

The study of Green Politics in America is a rich and varied field, yet one which has barely been explored. This is not to ignore the countless examples of research related to Green roots, both intellectual and movement related, or to Green values.1 Rather the point I wish to make is that exploration of the Green movement, as a separate and unique chapter in American political thought, has just begun. The field of Green political thought thus offers vast areas of academically unexplored territory. If the Green movement grows in importance in the United States as it has in Europe, I am sure this situation will soon be corrected.

My own interest in Green political thought has paralleled the rise of the American Green movement. I trace my introduction to this field to Jim Dator’s graduate political science course "Political Design for the Future." Dator’s course requirements included an analysis of several different futurists, one of whom was Mark Satin, a Vietnam draft resister who had written the book, New Age Politics (1979) while on "political vacation" in Canada. New Age Politics fascinated me. It spoke of a new form of politics originating with the heart rather than of traditional power politics, which stress manipulation and force. I asked Dator if such a politics was really "legitimate," meaning logically
coherent and capable of actual political change activity, or if it was the kind of nonsense which Michael Marien (1982) critiques as "the Sandbox Syndrome," behavior oriented towards the political equivalent of sand castle building rather than toward serious attempts to alter real life situations. I will never forget Dator's answer as he assured me that this "New Age Politics" was as "legitimate" as any other form of politics. I include this narrative because it is illustrative of the political awakening many of my Green cohorts have also gone through.

My interest in this "new field of politics" led me to Ira Rohter who was also teaching graduate political science courses at the University of Hawaii. Rohter introduced me to the vast arena of literature which was the precursor of modern Green Politics in the United States. Among the texts used by Rohter were The Turning Point (1982) and The Tao of Physics (1976) by Capra, The Politics of the Solar Age (1981) by Henderson, and Ecotopia (1975) by Callenbach. These texts complemented Satin's work by stressing the values of interconnectedness, interdependence, and ecological balance. They also argued that a positive alternative to the materialistic, self-oriented individualism expressed by the dominant culture of the 1980s was possible.

Many other books in this same era (1970s and early 1980s) were offering the same message in slightly different ways and reaching large numbers of people. Reich's The Greening of
America (1970), Ferguson’s Aquarian Conspiracy, Schumacher’s Small is Beautiful (1973), and Bookchin’s Post-Scarcity Anarchism (1971) made the bestseller lists. This "proto-Green" thought (variously described at different times in different arenas as "transformational politics," "new political science," "new age politics," "political ecology," or "ecophilosophy") became "the in-thing" with major publishing companies like Bantam Books, whose New Age Books series included dozens of offerings stressing proto-Green themes.

Then Capra and Spretnak’s Green Politics (1984) was published. Green Politics told the story of Die Grunen, the West German Greens, who managed to articulate the frustrations and hopes of many of their time, and also to turn these feelings into a political party with the capacity to challenge traditional electoral politics. Capra and Spretnak’s book struck a chord in America. Green Politics was the first full-length book in the United States to link the four Green values of ecological harmony, social justice, nonviolence and democratic participation with active politics. This is the point where the field of Green literature as a separate and unique entity in America can be said to have begun. The same year in which Green Politics was published, the first nationwide Green network in America was established. A number of periodicals strictly devoted to Green Politics and Green Political Thought in America quickly blossomed forth in the ensuing years including Green Letter.
Green Synthesis, and Green Action. Dozens of "alternative" periodicals devoted significant amounts of coverage to the Greens and Green-oriented issues. Academic journals such as New Politics, Tikkun, Telos, and Environmental Ethics increased their interest in Green-oriented articles as did the mainstream press.

In the mid-1980s, subcultures within the American Green movement began to distinguish themselves with texts like Tobias’s Deep Ecology (1984), Devall and Session’s Deep Ecology (1985), Foreman’s Ecodefense (1985), and Bookchin’s The Modern Crisis (1987). Subcultures also issued their own newsletters and journals. Session’s Ecophilosophy, Fox’s Creation, Foreman’s Earth First! Journal and the Bookchin influenced Green Perspectives are examples of prominent periodicals aimed at particular Green audiences.

In 1987, Brian Tokar’s The Green Alternative offered the first book-length analysis of the American Green movement. The Green Alternative was followed by publishing companies such as South End Press and Sierra Club offering titles focusing on the American Greens such as Biehl’s Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics (1991), Diamond and Orenstein’s Reweaving the World (1990), and Chase’s Defending the Earth (1991). New Society Publishers, built entirely around publishing "Green" books, now publishes close to one hundred Green-oriented titles.
With this boom in Green publishing (and the corresponding boom in activism explored in Chapter Three) several major figures have become prominent. Dave Foreman, Chris Manes, Rik Scarce, and Edward Abbey have become synonymous with the "take no shit," Earth First!, eco-warrior stance of Neo-Primitivism. Peter Berg, Paul Shepard and Gary Snyder represent a more sensitive, but no less confrontational Neo-Primitivistic relationship to bioregional advocacy. Charlene Spretnak, Starhawk, Paula Gunn Allen and Deena Metzger have emerged as major Mystical Deep Ecologists. Murray Bookchin, Janet Biehl, Ynestra King, and Howard Hawkins have risen to the forefront of Social Ecologist thought and activity. All of these people have written major works in the field and all participate in activism as well.6

A few authors have tried to transcend subculture affiliation to offer overviews of the American Green Movement.7 Tokar has published several articles since The Green Alternative expanding his view of the Greens and exploring recent changes in the movement such as the Social Ecologist attempt to dominate the Green Party/Green Movement USA and the increasing factionalism within the Earth First! network. John Resenbrink (1992) has recently joined the ranks of Tokar with a book-length analysis of the movement entitled The Greens and the Politics of Transformation. Other significant work in the field, such as Ira Rohter’s A Green Hawai‘i (1992), have ignored subculture
limitations. Rohter has recognized that he is attracted to aspects of each subculture and thus concentrates upon political change from a variety of perspectives without denigrating the worth of differing methods subcultures adopt for social change.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE AMERICAN GREEN MOVEMENT

The success of the European Greens as a political force encouraged Green-oriented individuals in the United States to advocate the formation of Green networks in America. As early as 1983, there had been attempts to organize American Greens (Baranoff 1988). So far, these attempts have resulted in loose networks of local affiliates rather than in a solid party or movement manifestation on the national level (Satin 1989; Resenbrink 1992). There are many reasons for this. Greens tend to organize around local rather than national issues (as per the Green slogan, "think globally, act locally"). The American majoritarian electoral system is also a factor. In many parliamentary systems a party only needs 5% of the total vote for parliamentary representation, in the United States a party needs 50% (+1) for a two-party race or 33% (+1) for a three-party race. The general apolitical attitude of the American people as a whole must also be taken into account. In many other countries elections average 70-80% voter turnout while national American elections are lucky to poll 50% of the eligible voters. Local elections in the United
States usually poll even less. Finally, the Green cosmology itself distains centralization and charismatic leadership.\(^9\)

The most successful of the Green networks in America was formed in 1984 in St. Paul, Minnesota. Influenced by the Capra and Spretnak book *Green Politics*, the group called itself the Committees of Correspondence (CoC) after the Revolutionary War network of the same name.\(^10\) The CoC has since changed its name to The Greens/Green Party USA. According to Steve Chase, attendance at the first CoC gathering mirrored that of the early German Green Party membership, including "farmers and community leaders, peace advocates, activists in churches and synagogues, environmentalists, teachers and others" who came together to create "a movement for the far-reaching moral, political and spiritual renewal of America" (Steve Chase, undated letter).

The Committees of Correspondence resembled Die Grunen in one other important way: They adopted the four pillars of the German Green Movement (ecology, social justice, nonviolence and grass-roots democracy) as their primary value orientations. The CoC later "Americanized" the four pillars by adding six additional elements (decentralization, community-based economics, postpatriarchal values, respect for diversity, global responsibility and future focus) to form a statement they called the "Ten Key Values."

The four pillars of Die Grunen and the ten expanded values of the CoC have found resonance throughout America.
By April 1987, the CoC had grown into a network of 65 locals. By August 1992 the CoC boasted a membership of over 425 local affiliates. The growth in CoC membership coupled with its early formation and longevity places the network as one of the primary Green voices in America today. This should not be taken to mean that the CoC is unchallenged in their representation of American Green orientations. Since the network’s inception, the CoC has been accused of elitism, orthodoxy and censorship. Green political parties in several states have refused to join the CoC, preferring their current independence.

Challenges to the CoC by Dana Beal and the Yippies have included the holding of alternative national conferences and the publication of the independent and anarchist newsjournals *Green Action* and *Overthrow*. Beal’s primary platform difference with the CoC concerned the legalization of marijuana (Yippies strongly support, the CoC takes no official position). Beal’s primary strategic difference concerned Green networking with already established third parties (Yippies strongly support, the CoC is hesitant). The 1992 elections show why: When Green Party candidates ran against other third party candidates they averaged over twice as many votes as candidates for the Libertarian Party and 68% more votes than all other third parties and independents combined (*Green Party USA Press Release*, "Greens Win 560,000 votes in 1992, Seat 11 Candidates," no date). The CoC has further accused the "Yippie Greens" of being overly
centralized and elitist, a charge the Yippies also levy against the CoC (Baranoff 1989; Hill and Hawkins 1988).

The Democratic Socialists of America have also taken an aggressive stand towards co-optation of the Green vote by establishing "Red/Green" caucuses within its organization and publishing the *Eco-Socialist Review* and the *DSA Green News*. The *Activist*, the journal of the youth section of the Democratic Socialists of America, has repeatedly emphasized the need for Green-Socialist linkage (Hughes 1989; O'Connor 1989). James O'Connor's journal *Capitalism, Nature and Socialism* stresses similar linkage though from a much more Marxist than Green position. The CoC has steered clear from such coalitions so far. Many Greens view Socialism in a suspicious light (*Green Tidings*, "Role of Capitalism in Eco-Destruction Debated," June 24, 1989, 1+) and others critique it as part of the same nature-exploiting worldview as capitalism (Porritt 1985).

Other Green activity has also increased during the last two years. New organizations outside the CoC network include a coalition calling itself "The Green Movement" which has established a headquarters in Washington DC to link activists from the farm, women's and African-American movements. A political action committee called "GreenVote" with headquarters in Boston, has organized to support pro-choice/pro-environment initiatives and candidates, and "The Green Politics Network", has formed to promote the
Dissent within the CoC has also blossomed in recent years. A major group of CoC supporters has formed the Left Green Network, while another Social Ecologist subgroup has formed the Youth Greens. The Left Green Network and Youth Greens are highly critical of many CoC members especially those oriented towards Mystical Deep Ecology and Neo-Primitivism (Biehl 1988; Bookchin 1988; Chase 1991). Social Ecologists seek a more mainstream (for the Greens) and political approach, which concentrates upon social justice as much as ecology. This is reflected in the Social Ecologist rewriting of the CoC 10 key values to include "ecological humanism, social ecology, racial equality, social ecofeminism, gay and lesbian liberation, cooperative commonwealth, human rights, nonaligned internationalism, independent politics, direct action, radical municipalism, strategic nonviolence and democratic decentralism."

Stating that they only wish to add diversity within the CoC, the formation of the Left Green Network and Youth Greens has sparked much debate about who is or who is not a "true" Green. Mystical Deep Ecologists and Neo-Primitivists have come under bitter attack by CoC Social Ecologist-oriented members. In return, the Social Ecologists are accused of playing power politics and attempting to take over the CoC
without regard to the large constituencies which make up Green subcultures other than their own. 14

This divisiveness seem to indicate a state of chaos and incoherence within the American Green movement, but this dissertation maintains that this seeming "chaos" deserves serious examination. Despite internal difficulties, the CoC has managed to maintain legitimacy with most local Greens, ratify a national policy program, adopt a national action plan, and form a nationally focused political party all in the last two years. The CoC has doubled local affiliates within the same time period. Work in Chaos Theory by Benoit Mandelbrot states that inherent in what seems to be chaos are patterns not yet understood. 15 Barbara Jancar's (1992) "Chaos as an Explanation of the Role of Environmental Groups in East European Politics" sees localized Green groups as fractuals of larger movement patterns typifying common responses to the ills of the modern world. This dissertation agrees with Jancar.

It is a further contention of this dissertation that the internal "chaos" which the American Green movement is experiencing is not chaos at all, but is due to three separate and identifiable subcultures which have vastly different worldviews, praxis orientations and visions of preferred futures. This dissertation attempts to identify the patterns of coherence in the seeming chaos surrounding the formation of the American Green movement.
WORLDVIEW SIMILARITIES IN AMERICAN GREEN SUBCULTURES

All three subcultures of the American Greens share basic characteristics that English observers of the Greens have begun to label as "ecologistic" (Dobson 1990; Bramwell 1989). Andrew Dobson describes ecologism as an ideology based upon an understanding of ecological and ontological precepts. According to Dobson ecologism desires to restructure the whole of modern political, social and economic life. Bramwell's definition of ecologism is similar to Dobson's. In addition to Dobson's description Bramwell has distinguished thirteen traits she associates with ecologism:

1. The belief that modern rationality does not pay enough attention to intuition,
2. The hunt for a scapegoat who "made" society go wrong,
3. Belief in the essential harmony of nature,
4. Responsibility for one's actions,
5. Apocalyptical beliefs,
6. The belief that ecologists are able to plan a better society,
7. Appreciation of aesthetic values and sensuous pleasures,
8. Hostility to the formal and the elaborate,
9. A search for a one-to-one relationship between man and object,
10. An underlying moral stance,
11. Scepticism towards science but not rejection of
science or objectivity,

(12) The rejection of the existing political system, be it capitalist or socialist,

(13) Putting faith in one's individual judgment ahead of party allegiance (Bramwell 1989, 15-21).

Bramwell's thirteen traits of ecologism correspond well with certain stances of the American Greens, but they also leave out critical differences between ecologism and Green political thought. Bramwell agrees with this and admits that while all Greens are ecologists, not all ecologists are Greens.16 Brian Tokar's work helps us distinguish between the two. Tokar states that at the core of Green thought is the call for radical political and economic democracy, a new understanding of humanity as one element in an intricate web of ecological relationships, a radical critique of social stratification and hierarchies of control and domination that lead to social injustice, and a strong orientation towards peace and nonviolence. The task of this dissertation is to examine the extent to which the three subcultures of the American Green movement agree with this core and to analyze how the various subcultures differ.17

A final similarity of importance amongst the three subcultures occurs on the level of community design and large-scale political affiliation, where all three Green subcultures share the "bioregional" vision. Under the
bioregional vision the boundaries of the nation-state and its political subentities would be superseded by affiliation to one's immediate geographical area (Bramwell 1989, 226). Natural borders such as rivers, mountains, and ecosystems serve to distinguish these bioregions from one another. The bioregional vision places emphasis upon learning the ecological interactions of one's own place and living within those interactions to as large a degree as possible.18

WORLDVIEW DIFFERENCES: THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST WORLDVIEW

The major precepts of the Neo-Primitivist worldview can be stated as follows: (1) Wilderness is a realm of ultimate freedom, (2) immersion in wilderness leads to the realization of biocentric egalitarianism, and (3) the worldview of modern civilization is destroying the biosphere. These precepts lead to a negative orientation towards modernity and a desire to return to earlier times, as early as the Paleolithic Age, seen as full of ecological harmony and personal freedom.

In the Neo-Primitivist worldview wilderness is glorified as an arena of freedom where escape from the domination and repression inherent in the modern world is possible. David Foreman (1991, 5) states his belief that humans ought to become wild because, "Wild animals cannot be ruled." Devall and Sessions take this argument even further by citing Henry David Thoreau's testimony to the positive effects of integration with the wild, "In wildness is the preservation
of the world....Life consists of wildness. The most alive is the wildest. Not yet subdued to man, its presence refreshes him....In short, all good things are wild and free.\textsuperscript{19}

Neo-Primitivists view wilderness in such a way because they see modern civilization as attempting to control all forms of nature, internal and external. These attempts are not seen as positive but as negative and are cited as diminishing important aspects of human existence, including the needs for spontaneity, independence from technology, emotional freedom, and freedom from systematic authoritarian repression. As David Foreman states (1991, 4-5), "We must break out of society’s freeze on our passions, we must become animals again....damn it, I am an animal. A living being of flesh and blood, storm and fury. The oceans of the Earth course through my veins, the winds of the sky fill my lungs, the very bedrock of the planet makes my bones. I am not...some New Age android."

In the eyes of Neo-Primitivism, the only way to recover the passion Foreman advocates and to eliminate the negativities associated with civilization and modernity is to reject these forms of social structure completely. Peter Berg (1990, 29) maintains that only by using wilderness as a model can humanity avoid the "enslavement" inherent in current society. Earth First! co-founder David Foreman (Foreman and Hayward, 1987, 17) goes even further, believing, "We haven’t had any progress on this planet in sixteen
thousand years." Berg (1990, 21), while not quite concurring with Foreman, does say that "to discover our wildness, the wild homo sapiens being within us, is very liberating....It is the future from my point of view."

The Neo-Primitivist worldview posits that the freedom found in the rejection of civilization will give humanity a new found (renewed) sense of self. Neo-Primitivists argue that this new self is not the isolated, individualized self of modern Liberalism, instead it is a self embedded in communitarian relationship with one's environment. The new self of the Neo-Primitivist is based upon the elimination of modern boundaries between self and environment, an elimination which the Neo-Primitivist believes will lead to less alienation and thus greater self-fulfillment. Foreman (1991, 6) argues that it is only through direct interaction with wilderness that one can experience the full connection between mind, body and the larger world which surrounds oneself.

In the Neo-Primitivist worldview, the negation of dualism through this new sense of self leads to a new ethics which rejects human self-interest as the sole measure of worth. David Foreman (1991, 53) argues that, "the ecological community is not just valuable for what it can provide human beings. Other beings, both animal and plant, and even so-called 'inanimate' objects such as rivers, mountains, and wilderness habitats are inherently valuable and live for their own sake." Foreman's Neo-Primitivism thus sees
wilderness or the state of Nature as an egalitarian realm of freedom in much the same sense as John Locke. Locke believed the state of nature was "a state of perfect freedom" where the "law of Nature...teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that...no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions...as if we were made for one another's uses" (Locke 1690). There are major differences of course between Locke's Seventeenth Century view of nature and the modern Neo-Primitivist worldview. Locke did not extend the state of freedom, equality and self-actualization to the nonhuman world. Neo-Primitivism does exactly this through the recognition of agency and intrinsic worth in the nonhuman world. As John Dryzek (1990, 206) has stated, "Regardless of its source, any recognition of agency in nature clearly undercut[s] the Cartesian subject-object dualism that legitimates the domination of nature, just as a recognition of human agency undermines the instrumental manipulation that legitimates authoritarian politics."^20

Neo-Primitivist Dave Foreman (1991, 11) argues that, "We have a moral obligation to preserve wilderness and biodiversity, to develop a respectful and symbiotic relationship with that portion of the biosphere which we do inhabit, and to cause no unnecessary harm to non-human life." Foreman further believes the above relationship means "these moral obligations frequently supersede the self-interests of humanity" (Foreman 1991, 116).
Neo-Primitivists can take such a radical position because they fear modern society does not only repress human nature, but also disrupts the basic life-supporting processes of the biosphere. In the Neo-Primitivist view of the modern world, technological man has become a cancer which assimilates all it can and destroys that which it cannot make like itself. The result is that Neo-Primitivists see war as an apt metaphor to describe the relationship between modern humanity and the nonhuman environment. This leads to a decidedly misanthropic perspective among many Neo-Primitivists and betrays the nonviolence stance of the larger Green Movement. Leading Neo-Primitivists have stated that they agree with John Muir's statement that "if it ever came to a war between the races, he would side with the bears."

Earth First!, the primary Neo-Primitivist network in America, is composed of members who believe the well-being of the earth must come first before that of any individual species, including the human species. One writer to the Earth First! Journal and mother of two children has stated, "If the Earth is lucky, maybe humans will kill themselves off completely within the next few decades" (Jacobs 1989, 3). Christopher Manes (1990b, 29), a leading Neo-Primitivist spokesperson believes, "There isn't one scrap of evidence that Homo sapiens is superior or special or even more interesting than, say, lichen." Manes sees misanthropy not as a potential problem but as leading towards a "richer,
nobler, humbler way of life." Another Earth First! Journal contributor, Sarah Bearup-Neal (1990, 30), apparently agrees and has stated, "I am fonder of trees than I am of people."

The perspectives cited here are not the isolated views of a few alienated individuals. Earth First! was created by five environmental activists on April 4, 1980. It has since grown into an international movement with an estimated 50,000 adherents in North America, a published journal with 15,000 readers and a network of activist cells which participate in aggressive political action oriented towards stopping wilderness destruction in all its forms. Although there are many smaller networks which represent the Neo-Primitivist worldview, this dissertation concentrates primarily upon Earth First! as the primary example of the Neo-Primitivist worldview in the rest of this dissertation.

THE WORLDVIEW OF MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY

The worldview of Mystical Deep Ecology is one which has existed as long as human beings have had conscious recognition of the world around themselves. Called the religious-metaphysical worldview by Jurgen Habermas, this cosmological perspective sees an enchanted and immanent world full of communicative, interactive, self-actualizing beings who are inherently valuable in their own right.24 Mystical Deep Ecology posits that modern ways of viewing the world leads to objectification of otherness and alienation of self; a situation in which Devall and Sessions (1985, 67 and
48) believe "we see ourselves as isolated and narrow competing egos" encompassed in a worldview which "has as its ultimate vision the total conquest and domination of nature."

The worldview of Mystical Deep Ecology puts forth an alternative vision of reality where a mystical, magical, enchanted world offers a sense of belonging by positing the Earth as a living body that has its own teleology. Paula Gunn Allen (1990, 52) describes the planet Earth as a body composed of many smaller beings each having their own needs, aims, goals and processes. Allen not only believes the Earth is alive in this way, but all other planets are as well. Allen's view of life, like that of most Mystical Deep Ecologists, includes planetary "by-products or expressions, such as animals, vegetables, minerals, climatic and meteorological phenomena." These smaller entities or "by-products and expressions" are seen by the Mystical Deep Ecologist as comprising immanent parts of a sacred totality. Luisah Teish (1985) summarizes this conception of reality with an ancient African adage, "We are all cells in the body of God."

This axiological, teleological and immanent view of nature leads Mystical Deep Ecologism to a biocentric egalitarianism which calls for restraint on human instrumental activity. For Starhawk (1989, 177), the Mystical Deep Ecology worldview "challenges our sense of values... each being has a value that is inherent, that cannot be diminished, rated, or ranked, that does not have to
be earned or granted." In the Mystical Deep Ecology worldview human beings lose their place of significance in the world and are seen as "no more valuable to the life of the universe than a field flowering in the color purple, than rivers flowing, than a crab picking its way across the sand—and no less" (Christ 1990, 66).

The reenchantment of this biocentric community adds a further restraint on human action through the addition of a sense of mystery to the world. As Carol Christ (1990, 66) explains, "Knowledge that we are but a small part of life and death is the essential religious insight. The essential religious response is to rejoice and to weep, to sing and to dance, to tell stories and create rituals in praise of an existence far more complicated, more intricate, more enduring than we are." To the Mystical Deep Ecologist, the proper role of the human individual becomes one of celebration of nature rather than manipulation of nature.

A number of Mystical Deep Ecologists have taken their worldview in an interesting direction. These theorists can be classified as Mystical Ecofeminists and differ from the larger school of Deep Ecologist thought through their radical critique of patriarchic society. In the Mystical Ecofeminist worldview, patriarchy bears the responsibility for virtually every modern social and ecological ill. Charlene Spretnak (1986, 30-31) illustrates this emphasis by exploring the linkages she sees between the patriarchic oppression of human and nonhuman nature in the following passage, "patriarchal
culture...connotes not only injustice towards women but also the accompanying cultural traits: love of hierarchical structure and competition, love of dominance-or-submission modes of relating, alienation from Nature, suppression of empathy and other emotions, and haunting insecurity about all of those matters."

Central to the Mystical Ecofeminist critique is the idea that patriarchal culture sets up dualities, which as Marti Kheel (1985) explains, "see the world in terms of static polarities--'us and them,' 'subject and object,' 'superior and inferior,' 'mind and body,' animate and inanimate,' 'reason and emotion,' 'culture and Nature'." According to Kheel these dualities always have two characteristics in common. One half of the duality is always valued more than the other half and "the more valued half is always seen as 'male' and the less valued half as 'female'." Kheel maintains the result of this patriarchal emphasis on dualism has been "the ruthless exploitation of women, animals, and all of nature."

The Mystical Ecofeminist solution to the problems which beset a modern world dominated by patriarchy is the return to a more feminized, Earth Goddess worshipping, matriarchal society. This goal sets Mystical Ecofeminism apart from those who believe women can only achieve "full human status" by joining men in exploits that express opposition to the natural world. Mystical Ecofeminists reject this view and
advocate the linkage between women and nature as a positive source of power. In setting their matriarchic goals for the future, Mystical Ecofeminism presents a further refinement of Mystical Deep Ecologist thought. The Mystical Ecofeminist critique of modern ills is one centered around androcentrism (the perspective which favors the view only of men) rather than the critique of anthropocentrism seen in the larger Deep Ecology Movement. Mystical Ecofeminism thus presents, in a clearer way, the extremes to which the main arguments of the Mystical Deep Ecology worldview can be taken. Throughout this dissertation we will return to Mystical Ecofeminism as a prominent representative of the Mystical Deep Ecology worldview.

THE WORLDVIEW OF SOCIAL ECOLOGY

The worldview of Social Ecology has been aptly described by Robin Eckersley (1988) as "communitarian anarchism rooted in an organismic philosophy of nature." Developed over the past fifty years largely by one man, Murray Bookchin, Social Ecology has evolved into a complex set of ideas, values and beliefs quite different from the Biocentric Neo-Primitivist and Mystical Deep Ecologist subcultures of the American Green Movement. Like the other two subcultures we have described in this chapter, the exploitation of the natural world is a significant theme in Social Ecologist literature. However it is not the major theme. Social
Ecologists believe the solution to environmental degradation lies in the socio-political sphere. Social Ecology posits that a society which accepts hierarchy and values one human being over another will naturally lead to a consciousness of domination.

The Social Ecologist worldview thus strives to reject domination in all its forms. Like Mystical Ecofeminism, Social Ecology supports the elimination of patriarchy. The Social Ecologist worldview also includes in its analysis the rejection of racism, sexism, ageism, and the structural violence begotten by such hierarchical cultural norms. Social Ecology disagrees adamantly with the enchanted aspects of Mystical Deep Ecology and supports the abolition of all concepts of religious hierarchy and superstitious thought. To the Social Ecologist, mysticism subverts its followers through self-subjugation to a superior goddess. Social Ecology further rejects Neo-Primitivism. In the view of the Social Ecologist, Neo-Primitivism subverts itself to the will of a superior natural world. Both the Mystical Deep Ecologist and Neo-Primitivist worldviews are seen by Social Ecology as establishing hierarchies of domination with a will superior to that of humankind. To the Social Ecologist this situation is simply a reversal of the present state of affairs where modern humanity dominates the natural environment to the point of exploitation (Bookchin 1989, 7-18).

The danger which Social Ecology sees inherent in fellow
Green subcultures lies in the Social Ecologist view that there is no firm dividing line between the social realm and the natural realm. Social Ecology posits that, despite their rhetoric, other Green subcultures fall into the same dualistic trap they seek to avoid. The result is "a systematic unravelling of the interface between nature and mind."

For the Social Ecologist, a consciousness containing any form of hierarchy cannot exist only towards one part of reality; the consciousness necessarily permeates into all arenas of human interaction. Thus fellow Green subcultures are seen to be as "misguided" as is the modern worldview.

The Social Ecologist worldview posits humankind as a "remarkably creative and social life-form that is organized to create a place for itself in the natural world, not only to adapt to the rest of nature" (Bookchin in Chase 1991, 33). This sense of human place in the world offers a middle ground to the modern placement of humankind as an alienated conqueror of otherness or the mystified subject of nature seen by Deep Ecology. To the Social Ecologist, the view of humans as highly evolved beings in a continuum of consciousness, able to reflect upon and control their actions, implies responsibility and the duty to their surrounding environment. Janet Biehl (1991, 126) argues this view of reality also demands the development of an ethics of service to both the natural and social realms of human existence. To the Social Ecologist this duty to service
implies that, at the very least, human beings acknowledge the integrity and subjectivity of other life forms and recognize that nature demands some kind of recompense for human instrumental activity (Bookchin 1982b, 303).

Bookchin (1982b, 45) sees a possible model for this way of interacting with the world in the cultures of the Wintu and Hopi Indians and in the expression of mother love. The Wintu Indians do not have a concept of ownership or possession. Rather they live with their surroundings. The Wintu Indian thus lives with but does not possess his bow and arrows just as he lives with but does not possess his children. Social Ecologists thus seek to extend the sense of solidarity and respect they advocate in the human realm to the nonhuman and even the inanimate world.

Interdependence is more valued than independence in the worldview of Social Ecology but variety and individuation is also prized. To the Social Ecologist the ideal societal relationship is the loving, nurturing, symbiotic interaction a mother/father (supposedly) has with her/his child. By stressing cooperation, interdependence and respect for difference rather than competition, self-interested individualism and fear of otherness, Social Ecologists believe their view of reality can change the modern world.
CHAPTER TWO - NOTES

1. See this dissertation’s bibliography for ample evidence of this argument.

2. Marien calls this the Sandbox Syndrome; a politics which keeps you contemplating your navel, or playing in the sandbox in Marien’s terms, while "real" political activity guides the reality around one’s self. See Marien, "The 'Transformation' As A Sandbox Syndrome" (Association for Humanistic Psychology Newsletter, October 1982, 31+).

3. One of my generational cohorts has remarked that as a baby boomer, he knew if he was going through a certain period or feeling a certain feeling that there were millions of people who were doing the same thing. I had been active in traditional electoral politics (working for the Senate Majority Leader of the Washington State Senate, who was a Republican, and the Senate President of the Hawaii State Senate, who was a Democratic). I had been successful in the business world. Yet, the material and status oriented rewards of the modern age were not enough. Nagging doubts about the current value system and structure of our society led me to seek possible alternatives. My dissatisfaction with the current values and structure of society (coupled with my interest in politics) eventually led me to the field of Alternative Futures and the study of the Greens.

4. Coevolution Quarterly, Utne Reader, New Options, and In These Times are just a few of these. See Donald Davis’s Ecophilosophy (San Pedro, CA: R and E Miles, 1989) and virtually any issue of Utne Reader for a good overview of Green-oriented periodicals.

5. Fox, like many Deep Ecologists is based in Canada but has a large following in the United States.

6. This brief overview of prominent writers in the various subcultures of the American Green Movement is necessarily limited. An annotated listing of subculture authors could fill pages with the talented people who deserve recognition here. Throughout the dissertation I have tried include this widespread wealth of diversity, rather than concentrating on any one person. The bibliography included in this dissertation should serve as sufficient testimony in this regard. Yet, as you will see, certain individuals such as David Foreman, Murray Bookchin, and Charlene Spretnak, have made such a contribution to their specific subcultures and are so illustrative of subculture thought as a whole, that they deservedly receive greater recognition than the more minor subculture contributors.
7. Alston Chase ("The Great, Green, Deep Ecology Revolution." Rolling Stone, April 23, 1987) is the only observer of the American Greens who has discussed the three subcultures I explore in this dissertation, as separate subcultures per se. Bookchin's Remaking Society (New York: Black Rose Books, 1989), has critiqued the subcultures of Neo-Primitivism and Mystical Deep Ecology but has not gone further into analysis of how these subcultures fit into the Green movement. Most observers and advocates are like Bookchin, critiquing their "competition" but not analyzing the roles they fulfill.

8. Capra and Spretnak (Green Politics. New York: E P Dutton, 1984, 193-229) see the possible forms the American Green Movement can take as network, movement, caucus within traditional political parties (2 forms), and independent party. They conclude that organization as a movement is the most likely to be successful in the U.S.A.


10. Mystical Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak was one of the primary organizers of the first meeting of the CoC. Social Ecologist Murray Bookchin, Ernest Callenbach, and Harry Boyt, author of The Backyard Revolution (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980), also attended.

11. Letter from Dee Berry (1987). See also Green Politics, 2, No. 2 (Summer 1992), 7. It should be noted that many of these members are nondues paying and many others do not participate in network decision making at all.

12. See Hill and Hawkins' "Dana Beal's Mid-Atlantic Greens are Bad News, But Not Because They Smoke Too Much Dope" (Green Synthesis, No. 28 [September 1988]); Baranoff's "Glastnost for the American Greens" (Green Action, 5, No. 3 [1988]); and Chase (1987) for an overview of the Yippie Greens. See "Green Voting Resources" (Utne Reader, No. 53 [September-October 1992]) for an overview of "Green" organizations existing independently of the Committees of Correspondence.

13. The Youth Greens are now called the Campus Green Network. The 10 values of the Left Green Network were stated in Letter From the Left Green Network, August 13, 1988.

15. Benoit Mandelbrot, (Speech at the World Futures Studies Federation XIII World Conference in Turku, Finland, August 23, 1993). Mandelbrot also stressed that chaos theory is a theory oriented towards the natural sciences and not the social sciences. I agree with Mandelbrot and use chaos theory here as an illustrative metaphor and not as an argument describing the essential nature of reality.

16. Bramwell argues in Ecology in the Twentieth Century (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, 21) that while there were fascist ecologists, fascism did not and does not have a Green component.

17. See Table One, "The Four Horsemen of the Green Apocalypse" for similarities between the Green critique of modernity and Table Three, "The Green Worldview and the Dominant Worldview: Three Levels of Difference" in Appendix One for an overview of Green worldview similarities on the perceptual, structural and value levels.


21. Shepard argues that by removing humanity from "a sense of place and time in the context of all life" human society has created a situation where it is destroying all life including itself (Shepard and McKinnley, The Subversive Science, Boston: Houghton, 1969, 8).
22. John Lovelock believes that environmentally, "We are in a similar position to that of Europe in 1938. In those days one knew a war was looming, but nobody had the slightest idea what to do about it...There were a few sensible people who prepared for war" (in "Only Man's Presence Can Save the Earth," Harper's Magazine, April 1990).


25. See Allen's "The Woman I Love is a Planet, the Planet I Love is a Tree" (in Reweaving the World, ed. Diamond and Orenstein, San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1990). Allen doesn't say anything about planets lacking the majority of these "expressions." One wonders how she views the moon in this regard.


27. Kheel (1990) is especially adept at pointing out these differences. See also Jim Cheney's "Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology" (Environmental Ethics, 9, No. 2 [Summer 1987]) and Michael Zimmerman's "Deep Ecology and Ecofeminism" (in Diamond and Orenstein, 1990).

28. Since 1974 Bookchin has had the help of his colleagues at the Institute for Social Ecology (which he founded in conjunction with Goddard College in New England) in the development of Social Ecology theory. The view of Social Ecology we take in this dissertation is larger than Bookchin's philosophy, but one should in no way slight his contribution to the Social Ecologist worldview. See Bookchin's many contributions in the bibliography for the basic tenets of Social Ecologist thought.

It should be noted that although Bookchin's view of Social Ecology has drawn much from the leftist tradition, including its emphasis on rationalism, its anticapitalist rhetoric, elements of its technological critique, and the methodological tool of dialectics, most Social Ecologists are critical of the economic reductionism, reliance on the working class as revolutionary base, and concept of a

Many Social Ecologists also reject the anticapitalist rhetoric of Bookchin as too inflammatory. Likewise, while many Social Ecologists adopt the communalism and mutual aid of Proudhon and Kropotkin and pay homage to the anarchist-syndicalist tradition, many Social Ecologists believe such traditions can no longer explain and mobilize the forces of modern change (see Bookchin 1985a, 1985c).

29. Bookchin (1982b) cites the main figures in Enlightenment empiricism (Descartes), liberalism (Locke) and philosophy (Kant) as being the philosophical forefathers of this unraveling through their articulation of the modern body/soul, perceiving senses/perceived world, and mind/external reality dualities.

30. See Tables One, Two and Three in the appendix for a summary of the Green critique of modern life.
CHAPTER THREE
GREEN PRAXIS

INTRODUCTION TO GREEN PRAXIS

Projects undertaking a serious attempt at creating alternative futures must address the issue of praxis, the ability to put theory into action. In the field of futuristics, the study of praxis involves analyzing a social change agent's methods of linking an idealized vision of the future to the imperfect present, or in the words of Jim Dator, developing a transition strategy enabling us to move from "here" to "there."¹ In this chapter we examine the transition strategies undertaken by the three subcultures of the American Green movement in their attempts to modify present society and thus move towards the creation of their preferred futures. The praxis orientations examined in this chapter are derived not only from the theories of social change posited in the primary texts of the three cosmological subcultures but also from the day to day practices of Green life.

In her analysis of the international Green movement, Anna Bramwell (1989, 9), has stated, "When cultural criticisms are combined with political action, it is time to take the phenomenon seriously...the evidence seems to be that the masses are being mobilized." I believe the same concern should be shown for the American Green movement. Members of all three Green subcultures are "mobilized" and participate
in common and traditional social change activities, such as lobbying, protesting and minor civil disobedience. Each subculture also has its own unique praxis orientations followed by subculture adherents. This chapter concentrates upon the differences in praxis strategies amongst the three American Green subcultures. These differences, grounded in the cosmological critiques and the worldviews explored in Chapters One and Two, lead this dissertation to the eutopian and dystopian future possibilities explored in Chapters Four and Five.

**NEO-PRIMITIVIST ACTIVE ECOLOGICAL RESISTANCE**

The dominant description of the Neo-Primitivist is that of Green warrior. This is because of the aggressive pro-wilderness theoretical and action orientations advocated by Neo-Primitivists. Neo-Primitivism believes humankind has declared war upon the world of wilderness. Green warriors view themselves as nature's main human allies, and have adopted slogans such as "Earth First!" and "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth." Neo-Primitivists call their praxis orientation by a variety of names from ecotage to ecodefense. Critics prefer to call these praxis strategies ecoterrorism.

To clear a value laden and muddied field of terminology, I prefer the term "active ecological resistance" to describe Neo-Primitivist praxis. Active ecological resistance contains three primary elements. First, active ecological
resistance is active in the sense that the tactics used are aggressive and proactive. Arne Naess (1988, 261-265) has identified the second element of active ecological resistance. He describes this element as an intense ecological orientation, involving identification and a sense of immediate connection with the natural world. This ecologism, as Andrew Dobson has described it, can be contrasted with mainstream environmentalism which maintains ecological problems can be solved within the framework of the present worldview without calling that view into question. The praxis orientation of environmentalism leans towards reformism such as demands for better management of industrial processes, recycling, limitations on pollutants, and cars with better gas mileage. Ecologism, on the other hand, demands fundamental changes in present political, social and cultural beliefs, values and structures. Calls by environmentalists to modify automobile emission standards are met by cries from ecologists to eliminate the need for cars altogether. Neo-Primitivists are ecologists in the fundamental sense, believing that duty to the Earth (meaning the realm of the wild and unmanaged) comes before duty to any economic, political or social structure.

When this ecologistic sense of obligation to the natural world is coupled with the aggressive action orientation described above, the third element in active ecological resistance is often awakened; an awareness of the power of the dominant economic, philosophic and political forces which
Neo-Primitivism finds itself opposed to (Foreman 1991, 122-23 and 144-45). This awareness leads to an anarchistic orientation of political resistance pitting Neo-Primitivists against virtually every form of legitimate power in modern society. This does not mean Neo-Primitivists do not use those powers such as the court system and legislative lobbying to their advantage whenever possible. What it does mean is that if efforts to achieve success within the system fail, other efforts undertaken outside of the system are viewed as equally legitimate.

NEO-PRIMITIVISM AND DIRECT ACTION

Observers of Neo-Primitivism discuss two main kinds of praxis strategies. These can be described as overt active ecological resistance and covert active ecological resistance. The primary orientation of both overt and covert active ecological resistance is direct action. In overt active ecological resistance this action takes the form of civil disobedience and includes activities such as blockading logging roads with one's body, chaining oneself to trees about to be cut, and staging public education/publicity events which often lead to arrest. Chris Manes believes the roots of Neo-Primitivist overt active ecological resistance rest in the experiences of the 1960s civil rights movement and emphasis on personal ethics, integrity and the "rightness" of the cause.
I agree with Manes that the goals of overt active ecological resistance seem to be twofold: (1) the personal/spiritual goal of "bearing witness against injustice" and (2) the political goal of making known to public officials and the public at large that ecological destruction is occurring and that there is active opposition to such destruction.

Overt active ecological resistance has had many successes. Lawsuits linked to endangered species acts have cost timber companies and other wilderness "developers" countless delays. Expenditures in legal fees and the employment of idle workers cost these companies millions of dollars each year. But overt active ecological resistance also carries a price. Because overt ecological resistance is direct and open, its practitioners can easily be targeted for retaliation. Protestors are often threatened and harassed, their vehicles and houses are broken into and vandalized. Sometimes this harassment is undertaken by the public authorities themselves. A greater concern is the real threat of injury or even death by those opposed to overt active resistance.\(^7\) Arrest for overt active ecological resistance is the norm and retaliatory civil law suits against active ecological resisters have become common.\(^8\) As a result, Neo-Primitivists who wish to avoid these consequences and who feel that even stronger measures must be taken to prevent ecological destruction often choose to pursue covert active ecological resistance.
Unlike overt active ecological resistance, covert activity is not aimed at bearing witness, personal growth, or public education. Instead covert active ecological resistance is more concerned with the goal of immediately stopping, or at least hindering, activity harmful to the natural environment. The roots of covert active ecological resistance reside in the anti-industrial sabotage of nineteenth century Europe. The modern version of anti-industrial activity includes the spiking of trees (with metal or ceramic nails) in areas slated for logging thus reducing the trees’ value as timber and making cutting of these trees difficult and dangerous. Survey stakes have been removed from wilderness areas delaying or preventing the construction of roads and buildings. Bulldozers, road graters, timber machines and other industrial equipment have been burned or sabotaged to slow and discourage the destruction of natural ecosystems.

That these actions are not the spontaneous activity of unthinking vandals is evidenced by the degree of planning which goes into them. The targets of covert ecological resisters are chosen carefully with maximum damage or public reaction in mind. In the case of tree spiking, many of these actions are done years in advance of actual threat to the ecosystem. As a result, few covert active ecological resisters are ever successfully prosecuted.

Dave Foreman (1991, 112-116) advocates that covert active ecological resistance consciously strike at the economic
realm where often marginally profitable capitalist ventures can be hurt the most. This successful strategy has driven up costs, led to the abandonment of ongoing projects and discouraged the undertaking of new projects. Timber sales in Washington, Oregon, Virginia, New Mexico and Montana have been stopped due to the economic disadvantages of harvesting spiked trees (Foreman 1991, 133-34). An appraisal of covert active ecological resistance published in 1990 suggests that covert direct action aimed at ecologically destructive economic targets is taking its toll nationwide with the annual cost of "ecotage" to industry and government estimated at $20-25 million in National Forests alone (C.M. 90).

One of the main advantages of covert active ecological resistance is that it often succeeds in ecosystem preservation after overt praxis strategies have stalled, thus buying time for further overt strategies to be implemented. In one spectacular operation by two members of the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, Iceland's plans to resume whaling (despite an international ban) were delayed due to $2 million in sabotage to a major whale processing plant and the sinking of half of Iceland's whaling fleet. Due to negative publicity and the threat of international boycotts, Iceland subsequently abandoned its whaling plans (Manes 1990, Chapter 6; Scarce 1990, Chapters 6 and 11).

As in the Icelandic case, covert active ecological resistance is usually found in conjunction with overt active ecological resistance. Many Neo-Primitivists have found that
a combination of the two praxis strategies is often more successful at stopping wilderness destruction than one tactic by itself. A case involving destruction of Hawaii's rain forest is a classic example. A company grinding up rain forest ohia for power-plant fuel was greatly hindered when ecoteurs firebombed a $250,000 wood chipper. Court action brought by overt active ecological resisters later revealed that the company had no permit for the operations. The company subsequently went bankrupt and its ecologically disruptive operations ceased (Foreman 1991, 134).

MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY AND WORLDVIEW CREATION

Julia Scofield Russell's, "The Evolution of an Ecofeminist" (1990), identifies one of the two main praxis orientations within Mystical Deep Ecology: concentration upon individual consciousness change as the method to create one's preferred future. Russell maintains that lasting societal transformation can only begin, and end, with personal transformation. The praxis strategy which Russell advocates to achieve this transformation is meditation.

Russell's emphasis on meditation as a praxis strategy for consciousness change is typical of the praxis perspective of the Mystical Deep Ecologist. Mystical Deep Ecology argues that the caring and nurturing values which they seek to promote exist in the intuitive realm but are slighted and suppressed by the dominant worldview's emphasis on rationality. Mystical Deep Ecology's praxis strategies thus
stress bringing "intuitive reality" to the forefront of individual consciousness through the suppression of logical reasoning.\(^{11}\)

Janet Biehl (1991) identifies a problem for Mystical Deep Ecology at this point. Biehl maintains that if one relies upon individualized intuitions as a basis for reality and "shuts off" one's attempts to critically analyze and communicate rationally, the recognition of "correct" or objective reality is indistinguishable from subjective perceptions (and misperceptions) of reality.\(^{12}\)

Chris Jones (1989) provides an answer to this critique in his dissertation "Gaia Futures: The Emerging Mythology and Politics of the Earth." Jones (1989, 278) describes Mystical Deep Ecology's "Gaia political consciousness" as a spiritually experienced, ecological and feminist perception of the world which stresses attunement with wilderness, sacred regard for all life, respect for diversity, and an awe for existence. Jones would see Biehl's critique of subjective misperception as being balanced by this "political consciousness."

Jones identifies the goal for Mystical Deep Ecologist praxis as the "propelling" of "this new cosmic story" into the collective consciousness. With this analysis, Jones has laid out the basis of the second praxis orientation we will discuss in this chapter, the attempts of Mystical Deep Ecologists to create and legitimate an alternative view of
reality in order to guide the intuitions of their followers in the proper direction.

THE SUPPRESSION OF REASON AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTUITION

The need for individual consciousness change posited by Mystical Deep Ecology centers around the subculture's critique of modernity. Since the Mystical Ecofeminist subgroup of Mystical Deep Ecology has refined this critique, I concentrate upon this subgroup as indicative of general Mystical Deep Ecology thought. Mystical Ecofeminists claim that the growth of instrumental-objective reasoning has created a cosmology of domination which has led to the exploitation of women and nature and which is rapidly leading to the total destruction of the earth's biosphere. Mystical Ecofeminism sees the solution to this destruction in the active recognition and development of one's feelings of empathy, compassion, desire to nurture and interconnectedness. Spretnak (1989, 127-128) posits that by focusing upon these intuitive messages from nature within one's body one can experience a worldview which leads to peace, abandonment of the concept of otherness, and an ethics of mutual respect where moral conduct can follow from one's moral identity.

The praxis strategies which Mystical Ecofeminism advocates in order to receive these intuitive messages from Nature calls for the negation of the critical aspect of thinking which has typified rationality since the
Enlightenment. 15 Orenstein (1990) sees this negation as positive. Orenstein calls for Mystical Ecofeminism to adopt a praxis of endarkenment, which she describes as a "bonding with the Earth and the invisible that will reestablish our sense of interconnectedness with all things, phenomenal and spiritual, that make up the totality of life in our cosmos."16

Praxis strategies undertaken to achieve this endarkenment include meditation, chanting, singing, dancing, drumming and ritualistic activity from a variety of traditions (Merchant 1990, 101; Christ 1990, 66). Paula Gunn Allen (1990) adopts methods from Native American tribes to encourage an awareness of interconnection with other forms of being through what she calls "thinking with one's heart." Allen advocates singing "Heya-hey" to "each shrub and tree, to each flower and vine, to each pebble and stone" and so on until one has sung to "all the beings gathered on all the planes."17 Allen believes this singing will enable one to connect to the loving, caring and nurturing aspects of the personality which she views the dominant western worldview as discouraging.

Mystical Ecofeminist Mara Lynn Keller (1990, 48-51) advocates the suppression of modern rationality through the reintroduction of ancient Greek rituals such as the Eleusinian mysteries. Keller maintains the fasting, praying and purification involved in these rituals present a "deeper" view of reality than modern rationality by inducing "a special seeing, an opening of the eyes," and a sense of
universal connection, love and transcendence.

Mystical Ecofeminists are not content merely to resurrect old ways of suppressing rationality but also seek to create new methods as well. Joanna Macy, a leading Buddhist writer, and Pat Fleming promote a ritual called the Council of All Beings. They contend the Council of All Beings deepens one's understanding of Mystical Deep Ecology by strengthening one's courage and commitment to heal the earth. Although drumming, meditation and ritualistic cleansings are incorporated into the Council of All Beings, the primary feature of the ritual is the suppression of the personalized self and the adoption of an ecological persona other than that of a human being (Fleming and Macy 1990, 95-98). The goal of this ritual is the negation of self to the point where one "becomes" one's adopted persona, be it animal, vegetable or mineral.

While the above rituals concentrate upon triggering specific aspects of the Mystical Ecofeminist worldview, Deena Metzger (1989, 121-125) has created a series of four rituals which she uses as a holistic introduction to the Mystical Ecofeminist worldview. The first is a ritualized meditation focused upon the development of empathy or what Metzger describes as "knowing with certainty the existence of another being." Two people sit facing one another, looking in each other's eyes, for a period of 20 to 40 minutes without speaking. The meditators are instructed beforehand to confront and dissolve any feelings of superiority, distinction or separation. This meditation is used to invoke
an awareness of otherness and a feeling of mutual comradeship with fellow human beings.

The second meditation invokes the human/nature connection which Mystical Ecofeminism centers upon. The meditator is led through various stages of meditation where human identity is gradually dissolved and replaced by imagining oneself as a tree. This is a common meditation used by Mystical Ecofeminists because the tree is seen as a sacred symbol representing connectedness, nurturing power, spirituality, and balance. The same feelings of empathy and mutualism established between human beings in Metzger’s first meditation are now transferred to the natural world of nonhuman being.

The third meditation described by Metzger involves the maintenance of personal strength in times of doubt. With eyes closed, the meditators are told to imagine the sun being covered with dark clouds but to maintain their focus upon and always imagine the light behind the clouds shining through. In this way the initiate is encouraged always to hold onto one’s faith no matter what "darkness" or doubt may come.

In the fourth meditation, Metzger encourages nurturance, connectedness and empathy through the adoption of a mothering role stressing personal care of diverse forms of otherness. One is told to allow images of everything one loves to fill one’s mind and imagine oneself cradling and protecting them. The meditation concludes with the earth being the last image cradled and protected. With these four meditations Metzger
has distilled the Mystical Ecofeminist worldview into a set
of rituals which she believes can form the base of a new
ecofeminist religion.

THE CREATION OF MYTHOLOGY

The intuitive understanding of "how the world really is"
which Mystical Ecofeminist rituals and meditations invoke
cannot be proven rationally but must be accepted on
faith. Janet Biehl (1991, 89-90) has described
this as the delegation of reality to the private realm where
it cannot be communicated to anyone who does not share the
faith. This presents a problem for Mystical Ecofeminism.
Intuitive wisdom which Mystical Ecofeminism might call
pathological can be claimed to be as legitimate as the
intuitive experiences which Mystical Ecofeminism
values. To counter this conflict of intuitions,
Mystical Deep Ecologists seek to legitimize their worldview
through praxis strategies involving the creation of
supporting myths and alternative versions of
history.

The most common of the supporting myths told by Mystical
Deep Ecologists are those of Gaia, the Mother Earth Goddess,
and the peaceful, ecologically benign, matrifocal societies
which worshipped her. Riane Eisler's version of prehistory
(1987, 1990) presents the story dominantly accepted by
Mystical Ecofeminism. Eisler begins with the early Neolithic
period in Europe, where she contends archaeological findings
by Marija Gimbutas, Nicolas Platon and Merlin Stone provide evidence of a Mystical Ecofeminist golden age. Eisler states that the harmonious cultures which existed, living in mystical, ritualistic connection with all their surroundings, were destroyed by Indo-European, Sky God worshipping invaders (Eisler 1990, 23-34). Although there is much evidence to refute Eisler's claims, she believes that a praxis strategy aimed at recreating the Mother Nature worshipping society she has posited in prehistory will correct the problems she sees existing in modern society. 21

Another interesting and important attempt at reality creation is Starhawk's (1987) vision of the origin of the universe in terms of a birthing process rather than a "Big Bang." Brian Swimme, a teacher of cosmology and author of The Universe is a Green Dragon, contends that Starhawk's reconception can free modernity from a violent way of thinking, obsessed with weapons and explosions, to one whereby children learn that all beings are their kin because of their common birth (Swimme 1990, 18-21).

The goal of these alternative histories and ways of viewing reality is the legitimation of the Mystical Ecofeminist worldview. To the Mystical Deep Ecologist, the ability of a story to support the kind of society Mystical Deep Ecology wishes to create is more important than historical accuracy or scientific observation. Devall and Sessions (1985, 151) confirm these observations with their belief that the most important aspect of the concept of Gaia
is that the myth itself is comforting and involving, while the scientific facts concerning Gaia are limited, cold, and manipulative. Literature is treated by Mystical Deep Ecologists in a manner similar to their approach to science and history, with comforting revision taking precedence over dominantly accepted theories, interpretations and texts. Spretnak, for example, has rewritten Greek mythology to make it more "prepatriarchic" by ignoring aspects such as abduction and rape.  

SOCIAL ECOLOGY AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIETY  

Using Isaak's (1987) analysis of political change strategies, one can identify two major praxis orientations within Social Ecology. The first praxis orientation can be categorized as "the radical approach" since it calls for total systemic change. The radical approach primarily utilizes strategies typical of nonviolent oppositional politics. The second praxis orientation can be called "the reformist approach." The reformist approach agrees that major changes in the system are needed but concentrates upon the gradual Greening of society through participation within the dominant systems of power. The goal of both the reformist and radical praxis approach is the integration of nature and what Social Ecologists call "natural precepts" into the realm of human being. Examples of these precepts include diversity, cooperation, and freedom. Social Ecologists posit
that their visions of eutopia can be realized by utilizing these precepts of nature as a blueprint for human design.

SOCIAL ECOLOGY AND RADICAL POLITICAL TRANSFORMATION

The primary praxis strategy of Social Ecologists who adopt the radical approach is the creation of institutions and participation in activities outside of the dominant political system. The theory behind this strategy is based upon the concept of dual revolutionary power, where counter-institutions are organised to compete with and offer alternatives to official political institutions, economic systems and cultural traditions. To accomplish this, Social Ecologist praxis stresses inclusiveness, communicative action and structures with power residing at the lowest possible level.

In the economic realm, Social Ecologist praxis strategies include attempts to break the stranglehold of corporations on small communities and their workers by establishing nonprofit community managed and owned food and merchandise co-ops. As a transitional stage, worker-owned and worker-managed workplace democracies are promoted. Social Ecologists have attempted to reduce their dependence upon the Federal monetary system by establishing barter networks called "Local Exchange Trading Systems." To reduce the power of those seeking only profit from small communities, some Social Ecologists have organized community land trusts where local people buy and then manage land and
businesses for the good of the entire community (Swann, et al, 1972; Rohter 1992, Chapter 5). The eventual goal of these economic praxis strategies is not only freedom from the dominant economic system but the development of a consciousness of community citizenship and mutual obligation. This municipalization of the local economy politicizes the economic realm and dissolves it into the civic domain (Bookchin 1986b).

Radical Social Ecologist praxis in the political realm has the goal of citizen empowerment. This praxis attempts to do away with professional politicians and to redemocratize government in the spirit of Athenian democracy and New England town meetings (Bookchin 1985a; Barber 1984). Radical Social Ecologist praxis strategies encourage the creation of neighborhood assemblies and alternative "citizen" legislatures to push agendas from the grass-roots (Kassman 1989; Rohter 1992, Chapters 8 and 11). Bookchin advocates that these alternative community-based institutions form confederations and begin to challenge the powers and functions of the present governmental system. 30

Ernest Callenbach has gone so far as to outline a general strategy for withdrawal from the United States itself by these small politically empowered communities in his book, Ecotopia Emerging. 31

Active attempts by radical Social Ecologists to integrate the natural world into alternative communities include Bill Mollison's attempts at self-sufficient communities practicing
"permanent agriculture" (Mollison 1990, 149-54). Mollison has designed ecovillages of 30 to 200 houses with the goal of being totally independent of outside support. Peter Berg and the Planet Drum Foundation (1989), John and Nancy Todd of the New Alchemy Institute (1984), and Ira Rohter of the University of Hawaii Department of Political Science (1992) have designed similar projects for the cities of San Francisco and New York and the State of Hawaii, respectively. These proposals include a breakdown of traditional city/nature barriers, with miles of fish-laden aquaducts and streams, sidewalk gardening with edible plants, and the reintroduction of wild animals. While the most radical of their ideas have not been realized, these Green City programs have inspired numerous reformist changes and served to network important civic organizations around common goals.32

Cultural traditions are also actively challenged by radical Social Ecology. Within Social Ecologist organizations, dominantly accepted and semi-accepted cultural beliefs such as racism, ageism, patriarchy and heterosexuality have been challenged by the formation of the Green Justice Caucus, the Youth Green Network, the Women's Leadership Network, and the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Caucus. These radical networks seek to break the hierarchical grip on power they see being held by old, wealthy, white men by ensuring that alternative voices (and votes) are heard on all deliberations. Other Green groups, such as the Hawaii Green
Movement, have institutionalized gender-balanced leadership roles from their inception and actively seek out people of color in order to break the grip of traditionally dominant elites (Kassman 1986; Slaton 1992, 99-104).

SOCIAL ECOLOGY AND SOCIAL REFORM

The second praxis orientation which Social Ecologists follow in their attempt to restructure society is reformist in that it advocates active participation in the dominant institutions of society in an attempt to "subvert from within." The most obvious of these attempts is the formation of Green political parties organized to run candidates for political office. A less obvious but more traditional method of electoral participation is for Greens to run as Green-Democrats and Green-Republicans.

Participating in public hearings, referendum drives and lobbying are other ways reformist Greens work within the political system.

Outside of the electoral arena, Green reformists operate in large governmental bureaucracies and educational institutions, attempting to "Green" these institutions from the inside out. In the economic realm, Green reformists have set up investment funds, banks, and credit unions advocating socially responsible investing. The advocacy of socially responsible investing is typified by Greens in Portland, Oregon, who have started a community investment fund to sponsor a mixed income
cohousing community and a transitional house for women recovering from drug and alcohol abuse. Reformist "Greens" have also set up businesses and manufacturing companies touting everything from mechanisms for improving automobile gas mileage to "Green" disposable diapers (Plant and Plant 1991, 414). Slickly printed corporate magazines appealing to Green readers have also proliferated with Garbage, Buzzworm, and In Business, The Magazine for Green Entrepreneurs. On the high technological front, Green computer networks and bulletin boards are readily accessible, and a Green television network has begun organizing in Chicago.

On the cultural integration front, reformist Social Ecologists try to combine public awareness, community rebuilding and personal empowerment in their attempts to combat racism, sexism and hierarchy. Examples include local Green groups nationwide who helped to organize and participated in Detroit Summer, a project which brought together activists from across the nation with people from "the Hood" in order to help rehabilitate one of America's most devastated inner cities (The Detroit Summer Coalition 1992). Syracuse Greens undertook a similar project linking inner city solidarity with ecology to highlight the problem of violence against children. The Demmy Project in Syracuse now plants a tree every time a child is killed in the community (Green Politics, Summer 1992).
Other attempts to make human space more ecological include solar power education and composting demonstrations, inner-city and rooftop gardening projects, the transformation of parking lots into parks, and the implementation of recycling programs. John and Nancy Todd (1984) have designed solar-powered bioshelters which feature greenhouses and aquaculture and are designed to be as self-sufficient as possible in energy and food. With ecological designs like the Todd's bioshelters readily available, people can choose the option to join the dominant economic system or to a large extent "opt out." Murray Bookchin is also helping people choose a more reformist path to social change. Bookchin has created a Master of Arts Degree in Social Ecology in affiliation with Goddard College. At his Institute for Social Ecology, students learn the design, construction and maintenance of ecotechnologies such as windmills and solar collectors. Over 2000 students have participated in college credit granting seminars at the Institute (Institute For Social Ecology, *Summer Semester Prospectives*, 1987-93).
CHAPTER THREE - NOTES

1. See Bettina Huber's "Images of the Future" (in The Procedures of Futures Research, ed. Fowles, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978, 187) and Jim Dator's, Decolonizing the Future, (Ontario Educational Communications Authority, April 1975, 14) for further discussion of transition strategies and their importance to the field of future studies.


3. By proactive I mean the taking of initiative and suggesting or seeking to impose change rather than merely reacting to change imposed by others. Examples include the Earth First! proposal to expand wilderness versus simple protest against the destruction of wilderness.

4. I utilize Andrew Dobson's distinction between ecologism and environmentalism spelled out in Dobson, Green Political Thought (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990).

5. Manes (1990, Chapters 9 and 10) describes the difference between overt versus covert active ecological resistance in terms of civil disobedience versus ecotage. Foreman (1991, 130-31 and 169-70) describes the differences he sees between the two praxis orientations in his Confessions of an Eco-Warrior.

6. Manes (1990, 169) cites the Peaceful Direct Action Code which many overt active ecological resistance advocates affirm before their activities as evidence of the values cited in the main text. Five points are invoked in this pledge including an attitude of openness, friendliness and respect, restraint from violence, restraint from property damage, refusal to carry weapons and the pledge not to run.

7. Foreman (1991) tells the story of his encounters with the FBI (pages 161-163) and cites incidents where ecological activists have been threatened, injured and murdered (pages 125-128). Chris Manes (1990, 193-208) cites further examples of retaliation against ecological activists including the incident where the agents of the French government blew up the Rainbow Warrior and killed a Greenpeace photographer.

8. The newest tactic of those who seek to harass overt active ecological resisters is the Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation or SLAPP suit. Professors Penelope Canan and George Pring believe their study of these suits, "Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation" (Social Problems, December 1988), show that thousands of civil
actions are brought against citizens each year to discourage public protest and punish those who have exercised their political rights.

9. The five goals of Earth First!, for example, have been stated as: stopping wilderness destruction now, (re)establishing large wilderness areas, reversing the growth of human population, reducing consumption and taking individual action (Foreman, "Now's The Time," *Mother Jones*, April/May 1990, 41).

10. Many Earth First! members proudly call themselves Luddites and express this heritage through anti-industrial activity. Dave Foreman (1991, 34) links the origins of the EF! tactic of "monkeywrenching," or ecotage, to the inspirations of Dutch workers who threw their wooden shoes, called sabots, into the gears of early industrial machines and thus creating the term sabotage. See also Tokar's *The Green Alternative* (San Pedro, CA: R and E Miles, 1987, 89).

11. Mystical Deep Ecologist argue this suppression of the analytic mind will allows "truer" perceptions of reality to appear.

12. For more information see Biehl's *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics* (Boston: South End Press, 1991, 81-104).

13. Spretnak claims this cosmology of domination is due to instrumental-objective reasoning's partial, fragmented and alienating view of reality in her book *The Spiritual Dimension of Green Politics* (Santa Fe, NM: Bear and Company, 1986, 27-9). Brian Swimme, agrees with Spretnak in his article "How to Heal a Lobotomy" (in Diamond and Orenstein's *Reweaving the World* [San Francisco: Sierra Club Books], 1990, 16). Swimme compares the standard scientific training typifying the instrumental-objective worldview to a frontal lobotomy, where emotions are severed and only a sliver of the original mind is left operative. Susan Griffin maintains that the sliver of mind that is left in Swimme's analogy embodies the worst of human tendencies and is oriented towards controlling, distancinating, calculating and dominating, which in turn leads to social exploitation and ecological destruction (Griffin, "Curves along the Road," in Diamond and Orenstein 1990, 87-99).

14. For Charlene Spretnak, author of several Mystical Ecofeminist books and co-founder of the American Green Committees of Correspondence, intuitive recognition means understanding "the true nature of being" through accessing "the subtle, suprarational reaches of the mind" (Spretnak 1986, p.41).

16. Orenstein, "Artists as Healers" (in Diamond and Orenstein 1990, 280-82). Orenstein sees "nonverbal communication with sacred sites in nature" as a primary method to achieve this endarkenment. I assume she means silent meditation by nonverbal communication although she also advocates nature sculpting.

17. Allen offers further examples in her article "The Woman I Love is a Planet; The Planet I Love is a Tree" (in Diamond and Orenstein, 1990, 55-6).

18. According to the ecofeminist witch Starhawk, "The mysteries of the absolute can never be explained - only felt or intuited" (Starhawk, *The Spiral Dance*, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1979, 25)

19. A good example of "right" versus "wrong" intuitions (in the ecofeminist view) is offered by Spretnak (1986, 51, note) who maintains that positive intuitions or "body parables" occur primarily in women. Spretnak maintains that the majority of men's experiencing of "body parables" is unpleasant, leaving men feeling vulnerable and fearful.

From personal experience as a man I must doubt Spretnak's statements. The question then arises as to whose intuitions and perceptions are wrong, Spretnak's or mine? Spretnak skirts this issue by automatically assuming men's intuitions are negative.

20. Orenstein (1990, 286) calls this literature "medicine stories" and claims they connect the Mystical Ecofeminist to power through their lessons of "healing."

21. Biehl (1991, 29-39) disputes Eisler's archaeological interpretations and contention that nature goddess worshipping societies were any less oppressive than present society. We discuss this further in chapter 5.

22. Spretnak's *Lost Goddesses of Early Greece* (Berkeley: Moon Books, 1978, 103-110) concerns the retelling of the myth of Demeter and Persephone. By seeking to control the dominant interpretations of reality, Mystical Ecofeminists thus hope to control individual intuitions concerning reality.

23. Isaak's *An Introduction to Politics* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foreman and Company, 1987, 287-91) discusses social change categories in detail. Also see Samuel Huntington's *Political Order in a Changing Society* (New Haven, CN: Yale
University Press, 1968) for an overview of political and social change categorization.

24. Green radicals often disagree with Green reformism, accusing reformists of cooptation and activity which soothes one’s conscience more than it changes society. Green reformists respond that Green radicalism is unrealistic and unnecessarily adversarial. For active discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of Green radicalism versus reform see Jay Walljasper’s "Can Green Politics take Root in the US?" (Utne Reader, September/October 1989, 142-43); John Resenbrink’s The Greens and The Politics of Transformation (San Pedro, CA: R and E Miles, 1992); and various authors under the broad topic title, "Shades of Green" (Utne Reader, July/August 1990, 50-63).

25. Social Ecology believes that the new sciences of evolutionary biology, quantum physics and ecology offer a "more true" view of the world than traditional science because the "new sciences" tend to posit nature as a balanced system stressing interconnectedness, participation, and process. See Capra, The Turning Point (NY: Bantam Books, 1982, 75-97); Nancy and John Todd, Bioshelters, Ocean Arks, City Farming (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1984, 9 and 14-8); and Maser, The Redesigned Forest (San Pedro, CA: R and E Miles, 1988) for overviews. Social Ecologists translate the above new science characteristics into ecological precepts which they then use as guides for the political restructuring of modern society.

26. Existing institutions are viewed as unwilling and unable to institute the fundamental changes which radical Social Ecologists seek. See the Youth Green Caucus May 1989 Gathering Summary (pages 7-9), for the rationale behind this view.

27. See Biehl (1991, 150-157) for one Social Ecologist’s view of an ideal structure for what she calls "a new political realm."


29. See Michael Linton and Thomas Greco, "LETS: The Local Exchange Trading System" (in Van Andruss et al, Home! [Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1990], 155-58) for an overview of how these systems work. In the Berkshire Mountains of western Massachusetts, people affiliated with the E.F. Schumacher Society have gone so far as to establish a local currency based upon the value of a cord of firewood
in order to remove themselves from the Federal economic system and promote community (Tokar 1987, 110).


31. Callenbach's Ecotopia Emerging (1989) begins with small communities issuing declarations of independence citing local authority and laws as having legal force above Federal and state laws. The County of Hawaii tried a version of this, through a citizen sponsored official initiative, declaring itself a nuclear free zone. The United States government promptly sent a warship suspected of carrying nuclear weapons into Hilo Harbor to show the locals who's boss. The leading advocate of the nuclear free initiative, Jim Albertini, jumped into the harbor to protest the ship's arrival. He spent three minutes swimming in the harbor, was arrested and sentenced to three years in a Federal prison 1,500 miles from his home. This example illustrates the difficulties local activists will face in actualizing Callenbach's scenario.

32. 135 citizen groups have endorsed the "New York Green City Program" (Van Andruss et al., 1990, 105). 150 groups in San Francisco participated in the creation of A Green City Program for San Francisco Bay Area Cities and Towns (Berg, Magilavy and Zuckerman [San Francisco: Planet Books], 1989).


34. In a survey of Green oriented legislation introduced into the U.S. Congress Carol Grunewald Rifkin came to the conclusion that 10 U.S. Senators and 39 Representatives could be considered "unofficial Greens." Leading the list was our current Vice-President Al Gore. Of these 49 legislators only 2 Republicans made the list. See Rifkin's "The Greening of Capital Hill" (Utne Reader, September/October 1992, 99).

35. See "Local Green Updates" (Green Politics, 2, No.2 [Summer 1992], 3-4), for current examples by local Green groups. Also see Seth Zuckerman, "A Grassroots Rebellion Revamps Environmentalism" (Utne Reader, May/June 1987, 76-79) for a good discussion of the pitfalls and successes of these approaches.
36. One of the best examples of ecological reformists working inside a government organization has got to be the dissident Forest Service employees who publish *Inner Voice*. These employees call themselves The Association of Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics and demand radical change in Forest Service policies and procedures. At the University of Hawaii there were more than one dozen Green activists teaching at the major campuses and community colleges when I taught there in the late 80's and early 90's.

CHAPTER FOUR
GREEN VISIONS OF EUTOPIA

INTRODUCTION TO THE AMERICAN GREEN MOVEMENT’S FUTURE EUTOPIAN VISIONS

This chapter explores eutopianism within the preferred futures of the three cosmological subcultures of the American Green movement. Neo-Primitivism, Mystical Deep Ecology and Social Ecology all put forth visionary images of radical transformation leading to what they consider to be ideal future societies. Some term these visions utopian: defining any Green preferred future as "a visionary, impractical scheme for social improvement" or "the depiction of some nonexistent society representing ideal perfection."[^1] Others such as Brian Tokar (1987, 55-56) maintain that Green visions are not impractical dreams but comprehensive critiques of the present advocating the creation of new political and social forms. The transformational images of the future envisioned by the three subcultures of the American Green movement can thus be viewed two ways: (1) as the impractical "no places" of utopian literature, or (2) as models for reachable and preferable future societies.

This dissertation accepts the latter definition. The future visions of the various subcultures of the Green movement have sparked movements for major political and social change in countries around the world.^[2] As
guiding images of the future used to orient action towards a set of long-range goals, Green visions should not be called utopias but are better classified as eutopias: feasible and desirable futures that people can and do strive to create. Eutopian images are important because they actively encourage and motivate political and social change activity. Dator (1974a), Pierre Bertaux (1968), and Eleonora Masini (1982) have all made the point that it is through images of desirable futures that the direction of the present is determined. Burt Nanus (1990) takes an even stronger position by positing such images as the basis of leadership.

The preferable "good societies" posited by Neo-Primitivists, Mystical Deep Ecologists, and Social Ecologists have the potential to create great changes in American (and world) politics. These Green eutopias deserve examination to determine what life might actually be like in these possible futures. This chapter approaches the examination of Green eutopias from two methodological positions. First, a scenario illustrating several hours in the life of a typical member of the future society is presented. These scenarios were created from a composite of the writings of major subculture theorists. The point of the scenario is to offer a montage of each subculture's future values, customs, environmental relationships, and social structures in mutual interaction. The form of the scenario presentation is intended to allow
the reader to "get inside the heads" of subculture advocates and present as realistically as possible what the people in these preferred future societies might think, feel and value.

The second approach used in this chapter concentrates upon "incasting" or "deductive forecasting," a methodological tool developed by Jim Dator, the Institute for Alternative Futures, and the Alternative Futures Option of the Department of Political Science at the University of Hawaii (Jones 1989, 261; Shultz 1991, 202). Incasting is used to expand upon the scenarios by penetrating more deeply into the philosophical, cultural and structural differences existing amongst the three Green subcultures. Incasting accomplishes this by projecting specific aspects of reality, such as the need for government, into a matrix of Green values. Each element cast into the matrix will take form in accordance with each subculture's worldview. The differences amongst the subculture future eutopias are presented below. Categories relating to the four major values of the international Green movement (ecological harmony, social justice, democratic participation and nonviolence) are used to group the results. Table Six in the appendix of this dissertation offers an overview of the incasting matrix and its results.

INTRODUCTION TO THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST FUTURE EUTOPIA

The Neo-Primitivist eutopia emphasizes the rejection of technology and the return to a simpler, less civilized time and way of being. There are no cars, no compact
disk players, no video games, no blow-dryers, no M-TV. In fact, there is no electricity in the Neo-Primitivist future. There are a few areas of permanent habitation but no cities. Technology is rudimentary and tools are handmade. Food is primarily hunted and gathered. Agriculture is looked upon as an unnatural manipulation of nature. It is unlikely that one would find many domesticated animals in this future given its emphasis on the free and the wild.

This eutopia is so unlike any continuation of the present that the most probable way such a future could occur is by a collapse of the present civilizational system similar to the collapse which left the Mayan civilization in shambles.\(^6\) It is an essential element of Neo-Primitivist ideology that such systemic collapse is ultimately probable and should be encouraged at every opportunity.\(^7\)

Models for the Neo-Primitivist future focus upon the long period of human existence before civilization and even before agriculture. Most Neo-Primitivists accept William Glasser’s arguments that the 500,000 years preceding the invention of agriculture was a relatively peaceful and abundant time where focus on individual identity triumphed over material concerns.\(^8\)

THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST EUTOPIAN SCENARIO

Donna Falcon Free, "Falc" to her friends, Falcon to the elders, bolted upright from her bed of cedar boughs.
Adrenaline pumped through her veins and her heart beat wildly. Falcon's head glanced swiftly back and forth scanning the animal hide shelter that protected her family from the elements. "The Dream," she thought, "I've had the Dream again. Surely, the hunting party will take me with them now."

Falcon knew the Dream well or should one call it the Vision? Whatever term one used, Falcon knew the significance and truth contained within the shifting spectral images that had now visited her three nights in a row. The dream started ordinarily enough. Falcon found herself wandering through the grassy plains to the northeast of her tribe's encampment. Over her shoulder Falcon carried her spear nonchalantly. She felt the slight wind on her cheek and studied the dark blue sky over the small rolling hill ahead. As Falcon neared the crest of the hill she became wary, feeling the presence of the many beings beyond. Crouching, the spear now steady in her hands, Falcon smelled the wind and knew what she had no need to see. Buffalo. It must be one of the smaller herds that now roamed the Northwest. Only 20 to 30 animals per grouping, these herds were no equal to the herds containing hundreds of buffalo which Falcon had been told now graze the grasslands of the Midwest. Still, a Northwest herd contained enough meat to last her tribe a winter, enough hide to keep one warm and protected when need be, and enough bone and horn to make many fine ornaments and tools. "Today, I have proved
my worth to the village," thought Falcon as she descended the crest on her way back home.

Falcon was halfway down the small bluff when suddenly from behind her back she heard a terrifying sound. The scream was high pitched, almost like the whine of a rabbit caught in the jaws of a coyote. Falcon covered her ears with her hands but still heard a low rumble, not unlike the clearing of phlegm from a great, deep throat. Falcon knew these sounds were meant as a challenge. She turned quickly. "So you little one would kill my people?" bellowed the biggest bull buffalo Falcon had ever seen. "In self-protection then I must kill you," the buffalo snorted. He lowered his mighty head, pawed the ground once and charged.

Falcon lifted the spear she had made with her own hands. The spear felt good and right. Falcon knew it flew true, she had thrown it a thousand times before. In practice. At pine cones. At squirrels and rabbits. At fish and at snakes. And now she drew her arm back to her shoulder and stared into the thundering face of death itself. Her arm moved forward in a steady motion. The spear flew, piercing the large bull’s right eye and sinking deep into his brain. The chief of the buffalo tribe rolled to Falcon’s feet without taking a further breath. Falcon let out a victory cry that echoed over the plain. She sank to her knees, asked forgiveness from the old buffalo, cut the liver from his hot body and
took a bloody bite. "Now I am you and you are me," said Falcon to the old bull, "We will both live on together."

"Greetings," said Falcon's father as he opened the flap of the teepee-like shelter. "Dad, I had the dream again," said Falcon. "I know," replied her father, "And I have just come from the elders. The purification rituals are ready and we await your presence in the sweatlodge. Today you join the hunt. Today you become one of the few, those called to the role of the warrior."

Falcon knew the honor of what was to come. The warriors in her tribe did more than protect the people from their enemies when the occasional skirmishes that marked the area's primitive form of warfare broke out. Warriors were also mediators. They were the people's protection from internal domination as well as external. In Falcon's tribe individual freedom was of ultimate importance and the warriors made sure that the loose form of consensual government accepted by the tribe stayed as limited as possible.

Falcon rose and followed her father past the tipi-like tents which encircled the tribal commons. Tools lay here and there upon the ground, used by whoever needed them at the time and then left for others to use. Falcon and her father walked past the cooking fires, past the blanket weavers and past the elder craftmakers. Falcon smiled at her friends, neighbors and relatives as she walked. "Everyone has a place and a duty," Falcon thought. Her own duties were very important, especially that of food gatherer since the tribe
eschewed agriculture (Falcon’s tribe even refused to domesticate animals).

Falcon soon arrived at a large circle of flames at the north end of the village. Surrounding the fire were two dozen men and women, ages 16 to 45. Their faces and bodies seemed to be the living renditions of the Spirits of the Hunt, painted with the natural hues of charcoal, ocher, fungus, berries, and blood. Behind the circle and directly to the north, with a tiny door facing directly to the south, was the sweatlodge. A small river, fed by a towering glacier over one hundred miles to the northeast, ran behind the tiny circular hut. The sweatlodge was made of mud and branches and covered with woven mats. The tribal Great Hunters, two men and one woman who had recently rotated into the honorary positions, were dressed in the skins of departed animals. The skins were considered totems, passed down from the Great Hunt of tribal legend. The success of that semi-mythological hunt would hopefully be repeated by caring for these sacred skins and calling forth their Spirit Guides. The Great Hunters invited Falcon into the circle and began to chant, smudging her with sage and asking the Spirits of the Hunt to accept Falcon as their newest warrior.

In the distance Falcon heard the hiss of steam as the cooking fires were extinguished. There would be no fire in the encampment except for the ceremonial fire this night. No craftwork was to be done, no repairs made, and no heavy work undertaken until the ceremony had been completed. Falcon
looked into the fire. She thanked the Stone People who had agreed to participate in her ritual. Without the stones, there would be no steam, and without the steam, no purification. Without purification there would be no atonement with the animals of the hunt. Bad luck would follow the entire village as the dishonored spirits sought to regain their self-respect. The Stone People were important participants in this ritual, as were the Fire, Water, Herb and Tree People. By agreeing to participate, these people showed Falcon their blessing and their acceptance of her as warrior to be. Falcon thanked them all sincerely.

When the chanting was over, Falcon followed the Greatest of the Great Hunters into the sweatlodge. The entrance was low, so she crawled on her knees onto the cedar strewn floor of the sweatlodge and into the darkness, as did the Great Hunter before her and the two Great Hunters who entered after her. The flap to the sweatlodge was closed. The inside of the sweatlodge was black: blacker than Falcon had ever seen before (at least in her conscious memory). The Great Hunters asked Falcon to retell her Dream. While Falcon did, the Great Hunters listened respectfully and then began to chant. The flap of the sweatlodge opened and the rest of the tribal warriors entered. One by one. On their knees. One to the right of Falcon, one to the left, until the entire tent was so full it seemed no more would fit. Still somehow more did.

The chanting by the Great Hunters continued. When the final warrior had entered the tent eight large Stone people
were passed in, glowing red hot and spitting sparks, to the small depression in the center of the lodge. Heat immediately filled the tiny space already crammed full of sweaty bodies. The rocks in the center of the room pulsed with life. The Great Huntswoman thanked the Stone People, the Spirits of the Water, the Fire, and the Cedar for their participation and cooperation. She began chanting and sprinkled a mixture of water and herbal medicine onto the rocks. Steam flew everywhere as scalding hot moisture suddenly filled the sweatlodge! The warriors began to sing their individual chants as the Great Huntswoman repeated her ritual blessing of the rocks. After what seemed like hours of praying, chanting, sweating, and almost blacking out in the unbearable heat and steam, the Great Huntswoman stopped. She motioned the door open and a blast of cool air hit Falcon like a hammer.

The hunters filed out of the sweatlodge on their knees and were blinded by sudden sunlight. When Falcon emerged the warriors give a cheer. They ran to the ice cold river and jumped in. Falcon followed feeling more dead, and then suddenly more alive than she had ever felt before. After the brief swim the hunters gathered around the fire, gave thanks to the Four Directions, to the Gods of the Hunt, to the Chiefs of the Animal Tribes, to the Plant, Stone, Fire and Water Peoples. The warriors then drank the ceremonial "tea" which the Great Hunters offered to them and reentered the lodge. This entire ritualized process was repeated four more
times until it was late at night and the sunlight no longer stung the warrior's eyes when they emerged from their fiery burrow of purification.

Inside the sweatlodge different chants, prayers, atonements and revelations came by the hour. Before leaving the sweatlodge for the last time all had become purified. All had heard Falcon's Dream. All had heard her prayer for forgiveness, and all had heard her find and sing her individual chant. The warriors agreed by consensus that Falcon would lead the hunting party to the place in her dream at first light of morning. Falcon crawled from the sweatlodge for the last time that night. She walked silently to the river and dove in. She felt purified and reborn. Falcon had no fear of the morning to come for she knew that her Vision was true. Falcon was meant to be and always would be a warrior.

ECOLOGY AND THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST EUTOPIA

The Neo-Primitivist future has the potential to be the most ecological of the futures posited by the three American Green subcultures. The emphasis in this future is upon keeping wilderness wild. Any attempt to domesticate natural wildness is discouraged. The focus on gathering food, rather than farming, illustrates the extent to which Neo-Primitivism is willing to go to limit the manipulation of nature.

Although hunting is allowed, which may seem problematic to animal rights activists, this expression of ecological
interaction is highly limited through ritualization. Neo-Primitivists are careful to keep hunting within the limits of bioregional tolerances. As is the case today, in situations of animal overpopulation, hunting in the Neo-Primitivist future is often seen as more ecologically benign than not hunting. Given the awareness of natural limits that many primal peoples have shown (such as establishing tabus on certain species during breeding times and periods when animals seem scarce) hunting could be viewed as violating the Green value of nonviolence more than the value of ecological harmony.\textsuperscript{9}

The extent of negative ecological impact on any one place is limited in this scenario because the Neo-Primitivist eutopian community is largely paleolithic and nomadic. The anticapitalist, nonmaterialist and extremely low technology stance of the Neo-Primitivists further limits human impact on the ecosystem. In this future, people have effectively become part of the natural region they find themselves in. Ecological knowledge is valued above all other knowledge. While nature is not worshipped as a God or Goddess, wilderness is seen as the site of spirituality, and thus it is sacred and worthy of respect. Like the other animals and plants of their bioregion, humans have adapted their lifestyle in the Neo-Primitivist future eutopia to fit their surroundings (Foreman 1991, 74; Sale 1985).
SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST EUTOPIA

Community organization, personal identity and security in the Neo-Primitivist future is oriented around the tribe and the clan (Foreman 1990, 65; Booth 1990, 73-4). The tribe and clan take care of their own, providing help and support to one another in meeting basic needs. All share equally in the good times and all suffer equally in the bad. All resources and material items are shared communally utilizing the concept of usufruct, where one takes or is naturally granted what one needs. The concept of private ownership is virtually nonexistent. What is important to this future society is not material wealth, but personal dignity and worth to the community as a whole. The amassing of wealth is not only frowned upon for being unecological and uncommunal, it is impractical in a nomadic society. Status is measured more by what one gives away than by what one possesses. Potlatches are yearly occurrences to redistribute wealth, gain status and cement bonds.

Freedom (meaning the ability to "be oneself" and the relaxation of norms stressing social conformity) is cherished and encouraged in the Neo-Primitivist future eutopia. A combination of warrior and hunter is the role most honored in this future due to the required skills, social protection and mythological history (relating the rise of the very first eco-warriors to the downfall of industrial civilization), however, all social positions are appreciated. It is recognized that every person is a positive contributor to
society, including the insane. There is little gender stereotyping and all social roles are open to all people.

DEMOCRACY AND THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST EUTOPIA

Given the Neo-Primitivist emphasis on freedom and individual responsibility, government has an extremely limited role in this future eutopia. The saying "No person can tell another what to do" is the basic law. The most common form of government is the consensual tribal meeting where all who are affected by the outcome of a decision have a say in that decision. In all tribal decisions individual compliance is strictly voluntary. This self-regulation includes participation (or nonparticipation) in tribal sanctions. Compliance with communal decisions is given because one believes the decision is right or that general compliance is needed for the good of the group as a whole. Since tribal members are very interdependent and close-knit, it is rare that governmental decisions are out of synchronization with the will of the vast majority of the people.

In large tribes, more than a few dozen people, the tribal council form of government is used. Tribal councils include representatives of recognized interest groups and familial clans of the tribe. When needed, the tribal council chooses a speaker to represent it in specific intertribal dealings. All leadership positions are task specific, limited as to scope and function. Tribal members value diversity and
self-determination. Although the best fisherman is usually the leader of the fishing parties, the best forager and cook is usually the leader of the gathering and so on, these positions are often rotated to encourage learning (and empathy) among tribal members (Paige 1977 and 1983).

Tribal disputes are decided by the tribe as a whole or by the persons most interested in the outcome. Emphasis is on individual freedom as well as tribal harmony. When individual self-control is broken, it is viewed as an individual or familial problem unless an act offends a tribe as a whole. Since the tribe is the basis of identity as well as life, expulsion from a tribe is the ultimate punishment.

NONVIOLENCE AND THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST EUTOPIA

Violence is recognized as an inherent part of nature and an inevitable part of humanity in the Neo-Primitivist future (Foreman 1990, 63). This violence seldom includes violence towards other human beings but is more oriented towards survival and directed at animals. Acts such as the eating of a raw but steaming liver from an animal one has just killed may seem savage to modern perceptions, but these acts are very different from the striking out of wanton or planned aggression one associates with modern violence.

Structural violence is virtually unknown in the Neo-Primitivist future eutopia. Since self-control is a valued norm in these anarchistic societies, when violence towards other humans does occur it is immediate, in the heat
of passion, and is quickly over. Although skirmishes or "wars" between tribes occur, they are of limited scope and duration and highly ritualized. The violence of these conflicts takes place away from tribal encampments and involves only trained warriors. Viewed in the context of modern conflict, social life in the Neo-Primitivist future eutopia is much more secure and less violent than life in most large cities today.

The killing of animals constitutes the primary violence in the Neo-Primitivist future eutopia because hunting is viewed as a necessary and important part of tribal culture. Elaborate rituals have been developed to control the violence inherent in hunting. As in the scenario above, fasting, dancing, chanting and praying to the many spirits which are believed to inhabit the world are used before violence is undertaken. These rituals are not made to ensure a successful hunt but rather are an atonement to the individual animals that are to be killed. Similar rituals are enacted after the violence has occurred to make right that which the hunt has unbalanced. The belief that spirits reside in all being and that these spirits can affect oneself limits the exploitation of animals, plants and inanimate nature.

THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY FUTURE VISION

This chapter focuses upon the ecofeminist aspects of the Mystical Deep Ecology eutopian vision. The ecofeminist
scenario presented below is more descriptive of the Gaia-centered cosmological orientations of Mystical Deep Ecology than scenarios taking a noncritical approach towards gender. Taken to its logical conclusions, it is the Mystical Ecofeminist interpretation of Gaia from which the three prime foci of the Mystical Deep Ecology future culture emerge: (1) a matriarchal orientation towards social structure, (2) a religious-metaphysical orientation towards ontology and epistemology, and (3) an ecological eutopian (ecotopic) reverence toward the natural world.

The comforting image of a divinely immanent Earth Mother has become the center of Mystical Deep Ecology's cosmology. The preferred future which Mystical Deep Ecology looks to is based upon models of a mystical, matrifocal, peaceful, and agrarian past, "a time when the wisdom of the mother was...honored above all" (Eisler 1990, 27).

MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY EUTOPIAN SCENARIO

Charles loved life in Fir City. While not a real city, at least not like the cities the elders spoke of in their mythological stories, Fir City was the biggest settlement in the bioregion of Cascadia. With over 3,000 people in his hometown, Charles imagined it must be one of the largest cities in the world. At least in the known world. Trips to the world outside the bioregion were pretty well limited to the immediate surrounding bioregions of Ish and Sage.
Communication was equally limited. After all, why bother with outsiders? Cascadia was self-sufficient. It produced enough for what little material needs its people possessed and was proud of it. Due to the fertile soil and temperate climate, the area surrounding Fir City was rich in foodstuff and the natural materials needed for clothing, housing and the light manufacturing done in Cascadia. The area was rich in beauty as well. The intensive "penetrations" of the ecosystem tolerated by previous ages (such as oil drilling, mining, clear-cutting, highways, and large cement buildings) were now outlawed. Nature was watched closely for signs that Gaia approved of the way human beings treated her and her many component parts. Wildlife was abundant due to the religious prohibitions against killing any form of life. Cascadia even had enough villages so Cascadians could intermarry without fear of limiting the genepool, so why leave one's family and homeland for any reason?

Charles lived in the house where his mother had been raised. And her mother before her. In fact, all three generations still lived together in the large wooden house nestled between Fir Forest and Trout Lake. Charles was sad to think that some day he would have to leave the home of his ancestors, but that was the way it was. Men who married must move in with the wife's family in this matrilineal society. Charles envied his sister who would inherit the house and use of the surrounding land, but then he thought about his sweetheart Charlene and his envy was replaced by a stronger
emotion, love. Although he was only 14 he had known Charlene all his life. At first, she was just the older girl across the lake, who would take him on walks and teach him the things about life he needed to know. Since Charlene was now 19 the time was fast approaching when Charles and she would wed as their mothers had decided more than ten years before.

The age difference between the two youths was usual in Cascadia. Males needed an older and wiser women to teach them the proper ways of life and it was common for boys to have such a mentor before they became toddlers. When both children became older the roles would continue, as marriage partners. The role of the young female mentors was not an easy one. Boys had to be taught to control their aggression, their loudness and craziness. They had to be shown how to listen to the voice of the Earth, the Mother Goddess, and obey her wisdom. Most of all they had to be taught how to love, cherish and nurture. It was often tough work, but most mentors loved their duty and most of the young boys worshipped their mentors.

Charles was still thinking about his love for Charlene and all she had taught him when he saw his friend Jim paddling his small canoe towards the backyard. "Ready to do some weaving?" shouted Jim.

"Got the looms all set up," answered Charles, "Were you able to get the goldenrod dye?"

"Yup, my father had some left over from the Equinox, but we have to replace it by New Moon. He wants to make a
special umbrella for mom before the rains start," said Jim.

Charles helped Jim tie up the canoe at the little dock behind the house. "I've got the design for Charlene's blanket all scoped out," he said to Jim, "Come on, check this out."

The boys ran up to the house, where the looms were set on the large deck facing the lake. "Wow," said Jim looking at the multicolored design on the piece of paper Charles eagerly showed him, "Wish I could imagine stuff like that."

"Ah, with someone like Charlene to inspire me it was easy," said Charles modestly, "Actually," he continued, "This is the story of our first real sexual encounter."

Jim nodded solemnly. He had expected as much.

"The dark blue in the blanket here represents the lake, over by Porcupine Peak."

"I knew it," interrupted Jim, "And the green running past is Seven Deer Meadow."

Charles laughed, "Ya, guess I'm not the first one to partake of the sacrament there. It really is such a holy spot. I was one with the grass, and the soil, and the trees. The trees were so magnificent. The sky was diamonds Jim, diamonds. And the dandelions Jim, that was why I wanted the goldenrod so badly. I swear the dandelions reached right into my soul and grabbed it! There I was, flat on my back, feeling that delicious warmth the summer soil gives you from below and that hot July sun gives us from above. I rolled over and looked at Charlene's mane of yellow hair then into
those golden eyes and they transmuted. Just like in the Holy Texts. Those glorious eyes turned right into dandelions Jim. I thought it was a reflection from the meadow or something at first, but then those dandelion eyes sucked me in and I knew it was all true. Gaia lives in each one of us Jim. Charlene was a dandelion. I became the dandelion in her eyes. There were a million shining brother and sister dandelions dancing all around us singing praises to Gaia. You were there Jim. And so was mom and dad and sis and grandma and everyone. And that is what I need the goldenrod dye for. In every speck of the blue and the green and the brown and the grey of our wedding blanket there will be a little goldenrod. And the two brightest spots of all will be smack in the center of the blanket to represents the day that the center spoke to me. Mother Gaia through Charlene’s eyes. The day of my enlightenment."

ECOLOGY AND THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY EUTOPIA

The Green criterion of ecological harmony and the philosophical stance of nonviolence towards nature are the most highly emphasized values within the Mystical Deep Ecology future eutopia. The Mystical Deep Ecologist future society worships the Earth as Mother and the life upon it as sacred kin. This religious-metaphysical perspective is coupled with the concept of biocentric egalitarianism to produce the cosmological foundation for the argument that instrumental use of the Earth and the creatures upon it be
highly restricted. The religious-metaphysical worship of Earth as Mother further promotes a detailed attention to one’s environmental surroundings. Since Gaia is immanent in all, one does not want to offend the Goddess through exploitative or disrespectful action towards one of her many manifestations.

The Mystical Deep Ecology future eutopia thus stresses a highly aware, low impact, environmentally benign life. The high level of environmental awareness is evident as nature is constantly watched for signs or messages from Gaia (Kassman 1990; Kassman 1989). The low impact consciousness translates into a low technology, "Conserver" society (Dator 1979; Jones 1989; Valaskakis 1979). To stress the benign nature of this society, ecologically unavoidable manipulations of the Earth are geared to "put more back than one takes" (Jones 1989, 239). Agriculture thus replenishes rather than depletes the soil (Rohter 1991, Chapters 4, 5 and 9).

Mystical Deep Ecologists argue that it is the compassion they show for the Earth and its creatures which puts Mystical Deep Ecology a step ahead of the ecological philosophy of noninterference posited by the Neo-Primitivists (Starhawk 1989). Hospitable environmental wilderness areas have been established for the flourishing of flora and fauna. Hunting and the raising of animals for food is forbidden. Such activities are seen in the same light as war and human cannibalism are seen today. Some limited free ranging domestication of cattle and poultry is allowed for milk and
eggs, but the entire society is primarily vegetarian. Clothing and other items made from animals, including fur and leather, are prohibited. Limited wool production is tolerated. Zoos are outlawed, being viewed as animal slavery, although personal companion animals are permitted. Companion animals are not thought of as being owned by a person as property but are seen as individuals who have freely chosen to live with humans and who may freely choose to leave. Mystical Deep Ecologists see themselves as stewards, protectors and enhancers of Gaia’s gift of life.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY EUTOPIA

Ethnographic studies suggest that the early Neolithic horticultural societies which Mystical Deep Ecologists adopt as models for their preferred futures were basically egalitarian with the status of women being much higher than in later civilized societies (Biehl 1991, 31). More recent models discussed by Mystical Deep Ecologists such as the matrilineal Iroquois of North America depict societies where women controlled the distribution of food and wealth, nominated and deposed tribal chiefs, and had a voice in all questions brought before the tribe (Leacock 1987, 28). Goods uncovered in the graves of matrifocal societies were found to be very limited and of equal quality and quantity thus suggesting nonmaterialist and egalitarian cultures (Ehrenberg 1989, 95-99). Utilizing ethnographic research, historical
Anthropology, the theories of twentieth-century Mystical Ecofeminists, and the feminist-utopian novels of the nineteenth-century the Mystical Deep Ecologists in Cascadia adopted a matrifocal "partnership model" for their society.\textsuperscript{17}

The official religion of Cascadia is the worship of Gaia as the Mother Goddess. As religion permeates every aspect of life, a matrifocal society is seen as a natural step in the evolution of societal by the Cascadians.\textsuperscript{18} Men and women share societal tasks fairly equally in this future, although jobs requiring nurturing and connection to the Earth are primarily reserved for men with women as guides or overseers. Both genders know that men need extra "practice" in these areas due to their innate biological weakness of being born male.\textsuperscript{19} Since the nonmaterialistic motto of "live lightly upon the Earth" is supreme, there really is not so much work to be done. Mostly the daily chores of tending the fields and gathering places, taking care of the house and surroundings, and cooking the meals. Institutions such as usury, money lending and the wage slavery of capitalism are outlawed. The means of production are communally owned and usufruct is the rule. If one participates in a project, one shares the results according to one's needs. Each household is basically self-sufficient, although strong kinship ties make communalist cooperation and sharing commonplace. Some light craftspersonship such as the making of glass exists but the practitioners are actually
teachers helping others to make their own products. In times of accident or disaster, each household is linked into two larger communities. The first is based upon kinship and follows the mother’s lineage. The second community is based upon religion in a manner similar to the parish or the ward. All members are expected to serve one another as needed.

DEMOCRACY AND THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY EUTOPIA

The partnership society of the Mystical Deep Ecologist future allows democratic participation by both genders, however, the ontological connection of the female to Gaia gives women some very special political responsibilities. Like the newborn child who must be nourished at his mother’s breast in order to become healthy, the Mystical Deep Ecology society of the future must be nourished by the female perception of reality. It is thus viewed as natural and not problematic that women’s opinions are given greater weight than men’s. As Jones’ matrifocal future scenario puts it "women are co-equal with men politically, although women possess absolute veto power" (Jones 1989, 235). Positions of power in the Mystical Deep Ecologist future society are thus shared cooperatively, however, one woman’s opinion is enough to overrule any number of men.

NONVIOLENCE AND THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY EUTOPIA

The matrifocal culture of the Mystical Deep Ecology future eutopia stresses compassion towards all life and thus
is remarkably peaceful. This peacefulness is structurally maintained in part due to intermarriage and the resulting dispersal of male relatives among the villages of the immediate area. Making war on neighboring villages in this future society amounts to literally killing one's own brother. The religious-metaphysical stance of nonviolence towards the natural world inherent in Gaianism further promotes a nonviolent orientation towards the social realm. The Mystical Deep Ecology future eutopia is the only Green subculture future which does not legitimate the killing of animals as right, good and just.

The line of reasoning here is this. In order to limit social violence one must limit the total consciousness of violence in a society. This includes violence directed towards nonhuman nature. Gaian biocentricity maintains that this show of respect for nonhuman otherness will translate into respect for human otherness and for the immanent Goddess. Violence is thus seen as the ultimate sin, a direct blow against the Goddess herself.

Mystical Deep Ecology's future eutopia contains no soldiers, hunters or weapons. Values associated with males (aggression, anger, jealousy and intolerance) are kept strictly in check in this future while values associated with the feminine (cooperation, sharing and acceptance) are encouraged and rewarded. Each young male is appointed a female mentor at birth to help achieve this harmony. Males are oriented towards fulfilling the caring and nurturing
roles of housekeeper, cook, gardener, social worker, and child provider. Aggressive sports are outlawed. Games are cooperative rather than competitive. There are no losers and everyone wins. Respect for life and nonviolence are taught to each child as primary rules of life and reinforced through daily rituals and routines as simple as the personal greeting, "May peace be with you."

THE SOCIAL ECOLOGIST EUTOPIAN VISION

Social Ecologist theory maintains that only through the creation of a just and participatory society can a healthy and benign relationship to the natural world be developed. Presupposing that the domination of "man by man" preceded the domination of nature by man, the Social Ecologist future is structured to eliminate all hierarchy and delegitimate all forms of discrimination. Every person is viewed as valuable to the community and worthy of community respect and mutual support. Social Ecologists argue that this harmony can then be applied to ecological relationships. Human beings, as nature rendered self-conscious, are seen as having a duty to respect and protect that which has given them life and continues to support them. This stewardship includes active assistance in furthering what Social Ecology describes as "the precepts of nature" (freedom, diversity, cooperation, interdependence and development) (Todd and Todd 1984; Maser 1988; Bookchin 1982b).
SOCIAL ECOLOGY EUTOPIAN SCENARIO

Murray felt something tickling his nose and opened his eyes. He brushed the resting butterfly off of his face, shook the sleep from his eyes, and glanced around his plant filled room. The sun was shining brightly through the large picture windows that took up the majority of space on Murray’s bedroom ceiling and four of the five walls surrounding Murray’s waterbed. "Dim," said Murray and the windows automatically darkened a bit letting Murray’s eyes adjust to the brightness of the day outside. Jimmy, Murray’s pet ferret, bounded from his cave in the corner of the room and stood up on his hind legs staring inquisitively at the boy. "Ok, ok" said Murray responding to the ferret’s stare, "Let there be light." Instantly the windows lightened and the sun shone full force into the grotto-like room of the 13 year old boy. Happily, the ferret bounced over to the waterfall, took a few sips of the fresh, clean water, and swiped at a curious minnow who had swum too close to his furry little face.

"May I enter?" asked a gentle voice.

"Sure Dad," answered the boy, who then asked his own question, "What’s on the agenda today?"

"I thought I’d take a walk over to Community Garden B-7," answered Murray’s father, "It’s getting towards the end of the month and our family’s still got a few hours to fulfill. I heard the new Dodo eggs from Palo Alta are ready to hatch
and we want to innoculate and incubate the chicks as soon as they do. Want to come along?"

"Sure," said Murray, "You know I never saw such funny looking birds before. I still don’t know what good they will do the community."

"You never know," said the father, "It started as just a lark but I suspect something interesting may come from those Dodos yet."

"Maybe they taste good?" asked Murray, "A couple of those Dodo eggs looked big enough all by themselves for one of Joe Able’s special omelets. By the way, I’ve got an important meeting at town hall later this afternoon. My age cohort wants to sponsor a bioregional culture fair in the longhouse and Linda McDervish and I got elected to make our case. If the Dodo’s aren’t ready maybe you can help me with my arguments while we work on the new permaculture acre?"

"Sounds good to me," answered the father, "I saw Joe working on breakfast duty this morning. Why don’t you grab a bite to eat and bend his ear a little? Joe represented us at the Centralia Bioregional gathering last year and he might have some good ideas. Meet you later out on B-7."

Murray jumped into his coveralls and quickly combed his mix of light purple, blonde and orange hair. He ran out of his family’s house, which had been provided by the community at no cost, and signed out for one of the community owned bicycles parked in the shelter a few dozen meters away. The bikes, like many aspects of the community, were free for any
one to use. Murray rode down the slim path towards town. The scenery on both sides of the path was pleasant. It was designed to be that way. The lightly forested hills with large grassy meadows were efficient as well as pleasing to the eye. Fruit trees and berry bushes dotted both sides of the bikeway. Domesticated and game animals roamed freely and abundantly around the forested pastures. Myriad small ponds, useful for a cooling swim on the warm days of summer, provided water for the animals, nesting places for a variety of edible and useful insect-eating birds, and fish for the community dining table. These ponds, the forests, and all the surrounding land belonged to no one and to everyone. They were community owned and "operated." If one wished to undertake a project on a certain piece of land one appealed to the appropriate committee. Just as Murray was soon to do concerning his age cohort’s use of the community longhouse.

Committee participation was a community duty, like work in the kitchen or the garden or any of the other required duties. Members were chosen at random from the community list of all citizens over 5 years old. Each committee member had an equal vote and served a one year term. Committee decisions were overseen by the community as a whole, which could overturn any committee decision by a two-thirds vote of the citizens. Since the random selection process usually provided a sufficient overview of community opinions this hardly ever happened. Murray remembered with glee the year the community purchasing committee was comprised primarily of
citizens ranging from 13 to 20 years old. For a while there was a lot of community concern but soon most of the citizens agreed that the youth oriented decisions were good for the town as a whole.

Murray rode up to the picnic benches in front of the community dining facility. A heated exchange was taking place between a small group of neighbors at one end of the bench.

"We’ve got a lot of communicative action going on today from the Bioshelter Flora and Fauna Committee." said Murray.

Joe, who was sitting cross legged under a large peach-apple tree peeling potatoes, laughed and shrugged, "Ya, they’re debating whether to trade the new plum-cherry plant hybrid to Oceania for their low fat lamb gene technology. Sue Ellen says she’s happy with the woolly pigs we’ve already got. They are lean and make much better coats than lamb’s wool. And Robin has her eye on the new Oceanic solar motor for bikes and boats."

"Ya, like she doesn’t need the exercise," snickered Murray, "How about trading for an automatic potato peeler as well?"

"Nah," said Joe, "If I wanted, I’d just throw them in the solar steam-peeler, but I like to take pride in my work, know what I mean?"

They both laughed then Murray got down to business. Despite his interest in peeling potatoes, or perhaps because of it, Joe had been a guest of several of the communities of
New Columbia and beyond. Joe filled Murray with tales of community diversity and widespread differences in bioregional priority, as well as with fresh eggs and hash browns. Joe suggested Murray invite his age cohorts from the Spiritualistic Oregonians, the Hanish who were known for their skilled craftwork, and children from the desert community of New Pueblo to his age cohort’s bioregional culture fair. Murray was familiar with these communes. The travelers that often stopped by New Columbia had sometimes been from these collectives. The computer net also had the latest news of course. But Murray had never before had such an important reason to contact his age cohorts. Murray was very excited by his talk with Joe. He quickly washed and dried the dishes he had soiled and rushed off to Permaculture field B-7 to tell his Dad the news.

ECOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL ECOLOGIST EUTOPIA

Unlike the Deep Ecologist futures that advocate limited human intervention in the ecosystem, the Social Ecologist future eutopia is one where the environment is actively "improved" through consciously abetting what Social Ecology posits as "the thrust of natural evolution." This thrust consists of movement towards a more diversified, varied, and fecund biosphere (Bookchin 1982b, 342-4). The activist position of Social Ecology’s future calls for the integration of nature into society through the development of ecocommunities and ecotechnologies. These communities and
technologies model themselves upon recognized precepts derived from observation of the interaction between nonhuman nature and ecosystem (Todd and Todd 1984).

The first step in this direction to further ecological harmony by early Social Ecologist utopian communities was the elimination of capitalism and its commodification of the natural world. Community oriented production and local technologies based upon renewable resources and the natural limits of the bioregion were encouraged as was bioregional self-sufficiency. Products not produced or consumed locally were heavily taxed and used to subsidize investment in community owned and managed ecological restoration projects. Factory farming was slowly replaced by community permaculture gardens and aquaculture ponds. These projects were designed not only to provide food but to yield a more fertile and beautiful environment than they began with. Fruit trees were planted on every city block. Small streams were brought out of the sewers to the surface and stocked with edible fish. Wild habitats such as marshes, wilderness corridors, and small lakes were created within the community and stocked with wild animals. Eventually the ecological restoration of the Social Ecologists was so successful it was impossible to distinguish a border between the city and the surrounding rural suburbs. 24

Social Ecology’s future utopia has moved into the laboratory in diverse attempts to better nature. Genetic engineering has made plants and animals stronger: meaning
more adaptable, more resistant to pests and disease, and higher yielding. New hybrids of plants and animals are developed yearly. Advances like the woolly swine which provides silky wool for cloth and very lean pork are highly valued. Some of these developments seem rather trivial such as the plum-cherry plant, but the Social Ecologists who developed them maintain that each one adds to the diversity and fecundity of the "natural" environment. Proponents of such research point to the reintroduction of extinct animals such as the Dodo, Passenger Pigeon, and Auroch as progress made towards replacement of some of the 50,000 species lost each and every year before the Social Ecologist "revolution" of the year 2023 (Myers 1984, 138-169).

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND THE SOCIAL ECOLOGY EUTOPIA

Social Ecology stresses the establishment of social justice as the precondition for any kind of societal or ecological harmony to occur. Emphasis is placed upon the elimination of hierarchy and its resultant forms of structural and personal forms of domination. The expansion of communicative action and acceptance of communal responsibility is a further priority. One of the main goals of the Social Ecologist future was the elimination of disparities in wealth and power due to age, gender, race, sexual orientation, talent and other separtist notions. Social Ecologist communities were among the first to establish affirmative action programs setting forth the
rights of minorities, gays and lesbians, women, children, the handicapped, and the aged. The values of social diversity, respect for others, nonviolence, individual freedom of choice and self-determination are now taught in every school room at every grade level. All social roles are open to all people.

The Social Ecologist future eutopia has further stressed social justice through the establishment of community ownership and control of most property including the means of production. The wealth produced by this property reverts to the community as a whole and is distributed through minimum income programs and communal purchasing for the needs of its members. Amassing of private wealth is outlawed through steep income and inheritance taxes. Societal sharing of resources and goods not currently in use is actively encouraged.

The workplace has been communalized. Since all citizens share in the benefits of the community, community duties are shared by all citizens. Duty hours are allocated by family size and ability but everyone contributes. Individuals can choose from a wide variety of community activities to fulfill these duty requirements from the permaculture genetic laboratories to the community kitchen to the solar cell repair shop to whatever meets one’s interests at any particular time. Community members are encouraged to partake in a wide variety of weekly duties thus learning new skills through interacting with a diverse selection of their neighbors and thereby becoming more well-rounded individuals.
DEMOCRACY AND THE SOCIAL ECOLOGY EUTOPIA

The Social Ecologist future eutopia is a model which strives to achieve the ideal "societas civilis" or civil society. 25 Citizens in the Social Ecologist eutopia engage in what Vaclav Havel has called "anti-political politics." Anti-political politics rejects the instrumentalism of Machiavellian power politics and instead concentrates upon service to and participation in the community as ways to achieve a meaningful life. 26

In order to actualize this ideal Social Ecologist eutopian communities have adopted the motto, "Every person shall have the opportunity to participate in every decision which has an influence upon them." This motto is taken seriously and the Social Ecologist society is structured so that decision making includes as much democracy as possible. The democratic structures in the Social Ecologist eutopia are based upon tried political designs and social models. These models included the Greek polis, the anarchist-utopian communes of the 1800s, and New England town meetings.

A wide diversity of community committees cover every possible political issue. This includes issues in the economic realm. Production decisions are made by community committees just like any other decision. Daily work assignments and priorities are made by the workers themselves (Rohter 1991, 103-132). In a similar way decisions concerning the community's education are shared between
teachers, students, and any other interested party. Strong
Democracy and the active participation in decisions which
touch one's life are essential parts of each child's
classroom experience (Barber 1984).

Membership on the community's general interest committees
is chosen by random drawing and frequently rotated. At
committee meetings anyone can come forth and present their
opinions and concerns. Decisions are made in an open meeting
fashion and all those attending can vote. If the vote of the
committee members themselves is more than two-thirds in
disagreement with the popular vote a rehearing of the issue
can be called. Decision making is reached through consensus
whenever possible. Proxies are counted for those unable to
attend committee meetings, however, since the questions to be
voted upon are often reformulated during the open discussions
proxies are discouraged as being of limited value.
Representatives to intercommunity confederalional assemblies
have to subject their decisions to the consensus of the home
community at all times. Community membership in these
confederations is voluntary, as is individual community
compliance with confederalional decisions.27

NONVIOLENCE IN THE SOCIAL ECOLOGIST FUTURE EUTOPIA

One of the main goals of the Social Ecologist future
community is the elimination of structural violence through
the expansion of social justice. The delegitimation of
racism, sexism, ageism, and other forms of discrimination has
reduced violence against minorities, women, the old, the young, and the different. Societal difference is celebrated instead of repressed. This has led to a reduction of personal and structural violence and a healthier, more creative and productive society. Courses in peace studies and nonviolence training have been institutionalized in every child's classroom. The horrors of a history of war, oppression and exploitation have been driven home to every citizen. There is no production or stockpiling of weapons and no military training in this future. Active nonviolence is the norm. Individuals feeling frustration and anger seek out inner-peace counselors. Chairpersons of community committees are trained in facilitation and the furtherance of communicative processes. Affinity education has been established where one assumes the roles of those with traits other than oneself.

Serious disputes between communities are decided by a mediation board. This board is appointed by the Confederation of Communities with board membership approved by the parties directly involved. Failure to abide by the mediation decision makes a community subject to total boycott, in essence confederational shunning of the community as a whole.
1. This description of utopia is from Wendell Bell’s The Foundations of the Future’s Field (draft copy). Bell’s Chapter 6 contains an in-depth discussion of the utopian concept and the futures field.

2. See Table Four in Appendix One for evidence of the widespread power of the Green vision.

3. Dator, "Neither There Nor Then: A Utopian Alternative to the 'Development' Model of Future Society" (in Eleonora Masini, ed., Human Futures, London: IPC Science and Technology Press, 1974). In the field of Utopian Studies, Lyman Sargent’s British and American Utopian Literature 1516-1974 (New York: Garland, 1988) has set the standard definitions of utopia as the genre, eutopia as good place and dystopia as a place worse than the present. Dator adds the criteria that eutopias are feasible, motivating images.


5. See Devall and Sessions, Deep Ecology (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1985). Earth First! Journal has had particular fun with the Neo-Primitivist notion using cartoons of cavemen as "mascots" and stone axes as logo’s.

6. Arnold Toynbee in Mankind and Mother Earth (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) has argued that such systemic collapses of civilizations are not uncommon in human history. Chris Maser’s The Redesigned Forest (San Pedro: R and E Miles, 1988) believes the downfall of ancient Greek civilization was due in large part to environmental exploitation.

7. The journal Live Wild or Die! has used the slogan, "Factories Don’t Burn Themselves Down...They Need Help From You!" for instance. Almost any issue of Overthrow or Earth First! Journal offers further examples.

1991, 56-8) disagrees with Shepard on this point and laments that it was the introduction of Cro-Magnon humanity in the Pleistocene period which brought about the extinction of Pleistocene megafauna. Foreman feels Paleolithic Neanderthalism is thus a better model for the Neo-Primitivist ecotopia.

Glasser has pointed out that although early human societies stressed cooperation and mutualism, there were also periods in which survival was precarious and humanity's primary goal was survival. The same is true of the surviving "ecosphere" societies which LaChapelle ("Sacred Land, Sacred Sex" in Plant's Healing the Wounds, Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1989, 155-8) and Snyder ("Bioregional Perspectives" in Andrus, et al.'s Home, Philadelphia: New Society Publishing, 1990) use as modern models for the Neo-Primitive future.

William Cronon's depictions of Native American lifestyles in New England (Cronon, Changes in the Land, New York: Hill and Wang, 1983) and Karen Liptak's analysis of Pacific Northwest Coast Indians (Liptak, Indians of the Pacific Northwest, New York: Facts on File 1991) illustrate that ecologically aware, nonagricultural cultures do not necessarily have to be survival oriented. Like Glasser's "primitive identity society" these cultures can be favorably compared to the modern world and be found to be living a "good life."

9. Cronon (1983) illustrates the harmony of New England Indians with the ecosystem they lived within by starkly contrasting the Native American worldview of "living with the land" with the European consciousness of nature exploitation.


11. Caroline Estes ("Consensus and Community" in Plant and Plant 1990, 94-103) offers examples of how such synchronization might work. Estes' theories rest on the concept of consensus, where each individual concerned about an issue has the right to express their opinion and participate in the decision making process. The goal of consensus is to find decisions which everyone can agree with.

12. LaChapelle (1989) discusses purification ritualization. Sally Abbott ("The Origins of God in the Blood of the Lamb," in Reweaving the World, Diamond and Orenstein, eds. 1990, 35-40), believes such ritualization limits violence towards animals but also alleviates the guilt involved in animal killing and thus enables such killing to take place.
13. The understanding of Gaia under Mystical Deep Ecology is very different from the scientific hypothesis presented by James Lovelock at Princeton in 1969. The scientific concept of Gaia which Lovelock, later joined by Lynn Margulis, postulated was a complex organism involving the cybernetic interaction of the Earth's biosphere, atmosphere, oceans and soil, which created and maintained an optimal physical and chemical environment for life on the planet (James Lovelock. *Gaia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979, 11). According to Lovelock, his theory broke with the scientific tradition which held that life adapted to planetary conditions as given and for the first time offered a scientific context for the idea that the Earth was a living planet more similar to the human body than a dead piece of matter (IBID, 152).

To the Mystical Deep Ecologists, who intuitively view the Earth as the "sacred fount of all life," the concept of Gaia holds a particular attraction, although the scientism of Lovelock does not. Mystical Deep Ecology has solved this problem by essentially removing the science from its concept of Gaia, emphasizing instead the countless cultures which have viewed the Earth in a religious-metaphysical way as Mother and Earth Goddess (Oates, David. *Earth Rising*, Corvalis, OR: Oregon State University Press, 1989, 196-7 and 204) Devall and Sessions (1985, 151) are typical of the antiscientific, Mystical Deep Ecologistic, approach to Gaia, criticizing the "limited, cold, manipulative, distant from reality" scientific version of Gaia in favor of Gaia myths which are "encompassing, intuitive, comforting, involving."


15. Riane Eisler's "The Gaia Tradition and the Partnership Future" (Diamond and Orenstein 1990, 13) calls this image, "our great Mother, the giver and creator of all."

16. For a comprehensive view of the ecological degradation caused by the modern meat oriented diet see John Robbins' *Diet For A New America* (Walpole, NH: Stillpoint Publishing, 1987). This book also stresses social, health and social justice issues and has become the "new testament" of vegetarianism, joining the older "bible" of Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation* (New York: Avon Books, 1975). For a cutting edge overview of the current ecofeminist position on animal liberation see the *Feminists For Animal Rights Newsletter*, a quarterly newsletter covering recent books and emerging issues in the field.

18. Other religions have not been outlawed but are viewed suspiciously as sects. Most traditional religions (such as Catholicism) were able to modify themselves sufficiently by stressing the feminine, egalitarian and nonviolent aspects of their faith and downplaying their former emphasis on male deities and priests, domination, intolerance and aggression.

19. According to the Mystical Ecofeminist perspective, women possess an "elemental power" due to their direct connection to the creation and maintenance of life which allows them a truer view of societal issues than that of men. This connection in turn leads to an epistemological advantage inherent in women's biological make up. Charlene Spretnak believes that because women "form people from our very flesh and blood and then...nourish them from our breasts..." women are "predisposed from a very early age to perceive connectedness in life...are more empathetic, and they remain more aware of subtle, contextual 'data' in interpersonal contacts" (Spretnak "Toward an Ecofeminist Spirituality in Plant 1989, 128-9). This greater awareness is recognized by both men and women in the Mystical Deep Ecology future eutopia and men appreciate and support the guidance they are given by their female mentors.

20. This is a probable assessment but may not always be the case as we will explore in Chapter 5, Dystopian Possibilities in Green Subculture Futures.

21. In part this is because I have concentrated upon the Mystical Ecofeminist aspects of this future. Many of these theorists see a connection between the exploitation of women and the exploitation of animals. See "Patriarchal Domination of Women, Nature and Animals: The Feminist-Animal Liberation Connection" by Gail Johnson in the Feminists For Animal Liberation Newsletter (iv, No. 1 and 2 [Spring/Summer, no date], 1-3).

22. The Social Ecologist sees human beings as nature, but a very special manifestation of nature. As nature rendered self-conscious, the Social Ecologist believes humans have the eutopian potential to rationally intervene in the ecosystem to direct evolution in an intentional, examined and beneficial way (Bookchin. Remaking Society, New York: Black Rose Books, 1989, 203-204).
23. Social Ecology argues that the synthesis of social freedom and complementarity with nature found in Social Ecology will lead to a new ecological instrumentalism which would transcend the present consciousness of environmental domination to bring human consciousness to the service of both humans and nature (Biehl. *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics*, Boston: South End Press, 1991, 126-127).


25. Manfred Henningsen ("Democracy or the Promise of Civil Society," *Linking Present Decisions to Long-Range Visions*, The World Futures Studies Federation's XI World Conference Proceedings, ed. by Mika Mannermaa, 1990, 195) describes the traditional European understanding of civil society "as being the congregation of free and equal citizens deliberating about the affairs of society as a whole."


CHAPTER FIVE
DYSTOPIAN POTENTIAL WITHIN AMERICAN GREEN MOVEMENT
SUBCULTURES

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I wish to balance the optimism of the preferred future societies of the Neo-Primitivists, Mystical Deep Ecologists and Social Ecologists discussed in Chapter Four with the presentation of the dystopian potential which is inherent in the worldviews of American Green theorists and activists. It is hoped that by illustrating this dystopian potential methods may be found to eliminate or balance the dystopian elements in these futures and thus encourage movement towards futures which support rather than undermine the four primary values of the American Green movement.

The question of what constitutes a dystopia is a normative issue. To address this problem I begin with Lyman Tower Sargent's standard definition of dystopia as a "bad place" or a society which is less desirable than the existing one.¹ But this definition presents a problem for our discussion. The Greens find existing society to be very undesirable in and of itself. And no doubt many in modern society would find the Green eutopian visions presented in the last chapter to correlate closely with their own visions of dystopia. To address these problems of preference, I have again chosen the methodological approach used in the last chapter to present and analyze the desirability of Green
future societies. This approach is twofold and includes (1) scenario creation based upon the major texts of Green subculture advocates, and (2) incasting analysis based upon the criteria which the Greens have established for themselves in their adoption of ecological harmony, social justice, democratic participation and nonviolence as their primary value orientations. The scenarios present several hours in the thoughts and actions of people living in the possible Green dystopias. Since this is a dystopian analysis, the four primary values have been inverted to illustrate the potential ecological disharmony, social injustice, authoritarianism and violence within the three subcultures. Table Seven in the appendix of this dissertation presents an overview of the results of this process.

**DYSTOPIAN POTENTIAL AND THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST FUTURE SCENARIO**

Falcon readied herself for the ambush. This was to be Falcon’s first attack on fellow human beings and she was ready to test her strength as a warrior. She longed for the olden days of the elder’s tales when a warrior’s mettle would be tested by the strongest and the fiercest animals in the forest. Now the only prey to test one’s strength against was the Strangers. She remembered the words her father spoke to her, "They aren’t Real People, you know. They walk on two legs but so do birds. They have two eyes, one nose, one mouth but the eyes are like the eyes of a scared rabbit, the nose like that of a pig and the mouth more like a fish than a
human being. To live we must kill the bird, the rabbit, the pig, and the fish. That is Nature's law. Those who kill fearlessly shall live. They shall have honor and they shall be rewarded by Nature and by Society accordingly. Those who do not kill live in shame like the filthy pig, and like the frightened bird. In the end it is their shame which brings death to them. Nature respects power. By remaining strong and culling the weak, we are fulfilling Nature's desire."

Her father's wise words brought comfort to Falcon's heart. Times had not been good lately. Drought had come again this year to the usually lush forest valley which Falcon's tribe called home. Food was scarce in the world and Strangers would make it scarcer. This was not the first time climate changes had brought Strangers to the once lush forest watershed which Falcon's tribe now occupied. Falcon remembered the legends of how previous Dry Times had led her tribe, the Real People, to the valley. She remembered the mythic tales told about the heroes among her ancestors who had fought countless battles to conquer the valley and then countless more battles to keep the prize in the hands of her people. These battles occurred many times in the past, but never before in the fourteen years which made up Falcon's short life.

The Elders prophesied that the new Dry Times were a signal that the precious food and water the valley contained would once again be desired by others. That Strangers had appeared meant the prophecy was beginning to show its truth.
The heroic battles were to begin again. New tales of honor would be sung, and new warriors would advance in status. Legends of the fierceness of the Real People would once again be spread throughout the land and strangers would come this way no more. Falcon clutched her long spear in her right hand, and felt the handle of the knife blade in her left. She thanked the Gods once more for this opportunity to serve Nature's will, protect her people, and increase her power. Then she patiently waited for the attack to begin.

ASSESSMENT OF ECOLOGICAL DISHARMONY IN THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST Dystopian Scenario

Large tracts of wilderness have been restored in the Neo-Primitivist future. This has been accomplished primarily through neglect, and with some active sabotage of dams, bridges, and power stations. Small game has returned to many areas. Still, life is hard and precarious. The limited ecological knowledge and overpopulation which accompanied the collapse of industrial society resulted in the overhunting, overfishing, and overforaging of what little natural resources were left. After "The Great Die Off," as the early decades of the twenty-first century were called, the human population reached the basic level of ecological sustainability in nonagricultural societies. The dominant social code of the warrior and huntsperson, where one must show bravery and skill through killing, led to the extinction of the few remaining large mammals. This included those
animals that had formerly been domesticated such as horses and cows. The animals which survived were mainly small, and fast propagators like rabbits, birds, and rats. All these animals are now hunted for their food value.

The foraging of the Neo-Primitivist dystopian lifestyle has limited ecological impact, although some of the less aware and more violent tribes live by ecologically ravaging one area and then moving on to the next. Life is hard and Hobbesian. Consequently, the little ecological wisdom which exists in these tribes stresses keeping population levels as low as possible. This strategy is not really a problem since little food is available for winter storage. Winter is thus known as "The Starving Time." The weak, the sick, and the old die during the winter. This is seen as part of the natural balance and is viewed positively because it keeps the population within the limits sustainable by the ecosystem.

SOCIAL INJUSTICE WITHIN THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST DYSTOPIAN SCENARIO

Neo-Primitivism’s emphasis on ecological diversity and respect for the biosphere offers the hope that tolerance and compassion would somehow find a way into the social sphere. Yet the current writing of many Neo-Primitivist theorists and activists make future respect for societal otherness highly suspect. The trade-off of tribalism is often a denial of the universalism of humanity. In the dystopian scenario above,
Neo-Primitivist tribes each consider themselves the Real People. Strangers are suspect and viewed with trepidation. The problems of overpopulation (in relation to the food supply) coupled with the misanthropy of many Neo-Primitivists tribes has led to the devaluation of human beings who are not immediately related to one's own tribe. Many tribes consider strangers on the same level as pests and pestilence. William Aiken (1984) fears that this aspect of Neo-Primitivism could lead to a total loss of all individual rights.

The naturalist ideology held by Neo-Primitivists in the above dystopia maintains that the strong live and the weak die. This leads to a view that individuals can and should be left to their own resources to fend against natural or societal forces. In the Neo-Primitivist dystopia this survivalist emphasis has led to a concentration upon the values of the warrior thus making this future dangerous for anyone who does not hold those values or excel in warrior skills. The young, old, sick, handicapped, weak, meek, and powerless are especially vulnerable in the seminomadic cultures of the Neo-Primitivist future. These social groups are forced to do the bulk of the work. The weak serve those stronger. When times are good strangers may be sought as slaves to do the work the weak cannot do. When food is scarce tradition has it that the strongest eat first.
AUTORITARIANISM WITHIN THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST DYSTOPIAN SCENARIO

Participatory democracy is virtually nonexistent in the Neo-Primitivist future dystopia. Instead, decisions are made by a variety of authoritarian mechanisms. Rule in some communities is by the big man/woman of the tribe. This person may be self-appointed and rule through a Machiavellian emphasis on fear and terror. Other societies have leaders who reflect the general consensus of the community. These leaders are charismatic and powerful figures to whom deference is more or less willfully given. Leaders are also put in place and supported by powerful interest groups such as the warrior class, religious elites, or a combination of both.

Given Neo-Primitivism's emphasis on warrior society and the need to survive in harsh ecological conditions, authoritarian warlords bent upon expanding their realm of control have risen to power in some areas. These warlords engage their tribes in semi-constant battles for power, prestige, booty, and territory. Those who prove themselves useful to the power holders in such societies are allowed limited participation in political decision making. This participation is limited to an advisory capacity. Those without the ability to challenge the power holders have little input.
VIOLENCE WITHIN THE NEO-PRIMITIVIST DYSTOPIAN SCENARIO

The American Green movement's principle of nonviolence is the value that seems most problematic in the Neo-Primitivist dystopian scenario. The Neo-Primitivist emphasis on the values of the warrior and the skills of the hunter could lead to social violence, manipulation, domination, and exploitation. At its worst, the Neo-Primitivist dystopia could become a savage future of strong warriors exploiting each other and everyone within their reach. It should be noted that when compared to modern standards of mass destruction, precivilizational conflicts in many areas and times can not be considered unusually violent.

Evidence shows that precivilized people do not necessarily eschew violence either. The Neo-Primitivist glorification of hunting (a violent act involving the taking of an animal's life and the eating of its flesh) is a disturbing part of its ideology. One wonders if the rubric of biocentric egalitarianism posited by Neo-Primitivists allows cannibalism of human beings, especially given the absence of other large mammals to hunt. Human and animal sacrifice, abortion, and infanticide were common among the "ecosystem" cultures Neo-Primitivists hold up as models for their preferred future (LaChapelle 1989, 158-160). Equally common was the abandonment of the old, the sick, and the weak when they could no longer survive without community support.

Given the low level of technology and the small number of people involved in these tribal societies, it is my
conclusion that the level of violence directed toward the average individual in a Neo-Primitivist future could be much less than that existing in many areas of the world today, including the modern American city. Without a specific ban on societal violence, however, I am afraid the Neo-Primitivist celebration of warrior cultures and their belief in the sanctity of natural violence could lead to a dystopian future rivaling the worst of the "blood and soil" cultures we have seen in this century.

THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY DYSTOPIAN SCENARIO

Little Charlene woke from her long night of sleep, stretched lazily and opened her eyes to observe the world around her. It was still a bit dark deep in the forest where Charlene had been told to go the night before by the First Mother. It was darker still in the ancient hollow cedar where Charlene had made her bed of cedar boughs. Live cedar for the pillow, dead cedar for the bed itself. Charlene remembered she had gathered the bed the night before, leaving a strand of her own hair to replace the branches she had "borrowed" from another cedar close by. A psalm from the Book of Starhawk ran through her head, "We are all one in the Goddess, never borrow from your sisters without repayment." Charlene was always careful to leave a gift in repayment for what she borrowed from the Earth, be it a small strip of handwoven ribbon to replace the wood needed for winter fires, or a bit of homemade cornbread in thanks for the food
harvested from her garden, or perhaps just a personal totem of thanks for the treat of some delicious summertime berries.

It was not every night that Charlene slept in a hollow tree. But it was not every day that one became a woman and a Mother of the Village either. Today was the day she had prepared for. For how long? Years it seemed. But the wait was worth it. Yesterday was the day of the first blood. Today was the day the rituals would be fulfilled. No longer would there be little Charlene the Sister. Now the village had a new apprentice Mother, Charlene the Woman.

Charlene loved being a woman. She thanked the Goddess that she was one of the lucky ones born of the gender with the magical powers. She thought about the duties she must soon assume. The role of Mother in Charlene’s village was not connected to the bearing of children but rather was a political and spiritual position. Mothers were in charge of the care and sustenance of the village. They filled powerful and demanding roles. These roles called for responsibility, wisdom and compassion, which was why only women could assume them. Village Mothers were teachers, leaders, interpreters of dreams, healers of the sick, insurers of the fertility of the fields, celebrators of the everyday victories of life, and sorrow holders of everyday loss. Perhaps most important of all, Mothers were the spinners of spells, the participants in the sacred rituals that honored the Goddess Gaia and kept Charlene’s village safe. These roles and much more must a Mother fulfill.
"Men have it so easy," thought Charlene, "plant the fields, care for the children, clean the village, cook the meals, and attend their always yammering gossip sessions." Sure, some men tried to act like Women but few succeeded in their pathetic attempts. Then, their primitive side really emerged. Men were full of negative emotions they just could not control: anger, jealousy, aggression, intolerance, and the inability to accept the natural state of affairs. It was no wonder that the old times when men ruled were ones of open rape and plunder when the deepest regions of the Earth herself were brutally probed and ripped open to extract the so-called resources needed by their spurious "civilizations." "Such blasphemy and defamation would never be permitted now in the most modern and civilized of times," thought Charlene. "When will men accept the fact that they are just not genetically able to fulfill the leadership roles culture requires of the intuitive sex?" wondered Charlene.

Charlene heard drumming and knew it was time to emerge from the cedar's protective womb and be born again. Outside the tree the Mothers of her village materialized out of the forest chanting, praying and calling. Charlene appeared and the women encircled her. The First Mother began to read from the Book of Plant, The Text of Bass.

"Women bleed," She read as the blood flowed down Charlene's naked leg and began to fertilize the sacred Earth she stood upon.

"Women bleed." chanted the Women of the village.
"Women bleed for the sins of man," First Mother read and the Chorus of Mothers rejoicingly chimed, "We bleed for the sins of men."

"We bleed to replenish the blood which has been stolen from the Great Goddess, the First Mother of all life and protector of all that is right," chanted the First Mother of Charlene's village while the crowd chorused, "We are sacred. We bathe the Earth in our blood. We give life to all we see and that which we cannot see."

"You are sacred Charlene," said the First Mother, "You can become a Woman. Do you promise to use your blood to heal the Earth, to wet the dry, and to feed all life?"

"I do, sacred Mother," answered Charlene.

"Charlene," said the First Mother, "You are a Woman."

Cheers broke out from the crowd as they rushed towards Charlene hugging and kissing her, welcoming her to the sacred Sisterhood and sharing their sacred blood of life with each other. When Charlene and the other Women returned home from the forest late that afternoon, tired, elated and red, she did not return to the home of her childhood but entered the House of Apprentice Priestesses, her new home as a Woman.

ECOLOGICAL DISHARMONY IN THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGIST DYSTOPIA

The nature worship of the Mystical Deep Ecologist makes a future ecological dystopia seem improbable, however, being Gaiacentric does not necessarily exclude ecological exploitation, nature manipulation and environmental
devastation. There is strong evidence to suggest that many civilizations which worshipped nature goddesses (such as the ancient Greeks from which the name Gaia originates) decimated their forests, overgrazed their pastures, and rapidly depleted the soil of their agricultural areas (Maser 1988, 66; Ferkiss 1993). This ecological disruption contributed to a change of climatic conditions which turned the once lush lands of the Mediterranean into virtual deserts.

One can project similar dystopian ecological possibilities into a Mystical Deep Ecologist future society. The necessity of maintaining a basic agricultural society in a temperate climatic zone could put stress upon even the most ecologically aware ideologies. Since the Mystical Deep Ecologist worldview discourages the penetration of the earth for coal, oil, or other sources of fuel it is likely the main sources of fuel for cooking and for heating will be wood and animal dung. Pressure upon the forested areas still remaining in the world would be inevitable. Similarly, the metals and plastic now used for the bulk of modern artifacts would have to be replaced by plant or animal materials. Since the Mystical Deep Ecology future is based upon a conserver society scenario the level of materialism and consumer consumption would be drastically reduced. Still, basic necessities such as housing, clothing, tools, and utensils would have to be produced thus putting further pressure on the natural
surroundings. In the case of clothing for example it is likely the instrumental use of animals would be acceptable practice.

Return to a primarily Neolithic agricultural economy offers other problems for the Mystical Deep Ecologist worldview that could lead to ecological disharmony and animal exploitation. It is likely that current high yield crop varieties which are dependent upon petrochemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides would no longer grow well without extensive human maintenance. Current agricultural products are the result of over 10,000 years of human manipulation (Myers 1984, 144). It is unlikely that this manipulation can be "uncreated" even by the best mystics of the Deep Ecologists. It is likely that farms in the Mystical Deep Ecology future dystopia will produce far less yield than they did in times of industrialized agriculture. Lower yielding crops mean large areas of land surrounding Mystical Deep Ecologist settlements will have to be converted to agricultural land. Given the lack of technology, slash and burn farming methods will probably become common thus causing further damage to forest land.

The Mystical Deep Ecologist stance on animal rights may also have to be modified. Trapping of animal pests such as rabbits and other rodents who threaten crops is likely. The use of these animals for clothing, tools, and food is probable. Sheep will be raised to provide wool for clothing. Cattle will be valued for their manure, which will be used
both for fertilizer and for fuel. The grazing of this livestock will require natural areas to be turned into pasture. Livestock grazing will also attract predators such as wolves and coyotes. It is only a matter of time until trapping or hunting is accepted as a means to stop these predators from attacking the valuable animal resources needed by the Mystical Deep Ecologist. These changes from the ecologically benign beginnings of Mystical Deep Ecology to a more instrumental and ecologically manipulative approach will require some philosophical sacrifice of extremist positions, but then survival usually does.

SOCIAL INJUSTICE IN THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY DYSTOPIA

When one begins to explore the Green value criterion of social justice one encounters the most problematic aspect of the Mystical Deep Ecologist future dystopia. One is particularly struck by the amount of female chauvinism expressed by Mystical Deep Ecotopians both male and female. The male conception of God currently touted is not made gender neutral or balanced by a multitude of deities in the Mystical Deep Ecologist future but is replaced by a female figure, Gaia the Earth Mother. Men’s roles in procreation and the defense of life are ignored by Mystical Deep Ecologists. "Masculine" value orientations are always seen as negative and in opposition to "the life-affirming values" innate in women. It can easily be extrapolated from the writings of current theorists such as Charlene Spretnak
(1986, 1989, 1990) that the Mystical Deep Ecologist future dystopia will merely reverse the domination and hierarchy of valuation expressed by modern andropocentric society. Rather than balanced or harmonize the current inequalities, this dystopia will invert them. Women will replace men as a privileged gender.¹³

The religious-metaphysical orientation which permeates all aspects of Mystical Deep Ecologist cosmology offers further problems for the issue of social justice. Bookchin (1989, 12-13) believes that the worship of any being, natural or supernatural, is always a form of self-subjugation leading to servitude and social domination. Another problem is that groups stressing religious-metaphysical experiencing often value intuitive and personal forms of rationality over objective forms. Emphasis is upon noncritical thought and upon accepting the "proper" intuitions one receives (Biehl 1991, 104). Inevitably leaders arise to coordinate these intuitions (Starhawk 1988, 269). Biehl (1991, 86) maintains that these leaders constitute a segment of society which holds considerable power to manipulate their merely intuitional followers.

At the most benign level, manipulation by leadership usually results in the transformation of the leadership class into an elite with privileges equal to its power. In the Mystical Deep Ecologist dystopian scenario this process of elite creation has serious social justice implications for the status of the majority of women as well as for
Certain women are chosen by the current elite of Priestesses to perpetuate a class which rules every aspect of the society. Everyone else is placed under their control "in service to the Goddess." Ena Campbell (1982, 21) actually finds an inverse relationship between goddess worship and high secular female status. Of particular interest to the Mystical Deep Ecologist dystopian scenario is the case of Minoan Crete. While many Mystical Deep Ecologists see Minoan Crete as a model of matrifocal society, Biehl (1991) sees a society where a hierarchy of corporations controlled by priestesses helped to develop an extremely exploitive and oppressive civilization.  

**AUTHORITARIANISM AND THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGIST DYSTOPIA**

Traditional feminist perspectives refute sexist ideologies which link the oppression of women to biological rather than social factors. Many Mystical Ecofeminists reject this stance and take an essentialist position that celebrates the biological stereotypes of "women's nature" as innate and essentially superior. The arguments which have been historically used to subdue women (that they are biologically more caring, nurturing, emotional, and irrational) have thus been accepted by many Mystical Deep Ecologists and used as a kind of ideological ju-jitsu that places women in a position far above that of men. Men are seen from this perspective as biologically aggressive, illogical and death oriented (and thus incapable of

The result of this ideology in the Mystical Deep Ecologist dystopia is that most men are treated no better than slaves or Indian untouchables by women in power. Participation by men in any form of political process is denied. The establishment of strict religious hierarchies has made the situation not much different for the majority of women. The emphasis on a Goddess-worshipping religious-metaphysical epistemology has allowed a hierarchy of priestesses to control all major decision making in society.

VIOLENCE AND THE MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGIST DYSTOPIA

The dystopian elements discussed in the three sections immediately above make suspect the nonviolent aspects of the Mystical Deep Ecology future dystopia. Privilege of one gender (or class) over another, especially when accompanied by the irrational elements of mysticism, can create a form of structural violence when one of the primary goals of the society is egalitarianism. Such privilege limits the development of both genders and suppresses the creative resources which society needs to meet the stresses of the future. Without an analysis of the social factors involved in gender stereotyping and an ethical stance emphasizing social justice and the democratic participation for all members of society, the Mystical Deep Ecology future contains the potential of dystopian oppression. Such oppression is likely to lead to a frustrated and violent
As the old peace movement slogan states, "There can be no peace without justice."

The archeological evidence cited by Mystical Deep Ecologists that goddess worshipping societies were peaceful and nonviolent is also questionable. Gimbutas (1970, 297) has found evidence of ritualistic child sacrifice apparently made to the Mother Goddess in several Neolithic grave sites. Peter Warren (1984, 48-54) found similar evidence including the possibility of ritualistic cannibalism in priestess oriented, goddess worshipping Minoan Crete. Other matrifocal societies such as the Iroquois Confederation conducted expansionist wars and were notoriously violent as warriors (Biehl 1991, 48). Mystical Deep Ecologists have ignored these violent tendencies in the societies that they put forth as models. Thus they offer no attempt to eliminate such tendencies. By ignoring the violent potential that could exist within the Mystical Deep Ecologist future, proponents of this future are leaving themselves open to the charge that the violent inclinations seen in the past will be recreated in this future.

DYSTOPIAN POTENTIAL WITHIN SOCIAL ECOLOGY: A SCENARIO

Murray looked at the duty roster even though he knew what was written on the schedule. After all, the job schedule was made a year in advance. Such advance scheduling worked well in every aspect of the colony. Unexpected events such as death and illness were easily covered by the relief crews and
"voluntary" extra duty. Murray hoped that by some miracle the roster would suddenly have changed and instead of "Flesh Production - Warehouse Number Three" being neatly printed next to his name there would be something (anything) else. It was not that he minded the work, it was just that it was sooooo boring month after month. The Scheduling Committee had decided four years ago that job switching was inefficient at intervals less than six months. Murray still had two months to go on the "flesh farm" and was already weary of processing, feeding and guarding Chicken Little. 18

It was not that flesh production was a minor duty. Indeed, the meat produced by the biogenetically engineered, big-as-a-house masses of living flesh known (affectionately?) as Chicken Little, Big Beef, and Porky were assigned only to the most responsible of citizens. The meat produced by these three living but not feeling entities fed the entire colony. And of course Chicken Little must not only be harvested for the colony to eat but it had to be maintained as well. To keep alive a mass of flesh weighing over one ton (with no brain at all and very little in the way of internal organs) is not a task for the irresponsible. The numerous probes stuck into the mass of Chicken Little had to be monitored for circulation and health. The climate of its warehouse "home" had to be kept perfect as to temperature, air flow and amount of oxygen. And of course Chicken Little must be fed.

Chicken Little was fed a continuous diet of high protein liquid pumped directly into its "stomach." Vitamins,
minerals, amino acids, and the other essentials of healthy flesh production had to be mixed into a nutritious and properly constituted soup. Or Chicken Little would take ill. And flesh production would drop. And the colony would suffer. And Murray, the consistency of the soup being his duty, would be held responsible. Failing in one's responsibilities was not met with kindness by the communal leaders. Public explanation and self-criticism was expected. Although some of the more political of Murray's comrades enjoyed these spectacles, Murray did not. These communal sessions often turned ugly as some sought to shift blame upon others. To be a scapegoat was never a pleasant alternative and even less so now that a particularly cruel and vindictive gang had managed to manipulate their way into many positions of communal power.

Murray yearned for a change of routine. It wasn't that Murray would try to shirk his responsibility to the community. He could hardly even imagine such a thing. After all, school lessons from kindergarten on had taught him that the sacrifice of the one for the good of the many was not really a sacrifice but a privilege. It was just that he imagined after spending six months of feeding and caring for Big Beef the job change the Scheduling Committee would give him would be something a little different than another six months of feeding Chicken Little. The switch from one flesh production warehouse to the other was not so different even though, as the Committee had pointed out, the makeup of the
feed for Chicken Little did contain less iron, more vitamin K and a completely different mixture of steroids from that for Big Beef.

"Perhaps if I speak out more and support the Leader at the gun control meeting on Thursday, I'd get a different job," Murray thought. The commune's current leader wished to trade scarce resources to other communes in order to stockpile even more weapons than the commune currently had. "I really think we have more than enough weapons already but perhaps I don't fully understand the Leader's position," thought Murray, "After all, the Leader has the overview. He's the expert. I've been keeping so busy with my job requirements and communal duties, I haven't really had time to devote much thought to the nuances of the issue."

"Besides," Murray told himself, "If the Leader's gang wants guns, they'll get guns--one way or another. I might as well be on the winning side for a change."

ECOLOGICAL DISHARMONY WITHIN THE SOCIAL ECOLOGIST DYSTOPIA

The Social Ecologist future dystopia falls short of the ideal Green approach to nature in one major respect: the lack of limitation on the instrumental manipulation of nature. Social Ecologists make the point that humans must intervene in the natural world because, they argue, we have no choice. The choice human beings do have, according to Social Ecology, is to make our interaction with nonhuman nature as rational
as possible in meeting nonhuman and human needs (Biehl 1991, 26).

The basic flaw of this rationalist orientation, in relationship to ecological disharmony, is that Social Ecology equates the concept of human self-interest with ecological service to nature. Social Ecology thus posits that what is good for humanity is ipso facto good for nature as a whole. Social Ecology can advocate such a humanistic and activist viewpoint towards nature manipulation because it views human beings as nature rendered self-conscious and thus capable of recognizing and furthering the basic precepts of nature. Bookchin (1982b, 342) has gone so far as to call the ability of humans to make nature more fecund, varied, whole, and integrated the hidden desiderata of natural evolution. Given this call, it is not hard to imagine a Social Ecologist future which is even more oriented toward the manipulation of Nature than is our present society.

It is this emphasis on ecological manipulation which gives rise to the possibility of Chicken Little, Big Beef and Porky in our dystopian scenario. Although some Social Ecologists might view a brainless, unfeeling mass of flesh the ultimate achievement in humanistic (animal rights sensitive) meat production, it is unlikely the majority of Greens would agree that this fits their ideal of ecological harmony.19

The Social Ecologist future dystopia is one where the philosophy of beneficial manipulation has gotten out of hand.
The view of an ecologically rational human society has slammed into the reality of limited human knowledge of the natural world and its complex interactions. This limited knowledge base, coupled with human fallibility, has often led to unexpected, unpredictable and negative consequences. Worse case scenarios of the accidental escape of genetically engineered catastrophes such as artificial diseases, oil and plastic eating bacteria, and modified plants and animals seem to be daily occurrences. Attempts to beautify and rationalize wilderness areas have backfired with indigenous plants being subsumed by ruthless introduced competitors with the resulting extinction of countless plant and animal species. In essence, most of the Social Ecologist attempts to solve the problems of the post-industrial age by technological means have only created more problems and increased ecological disharmony.

INJUSTICE AND THE SOCIAL ECOLOGIST DYSTOPIA

Social Ecologists take a dark view of the history of humanity, seeing a past where emphasis on self-interest, exploitation, greed, and violence has ruled. They also believe that human beings are naturally loving, nurturing and social. Social Ecologists explain the discontinuities between the two realities by emphasizing the exploitation and oppression which hierarchy and scarcity force upon society. In the Social Ecologist view hierarchy and scarcity are linked and this linkage leads directly to dysfunctional
cultural systems. The Social Ecologist attempts to rationally create the perfect society by eliminating both scarcity and hierarchy.

In our future dystopia, the Social Ecologist project to create the good society has become pathological. The emphasis on social manipulation and behavioralism approaches Skinnerian proportions. The Social Ecologist dystopia attempts to overcome the faults of humanity by enforcing strict ethical systems of cultural and structural restraint on unwanted social behavior. Likewise, systems of reward have been established for desired activity. Freedom, one of the most cherished values in Social Ecologist rhetoric, has become the freedom to agree with community values and abide by community standards. Political correctness, meaning adherence to community norms, is valued above individualistic behavior. Required classes in "right thinking" are a lifelong institution. Attempts to avoid this conformity are viewed as dangerous to the community and seen as being undertaken only by the mentally ill or the criminal.

Materialism is viewed as suspect in this future. The power once wielded by the wealthy has now shifted to those who can walk the party line. Those who enjoy aggressive politics, the give and take of public debate, and the victory of winning seemingly insignificant points are especially rewarded as long as they keep within the bounds of safe discourse. Since every aspect of life in this future is
viewed as political, the women and men who shape the new orthodoxy control a great deal of power.

AUTHORITARIANISM AND THE SOCIAL ECOLOGIST DYSTOPIA

Politics in the Social Ecologist future dystopia has become the art of manipulation in the Machiavellian sense of power grabbing and power holding. The art of mass manipulation is highly respected among the elite and individual manipulation is ever present when those elites deal amongst themselves. The structures and traditions of democratic participation such as the town meeting and the ballot box still exist but those individuals whose views are deemed reactionary, counterrevolutionary, and otherwise dissident are shouted down, ridiculed or shut up by parliamentary procedures. Politics has become murky and unfathomable to the average citizen, whose main interest is keeping to the politically correct rather than voicing independent opinion. Subtle threats and the example of what happens to dissidents makes the common citizen look for clues as to the right way to vote from the power elites. Political elites comprise the community committees, frame the political issues, choose the wording and candidates on public ballots, and control the dispersal of the resources of the community.

VIOLENCE AND THE SOCIAL ECOLOGIST DYSTOPIA

Most active physical violence in the Social Ecologist dystopian future would be eliminated, however, structural
violence and mental abuse would be the primary methods to enforce conformity. Self-criticism sessions similar to those used in communist cells would be common events. Neighbors and colleagues would gladly volunteer their observations to community authorities as to how well one seems to meet community goals and ideals. Shunning, taunting, public and private embarrassment, and bad work assignments would be the new forms of community violence replacing the overt physical violence of the present. Eternal reeducation classes would be the ultimate punishment for nonconformity.

Violence between Social Ecologist communities is a distinct possibility. The lack of centralized authority, the revolutionary and missionary zeal of some Social Ecologist communes and the natural disparity in resources, talent and wealth between communities could lead to tension, anger and frustration. As in the world system of nation-state disorder today, communities which feel they do not have a fair share of a region's resources may raid other communities or demand payment from those communes less aggressive but better off materially. Like the religious fundamentalism of the present, fanatic communities in the Social Ecologist dystopia which see themselves as ideologically pure will resent the impure influences of surrounding "less correct" communes and sponsor destabilization campaigns against them. Some Social Ecologist communities will stockpile weapons citing self-defense as rationale for their community armories and mandatory military training classes.
An additional problem of violence arises for animal rights activists within the Greens. Bookchin (1982b and 1986a) views aquaculture, the raising of livestock and hunting as new crafts in his future eutopia. Rohter (1992) also includes these elements in his future vision of a Green Hawaii. While animals are an integral part of any ecosystem (and the livestock raising advocated by the Social Ecologist varies greatly from the factory farming of today) the question must be raised, "To what extent is the ultimate exploitation of other forms of being, the removal of life for one's own selfish desires, consistent with the Green value of nonviolence?" This question is still being debated in all three subcultures of the American Green movement and will no doubt be a source of contention for some time to come.
CHAPTER FIVE - NOTES

1. See Lyman Tower Sargent's British and American Utopian Literature 1516-1974 (New York: Garland, 1988). Sargent's work delineates the standard definitions of eutopia as good place, utopia as the genre, and dystopia as a place worse than the present.


3. Dave Foreman has stated his opposition to sanctuary for Central American refugees, for instance. He believes they belong in their own bioregions. See King, "Coming of Age with the Greens," in Z Magazine (1, No. 2 [Fall 1988], 19).

4. A common point of identity for Neo-Primitivism is the belief that the earth is overpopulated and human beings are a disease organism destroying the biospheric body. Foreman calls people "humanpox" for example and considers himself an antibody protecting the earth ("The Green Guerrilla," Entertainment Weekly, March 22, 1991, 64). Foreman has further opposed aid for famine victims in Africa and stated that AIDS is a natural way to reduce overpopulation. See Tokar "Exploring the New Ecologies," (Alternatives, 15, No. 4 [November/December 1988], 33-5).


6. Foreman believes modern wilderness areas should have a no rescue clause leaving people to survive or not on their own no matter what the circumstances. He cites Jimmy Colter who walked naked for 150 miles through Blackfoot territory in 1808 as an example (Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior, New York: Harmony Books, 1991, 66).

7. Unless one includes John Locke's concept of democracy as the freedom to leave and start your own society elsewhere. See Locke, "Second Treatise of Government," [1690] (in Communism, Fascism, and Democracy, Carl Cohen, ed., New York: Random House, 1972, 405-6). If this "right" is pursued by too many it will be viewed as revolt and crushed as in the former communist states of Eastern Europe.

9. An example of such ecological extremism is the "Plant Concerns" sections of the U.S. Green Policy Platform. This section suggests a total ban on the importation of nonindigenous plants be implemented to increase the quality of life for indigenous plants. The "right" of plants to develop to their full potential is also stated. Further statements include the banning of herbicides, pesticides, toxic agricultural chemicals and the elimination of predator control in order to keep the world "natural" ("Green Program USA - Life Forms," Green Letter/Greener Times, Autumn 1989, 22).


11. Rohter's A Green Hāwai'i (Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1992, 345-7) offers arguments that "regenerative" agriculture will work without industrial support and produce high yields. The scenario presented in this dissertation chapter is a worst case dystopia.

12. Such changes in Mystical Deep Ecology's philosophical stances would not be out of line with the views of many current Mystical Deep Ecologist theorists. Timothy Luke argues that the rituals of Deep Ecology can be seen as attempts to exert control over and manipulate the natural environment in "Deep Ecology and Distributive Justice," (paper presented to the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, 1987, 17-18). And despite its biocentric rhetoric, Mystical Deep Ecology accepts a hierarchy of value with human self-interest (or preference) high, if not on the top, of the list. Starhawk's "Feminist Earth-based Spirituality and Ecofeminism" (Healing the Wounds, ed. Plant, Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1989, 179-181) views the AIDS virus, diseases, and parasites that kill acid rain weakened trees as symptoms of a declining and increasing toxic environment. "Healing" the planet, in Starhawk's sense of the word, would mean the reduction or elimination of these lifeforms, thus showing a discriminatory preference in terms of biocentric equality. I have no doubts
that this preference will be expanded in times of extreme stress.

13. Zimmerman’s "Deep Ecology and Ecofeminism" (in *Reweaving the World*, ed. Diamond and Orenstein, San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1990, 143), states "Some ecofeminists even speak as if men were so flawed that only women can solve the environmental crisis." See Spretnak’s *The Spiritual Dimension of Green Politics* (Santa Fe: Bear and Company, 1986, 30-1) and "Toward an Ecofeminist Spirituality" (Plant 1989, 127-9), for classic examples of this reverse chauvinism. The religious-metaphysical emphasis on matrifocal spirituality which permeates every aspect of Mystical Deep Ecologist cosmology presents significant ontological and epistemological problems for the creation of a just society as well. To the Mystical Deep Ecologist, the Goddess is immanent. She is inherent in every form of Being (Jones 1989, 239). Although the Goddess is immanent in all forms of Being, She is not necessarily actualized in all forms. Those forms of Being and patterns of behavior illustrating closeness to the Goddess, femininity and nature are highly prized. The andropocentric culture of the present thus gives way to a matricentric future where feminine is "good" and masculine is "bad."

14. Marina Warner in *Alone of All Her Sex* (New York: Knopf, 1976, 283), argues that there is no logical equivalence in any society between exalted objects of female worship and a high position for women in general.

15. See Eisler’s "The Gaia Tradition and the Partnership Future" (Diamond and Orenstein 1990, 29-30) for the positive view of Minon Crete and Biehl’s *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics* (Boston: South End Press, 1991, 39) for the negative view. It is interesting to note that the word hierarchy itself is etymologically derived from the Greek word for priest/priestess (Biehl 1991, 49).


18. Chicken Little is adapted from a similar creature of the same name in Frederick Pohl and C.M. Kornbluth’s *The Space Merchants* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1953).

19. Given that some instrumental activity towards the nonhuman world is necessary, the ecological question now becomes one of limitation. The Green value criteria of
ecological wisdom would seem to suggest that given humankind’s limited knowledge of the natural world and its processes, manipulation of nature should be limited to as great an an extent as possible. According to the Worldwatch Institute, it was well-intentioned human intervention which created many of the ecological disasters we face today. Irrigation to make land more "useful" is a good example. Salinization of crop land due to irrigation has become a major global problem. In the USA 25-30% of irrigated land now offers lowered yields and salt reduces the yields of an estimated 24% of all land irrigated globally. Eventually much of this land will become salt desert. Water tables are also dropping at dramatic rates as outflow exceeds inflow. The most vivid case is the Aral Sea, once the world’s fourth largest freshwater lake, which has lost 40% of its surface area and 66% of its volume since 1960 due to irrigation outflow. Salinity has tripled and native fish species have disappeared destroying a once thriving fishing industry. Winds pick up 43 million tons of dried salt from the exposed seabed annually and dump it on surrounding farmland, damaging harvests (Sandra Postel’s "Saving Water for Agriculture" in State of World 1990, ed. Brown. New York: W.W. Norton, 1990, 44-46). Yet Social Ecology argues just the opposite, that human beings know enough to actively and purposefully manipulate the environment in a way that is not only beneficial to humans but to the ecosystem as well. The question of limited human knowledge, fallibility and unexpected consequences never occurs to the activist Social Ecologist just as they are ignored by many modern industrialists and scientists.
SUBCULTURES AND GREEN VALUES: CONCLUSIONS

In summarizing my analysis of the subcultures of the American Green movement perhaps the best place to start is with the four Green pillars of ecological harmony, social justice, nonviolence and democracy. As shown in the previous chapters, it is difficult for Green subcultures to actualize all four of the value criteria the Greens put forth as standards. Below are my conclusions about just how close the subcultures actually come to realizing the ideals they posit.

ECOLOGICAL HARMONY

Neo-Primitivism could be considered the most ecologically harmonious of the three subcultures we have examined given their love of wilderness and all things wild. This love of the wild extends to the virtual rejection of domestication and thus limits instrumental manipulation to the point where even agriculture is disparaged. If one adopts a definition of ecological harmony that concentrates upon noninterference with nature, the Neo-Primitivists can be rated very highly.

Social Ecologists dispute noninterference as the definition of ecological harmony. Instead Social Ecology argues that people have always manipulated their environment and always will. Social Ecology advocates an active and purposeful manipulation of the natural world as progress.
towards an ecologically sensitive society. Social Ecologists believe that all the world is "impelled towards development" and that human beings have a duty to help further the potential inherent in nature (Bookchin 1982; Biehl 1990). This duty includes the betterment of the human condition through pest control and the genetic improvement of food stocks, but it also includes increasing the fecundity and diversity of nature. Many Greens fear this line of reasoning will lead to a future somewhat like that of the Social Ecologist dystopia explored in our last chapter and demand strict limitations on human manipulation of the biosphere.¹

Mystical Deep Ecology takes a centrist position in this instance. Mystical Deep Ecology's adoption of "earthly immanence" and biocentric egalitarianism places limitations on human manipulation of nature. Still Mystical Deep Ecologists realize that human beings have certain needs and usually place these needs above those of other species. By further adding the criterion of compassionate intervention, Mystical Deep Ecologists promote human interference with nature in order to "heal" the planet or to shorten suffering.²

The American Green Movement has no set interpretation of ecological harmony set in stone. It is thus impossible to say which is the "Greenest" position. Acceptance of a nonmanipulative interpretation of ecological harmony implies the subculture with the lowest ecological impact would be the
Neo-Primitivist future, followed by the Mystical Deep Ecology future and finally the highly manipulative Social Ecology future.

As a child of the technological age and highly appreciative of the positive wonders modern manipulation of nature has wrought, I find this conclusion disturbing. I agree with the ecological critiques of modern civilization brought forward by the Greens; however, I further accept the Social Ecologist argument that it is not science or technology per se that is the problem but rather the values guiding these processes. I would hope future Green consciousness could spawn an ecologically sensitive science. Such a science would concentrate upon natural processes and awareness of human fallibility, thus leading to a restrained, but not abandoned, recognition of the human need to manipulate the environment. A more subdued and humble Social Ecology or a more technologically empowered Neo-Primitivism would seem to be best for this, although one should not discount the possibility of an "enchanted science" of Mystical Deep Ecology.3

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND DEMOCRACY

The issues of social justice and democracy are so interrelated that I wish to address both in this section. The ambiguity which existed in the analysis of ecological harmony seems to be diminished when approaching the value criteria of social justice and democratic participation.
Social Ecology, being primarily concerned with the political realm, is much more focused upon the underlying societal roots of modern ills than is Neo-Primitivism or Mystical Deep Ecology. Social Ecologists go so far as to argue that social justice and democracy are necessary preconditions for a society that wishes to actualize ecological harmony and/or nonviolence. To further their understanding of these values, Social Ecologists recommend experimentation utilizing various aspects of political designs and social models from the past, including the Greek polis, the anarchist-utopian communes of nineteenth-century America, and New England town meetings.

In adopting these models, Social Ecology places primary emphasis upon the elimination of social hierarchy, domination and the expansion of communicative action and communal responsibility. A further goal for Social Ecology is the elimination of the disparities in wealth and power that exist today and that perpetuate social inequality and prejudice. Ageism, sexism, racism, patriarchy, and other cultural manifestations dividing people are heavily critiqued in Social Ecologist literature. Social Ecology is by far the most obvious supporter of the value criteria of social justice and democracy in the American Green movement.

Within the two Deep Ecologist subcultures of the American Green movement, rankings are more difficult to make. Neo-Primitivism stresses individual freedom and self-reliance as two of its fundamental precepts and thus offers possibilities for anarchist and libertarian communities
valuing the democratic process. These tendencies coupled with the Neo-Primitivist regard for biocentric egalitarianism should yield a basis for social justice. Since the posited Neo-Primitive tribes of the future will be largely nomadic (in a paleolithic sense) and eschew the domestication of animals, a large amount of goods would be hard to transport. One can thus expect a fairly egalitarian society as far as material wealth is concerned. It should be noted that this does not suggest the elimination of status. Assuming that concepts such as basic human rights and the concept of the irreducible minimum (where each member of society is assured the basic necessities of life) were adopted, this future would be ranked rather high concerning the criteria of social justice.

The main problem with Neo-Primitivism, in regards to these values, is that basic concepts such as human rights are not well articulated in the literature. The Neo-Primitivist emphasis on freedom, wildness and integration into wilderness often overshadow and seem to conflict with the social justice and democratic orientations of the larger Green movement. The more subtle aspects of social justice and democracy are often left out completely or must be extrapolated from misanthropic statements concerning the evils of humanity as a whole. In essence, more social Green goals seem to be forgotten while more the ecological goals command an inordinate amount of attention. Without the social analysis and articulation of social which Social Ecology stresses,
Neo-Primitivism opens itself to the prejudices of racists, sexists and misanthropes. Coupled with the code of the warrior, Neo-Primitivism could lead to a nightmare society of ecofascism where self-righteous and self-appointed protectors of the earth have decided to conquer or eliminate those they see as defilers.

This problem of diametrically opposed eutopian and dystopian future possibilities also exists for Mystical Deep Ecology. Although compassion and social harmony are often stated as goals by Mystical Deep Ecologists, there is an undercurrent in the literature which speaks of "right knowledge" and "right being." The emphasis on mysticism and intuitive knowledge in this subculture removes knowledge and truth from the communicative realm and places it in the private realm. An elite inner circle of truth interpreters and knowledge validators must then arise to control and legitimate acceptable common practice and belief. Critical thinking is sacrificed and with this sacrifice comes legitimation of the powers and ways that be, regardless of their relationship to social justice and democratic action.

The Mystical Deep Ecologist's emphasis on a culture stressing goddess-worship and the idealization of the feminine leads one to wonder if present patriarchal society, with all the inherent injustices, will merely be turned upside down with women as the oppressors and men as the oppressed. Since the Deep Ecologist subcultures do not emphasize social or political analysis, the critical observer
is forced to extrapolate the worst as well as the most favorable possibilities. If Mystical Deep Ecologists wish to avoid comparison with fascist, authoritarian and totalitarian societies of the past, they should stress the social rights which all members of their societies, and all of humanity, are granted. Social Ecology presents its stand on these values in no uncertain terms. If such presentations of social and political rights appear contrary to Mystical Deep Ecology, then this issue too must be addressed. The possibilities for socially just and democratic future societies exist for both Mystical Deep Ecology and Neo-Primitivism. Without the further theoretical development of their preferred political/social realms, however, these subcultures must be viewed as falling short concerning the Green value criteria of social justice and democratic participation.

NONVIOLENCE

The final value criterion of the Green movement, nonviolence, is perhaps one which all of the three subcultures stress but still fail to maximize. The Neo-Primitivist subculture that stresses wildness, a trait often associated with violent behavior in the modern mind, may offer one of the best examples of limiting violence. Neo-Primitivism emphasizes ritualization, purification, ecological harmony, and the "setting right" of universal "balance" before and after any violent act is undertaken.
Mystical Deep Ecology does the same. The example of pulling out a piece of one's own hair when gathering cedar boughs symbolizes acknowledgement of the pain and sacrifice which the cedar tree is making and illustrates a respect for otherness.

Mystical Deep Ecology goes even further than does Neo-Primitivism in the quest for a nonviolent culture. Mystical Deep Ecologist visions of the future contain no mention of soldiers or of weapons and depict a harmonious, agricultural society oriented around the values of peace, love and harmony. Violent behavioral traits often associated with males, including aggression, anger, jealousy and intolerance are kept strictly in check in the Mystical Deep Ecologist eutopia, while values and behavioral traits associated with the feminine (cooperation, conciliation, sharing and acceptance) are encouraged and rewarded.

Social Ecology also stresses nonviolence. It offers numerous examples of limiting the structural violence of the social realm linked to poverty, racism, sexism, and hierarchy. Yet in all of these futures, unnecessary violence still exists. The Social Ecologist in his/her future, farms living animals for meat as a "craft." The Neo-Primitivist in his/her future hunts living animals for meat and raw materials. The Mystical Deep Ecology eutopia is the only future which does not celebrate this violence against animals as right, good and just.
Minorities in both the Social Ecologist and Mystical Deep Ecologist subcultures have critiqued violence against animals, including the use of animals as food. These theorists often see a connection between human violence against other humans and the exploitation of the natural world. The exploitation of women and the exploitation of animals have been directly linked by several theorists in both subcultures. They believe the violence inherent in the act of killing another animal establishes a consciousness of violence and exploitation, which in turn is transferred to the social realm. For these theorists, stopping societal violence or violence of human against human is not enough (Abbott 1990). These theorists argue that one must limit violence wherever it occurs.

All three subcultures of the American Green movement attempt to limit violence in various ways. If one accepts the arguments of the ecofeminist/animal liberationist movement, however, each subculture falls short of the Green ideal by not actively renouncing the violence inherent in the slaughter and utilitarian use of animals.

CAN THE AMERICAN GREENS CREATE SERIOUS POLITICAL CHANGE?

The question of whether the American Green movement can create major political change lies at the core of its future prospects. Some of the earliest and most ardent supporters of the Greens have begun to express doubts (Satin 1990b; Resenbrink 1992). Satin concludes that as currently
manifested, the American Green movement is more interested in internal power struggles and arguments over dogma than with serious political change. Resenbrink comes to a similar conclusion but is more hopeful than Satin about the possibilities of Green politics in the future.

Such charges certainly are not new to the Green movement. Nor are they unfounded. Satin's accusations spring from the 1989 Green conference called to ratify a national Green platform, which it did. The conference alienated many, including Resenbrink and Satin, with divisive infighting, inflammatory rhetoric and general disrespect for others opinions (Satin 1990b). When reading Satin's description of the 1989 national Green conference, one is reminded of the similar platform battles and the type of divisiveness seen at the 1968 Democratic national convention, the 1992 Republican national convention and the 1985 and 1989 West German Green Party national conventions. At these conventions, serious differences led to equally serious losses. In the case of Die Grunen, the refusal of the 1985 convention to include a ban on animal experimentation led to the resignation of Rudolf Bahro, a key theorist and founding member (Bahro 1986). The 1989 convention led to the split of the German Greens into East and West alliances, with the resultant loss of the West Germans' seats in the Bundestag (Wiesenthal 1993, 190; Poguntke 1993, 50; Rudig and Franklin 1992, 55).

Despite these setbacks, I believe Satin is premature in his judgement of the Greens. In every instance mentioned
above, the crisis was overcome. In the case of the German Greens, a solid core of Green voters provides the stability the party needs for long-term success (Rudig and Franklin 1993, 53-55). Local elections in 1993 and 1994 have actually given the Greens gains over their previous highs. Wiesenthal (1993) cites the "overstrain" of the Greens in 1985 and 1990 as due to the structural demands inherent in representing diverse constituencies on cutting edge issues, which other parties will not even discuss. At times the priorities set by these diverse constituencies are bound to clash. Jobs versus ecological well-being is one obvious example.

The structural strain seen in the case of Germany’s Die Grünen is also visible in the American Green movement. The Deep Ecology/Social Ecology split represents the commitment of the Greens to both the ecology of the natural world and to the poorest and most oppressed members of society. Another structural fault line lies between the (primarily) Neo-Primitivist eco-anarchists who want limited government and the Social Ecologists who recognize that a large amount of government intervention may be necessary to solve many current ills. These strains are so great that one must expect cracks in the movement. The ability of the Greens to continue as a movement despite these setbacks offers testimony that not all Green supporters are willing to abandon the movement when their highest expectations are not immediately met. Wiessenthal’s research (1993, 191-204) offers a glimmer of hope for a more Green future in this
regard by concluding that if not for "the commitment and sacrifice of countless local activists," who maintain their faith in the Green alternative despite the factionalism, the constant multiplicity of conflictual issues would have destroyed the Greens completely by now.

In light of these problems, Resenbrink (1992, 216-220) argues that the Greens should organize as a collective "house" with a common room for their common values and separate rooms for various action orientations. These "activity rooms" would include space for direct action (demonstrations, civil disobedience), creation and perpetuation of Green alternative institutions (intentional communities, street theater groups, economic enterprises), Green media activities, and specific issue organizations (as long as they are rooted in ecological theory).

What Resenbrink seeks in his proposal is a centralization of sorts which I feel is impossible for the Greens to achieve. I also doubt the desirability of such a plan. Given the current level of divisiveness between the Green subcultures, I cannot imagine any coalition of these subcultures adequately providing the framework needed to hold itself together as a cohesive unit in the near future. These integrative attempts to put the Green movement under one roof may even be counterproductive at this point in time. The Greens have lost key members due to divisiveness at each of the several major meetings they have held.
Idealistic members of the movement become frustrated and the already frustrated members leave the movement altogether.

I have doubts concerning the wisdom of seeking to establish a permanent alliance between American Green subcultures at all. As shown earlier in this dissertation, the basic precepts of subculture worldviews, praxis orientations and visions of positive futures contain significant differences. What has happened in the centralization process of more established Green movements is that certain tendencies were eventually moderated or purged completely. Perhaps the best example of this is the purge of the more extreme Marxists and ecological fundamentalists from the West German Die Grunen over its first ten years of life (Bahro 1986; Wiesenthal 1993, 212-213). As Green parties elsewhere have won electoral success and attempted to maintain their new positions of responsibility, they have adopted increasingly centrist positions. Those on the Green periphery, be it the cutting edge or the left-over activists from previous noncenter movements, end up withdrawing their support (or being forced out), and issue positions are narrowed even further. This can be seen in supporters’ abandonment of the New Values Party after its early success in New Zealand (Rainbow 1992). Green supporters in Tasmania noted similar complaints after Green Party coalition governance there in 1989 (Hay 1992). The Hawaii Green Party’s rejection of strong positions on the issues of animal rights and marijuana legalization illustrate these centrist
tendencies at work in the American Greens. I view the homogenizing of these originally diverse and divisive Green organizations as dangerous to the movement as a whole. Certainly harmful extremist positions running counter to basic Green ideals should be identified and corrected. How this goal can be accomplished in a decentralized way that avoids the dangers of the above examples is a serious question that deserves further research. Adoption of centralized organizational structures and centrist issue positions may bring power, but such tactics can create dogma, corruption and a narrowing of ideals to the point where original intent is lost. The history of the Catholic Church and the Soviet Union serve as apt examples.

To this author the success or failure of a highly centralized Green organization or network seems worth little concern. When one views "Greenness" as a state of consciousness, one celebrates its appearance in all its myriad forms. The ancient Hawaiians saw the mother goddess Haumea as having "four thousand forms and four thousand more forms, and yet thousands and thousands of forms" (Dudley, 1990, 75). I view Green consciousness in a similar way. An overlaying form in the recognition of the four dominant values can be distinguished. Definite subculture tendencies derivative of this overall form can also be distinguished as has been shown in this dissertation. To assume that some overall linkage and coordination of these diverse derivatives under one umbrella organization is possible seems to ask for
too much. Human beings are complicated. Greens operate at many different levels of consciousness and hold beliefs that conflict not only with other Greens but also often within themselves. The three Green subcultures identified here illustrate this argument. The subcultures are stereotypes and extremes: few people fall strictly into one subculture typology. Most exhibit a blending of subculture alliances. The strength of a certain subculture affiliation is often situational: it varies according to issue, circumstance and immediate environment (although most Greens should be able to indicate which subculture they most often identify with).

What matters then is not so much the operational successes of specific Green strategies, but rather that Green consciousness be expanded. Operational success is important, but the long-term fundamental consciousness change which Green actions promote may be the larger indication of ultimate Green movement success.

Thus I expect "chaos" in the Greens. It seems a natural and healthy phenomenon and not something to be overcome for the sake of political immediacy. If the Green consciousness being developed now is to form the basis of a cosmology for the future (as I believe it has the potential, but not the inevitable possibility to do), it must manifest itself as did Haumea, in thousands and thousands of forms. It is unfortunate that some people within the Movement think of themselves as having the monopoly on "Green truth." Such
nonsense has little place in Green thought. Valid critique and difference, yes, dogmatism no.

This does not mean I cannot foresee a future where members of the various subcultures work together for common goals. They do this now, in certain situations. What it does mean is that it seems highly improbable that a single centralized Green organization comprised of the subculture triad posited in this dissertation will ever seriously threaten the status quo.

This being said, a caveat must be added. The impact of political change activity by coalitions within and between Green subcultures should not be underestimated. I believe the Greens and their diverse subcultures can have a serious impact on the future of the American political scene. The probable futures that I see for the three subcultures of the American Green movement are explored immediately below.

THE FUTURE OF NEO-PRIMITIVISM

The future of Neo-Primitivism will be heavily influenced by two primary factors. The first factor concerns the continuing trends of environmental degradation and destruction of wilderness in America. It is unlikely we will see any drastic change in these trends, at least in the near future, due to their traditional linkage with the expansion of the economic realm. All powerful political players in America today see economic expansion as a worthwhile public policy and accept some environmental degradation as an
unfortunate but inevitable result. As the negative environmental impacts associated with maintaining our level of technological comfort continues to spread to populations in relatively unspoiled areas, it is likely that a certain percentage of the people in those areas will be drawn to the philosophy of Neo-Primitivism. No doubt a number of these people will be drawn to Neo-Primitivist tactics as well. Thus a future of increased active ecological resistance is virtually assured.

The second major factor shaping the future of Neo-Primitivism will be the official reaction to Neo-Primitivist activities. Presently official reaction to active ecological resistance seems to have two goals: (1) punishing the perpetrator of the activity and (2) limiting the expansion of such activity. The methods utilized to achieve these two goals include extensive private and government surveillance and infiltration of suspected Neo-Primitivist cells, an increase in penalties for ecodefensive activity, an increase in covert and overt negative public relations and media coverage, and a variety of counter-intelligence operations similar to the FBI’s COINTELPRO reaction to the anti-war and civil rights activism of the 1960s and 1970s.6

One consequence of the increase in legal penalties, SLAPP (strategic lawsuits against public participation) suits, and harassment of Neo-Primitivist active ecological resisters is the recognition that overt active ecological resistance can
carry serious penalties.\footnote{7} This recognition may result in reducing the amount of overt active ecological resistance. Another possibility is that overt active ecological resistance will be driven underground into covert operations. To the ecodefender the covert strategy has a prime advantage in that very few covert active ecological resisters have ever been arrested and even fewer have been successfully prosecuted.\footnote{8} Ecological activists feeling the urgent need to undertake ecodefensive action may decide the small risk of getting caught while undertaking covert active ecological resistance is a more attractive option than the almost certain penalties associated with overt active ecological resistance.

Government and corporate attempts to limit Neo-Primitivist praxis may thus have the unintended side effect of increasing that activity which they find most undesirable. While overt ecological resisters are languishing in jail, struggling to raise funds for legal fees and fines, and fighting the consequences of harassment, covert ecodefenders are planning and undertaking their next actions. Surely this fact has not gone unnoticed by aware adherents of Neo-Primitivism. It thus appears likely that an increase in covert active ecological resistance is imminent in the future in spite of and perhaps because of increased official suppression of overt ecodefensive activity.\footnote{9}
A likely consequence of increased covert active ecological resistance in the future should be the increased formation of small Neo-Primitivist groups of ideologically similar individuals bound together in common trust with common purpose. These groups could eventually become the tribes discussed in the future scenarios of Chapters Four and Five. Earth First!, the largest and most known Neo-Primitivist network, offers a prime example of this familial, anarchistic orientation in development. The Earth First! network itself is organized into cells consisting of small groups of trusted acquaintances. The published ecodefense guidebooks encourage this structure and recommend that ecodefenders become known as ecodefenders only to those to whom they would entrust their lives (Foreman 1991, 163). A bond close to that of kinship, perhaps closer than that of modern kinship in America, is thus established and nurtured through the undertaking of illegal (but in Neo-Primitivist eyes sacred) activity against common enemies. It is likely that in a future of increasing suppression of Neo-Primitivist activity, these kinship bonds and group identities will become even stronger. Many members of Earth First! already view themselves as separate from ordinary Americans. They consider themselves members of a tribe in opposition not only to American culture but also to civilization in general.

The question raised at this point is how far such eco-warriors are willing to go to achieve their goals. Humans are not presently being targeted by Neo-Primitivists.
Some will argue that tree spiking represents such targeting. However serious efforts are made to warn loggers of spiked areas and eliminate possible injury arising from these Neo-Primitivist activities. Earth First! has publicly disavowed violent action towards humans and discourages the use of explosives, firearms and arson.

In the case of the sinking of the Icelandic whaling fleet, the Sea Shepherds deliberately left afloat one whaling ship due to a sleeping guard on duty. Still it must be taken into account that monkeywrenching is a direct outgrowth of guerrilla war theory (Foreman, 1991, 162). Doug Bandow (1990) of the conservative Heritage Foundation calls ecodefensive actions ecoterrorism and believes that some day these activities will escalate to the murder of "innocent workers and park employees." Since Neo-Primitivists view themselves as warriors and "antibodies against the cancerous disease of humankind," and since they spout slogans such as "No compromise in defense of Mother Earth," "Factories don't burn down by themselves...they need help from you," and "Go clear-cut in Hell," one must wonder at what point ecological destruction will turn the Neo-Primitivist from anticivilizational and misanthropic rhetoric to reality. Rik Scarce (1990, 266) cites a veteran eco-warrior who states that "someday shooting timber workers would replace monkeywrenching as the most drastic means for saving old-growth trees." Sheriff Jim Weed of Okanogan County in Washington State has publicly associated Earth First! with a
near fatal lumber mill injury, a gun battle at a lumber camp, and a fatal helicopter crash (Live Wild Or Die! 1988, 24-25). None of these charges resulted in prosecution and all of the charges are denied by Earth First! Still, charges of this nature represent the very real possibilities inherent in an ideology that purports to side with the bears in a war against humanity. One wonders at what point the combination of misanthropy, apocalyptic rhetoric and biocentric egalitarianism will lead to the rationale that the lesser of two evils involves killing a few timber company executives or road surveyors in order to save a living ecosystem comprised of countless species vital to sustaining the biosphere. Increased wilderness destruction and the suppression of overt active ecological resistance by governmental and private interests may unfortunately lead us to an answer in the near future.

THE FUTURE AND MYSTICAL DEEP ECOLOGY

The religious-metaphysical impulse has existed as long as human society itself and has been a part of every human culture. The American Green movement subculture of Mystical Deep Ecology thus taps a very ancient part of the human psyche. Even in the face of constant repression and attempted extermination, mysticism has managed to survive. In America, despite cycles of boom and bust, religious-metaphysical impulses have always had a major influence. Even in our seemingly secularized culture, over
ninety percent of Americans profess a belief in God. Their interpretations of this God and how to properly relate to him/her/it, however, are fragmented into over 1,500 different religious doctrines (Woodward 1993).

While still a minor force on the American religious scene, the 20,000+ adherents of ecological spiritualism have played a major role in the philosophy of the American Greens.\(^{10}\) Time and time again, otherwise secular ecologists come to the conclusion that some sort of spiritualistic awakening related to ecological values is needed to reverse modern trends of utilitarianism and instrumentalism (Ferkiss 1993; Resenbrink 1992). Chris Jones (1989) argues that such an awakening will fundamentally challenge the basic structures of governance and economics by introducing the "new values" of respect for all life, reverence for wilderness, and respect for diversity.

Many Greens see a dark side to Mystical Deep Ecology’s emphasis on spirituality. Arne Naess (1988), who first coined the term Deep Ecology, is quick to point out that a Deeply Ecological worldview needs no spiritual orientation. Naess further offers three reasons for Deep Ecologists to avoid the mystical tradition:

(1) mystical traditions stress dissolution of the individual in a nondiversified supreme whole,

(2) the modern scientific community has strongly associated mysticism with vagueness and confusion, and
(3) the consciousness which mystics seek is rarely sustained under normal, everyday conditions.

Most Social Ecologists readily concur with Naess. Janet Biehl (1991) and John Dryzek (1990) harshly critique the holism of Mystical Deep Ecology, with Dryzek calling it, "the essence of totalitarianism."


The Mystical derivative of ecofeminism is a special target for Social Ecologist Janet Biehl. Biehl (1988 and 1991) sees no linkage between goddess worship and social justice, and argues that religious communities are often ruled by exploitative priestly hierarchies which prey upon the superstitious fears of their followers. Biehl sees further problems in the emphasis Mystical Ecofeminists place upon myth. The primary problem for Biehl is that the politics of myth is based upon appeal to intuition and emotion, a private realm of experience, rather than upon communicative and objective reality. Biehl critiques the Mystical Deep Ecologist stance that whatever is privately
intuited, felt, or dreamed is as real as any other measure of reality. Biehl maintains that mythology based upon emotive storytelling is not open to rational discussion, but is open to manipulation by unscrupulous leaders.

Rational discussion and validation of certain nonorthodox intuitions is actively discouraged by Mystical Ecofeminist leaders. Starhawk (1988, 104) is typical of this aspect of Mystical Ecofeminist praxis when she instructs her initiates to actively suppress the critical mind, saying "All you voices...telling us we're bad or wrong or stupid or crazy--leave right now...increase the power of this banishing, accompany the word with shouts, yells, foot-stomping." The world of rational self-doubt is thus driven away and the new mystically-based ecofeminist worldview can be accepted uncritically. The danger in such suppression of critical thinking lies in the possibility that self-doubt may exist for a valid reason.

The problem of leadership in the intuitive group is also one which should be addressed. Leaders who discourage individual critical thinking in favor of intuitive group understanding have often misused their power. Biehl has warned of such possibilities within Mystical Ecofeminism and maintains that Mystical Ecofeminist group leaders constitute "an elite with considerable power to manipulate the merely intuiting congregants" (Biehl 1991, p. 86). Mystical Ecofeminist leaders are aware of the power they hold but they dismiss the negative implications of Biehl. Starhawk (1989)
believes the intuitive group needs leaders because leaders are the brains of the group and the "benders and shapers of reality."

Margot Adler (1989) argues that the neopaganistic methods used by Mystical Ecofeminism are nonauthoritarian and likens Mystical Ecofeminist ceremonies to, "just a gathering of friends." Adler (1989, 154) further maintains that the power which group leaders hold over initiates is temporary and "when the drum stops and the dancing and chanting ceases, you can come back to a very grounded and rational self." While I would like to agree with Adler, the recent history of semimystical political movements does not seem to warrant disregard of Biehl's warning.

Despite these critiques, I believe the Mystical Deep Ecology subculture of the American Green movement will grow and thrive. This does not mean I foresee a Mystical Deep Ecology takeover of the Greens or any other segment of society, but rather I find I must agree with Mathew Gilbert who sees spirituality as recognition of a fundamental truth, that the center of all things is spirit and not materiality (Gilbert 1988). Even such adamant critics as Murray Bookchin (1982 and 1989) recognize the limitations and domination of modern rationality and the need to experience basic perceptions and truths which science denies and modern society ignores. Mystical Deep Ecology fills this void and thus plays an important role in the ecology movement which is unlikely to disappear.
Whether Mystical Deep Ecology will grow even stronger is subject to speculation. Mystical Deep Ecology is what futurists call "a wild card." It is an unpredictable element which has the potential to radically change the future, and also the potential not to. It is conceivable that, given the makeup and orientation of Mystical Deep Ecology and the current alienation of many with the modern world, a charismatic figure could arise and start a major religious (and political) movement. There seem to be many minor figures in the Mystical Deep Ecology movement who are seeking such a role. None has had what it takes to expand the movement into the mainstream culture yet, but it cannot be ruled out that such a charismatic figure will not arise in the future. A more likely alternative is that Mystical Deep Ecology will continue to survive on the fringe of society as an essentially apolitical and privativistic spiritual preference while occasionally empowering its adherents to political change activity similar to that undertaken by Neo-Primitivists and Social Ecologists.

THE FUTURE AND SOCIAL ECOLOGY

I see Social Ecology as having the greatest potential for political impact of all the three subcultures in the American Green movement. This potential exists, however, only in a Social Ecology that is broadly defined and which carefully adapts its rhetoric to meet the hopes and dreams of the average American citizen. I believe this is not so difficult
a task. America has a long tradition of support for egalitarian and libertarian ideals. These traditions include the abolitionist, feminist, peace, populist and progressive movements of the nineteenth-century. In the twentieth-century we have seen several of these movements rise again, along with strong ecological and countermaterialist sentiments.

Despite rhetoric to the contrary, polls show the American public is concerned about the environment. Seventy-eight percent of Americans consider themselves environmentalists (Hueber 1991). This is a larger percentage of the population than the combined total of those Americans identifying themselves as Republicans and Democrats. The history of ecological awareness and conservation in America is also long and strong. Despite the wanton waste of what were seen by some as overabundant natural resources, other early Americans advocated reserving areas of forest for posterity. Official government preservation of an ecosystem for nonutilitarian purposes was achieved first in the United States, in 1864 (Maser 1982, p.26). The first national park in the world was established in America in 1872 (Runte 1987, 33) and by 1891, Congress had created three major forest reserves (Allin 1982, 34-36). In this century the U.S. has continued its leadership in wilderness preservation. An executive order from Teddy Roosevelt established the first wildlife refuge in America in 1902. In more recent years Congress has passed the Wilderness Act of 1964, the Endangered Species Acts of
1966, 1969 and 1973, and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 established eight new wilderness areas totaling almost two million acres and doubling the total designated wilderness in the National Park system. The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 did more for wilderness preservation than any previous law in history. More than 32 million acres were designated for wilderness preservation under the National Park System and just under 55 million acres were set aside in the National Wildlife Refuge System. In addition the total wilderness acreage in the National Forest System was increased by 30% and the total acreage protected under the National Wild and Scenic River System was tripled (Allin 1982).

The long history of American peace movements, worker’s movements, communitarian movements, and movements for social justice and democracy discussed earlier in this dissertation are also the ancestors of Social Ecology. Yet, Social Ecologists have not stressed these American traditions in their writings and I feel this is a major weakness. The possibilities inherent in utilizing the above histories coupled with the "grand American tradition" of seeking the good life through community service, reflection, simplicity and self-improvement could be used by Social Ecology to counter the currently dominant vision of success as the frantic rush for material and status accumulation. Radical Social Ecology makes a mistake by using the anticapitalist
rhetoric of Marx, rather than the agrarian communitarianism of Jefferson, the transcendentalism of Thoreau and the nonviolent egalitarianism of Martin Luther King. By not adopting the language of American heroes and instead favoring the rhetoric of the intellectual Left, radical Social Ecology not only fails to win over new converts from mainstream America but also manages to alienate its more reform-minded allies. The struggle over how to critique capitalism, (or whether to at all) is ever-present at major Green gatherings and has been a divisive force within the movement (Green Tidings, June 24, 1989). If radical Social Ecology is to grow and prosper beyond the confines of Vermont, New York and other strongholds, I believe it will have to adapt its message to one more acceptable to those it wishes to reach.

This critique does not mean that Social Ecologists should forsake their visions of radical political, economic and social change. Indeed, these visions are the source of Social Ecology's strength. Examples such as Bookchin's Institute for Social Ecology, the Todd's New Alchemy Institute, and projects like Detroit Summer serve as inspiration and as important transition points in channeling the Social Ecologist vision into praxis. Ira Rohter's A Green Hawai'i: Sourcebook for Development Alternatives (1992) lists literally hundreds of ongoing community projects which fit into the Social Ecologist scenario. Rohter has taken these international examples and adapted them to his specific community; using local history, culture and language to
provide a blueprint (Greenprint?) for positive change. This is the kind of work which the American Greens need more of.

The question of how to achieve the Social Ecologist vision is one which further divides the subculture. Radical Social Ecologists, primarily followers of Bookchin, believe work in local communities to be the primary route to Greening America. A newer subgroup of Social Ecology has become prominent recently by challenging this approach and advocating electoral politics through a nationwide and several statewide Green third parties. Green party activists argue that their approach can strengthen ties between the Greens and other movements, help the Greens gain legitimacy and publicity, and permit official Green input into future public policy questions (Tokar 1991). Radical Social Ecologists view the third party approach as premature, wasteful of scarce Green energy and resources, and as a betrayal of Bookchin’s libertarian municipalization.

The fundamental question surrounding the Green parties debate concerns the extent of change available to those finding themselves inside political institutions. Radical Social Ecologists fear that successful Green candidates may find themselves in positions where holding on to power becomes more important than creating Green change. They worry about the examples of Germany, Tasmania and New Zealand, where Green parties have compromised and have cast out vital political issues as "too extreme" (Bahro 1986; Hay 1992; Rainbow 1992; Wiesenthal 1993).
On the other hand, the success of Green parties in Europe and the Pacific has had a major influence on the traditionally dominant parties (Wiesenthal 1993, 202-212; Rainbow 1992). In Germany the two major parties, the Christian Democratic Union and the Social Democratic Party, have adopted several Green positions, including stances reflecting greater ecological awareness and the systematic incorporation of women into positions of leadership within their parties (Poguntke 1993). The power of the Greens is felt so strongly that in February 1994 the party convention of the ruling conservative Christian Democratic Union brought forth a major battle over modifying the 45 year old description of its policies from "social market economics" to "ecological and social market economics." The change to a more public ecological stance was eventually approved by a 359 to 277 majority. With such changes towards Green stances occurring, the analysis of Green Party involvement becomes one of mutual co-optation. The Greens are made more moderate by the electoral system, while the traditional parties are "radicalized" by addressing issues and adopting positions they would normally avoid.

One problem with third parties in the American political system is that even successful ones have not had very long lives. In the 1880s and 1890s the Populist movement had organized 40,000 local "alliances," elected dozens of members to Congress and hundreds of state legislators (Goodwyn 1976). Populism's critique of the corporate state represented
millions of workers, small farmers and impoverished Americans who joined the movement. By 1896, Populists had the support of 25 to 45% of the electorate in at least 20 states and came in second only to the Republicans in many states in the West and Midwest. Yet, as we know in American politics, second place is no place. Populist politicians sought to broaden their appeal and become "fusion" candidates in order to become and then stay elected. In the end this fusion destroyed populist uniqueness and the radical political potential of the movement (Goodwyn 1976, 430-431; Degler 1977).

Populist calls for radical structural change in the economic and political systems gave way to Progressive reformism. The dreams of a Jeffersonian democracy and an agrarian society were supplanted by advocates of industrialism and the Gilded Age. In the era of the Populists, major changes were occurring in American society and culture. Many of these changes were outside of the control of any political party of the times. In the 1880s one out of every five midwesterners was living in a city of 4,000 people or fewer, by the 1890s the figure had changed to one out of three (Degler 1977). Although trusts were "busted," by 1904 three hundred industrial corporations had the power to directly influence over four-fifths of all the nation’s manufacturing. Economic power translated into political power and the effective negation of radical reform. By 1929 only two hundred corporations held 48% of all
corporate assets and 58 percent of net capital assets (Trachtenberg 1982, 4). After the consolidation of wealth which took place in America during the Reagan-Bush presidencies, the picture does not look all that different today (Phillips 1990).

The Populist movement and later the Progressive movement, as powerful as they were, could not stop these trends, but these movements did help to curb their excesses. A minimum wage for women, prohibition of child labor, workmen’s compensation, and social insurance were advocated in the Progressive Platform of 1912, as were calls for referendum, recall, initiative, and campaign finance disclosure (Link 1954, 16). It should be noted that while such demands were made and eventually accepted, it is likely the mass demonstrations, strikes, and nonelectoral tactics of the larger social change movements also involved may have had a greater effect upon public policy than did the organization of political parties (Rubenstein 1970).

Many former Populists, not happy with Progressive reformism, took a more radical road and helped form the Socialist Party of America in 1901. By the 1912 elections the Socialist presidential candidate, Eugene V. Debs, polled 897,000 votes, about 6% of the total cast. But by 1936 the Socialist Party in America, like its predecessors, had virtually disappeared. In part the blame for the failure of the Socialists lies in internal factionalism, the failure to adequately organize as a party, and in active ignorance of
local issues. In part the Socialists failed because of government repression, on one hand, and the reformism of Roosevelt's New Deal, on the other hand (Shannon 1955).

Other third parties which have attempted political change in America have had even shorter lives. The Libertarian Party, the Peace and Freedom Party, the Citizens Party, and the dozens of other little organizations which have sprung up to challenge the American political arena might better be called "fourth parties" for the slight influence they have had. More serious third party challenges such as Teddy Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party and the more recent attempts of George Wallace, John Anderson and H. Ross Perot have been onetime-wonders, which at best have played the part of spoiler rather than long-term political change agent (Ogden 1992).

There are valuable lessons for the Greens to learn from the serious study of these movements and parties. The most successful movements in American history have started at the local level, with a largely dissatisfied and unrepresented public, and later organized upward (Cooney and Michalowski 1987; Rubenstein 1970; Flexner 1972). Many observers of the modern political scene believe a similar dissatisfied and underrepresented constituency exists today (Tokar 1991; Slaton 1992). If the Greens continue their focus on the local level, it is entirely possible they could combine both strategies advocated by Social Ecologists. Green parties have the potential to gain significant political influence in
many communities throughout the U.S. Building on this constituency could then help bring about the community confederations advocated by radical Social Ecology.

If such a scenario is to occur, the Green tendency towards divisive infighting will have to be controlled. I believe such infighting is now taken to extremes which serve little positive purpose. Natural allies must recognize and appreciate their differences. Some Social Ecologists will always be drawn to third party organizing just as others will be drawn to community activism. The success of both factions will benefit from the success of the other.

Without the backing of the larger Green movement, and other related special interest movements, it seems highly unlikely American Green parties will be able to play an important role in electoral politics. Green politicians must remain true to the basic values and goals of the Green movement in order to: (1) gain the support of natural Green allies in the feminist, peace, social justice and ecological movements, and in the general population at large, and (2) shift political discourse in America in a Green direction.

Green electoral campaigns can bring significant amounts of attention to Green goals and values and can mobilize resources which otherwise might not be made available. Despite the limitations, Green electoral campaigns thus deserve the support of all Green subcultures and related single interest movements.
CONCLUSIONS

The three subcultures of the American Green movement have very specific roles to play in the propagation of a new view of the world. Each of these roles appeals to certain types of people who are not likely to gravitate towards other subcultures in the Green movement. Rather than considering this as problematic, I see it as a blessing for the larger movement. In diversity there is creativity, and the possibility to adapt to the changing situations which the Greens will face in the future. The Green dogmatists who believe they have a monopoly on "Green truth" ignore this reality. Constructive criticism and warnings as to the dangers inherent in certain tendencies and philosophies in the Green movement are needed, and certainly should be heeded by proponents who wish to make their subcultures even stronger. The main challenge facing Green movement proponents today, however, should be the challenge of inclusion rather than exclusion.

This does not mean that the Greens need a centralized organization; in fact this seems impossible given the differences in worldview, praxis orientations and eutopian visions exhibited by the three subcultures explored in this study. What it does mean is that the Greens should recognize that despite their differences, each Green subculture has much in common with other Greens. If the Green assessment of the present state of the world is correct, then much needs to be done by as many diverse factions in as many diverse ways
as possible. The sooner the American Green movement realizes this, reduces infighting, and begins to concentrate upon encouraging all supporters of ecological harmony, social justice, nonviolence and democracy to make the changes they personally deem necessary (in whatever manner they deem necessary), the more likelihood the Greens have of becoming a serious and significant force for political and cultural change in America's future.
CHAPTER SIX - NOTES

1. Eckersley argues in "Divining Evolution" (Environmental Ethics, 11, No. 2 [Summer 1989], 109-166), that humankind's participation in the natural realm has been too active and perhaps humans need more humility and less activism in regards to manipulation of the natural world. She further contends that even if Social Ecology is "right" in its assessment of the telos of nature, "This discovery does not tell us why we ought to further it."


3. An enchanted science would be based upon the ritualized manipulation of nature, in tune with certain recognized ecological precepts, and shrouded with the cover of working with nature's intent (rather than making nature work against her will).

4. Feminists for Animal Rights (Berkeley, CA), is devoted to making the connection between violence against women and animals clear. Their newsletter is full of articles and book reviews making this argument.

5. Christa Slaton and John Resenbrink are both examples of Green leaders who have quit in frustration. See "You Don't Have to be a Baby to Cry" (New Options, September 24, 1990), by Mark Satin for an overview of the Boulder, Colorado Green conference leading to their resignations.


8. To a large degree this failure is due to the consciousness of the covert ecodefender. Covert Neo-Primitivists are out to accomplish only one goal: the protection of a certain specified piece of wilderness. They know their actions are illegal and take every precaution to avoid detection.

9. An accurate account of the extent of covert active ecological resistance is hard to come by due to the desire of
government and industry to discourage publicity surrounding this area. Using available figures, one can begin to glimpse the extent of ecodefensive activity taking place in the United States today. Jim McCauley of the Association of Oregon Loggers estimates the average cost of an ecodefensive incident in Oregon to be $60,000 (Foreman 1991; also see Manes' Green Rage [Boston: Little, Brown and Co.], 1990). It is estimated that over 300 covert ecodefensive actions take place every year in National Forests alone. Given an estimated membership in Earth First! (the most visible proponent of ecodefense) of 10,000 in 1989, and a core of sympathizers estimated at over 100,000 in the mainstream environmental movement, it is likely that over one thousand acts of ecodefense take place each year causing up to $60 million in damage (Manes 1990, 76; Mike Roselle, "Mike Roselle, Co-Founder of Earth First! on Direct Action," Ecology Center Newsletter, Berkeley, CA, July 1989, 3).

10. Barry Kosmin and Seymour Lachman’s One Nation Under God (New York: Harmony Books, 1993), estimates there are 8,000 followers of wicca and 20,000 New Agers in America. Many of these are Mystical Deep Ecologists. Including movements like Sun Bear’s Bear Tribe, Ananda Marga, the "new communities" movement and nonaffiliated neopagans, the 20,000+ estimate seems realistic.

### APPENDIX

#### TABLE ONE

**THE FOUR HORSEMAN OF THE GREEN APOCALYPSE:**

VIOLENCE, ECOLOGICAL DESTRUCTION, INJUSTICE, AND ALIENATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Environmental Destruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spretnak² - We live in a society of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill will</td>
<td>environmental crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>disregard for limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horror</td>
<td>alienation from Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebellion</td>
<td>disastrous results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manipulation</td>
<td>clocklike worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazis</td>
<td>ecologic crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>squelched talk</td>
<td>ecological subjugation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanistic control</td>
<td>dying lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national chauvinism</td>
<td>dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unyielding rage</td>
<td>topsoil loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injustice</td>
<td>polluted aquifers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchy</td>
<td>species extinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destruction</td>
<td>species suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance/submission</td>
<td>ecocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppression of empathy</td>
<td>nuclear holocaust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Foreman³ - We live in a society of:  |                                                |
| perilous times                        | war against the Earth                         |
| World War III                        | high extinction rate                          |
| crisis                               | war on large mammals                          |
| wholesale devastation                | desertification                               |
| blitzkrieg                           | rapacious overfishing                         |
| poaching                             | habitat destruction                           |
| battle for life                      | climate upset                                 |
| terror                               | poisoning the oceans                          |
| conquest                             | ozone depletion                                |
| manipulation                         | greenhouse effect                             |
| life destruction                     | end of evolution                               |
| tree spiking                         | wilderness destruction                         |
| ecotage                              | loss of biodiversity                          |
| destruction                          | clear-cutting                                 |
| sabotage                             | erosion                                       |
| eco-terrorism                        | strip mining                                  |
| Nazis                                | overgrazing                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Environmental Destruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bookchin 4- We live in a society of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domination</td>
<td>famine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperialism</td>
<td>excess population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racism</td>
<td>overcrowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revolution</td>
<td>planetary cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjjugation</td>
<td>rain forest destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social dislocations</td>
<td>pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oppression</td>
<td>ozone depletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>war</td>
<td>CO2 build up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate exploitation</td>
<td>acid rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antihuman tendencies</td>
<td>disastrous alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics of lesser evils</td>
<td>agricultural poisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chauvinism</td>
<td>water pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power politics</td>
<td>cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grow or die attitudes</td>
<td>ecological ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police states</td>
<td>plunder of the planet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totalitarianism</td>
<td>clear-cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic weapons</td>
<td>nuclear waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveillance</td>
<td>simplified ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfeeling parochialism</td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authoritarianism</td>
<td>human parasites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaos</td>
<td>extinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanton destruction</td>
<td>natural catastrophe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misanthropy</td>
<td>massive urbanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadistic individuals</td>
<td>new illnesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Injustice</th>
<th>Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spretnak- We live in a world of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill will</td>
<td>emptiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distortion</td>
<td>anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manipulation</td>
<td>no inner life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazis</td>
<td>spiritual poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gargantuan corp.</td>
<td>alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monoculture</td>
<td>mechanistic thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriarchy</td>
<td>truncated reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyper-masculinization</td>
<td>nature alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love of dominance</td>
<td>suppression of empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love of hierarchy</td>
<td>haunting insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structural violence</td>
<td>mechanistic cogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misogyny</td>
<td>indistinguishable blobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Injustice</td>
<td>Alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman- We live in a society of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobotimization</td>
<td>robotization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frozen passions</td>
<td>dulled expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jail</td>
<td>domestication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gilded chains</td>
<td>jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow alternatives</td>
<td>gilded chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gray bureaucracy</td>
<td>jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greed</td>
<td>narrow alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elites</td>
<td>gray bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperialism</td>
<td>greed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totalitarianism</td>
<td>elites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI harassment</td>
<td>imperialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maldistribution</td>
<td>totalitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust economic systems</td>
<td>maldistribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manipulation</td>
<td>unjust economic systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Bookchin- We live in a society of:                   |                                 |
| oppression                                           | self-subjugation                |
| racism                                               | mindlessness                    |
| hierarchy                                            | shaping by Hollywood            |
| social dislocation                                   | racism                         |
| powerful corporate elites                             | social dislocation             |
| concentration of ownership                            | powerful corporate elites       |
| authoritarianism                                      | concentration of ownership     |
| machismo                                             | authoritarianism                |
| reactionaries                                        | machismo                       |
| bitterly divided societies                            | reactionaries                  |
| world banks                                          | bitterly divided societies     |
| disempowerment                                       | world banks                    |
| social domination                                     | disempowerment                 |
| technocratic bureaucracy                             | social domination              |
| totalitarianism                                       | technocratic bureaucracy       |
| unfeeling parochialism                                | totalitarianism                 |
| cold bureaucratic agencies                            | unfeeling parochialism          |
|                                                      | cold bureaucratic agencies      |

**NOTES**

1. This table lists factors in the critique of modern society as expressed by leading theorists in the three subcultures of the American Green Movement.
TABLE TWO

AMERICAN GREEN MOVEMENT
NATIONAL PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Green Stance Concerning Community.

The Green Critique
The old, poor and marginal are categorized as losers.
The present anthropocentric point of view is too narrow.

The Green Vision
Community as extended family.
Interconnection and co-existence stressed.
Diversity valued and celebrated.
Social responsibility for all.
Human beings seen as inherently good, loving, worthy and cooperative.
Geocentric and biocentric values stressed.
Bioregional awareness emphasized.
Support for the arts.

Green Strategy
Develop face-to-face relationships.
Create a global community of communities.
Stress democratic self-determination.
Include nonhumans as community members.
Develop an attitude of stewardship.
Increase ritualization.

The Green Stance on Land Use.

The Green Critique
Materialism and consumerism puts pressure upon our limited land and resources.
Population growth (including migration) puts pressure upon limited land and resources.

The Green Vision
Sharing the land with other life forms.
Community collectively deciding how to use the land.
Sustainable development stressed.
Recognition of an inherent right of Nature to exist.
Decentralization.

Green Strategy
Deemphasis on automobiles.
Think globally, act locally.
Stress regional coordination.
Encourage democratic decision-making.
Reduce/reuse/recycle.
Social ownership of land.
The Green Stance on Peace and Nonviolence.

The Green Critique
Poverty is linked to militarism.
The "First world" supports most violence.
The nation-state derives from patriarchy and militarism.
Corporate, governmental and academic elites perpetuate violence.
Lack of access to food, land, meaningful work, justice and education are forms of violence.

The Green Vision
Decision-making should be at lowest possible level.
Civilian-based defense should be adopted.
Mediation instead of conflict.
Nonviolent means are always preferable to violent ones.
Means and ends are inseparable.

Green Strategy
Challenge structural violence of all kinds; individual, family, bioregion, nation, biosphere.
Establishment of counter-institutions.
Support conscientious objection.
Ecology should inform public policy not militarism.

The Green Stance on Social Justice.

The Green Critique
Everything is to be sold.
Progress equals destruction.
The dominant culture is life denying.
The dominant culture separates us through racism, sexism, heterosexism, class oppression.
The most intense environmental degradation destroys the life and communities of people of color.
Women continue to be viewed as different, special or inferior in important social, economic and political ways.
Consumerism is directed largely at women.
Men also suffer from the way our society is structured.

The Green Vision
Greens wish a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic movement to create a life affirming society.
Elimination of sexual harassment.
Equitable empowerment of all citizens.
Greens seek to cultivate personal, social and environmental relations that will help women welcome the gift of life.
Green Strategy
Adoption of a feminist perspective.
Alternative means of paying for child care must be created.
End all advertising which objectifies women.
Recognition of uneven burden of poverty on women and children.
Greens call for an end to the dominator/patriarchal culture to a partnership/feminist culture.
Greens affirm the innate humanity, dignity, and worth of lesbian, gay and bisexual people and affirm their full civil rights.
Greens see death and dying as a natural process not to be despised.
Priority should be given to the provision of basic needs, AIDS, third world liberation and immigration policy, apartheid.
Native American wisdom incorporated into the dominant culture.
Diversity, cooperation and gentleness must be stressed.
Greens oppose institutional, interpersonal and cultural racism.
Paid maternity/paternity leave of 1 year or more.

NOTES
TABLE THREE

THE GREEN WORLDVIEW AND THE DOMINANT WORLDVIEW:
THREE LEVELS OF DIFFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptual Level</th>
<th>Dominant Worldview</th>
<th>Green Worldview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Communitarianism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionist</td>
<td>Integration and holism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer motivation</td>
<td>Inner motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonquestioning of technology</td>
<td>Discriminating use of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical nature</td>
<td>Participatory nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on experts</td>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropocentric</td>
<td>Biocentric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth as resource</td>
<td>Intrinsic value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplistic uniformity</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>Timelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanistic perception</td>
<td>Systems perception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear thinking</td>
<td>Nonlinear thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td>Living, mindful earth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivism</td>
<td>Value based science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterministic future</td>
<td>Many possible futures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Level</th>
<th>Dominant Worldview</th>
<th>Green Worldview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packaged knowledge</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized violence</td>
<td>Nonviolence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production for profit</td>
<td>Production for use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income differentials</td>
<td>Low income gap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free market economy</td>
<td>Production for need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand stimulation</td>
<td>Voluntary simplicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital intensive</td>
<td>Labour intensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economies of scale</td>
<td>Human scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical structures</td>
<td>Nonhierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on experts</td>
<td>Personal participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative democracy</td>
<td>Direct democracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation-state sovereignty</td>
<td>Internationalism and</td>
<td>Localism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear power</td>
<td>Renewable energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High energy consumption</td>
<td>Low energy consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High technology</td>
<td>Low technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Experimentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated products</td>
<td>Interrelated processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsustainability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Self-organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasteful consumption</td>
<td>Value Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of wealth</td>
<td>Green Worldview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largeness</td>
<td>Value free science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td>Self-assertion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Worldview</th>
<th>Green Worldview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value free science</td>
<td>Value based science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assertion</td>
<td>Social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropocentrism</td>
<td>Biocentrism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchal values</td>
<td>Feminist values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Sustainability/quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td>Libertarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalism</td>
<td>Ecstasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumerism</td>
<td>Enoughness/recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term absolutism</td>
<td>Long-term trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/bad dualism</td>
<td>Neutralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**
### TABLE FOUR

**COUNTRIES WITH GREEN PARTIES OR ORGANIZED GREEN MOVEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Azerbaijan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

TABLE FIVE

THE MINORITY TRADITION
VERSUS THE DOMINANT WORLDVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Minority Tradition</th>
<th>The Dominant Worldview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonhierarchical</td>
<td>Authority-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale community</td>
<td>Bureaucratized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local autonomy</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-responsibility</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Radical subjectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership by example</td>
<td>Leadership by violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual aid</td>
<td>Deluxe nihilism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communalism</td>
<td>Consumerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity of wants</td>
<td>Frequent encouragement to produce more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>Government regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual-religious mentors</td>
<td>Secular authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community fully participates in rituals</td>
<td>Churches monopolize rituals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of variety</td>
<td>Monopoly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of approaches to being</td>
<td>of ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More open communication with nature</td>
<td>Nature perceived as &quot;data,&quot; natural resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader definition of community, including animals, plants</td>
<td>Narrow definition of citizenship, all other inhabitants are slaves or disenfranchised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition of organic wholeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES
### TABLE SIX

**GREEN SUBCULTURE EUTOPIAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neo-Primitivism</th>
<th>Mystical Deep Ecology</th>
<th>Social Ecology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biocentric egalitarianism.</td>
<td>Biocentric egalitarianism.</td>
<td>Benevolent service to further evolution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Justice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Nonmaterialist survivalism</td>
<td>Nonmaterialist communitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Sectarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. Roles</td>
<td>Gender-neutral</td>
<td>Gender-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Skill oriented</td>
<td>Allocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form of Democracy</td>
<td>Charismatic egalitarianism</td>
<td>Partnership society with feminist egalitarianism bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Positions</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Priestess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Protector</td>
<td>Shawoman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonviolence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Active deconstruction and personal violence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is ritually limited.</td>
<td>Aggression is actively repressed and punished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control is stressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control is stressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE SEVEN

**Dystopian Potential Within Green Subcultures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neo-Primitivism</th>
<th>Mystical Deep Ecology</th>
<th>Social Ecology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecological Disharmony</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhunting</td>
<td>Overgrazing</td>
<td>Encourages overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overfishing</td>
<td>Trapping and hunting animal &quot;pests.&quot;</td>
<td>environmental manipulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overforaging</td>
<td>Soil depletion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Injustice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite of warriors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governmental System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictatorial rule by the strong and charismatic.</td>
<td>Dictatorial rule by hierarchy of priestesses.</td>
<td>Bureaucratic rule by &quot;politically correct&quot; Machiavellians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong matrifocal bias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior society.</td>
<td>Religious and cultural - structural violence against individuality.</td>
<td>Structural violence against individuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees violence as natural and inevitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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