BILL DEVALL'S DEEP ECOLOGY: SIMPLE IN MEANS, RICH IN ENDS

By

Travis Arthur Byrne

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Art

In Sociology

May 2011

BILL DEVALL'S DEEP ECOLOGY: SIMPLE IN MEANS, RICH IN ENDS

by

Travis Arthur Byrne

Approved by the Master's Thesis Committee:

Dr. Sing Chew, Committee Chair	Date
Dr. Sheila Steinberg, Committee Member	Date
Dr. Anthony Silvaggio, Committee Member	Date
Dr. Sheila Steinberg, Graduate Coordinator	Date
Dr. Jená Burges, Vice Provost	Date

ABSTRACT

BILL DEVALL'S DEEP ECOLOGY: SIMPLE IN MEANS, RICH IN ENDS

Travis Arthur Byrne

This thesis is an intellectual exploration into Bill Devall's writing on Deep Ecology. The thesis will examine Devall's earlier work, especially his doctoral dissertation on the Sierra Club, and continue to follow his intellectual development in the promotion of Deep Ecology. Drawing from the works of philosopher Arne Naess and others, Devall articulates that we must find the right form of practicing that helps us to explore and cultivate our *ecological Self* that, in turn, provides a living form of "practical activity" and ecosophy. Practicing Deep Ecology lifestyle "is a process of rediscovering what is essential, and what is meaningful in our lives." Simple elegant means - can reveal rich experiences. The thesis will explore the intellectual journey of Devall through his thinking in Deep Ecology and his development of his ecological consciousness. It will also document the effect and impact that Devall's writings has on Environmental Action Groups and Environmentalism in the late 20th century. The thesis will conclude with Devall's final thoughts on the future direction of the Environmental Movement, national and local; and will highlight a *sense of place* (*bioregionalism)* as the "frontline" for the future practice of the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Sing Chew, for his help and advise throughout my paper. Additionally, I would like to acknowledge the rest of my committee, Dr. Sheila Steinberg and Dr. Anthony Silvaggio, for their counsel on my work. Without the help of my committee, this paper would not have come together as it did.

I dedicate this thesis to my beautiful wife and our future that we are building together. Ashly has always supported and believed in me, no matter what. She is my love - and my light. I also dedicate this paper to my daughter Makayla Jean. This paper is for her future, and her future siblings.

Lastly, I would like to thank my parents, Linda and Wil, for their words of wisdom and unconditional love that they have always had for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Deep Ecology is a field that Bill Devall has greatly contributed. This thesis will cover an intellectual examination of Devall's writing on Deep Ecology. It will examine Devall's earlier work, particularly his doctoral dissertation surrounding the Sierra Club, and will continue to follow his intellectual advancement in the promotion of Deep Ecology. Devall, drawing much from Arne Naess and others, articulated that we must find the right form of practicing that helps us to explore and cultivate our *ecological Self*. By seeking out and finding our ecological Self, in turn, provide a living form of "practical activity" and ecosophy. Practicing Deep Ecology lifestyles and life practices, "is a process of rediscovering what is essential, and what is meaningful in our lives" (Devall, 1988: p 2). Purely put, simple elegant means – can reveal rich experiences.

This thesis examines the intellectual journey of Devall through his thoughts in Deep Ecology and his development of his personal ecological consciousness. Devall's growth through his own spiritual practices has helped him discover his own "maturity," or as Arne Naess would say, "full maturity." Through the Deep Long-Range Ecological Movement, Devall finds the realm that takes him into a consciousness that allows ecotopian ideals and ecosophy to emerge. Drawing much from environmentalist Aldo Leopold and his ideas of "thinking like a mountain" or his perspective on the *land ethic*, Devall felt a need for a change in thinking towards the environment, one that

encompassed human-kind as an integral part of its own environment. Witnessing land destruction and ecological devastation around the world and in his bioregion (Klamath-Siskiyou Region of the Northwest), Devall was dedicated to teaching and explaining the lifestyle and practice of Deep Ecology.

In addition, the thesis will also document the effect and impact that Devall's writings has had on Environmental Action Groups (EAG) and Environmentalism in the late 20th century. Devall contributed greatly to the literature surrounding Deep Ecology and its proponents. This thesis will also discuss the inverse impact that EAG and Environmentalism in the late 20th century had on Devall. It will briefly examine the tactics of EAG, such as: Direct Action, Monkeywrenching, and Ecotage. Philosophy and tactics such as these can be seen as political acts used in a campaign to achieve some goal. They also can be seen as means for practicing Deep Ecology if they are based on authentic self-defense and are generally nonviolent. In this sense – the means are part of the end.

Besides the above, this thesis will also discuss the critiques of the ideas and philosophy of Bill Devall, his colleagues, and the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement. There are many opponents and critics from all over the world that feel that Deep Ecology, and 'green politics' may be the reconstruction of meaning in an age of destructiveness. There is a realm of criticism from a feminist perspective too, indicating that Deep Ecologist do not examine gender in the discussion of Deep Ecology.

In concluding, the thesis will illustrate Devall's final thoughts on the future of the Environmental Movement and the direction it is heading. This will include both impacts on the national and local ecological movements. Some scholars proclaim that the

Environmental Movement is dead, as I will explain further, but Devall feels that the movement is still very much alive "in the protection of the places wherein we dwell." Here I will highlight the notion of a *sense of place*, or *bioregionalism*, as the "frontline" for the future practice of the Deep Long-Rang Ecology Movement. This is the work that Devall was working on with his colleagues in his latter stages of life. Acting on bioregionalism, humans will find what is meaningful in their lives, and take the necessary actions and lifestyle changes to keep their bioregion intact. Political activism, is one way of demonstrating solidarity with our bioregion, "affirming the integrity of the principle of preserving native biological diversity, wilderness, forests, and marine ecosystems" and solidarity with each other in the movement (Devall, 1993: p 231). Through activism, people may set limits on corporations and governments and at the same time affirm the integrity of places close to our hearts.

CHAPTER TWO

Early Work

"Everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in and pray in, where nature may heal and give strength to body and soul alike."
- John Muir (1912)

This chapter explores Devall's earlier work, starting in 1970, concerning his doctoral dissertation covering the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club is an environmental organization that is a part of the Conservation-Preservation Movement. The chapter will look critically at Devall's analysis of the organization focusing on the theoretical perspectives he used to understand how organizations govern themselves in a democratic way. His research design will be examined and I will conclude the chapter by showing how the Sierra Club evolved over time to develop into a more rational institutionalized organization. Devall's work here helped him formulate more clearly the Deep Ecological concept of "shallow" and "deep" agendas that represent environmentalism.

In the spring of 1970, Bill Devall wrote a 400-page doctoral dissertation on the political structure of the Sierra Club. Finding extreme violence and disagreement in the world, Devall was interested in the fact of "how men may settle their disputes in an organization in an orderly manner without violence and without the destruction of the organization" itself (Devall, 1970: p vi). Devall set out to understand more fully how organizations govern themselves in a democratic way. His research aimed to focus on the Sierra Club because it was nationally recognized as "a formal voluntary organization

devoted to the preservation of nature in the United States" and because it is an important aspect of the environmental movement (Devall, 1970: p xix).

Devall additionally was attracted to understanding how the policy and strategy is formulated in one of the most influential organizations of the environmental movement. Being a member of the Sierra Club himself, Devall was concerned that the Club's organization was developing into a more "bureaucratic system and becoming larger in membership and scope of activities" (Devall, 1970: p 11).

Brief History of the Sierra Club:

The Sierra Club is one the oldest environmental conservation organizations in the U.S., with the purpose - as illustrated in the founding mission statement - to "explore, enjoy and render accessible the mountain regions of the Pacific Coast; to publish authentic information concerning them; to enlist the support and cooperation of the people and government in preserving the forests and other natural features of the Sierra Nevada Mountains" (bylaws, 1892, Article III). The founding fathers of the club instituted the organization because they wanted to preserve not only California's beautiful mountain range, but especially because they wanted to save Yosemite from encroachment and expansion from urban population and development.

The Sierra Club can be viewed as developing from the Progressive Movement of the late 19th Century, when the notion that the "environment and nature could be used for enjoyment and not just for exploitive purposes" was beginning to gain acceptance in the U.S. (Devall, 1970: 94). However, developing from the Progressive Movement and its utilitarian concepts of conservation from a standpoint of "renewable resources" that may

be managed by humans for their enjoyment, the founders of the Sierra Club and figures like John Muir, were talking in "non-utilitarian, esthetic terms." Over the years, the club had grown from a small S.F. organization in 1892 with 182 charter members, to one that encompassed the whole nation, with a member population of 81,000 members in end of 1969, and currently over 1.3 million affiliated members and supporters today in 2010.

Structure of the Sierra Club:

In Devall's writings, he examines the structure of the Sierra Club from two separate perspectives: Oligarchical and Democratic. To determine Devall's hypotheses for his research surrounding oligarchy, he draws from Michels (1949), who proposes that oligarchy is "inevitable" in formal voluntary organizations even if they include democratic provisions in their charters or other basic documents because (a) "large organizations tend to be bureaucratic, and (b) because leaders of formal voluntary organizations want to maintain their position of power and will subvert and manipulate the democratic system in order that they and the successors they pick can control the organization" (Devall, 1970: 1-2). In addition to Michels (1949), Devall also takes from Lipset's (1962) notion of oligarchy claiming that oligarchical tendencies in large organizations are not inevitable "if incumbent administrations in formal voluntary organizations do not have a monopoly on the resources of power and if loyal opposition candidates within the organization have a chance to win power through open, competitive elections" (Lipset, 1962. Devall, 1970: 11). Oligarchy then is the rule of the many, or masses, by the few (Michels, 1949). In terms of Devall's research, oligarchy applied to the Sierra Club would be that the leaders of the organization make the policy and

administer the organization without consulting grassroots members as to their wishes or preferences (Devall, 1970).

To formulate a hypothesis in relation to situations that promote and maintain democracy in formal voluntary organizations, Devall examined different definitions and criteria for democracy. What Devall established and concluded was that the most central standard that democracy is held on is the "ability of grassroots members of a formal voluntary organization to attempt to influence substantive decisions in the organization - not just to participate in the selection of leaders through elections" (Devall, 1970: 8).

Devall defined democracy as "widespread participation by members of a formal voluntary organization in the decision making process of the organization; one type of decision making is the selection of leaders, and other types of decision making revolve around policy formulation on substantive issues facing the organization" (Devall, 1970: 6). Also included in this definition is the ability of the members of the organization to be able to be knowledgeable about politics, and interested in the governance of the organization (Devall, 1970: 6).

For Devall to articulate his hypotheses, he first had to make this initial basic statement in his dissertation:

> "formal voluntary organization which are undergoing rapid expansion in membership, scope of activities and becoming bureaucratized, can avoid the inevitable trend toward oligarchy if the incumbent administration does not hold a monopoly of power" (Devall, 1970: 11).

From this statement, he generated 18 different hypotheses; but the variables in his hypotheses could not be fully "controlled" through the multi-variable analysis. Devall had to rely on techniques such as discerning and multi-level analysis.

Analysis:

Throughout his analysis, Devall was also particularly attracted to what Lipset (1962) illustrates as "crucial turning points," in the history of the Sierra Club; and it was felt that this particular turning point could have come during a 1969 election that might lead to the "institutionalization of a two-party system in the Club" (Devall, 1970: 16).

Devall's study of the Sierra Club is consistent with the tradition of case studies in using "diverse data sources such as: interviews, mailed questionnaires, minutes of Board of Director meetings, records in archives, memoirs of Club members, published histories of the Club, and a variety of field notes from participant-observation" (Devall, 1970: 26). Devall's methodology and data collection techniques of his research consisted of four phases. In the first phase, Devall was involved with informing himself as comprehensively as possible about the Sierra Club. He did this by reading meticulously many of the issues of the Sierra Club *Bulletin*, the "official house organ" of the club that has been published since the founding of the club in San Francisco, 1892, as well as the Sierra Club *Circular*, an inner club journal.

While reading the Sierra Club *Bulletin*, and *Circulars*, Devall (1970) concluded that it was never apparent in the writings that there was institutionalization within the Club. He found that "arguments may have occurred behind closed doors, but unless they were in the informal communications networks, the grassroots members would only hear hints of controversy in the official announcements of policy appearing in club journals.

Additionally, Devall thoroughly read Holway Jones' (1965) account of *John Muir and the Sierra Club*, and the Sierra Club's handbooks, which were published over time and sent to all of the members of the club. As a member, he attended meetings of the

National Board of Directors of the organization throughout the fieldwork performed for this research.

Devall's second phase of his methodology consisted of qualitative semi-structured interviews with the current and former leaders of the Club. With this data, Devall was able to extract information on the history and informal traditions of the organization. Also, through these interviews with these members, Devall was able to obtain helpful advice on how to acquire information on the Club because in many informal voluntary organizations, activities and procedures are never written down. One structural change that Devall was able to discover from this research was an amendment to the bylaws in 1923, which "allowed the Board of Directors to amend the bylaws without consulting the membership through a referendum" (Devall, 1970: 109 - 110). By doing this, the club's Directors had limited the member' ability to directly have their contribution heard in the decision making process of the Club. This referendum policy supported and reinforced the oligarchical tendencies in the Club. Another reinforcement of oligarchical tendencies came from when the majority of the Board of Directors rejected the view that Board members should be restricted to a limited number of terms in office, in the 1923 revisions of the bylaws. The Club Director's, through their actions in 1923, paralleled the actions of a business corporation by beginning to run the voluntary organization like an efficient company by exemplifying that the members would have very little to say over the majority of the decisions in the club. A quote from the Sierra Club *Circular* in 1923, that Devall found, says, "A few members objected to the provisions giving the Board of Directors power to amend the bylaws. Practically every business corporation has this power, and the Directors presumably are especially familiar with the administrative needs

of the Club" (Devall, 1970: 110). With the fast growing generation of new members - from the foundation of the club to when Devall conducted his research in the latter part of the 60's – the Club obtained a million dollar budget for publications and conservation, which led the Club to clearly become a "big business."

Another extraction of history and informal tradition that Devall was able to obtain was the "inner circle" of the Club that consisted of: national committee chairmen, long-time members of the Board of Directors, some ex-Board members and Chapter leaders from the largest chapters of the Club. The "inner circle" group tended to support new members into the circle that acquired the highest leadership strata. Devall found that the Nominating Committee tended to nominate members to the Board who were willing to serve and who were already informally members of the "inner circle" – members who exemplified "loyal service," – not individuals who held "divergence of views."

In the third phase of the methodology, Devall constituted an intensive study of the 1969 campaign for the National Board of Directors and the structure of the club during this time. Devall stated that, even though as a participant-observer in this election, he found it "difficult to obtain accurate and complete record of all events which were occurring" during that point (Devall, 1970: p 31). Throughout this time the election was taking place, there was a major reorganization of the Club and its plans for the future of the Club. The Club sought out to establish more efficient means of policy procedures and decision-making tactics. The Club had designed and prepared a "Table of Organization" which its primary agenda was to update "existing members of the "proper channels of communication and the hierarchy and authority in the Club" (Devall, 1970: p 135). Devall made mention that the principle of hierarchy in the table presented by the

Club, was being violated in many places by dual responsibility and by the horizontal consultation procedures in the decision making structure.

During the era before the election, there was an increasing number of "paid staff" that were added to the national office that consisted of clerks, middle management and office administrators. There was a direct correlation between the growth and size of the Club with the formation and development of paid employees. With the creation of "paid staff" members, Devall found through his interviews that the members of the Club repeatedly referred to the *tradition of volunteerism* during the 1969 election. Through this phase of methodology, Devall (1970: 161) established that the tradition and ideology of volunteerism had "led some members, on one hand, to mistrust the paid employees and on the other hand, to know that they must rely on these paid employees to perform the day-to-day housekeeping functions of an organization" that has developed so large in scope that no unpaid assistants could operate it on a part-time basis. Noted in his research, Devall says that time and time again he heard the remarks during the '69 election, "We don't want the Sierra Club to be like the Wilderness Society!" where the constituents of that organization have little or no say in developing or creating policies, and also have no contact with one another.

With the development of factional disputes in the Sierra Club leading up to the 1969 election for the National Board of Directors, Devall found that the election represented consequences for the style and form of government of the club. In terms of democratic values inside the structure of the club voters did not know the positions that nominees took on issues facing the club and if there wasn't a partisan campaign by the candidates, or if all the candidates are similar on their views, there was no viable

democratic election. Devall states that issues surrounding the conditions and rules of campaigning and electioneering continued to be a center of controversy in the club.

The formation of "slates" of candidates - a group of nominees that are running for multi-seat positions that share a common platform - for the '69 election came after the Board of Directors accepted guidelines for electioneering in May 1968. There were two slates of candidates that were established: (a) "active, Brower-type conservationists" or "ABC" and (b) "Concerned Members for Conservation" or "CMC."

The CMC platform emphasized four points: (1) give greater emphasis to local chapters, (2) fire Dave Brower, the Executive Director, on "grossly irresponsible acts, (3) re-establish "financial stability" within the Club, and (4) adopt a clear policy directed towards the publications program, where the editorial power would lie with the Board of Directors. From an opposing platform, the ABC slate announced that their emphasis in the campaign was that "the Club should not compromise its principles of preservation, that the Club was a national Club which should be establishing international emphasis including publications on wild areas around the world, and that the Club should be concerned with the *total environment*" (Devall, 1970: 219). The ABC platform particularly wanted to "untangle" the mess and to limit the power of the Board of Director, and to "separate the duties of the Board, committees, Club Officers, professional staff and volunteers." Devall (1970) points out that the issues that the CMC was standing for was for "democratic control of the Sierra Club," while the ABC platform was advocating "active conservation."

Neither of these groups could have formed without the" provision for nominations by petition" that was one of the important factors in the legal bylaws of the club that had

opened the elections and made them more "competitive" (Devall, 1970: 213). With the debate surfacing within the Club, and interest taken by the mass media relating to the idea of electioneering, and its written guidelines indicated - that this was a novel situation in the Club not welcomed by everyone. Due to the increased attention on the Club from the mass media during this time, Devall noted that members of the Club were bombarded with a large number of memorandum, television debates on local San Francisco television, campaign literature and "news" stories in the newspapers about the inner disagreement inside the club. This undoubtedly, increased the member's awareness of the "inner circle" and their conflict of politics.

From Devall's description of the 1969 election, it can be seen that this idea of electioneering and the formation of "slates" of nominees was a recent innovation within the Club's government structure. It was noted in the research, that many members of the Sierra Club felt that open campaigning was not appropriate for the organization of the club.

The last phase of Devall's methodology of data collection involved a sample survey of the club's membership. Devall mailed a questionnaire that was sent to a systematical sample of the adult members of the club. He had a return rate of 71% from his surveys that he administered through the mail. Knowing that successful, educated, upper middle-class professionals founded the Sierra Club in 1892, Devall felt it was necessary to obtain and document the socio-economic characteristics of the members of the Club, and he was able to do this through the surveys. One of Devall's hypothesis at the beginning of his dissertation indicated: if members of an organization were homogeneous in social characteristics, they would tend to form political cleavages along

"ideological" lines rather then on the basis of social class, ethnic group or other socio-economic characteristics. Through his data collected in the sample survey in 1969, Devall found that the Club member's social composition continued to represent the same characteristics as the founding members. His survey illustrated that the member's were in fact homogenous on education, occupation, and income characteristics – and it "definitely shows the membership of the Sierra Club to be overwhelmingly upper middle-class and affluent" (Devall, 1970: 184). Devall's findings are matching with other studies on activities within the conservation-preservation movement as pointed out by Harry, Gale, and Hendee (1969). Devall's analysis of the figures and data collected from this sample survey is the main foundation of the discussion section of his dissertation.

In his data analysis, Devall did not perform any quantitative tests of significance because he felt that "mathematical models and elaborate statistical proofs were not appropriate and relevant" to his dissertation (Devall, 1970: 36). He was mainly attracted to the relationship between the variables of his hypotheses. Devall noted that his aim in his analysis was to explain why some "formal voluntary organizations become stable oligarchies and others tend toward stable democratic governments," and to focus on an explanation of the "conditions of change from one form of government to another within the same organization" (Devall, 1970: 38).

In Devall's findings, he concluded that the Sierra Club could be called a consultative oligarchy, and the "top leaders of the Club will listen to a variety of views from members of the organization and will not attempt to run the Club in an autocratic or arbitrary fashion" (Devall, 1970: 309). The results of the 1969 Board of Directors election was that the CMC slate had overwhelming defeated the ABC slate which limited

the chances for a two-party system at the national level. The election on the other hand, was an extraordinary example of the *possibility* of democracy in the Club. The size of the organization, the number of issues, and the complexity of the organization structure were key variables to helping Devall answer his dissertation hypotheses. Devall noted that the "rate of growth of the organization was important for the government structure in terms of the patterns of socialization into the political system which were available to new or recent members" (Devall, 1970: 129).

For a new member, because of the absence of political parties, it was difficult for that member to be able to educate him or herself on how the Club works in structure. Without having personal contact with Club leaders on a national or local level, and without anything but the voter's handbook which was sent with a ballot at the time of election, the new member may have little information on which to base their personal decision or the procedures on how to initiate policy within the Club. Devall further argued that on account of the Sierra Club being understood as an oligarchy, "a two-party system in the Sierra Club would help members clarify their views on differences in ideology" in the conservation-preservation movement (Devall, 1970: 343). With the absence of political parties, the new members do not recognize a reference group to identify with to be able to have their own self-interest acknowledged in the political system. He also added that the use of referendum procedure in the Club would also increase political debate within the Club. The Club's organization had become more bureaucratic in structure and institutionalized by the increase in the routinization of procedures in many of the national offices of the Club. The more bureaucratic an organization is in its structure and make-up, the more likely the decisions that are to be

considered will be "technical" or "administrative," and less likely to be political in nature – that is decisions on which there is debate and discussion which are resolved by either vote of the membership as a whole or some policy-making body.

After the defeat of Dave Brower and the ABC platform, Devall stated that it seemed likely that there would not be opposition slates in the future elections within the Club. Although "loyal opposition" defines the probability of democracy, Devall found that the Sierra Club, although he would expect it to, had not developed this attribute. With the elaborate, controversial election of Board of Directors in 1969, there is the sense that the election had contributed to democracy in the Club by educating and allowing members to become much more aware of the internal politics of the Club and exposing the "inner circle" to the members.

Devall's Dissertation Contribution:

Devall's case study has contributed to our body of knowledge in several ways. First, Devall's research findings were parallel to other sociologists, in his field of work, because his research supported many other case studies within formal voluntary organizations, even though Devall's approach to sociology represented somewhat different direction from the current mainstream view of positivistic sociological research - such as choosing a problem in society that could be directly studied with a certain research technique and analyzed with quantitative data.

Secondly, Devall's doctoral dissertation research work contributed greatly to the Conservation-Preservation Movement and to a better understanding of the Sierra Club's stance in the Environmental movement. His effort was the first social history of a policy

formation and political system of one of the most important voluntary organizations in the Conservation-Preservation Movement.

Thirdly, Devall's conclusions had reaffirmed Lipset's argument that sustained and legitimate political divisions in a voluntary organization cannot be maintained without autonomous power centers, including possibly political parties in the organization. Devall had suggested that this statement factor is necessary for the development of competitive elections and perhaps a two-party system.

Lastly, Devall states that his research may provide practical guidelines for leaders who might want to increase the chances of oligarchic control in the organization. To add to this, his data could help leaders of an organization implement and increase the possibility of democracy within their organization. Devall says that, "We as sociologists, can make statements about variables which operate to increase the oligarchic tendencies of voluntary organizations, but there are no logical ways to determine which definition of oligarchy and democracy is best nor which state is preferable in a given organization" (Devall, 1970: p 344).

CHAPTER THREE

Developing Deep Ecology - Creating "Practical Activity"

"To study the Way is to study the self.
To study the self is to forget the self.
To forget the self is to be enlightened by all things.
To be enlightened be all things is to remove the barriers between one's self and others."
- Dogen

In this chapter, I will discuss Devall's personal ecological consciousness and his development of the *ecological self*. The ecological self is developed in response to the *egotistical self*. Devall's own spiritual practices following the Buddhist faith have helped him discover what Arne Naess calls, "full maturity" in his writings on Ecosophy T. Devall encourages people to exemplify and take from their own spiritual awareness and apply it to the theory of Deep Ecology's principles and platform. Additionally, I will relate the Deep Ecology principles to Warwick Fox's concept of *transpersonal ecology*. I will highlight the different religions and spirituality backgrounds that Deep Ecology builds its foundation on. This chapter will also discuss Devall and his concept of using *practical activity* in our everyday lives while we are living in what Devall describes as the "Age of Exuberance". The chapter will also touch on cultivating the "real work" that we must conduct in order to discover and rediscover the ecological Self and what is truly meaningful in our lives. I will argue, as did Devall, that we must begin to enrich and change our lifestyles in order to sustain our environment for future generations and in turn, preserve ourselves.

Egotistical Self to the Ecological Self:

From Devall's earlier work with the environmental movement and the research from his doctoral dissertation, he has shown how the shallow-reform environmental perspective has institutionalized the conservation-preservation movement and the implications with it. The current worldview in today's society is an *anthropocentric* perspective. From this view, humans put themselves as the up-most importance over all plants, animals and their environment. Shallow, or what Devall refers to as *Reform Environmentalism*, attempts to make an effort within the limitations of conventional politics of advanced industrial nations to lessen or ease the worst forms of air and water pollution, destruction of indigenous wildlife, and some of the most short-sighted development schemes of that our planet. These efforts come from those who see the problems in isolated ways compatible with mild reform (Drengson, 1980). Shallow Ecology, or Reform Environmentalism, is viewed as a 'band-aid' on the world's ecological and social problems. This means treating merely the symptoms themselves, not the causes, through technological fixes such as pollution-control devices, regulations upon industry, etc (Naess, 1989). In this perspective, humans view themselves as superior to the environment and stewards of the land. This perspective shows that humans are here to protect and control the environment to meet their own needs and uses, instead of being a part of the environment surrounding them. According to Devall (1988) the Shallow Ecological philosophy of the environmental movement has become twisted and misused. Reform environmentalism is institutionalized in large organizations and government agencies. Social and political transformation will only develop after the egotistical identity is dissolved and the ecological self is fostered.

The egotistical identity is cultivated and encouraged under anthropocentric values. Sociologically, the ego has been defined as a collection of memories, information, images, concepts, and fiction about who a person is (Devall, 1988: 41). Most often, when we as humans act under the anthropocentric outlook, we loose sight of what is really meaningful in our lives. Devall (1988: 41) states that, "the ego can be understood as the voice of the self, but when we use the ego to build a barbed wire fence around our feelings, to deny our vulnerability and deny our interactions with watersheds, forests, deserts, and rivers, then the ego becomes a prison guard - and not a voice." When humans begin to stop defending and supporting the egotistical identity - the idea of self that does not match up with their current life experiences – that is when they may begin to cultivate and implement the practice of the *ecological self*. Human beings must "become part of something larger than our narrow, egotistic self" (Devall, 1988: 41). The deepening and expansion of the ecological self will be limited in its self-realization process if exploitation and suppression are applied to the model. The Deep Ecologist must seek the transformation of his/her self not the egotistical growth, or "spiritual materialism."

Bill Devall and supporters of Deep Ecology argue an alternate view of how the interaction between the environment and humans should exist. Developing Deep Long-Range Ecological principles is a reaction to shallow ecology. The Deep Ecology Movement aims to participate in overcoming the ecological crisis it foresees by developing a "process of ever-deeper questioning of ourselves, the assumptions of the dominant perspective in our culture, and the meaning and truth in our lives" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 8). This analysis of the ecological crisis is from those who see problems

holistically as requiring a deep change in our form of life (Drengson, 1980). Only from this form of analysis, according to Arne Naess (1973), will our relationships with our eco-systems be on a sound, co-evolving basis. The worldview of the Deep Ecology practice is that of an *ecocentric* point-of-view. Devall defines ecocentrism to mean, "rejecting the position that some life forms (such as humans) have greater inherent worth than other life forms" (Devall, 1988: 15). This means that plants and animals both are seen as possessing equal "rights" as human beings. Deep Ecology strongly calls for humans to drastically begin treating the environment in a more caring manner. According to Devall (1988: 30), "the Shallow Ecology movement tends to talk about resources for humans, whereas in Deep Ecology we talk about resources for each species." Richness and diversity of life forms are being undermined by many common practices of humans in our era. Humans are physically and spiritually connected to the environment that they live in and if we treat the environment poorly, in turn, it reflects on the style and manner in which we are treating ourselves. Deep ecologists believe that humans have a vital need to develop their ecological consciousness and that this need is directly related to the needs of the planet; at the same time, humans need *direct contact* with untrammeled wilderness – places undomesticated for narrow human purposes (Devall & Sessions, 1985).

Deep Ecology Platform:

The Deep Ecology Platform is compatible with a strong diverse combination of fundamental views. Below I have laid out the Deep Ecology Platform, developed by

Arne Naess and George Sessions (1985), which express the ideas and practices that the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement follows and supports:

1) The well-being and flourishing of human and nonhuman life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: inherent worth, intrinsic value, inherent value). These values are independent of the usefulness of the nonhuman world for human purposes.
2) Richness and diversity of life-forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves.
3) Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.
4) Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.
5) The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of non-human requires such a decrease.
6) Policies must therefore be changed. The changes in policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different than the present.
7) The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent worth) rather adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.
8) Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to participate in the attempt to implement the necessary changes.

This platform listed above, which describes the Deep Ecology position, is grounded in a variety of philosophical, spiritual, and cultural beliefs. The Deep Long-Rage Ecology Movement would loose its transcultural character without these underlying views and ethics. The Deep Ecology Platform emphasizes the fact that Nature has intrinsic value, that is, value for itself, rather than only aesthetic, commodity, or recreational value for humans (Devall, 1993).

In the paper where Naess and Sessions (1985) provided these eight notions, they also gave comments on the basic principles. In response to (1), the formulation refers to the ecosphere as a whole. This includes all “individuals, species, habitat, populations, as

well as humans and nonhuman cultures" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 70). This attitude is one that draws from deep fundamental concern and respect for all-pervasive intimate relationships. In addition to this formulation, both men use the term 'life' to refer to what biologist classify as 'nonliving' entities such as: watersheds, landscapes, mountains, and ecosystems. An example of this can be seen in a slogan such as "Let the river live!" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 71).

In response to formulation (2), Naess and Sessions (1985) explain that from an "ecological standpoint, complexity and diversity symbiosis are conditions for maximizing diversity" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 71). From this principle, we can conclude that undemanding, or primitive species of plants and animals fundamentally add to the boldness, and richness or diversity of life on Earth. Naess and Sessions note that complexity, in this term, does not imply complication.

Principle (3) refers to the term "vital needs" of humans. Naess and Sessions (1985) deliberately left this term to have a vague meaning. The idea behind this is to show the differences in the structures of societies as they now exist. An example given is from the differences in climate and weather related factors throughout the world. For some Eskimos in Alaska, snowmobiles are necessary today to satisfy vital needs of transportation for them.

Principle (4) sits on the premises that human population must drastically decrease in order for nonhuman life to increase. Naess and Sessions (1985) turn to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and their State of World Population Report (1984). In that report, they described that the growth rate of the human population has "declined for the first time in human history; but at the same time, the number of people

being added to the human population is bigger than at any time in history because the population base is larger" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 72). It is concluded that to alleviate the poverty and to increase the quality of life of humans on Earth, governments must act to set forth population targets in their public policy. This content is very deep and debates over human rights, practicability and the types of measures to be taken for population control (contraception, abortion, etc.) are in process today in many public arenas. Naess and Sessions (1985) illustrate that it is crucial, to sustain the ecosystem, to curb industrial nations from developing, and overdeveloping as they are a greater threat than Third or Fourth World countries.

In response to formulation (5), Naess and Sessions (1985) extend and highlight that the "struggle to preserve and save our wilderness (or near-wilderness), should continue and should focus on the general ecological functions of these areas" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 72-73). An example given is the task of large wilderness areas. Naess and Session go on to state that these areas are required in the biosphere to allow for continued evolutionary speciation of animals and plants.

Naess and Sessions' (1985) response to principle (6) states that, "when governments of industrial societies try to promote ecological measures through Third World governments, practically nothing is accomplished" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 73). They insist that, given this situation, support for global action through nongovernmental international organizations becomes increasingly important. The actions of these organizations, avoiding negative governmental interference, act on the grounds of "grassroots to grassroots" campaigns. Although deep changes require global action

(action across borders), the slogans, "think globally, act locally," and "Eat local," will still remain key terms in the ecological make-up of human communities.

In regards to formulation (7), of the Deep Ecology principles, Naess and Sessions (1985) acknowledge that some economists criticize the term "quality of life" because it is supposed to be vague. In response to that, they find on closer inspection, that what criticizing economists consider to be vague, is actually the "non-quantitative nature of the term" and that "one cannot quantify adequately what is important for the 'quality of life' as discussed here – and there is no need to do so" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 73).

Lastly, in response to principle (8), both Naess and Sessions' (1985) recognize that supporters of the Deep Ecology platform come from a variety of different backgrounds in culture, philosophy, and religion socialization. They find that there is "ample room for different opinions about priorities" surrounding the eight principles (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 73). For instance: what should be done first, what next? What is most urgent and what is clearly necessary as opposed to what is highly desirable but not absolutely pressing?

Transpersonal Ecology:

Implementing the practice of the eight principles in the platform highlighted by Naess and Sessions (1985) would be what Warwick Fox (1984) considers to be a *transpersonal ecology* – that is, letting go of the personally based forms of identification and dissolving our ego. Fox's contributions to Deep Ecology literature encourage people to experience and to relate to Nature to better identify with awareness in an eco-philosophy. Fox introduces three general kinds of bases for the experience of

commonality that we refer to as identification. These three foundations of identification, which I will briefly touch on, are: *personal*, *ontological*, and *cosmological*.

The first kind of basis for identification that Fox has presented is personal. Personally based identification revolves around the experiences that are shared with other entities and are brought about through personal involvement with such entities. This is the most common process that we as humans identify with in the identification development. This involves the concrete entities that we are in most contact with in our every day lives, such as: the members of our family, friends, our pets, our homes, and objects that are close to us, such as: our car, or teddy bear. This process of identification also includes more abstract kinds of units that we have personal contact with, such as: organizations we are involved in, our job, or our country. Fox explains that, "We experience these entities as part of *us*, as part of our identity - an assault upon their integrity is an assault upon our integrity" (Fox, 1990: 136-137). Personally based identification is a far more personal form of identification than the other two forms of identification.

The second form that Fox (1990) presents is ontologically based identification. This form relates to experiences of commonality with "all *that* is" which is developed through deep-seated realization of the fact "*that* things are" (Fox, 1990: 137). Fox derives ontologically based identification from *ontology*, which is a branch of metaphysics that studies the nature of existence, or 'being as such.' Fox explains that this notion sits with the realm of proper training of the consciousness, or perception, such as from the guidance of spiritual disciplines as Zen Buddhist teaching. Knowledge from

this form of practice, Zen Buddhism, may show us the expression of the manifesting of *Being* – of existence - as we ourselves are. Fox states that,

> "We have all perhaps experienced this state of being, the sense of commonality with all that is simply by virtue of the fact *that* it is, at certain moments. Things *are*! There is *something* rather than *nothing*!" (Fox, 1990: 138).

These statements are difficult to grasp, and those who do grasp the idea "warn of the limits of language in attempting to communicate their experientially based insights" (Fox, 1990: 137). Taking from this form of identification, we may illustrate the experiences of identification with *all* that exists.

The third basis of identification that Warwick Fox (1990) proposes is cosmologically based identification. This form highlights the experiences of commonality with 'all that is' through deep-seated realization that everything in existence is an aspect of a single unfolding reality. This form of identification's origin can come from a variety of empathic incorporation of mythological, religious, philosophical, or (as for many people in the modern world) scientific cosmologies. Cosmologically based identification, which is similar to ontologically based identification, directs us towards neutral identification with the 'whole picture' of existence. To better highlight this concept of a ritualized experientially approach of developing a cosmologically based notion of identification with the world can be illustrated through Joanna Macy's, Council of All Beings. Macy, an Adjunct Professor at California Institute for Integral Studies in San Francisco, as well as a worship leader, conducts retreats to perform the promised ritual of the Council of All Beings. Here at these circle assemblies at a designated wilderness site, individuals *become* a specific animal, plant, or environmental being and speak freely the concerns of that entity they have adopted and symbolized. They speak of

the changes necessary in order to preserve the single unfolding reality that they all share and have common ground on. Some beings speak of fear, anger, laughter, and sympathy – and each Being gives the other a chance to speak. After all beings have spoken, everyone (as human beings) will embrace one another and discuss these concerns that have been highlighted in the gathering. They will converse about the changes that they will work for in their lives and in our world. They will make plans for action, hatch strategies, and create ways of supporting each other in the struggle to save the planet and future generations to come.

Sociologically, we can create and recreate what is essential to our lives and lives around us, and it is based on how we are personally socialized in our environments. Fox's perspective on identification exemplifies the importance that the greatest way to avoid human destruction of the natural world is to promote and support people to develop their ecological Self. In part, Fox (1984) additionally encourages people to experience themselves as part of the nature around them. Devall was an avid supporter of this philosophy and stressed that by expanding our will-to-live, we contribute to realizing the biosphere more fully. By the process of personalization of the environment and wilderness, humans are able to better understand the inter-relationship between the environment and human beings. Through the process of discovering, exploring, developing, and building upon our ecological Self, "we will joyfully defend and interact with that with which we identify; and instead of imposing environmental ethics on people, we will naturally respect, love, honor, and protect that which is of our self" (Devall, 1988: 43). We must actively turn the table of the destruction of the environment and become more in-tune with the strong identification with our bioregion and ecosphere.

Devall states in an essay published in The Trumpeter, entitled "Wilderness" (1994: 22-23), when "we defend wilderness we defend something in our Self – our larger Self - rather than the narrow Self which is usually considered as our social identity. We are defending our connection with the greatness beyond our narrow Self." Chapter 5 will explore this concept deeper when I discuss *bioregionalism*.

Deep Ecology, Religion, and Spirituality:

It should be understood, as Devall (1993) points out, that there is not one definite or specific way of viewing the Deep Ecology Movement. The Deep Ecological perspective is inclusive by drawing support from a wide diversity of cultural traditions. We find that individuals may consider the Deep Ecology Movement as a personal one. Individuals, based on their own backgrounds and personal experiences, need to implement the platform that the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement stands on. It is possible for humans to create a common ground and understanding for which enables us to work together to attain harmonious relationships with the environment around us. The Deep Ecology Platform is a starting point in helping humans move in that direction. Arne Naess, the founder of Deep Ecology, argues that the basic principals, or platform, within the Deep Ecology Movement are grounded in religion and/or philosophy (Devall & Sessions, 1985). People develop their own ecosophies similar to that of Arne Naess' *Ecosophy T*. Ecosphy T is Naess' substitute for ecological philosophy. The notion is based on the "practice of extended identification, increased awareness, and care for the ecological Self" (Naess, 2008). The term is made up of *eco-* (which means "habitation" or house") and *–sophy* (which means "wisdom"). The "*T*" is derived from the name

Tvergastein, which is where Naess' quaint little mountain hut in Norway is located. Here Naess cultivated his deep understanding of ecology and his spiritual relationship with his own bioregion. Arne Naess finds this phrase, Ecosphy T, to represent his own personal place and space. The development of ecological wisdom involves deep intuition and insight that energizes our spirits, minds feelings, and senses with unified understanding (Naess, 1989). Naess is able to build on his ecological self through his pursuit of outdoor activities. Naess is an avid and experienced mountaineer who connects much of the Deep Ecology experience and practice to climbing and scaling mountain cliffs. For Naess, climbing is a way of becoming 'one' with the mountain and to do as Gary Snyder says, "to think like a mountain." Being connected to one's environment and habitat are key factors to the Deep Ecology perspective and having this connection, we as humans are able to understand the complex dynamics between our relationships with our environment.

Devall argues that the Deep ecology Principles come with a variety of different lifestyles. He highlights that his discussion on Deep Ecology is intended to stimulate practicing, not to be taken as a code of conduct for everyone who accepts a Deep Ecology philosophy (Devall, 1993). Many lifestyles such as having goals of consumption of materialistic things or buying something like clothes, cars, or technological gadgets just because they are new go against the principles of developing the ecological consciousness. There are studies that exemplify data that economist, politicians, and advertisements tell society to consume more and more. The love of something just because it is new is called novophili. Arne Naess explains it is consistent with Deep

Ecology to have an "absence or low degree of novophili – the love of what is new merely because it is new" (Naess, 1984: 58).

As for Devall, he draws much of his inspiration from the Buddhist practices of the East. The Buddhist philosophy finds peace in meditation practices and the meaning in all life on Earth. Referring to the renditions of Sanskrit, Buddha taught his disciples that the human mind (Self) should embrace all living things as a mother cares for her son, her only son (Naess, 1987). Devall finds the unity and tranquility within his Buddhist teachings to inspire and strengthen his passion for Deep Ecology. Devall (1993) explains that within Buddhist practices we work not only to work on the work, but also to work in the moment while realizing the far different future.

Another form of religious philosophical notions that Deep Ecological practices may be built upon, come from the Jewish/Christian traditions. Many Christian teachers have written about and expressed that individuals must develop and nurture their 'oceanic Self' (Devall, 1988). From the contemporary writings of Christian writer, Thomas Merton, the process of promoting the oceanic Self through the practice of prayer, with God is discussed. Another example from the Christian based ecological consciousness comes from Mathew Fox (1988) and his version of transpersonal ecosphy, which takes the Christian practice of love and humbleness to find the spirit of Christ revealed in the ongoing creation of the world. This example can be interpreted as given humans the ability to have an expansive communal sense of Self overflowing with the spirit of compassion, and allows us to find "divinity everywhere, within and without" (Naess, 2008).

An additional example of a different foundation in Deep Ecology comes from the Native American tradition. For thousands of years, Native American culture has had the language and tools necessary for practicing the Deep Ecology perspective. Native American custom has promoted solidarity with the land and the environment. Using language to represent the 'land as sacred' – or 'all the land is sacred.' Gary Snyder (1995), a deep poet, writer and faculty member at University California Davis, says that humankind must find our way to seeing the cycles of the land, similar to the Native culture and traditions. We must recognize the mineral cycles, the water cycles, the air cycles, and nutrient cycles as *sacramental*. Snyder reflects that the Native American attitude draws awareness of the mystery of life and death; of taking life to live; of giving life back – not only to your own children, but also to the life of the whole land (Snyder, 1995). These are tools and insights that we must incorporate into our own personal spiritual quests, and to be able to integrate that understanding with all the wisdom teachings we have received from the nearer past (such as Ecosphy 'T').

Creating *Practical Activity* & "*Real Work"*:

Bill Devall uses the language of "practicing" to implement the Deep Ecological perspective into our lives. By implementing this practice of the Deep Ecology Platform, and exploring our ecological self, it is an aspect of what Arne Naess calls, "all around maturity, of "self-realization" or what Devall states as, "full maturity" or "many sided maturity." This concept directly consists of the developmental stages and practice of our ecological selves. Humans, while living in Devall's notion of the "*Age of Exuberance"*, are drawn to their personal development, and maturity, of self. The "Age of Exuberance"

is the period of economic booming, overconsumption, and generating more of everything. It was the period that a "dark shadow emerged over industrial civilization, and that shadow was defined as the environmental crisis, which perceptive commentators recognized as the cultural crisis, a spiritual crisis, and a psychological crisis for those who were brainwashed in the conventional slogans of the 'Age of Exuberance'" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 29). America was labeled the 'throw-away society.' Supporters of the Deep Ecology movement "humbly recognize human ignorance, and the need for cautious development of technology," and they seek to circumvent the "fragmentation and complication of human life that results from too great an emphasis on technological control" (Drengson, 1980: 76). Bill Devall discovered that to avoid this fragmentation and complication in our lives, we must follow a path for enriching our lives and greening our lifestyles that begins at the point of *reduction*. We may start with "reductions in wastes that are thrown into the environment, reduction in the stuff we surround ourselves with, reduction in the size of our impact on the natural processes and systems" (Devall, 1993: 48).

Also, individuals may practice the form of *downscaling* in their everyday lives to be able to coincide with the theory of the Deep Long-Range Ecological Movement. Downscaling means recovering from the excessive and wasteful and, for some, hedonistic, patterns of behavior of the "Age of Exuberance." It means simplifying our household tasks, and begins with *reduction* – "reduction in wastes that are thrown into the environment, reduction in the stuff we surround ourselves with, reduction in the size of our impact on natural processes" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 48). Downscaling is a recovery process. It is a process where in turn individuals may find and build upon their

ecological selves. It is a process where we find the real work in our lives. This recovery process, from the behavior and lifestyle practices of the "Age of Exuberance," will take a very extensive period of time and many generations. The healing will take effort from all parts of mass society. Many people never take the time to actually challenge themselves and engage in the *process of discovery*. The majority of humans let themselves become overtaken with the conceptions that mass media present to us. To break away from this vicious cycle of being seduced by entertainments and promises of pleasures on city streets, Devall calls for "revitalization of "our sense of place in nature, including revitalization of our institutions – churches, schools, finance and savings institutions – to make decisions on the emerging ecocentric worldview" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 48-49). A change in our persons and consciousness requires action and change in our culture and vise versa. The recovery starts with people who are ready with an open-mind and spirit to "create new lifestyles that conform to ecological principles; for people who want to engage in real work within their communities for long-range bioregional health" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 49). We must strive to extend our *Self* from the egotistical minimal self to more mature, 'maximum self-realization' and to widen our self-conscious knowledge in our daily lives. Devall (1988) says the process is not intended to be forced on anyone's ideology but rather to provide the tools necessary in order for individuals to "ground themselves through fuller experience of his/her connection to Earth" (p 11). It is intended to encourage modesty in our lives, instead of excessive self-pride or confidence.

In an essay entitled "Self Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World" (1986), Arne Naess said, "The joys of life and the meanings of life are increased through increased self-realization" (p 35). This means happiness is reached when the

given individual potentials that we all possess are fulfilled. Each person's potentials may be different from other living creatures, but whatever the differences may entail, "increased self-realization implies broadening and deepening of one's self" (p 35). Humans strive for self-preservation and self-interest which can be directly related to Spinoza's "self-interest or the interest to seek one's profit" (pg 36-37). According to Naess, "to seek one's profit is to say - to preserve one's being" (p 37). By preserving our own profit, "it is in the interest of humans to preserve their existence, which is the same as realizing our inherent potentialities" (p 37). The environment should be preserved in order for humans to reach their real full potential, or the 'real work' in our lives. By this process of self-realization, it is made easy to see the possibilities of ignorance and misunderstanding in terms of what these potentialities are. We must look at the true, real, vital needs that we as humans deceive ourselves from under an anthropocentric perception of the world.

Drawing much from poet Gary Snyder (1976), Devall builds upon his notion of 'real work' – personal inner work that seeks clarification and insight that helps us "become real to ourselves" (Devall, 1993: p 51). Devall (1993) sees that through the activity of practice, we may test our theories and develop further insights from which more sophisticated theories develop. Gary Snyder (1976) explains *real work* as the work that is to make the world as real as it is - and to find ourselves as real as we are within it. In Snyder's essay *The Real Work* (1977), he explains that each of us, according to our own needs and nature, can draw up the criteria for what expression suits us best, and what *practice* suits us best out of that, to be able to conduct the real work. Cultivating our ecological consciousness shall convey the 'real work.' This process "is simple, but not

easy work" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 7). This process involves becoming more aware of the actuality of rocks, mountains, rivers, trees, oceans and animals – "the cultivation of the insight that everything is connected" (Devall & Sessions, 1985: 7-8). Both Bill Devall and George Sessions (1985) state that cultivating the ecological Self is a process of learning to be grateful for the silence and solitude of rediscovering how to listen, how to be more receptive, trusting, and a process of being grounded in a vision of non-exploitive science and technology.

We as humans identify with intermediate landscapes more willingly than with remote or abstract ones. Devall emphasized in the discussion of "practicing" that the more we understand and become familiar with a particular place intimately - knowing its moods, seasons, changes, aspects, native creatures – the more we know our ecological Selves.

CHAPTER FOUR

Simple in Means, Rich in Ends

"I only went out for a walk, and concluded to stay until sundown - for going out, I discovered I was going in."
- John Muir

In this section of the thesis, I will examine Devall's notion of living with simple means, to reveal rich, meaningful ends. Devall, and others, were devoted to teaching and explaining the tools necessary to make possible the theoretical concept and lifestyle practice of Deep Ecology. Additionally, this section will discuss the paradigm shift that is being witnessed in today's human culture. I will talk about the tools of empowerment that Bill Devall's Deep Ecology gives to one's life and how that empowerment can be used to influence the community around us. This chapter will also discuss the role that experts have in the Deep Long-Rage Ecological Movement. Finding resistance in their fields, it is difficult for experts to express the Deep Ecological perspective in the current anthropocentric worldview, so I will also discuss the critics of Deep Ecology.

Ecosophy 'T' and Self-realization:

Arne Naess coined the phrase Deep Ecology in his paper titled "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement." Devall, in 1975, was sparked and instantly attracted to Naess '73 article. From this essay and lecture held in Bucharest, Romania, a new spark had ignited in the worldwide Environmental Conservation-Preservation

Movement. Naess (1973) emphasized in his writing that Deep Ecology is a rejection of the man-in-environment image and favors the relational, total-field image to foster intrinsic value for all things. Understanding that Arne Naess uses his term 'Ecosphy T' which is derived for one's personal life philosophies aiming for ecological harmony, also known as *Deep Ecology*, is to explain his own notion of ecological principles and philosophy which is built around the concept of 'self-realization.' Freya Mathews, a philosophy professor at LeTrobe University in Australia, explains in an article written in *Environmental Ethics*, her version of Ecosophy 'T', which she refers to as the *identification thesis*. In her article, Mathews (1988) articulates that the identification thesis is built on the concept that if my identity is logically interconnected with the identity of other beings, then my chances of self-realization depend on the existence of those beings – my interest is to ensure their existence.

Mathews asks the question of what it means to say that a being has interests. She says that a being may be constituted to have interests if it has needs, and it may be said to have needs if it is seeking to maintain or realize its own existence – it needs those entities which contribute to its self-maintenance or self-realization. The concept of self-realization is a principle to which philosophers of the 1600s referred to as the *"conatus."* She explains that *conatus* was the impulse for self-preservation, but also for self-increase or self-perfection - an impulse that is present in all living beings. Philosopher Benedict de Spinoza, defined this concept as "the effort by which each thing endeavors to persist in its own being" (Spinoza, trans. Elwes, 1951). Seen in the notion of *conatus* is the desire to recognize the complete potentials of one's own nature and the need to preserve one's self physically. Mathews (1988) further states that in this greater sense, it is in our best

interests to promote the interests of the wider systems of nature – and clearly the identification of self with nature is only possible when nature is itself possessed of *conatus*. Mathews (1988) expresses that nature in its widest cosmic sense is indeed a Being endowed with *conatus*, a self-maintenance entity, and she uses the phrase *ecocosm* to describe a self-realizing, internally interconnected cosmos. Under Mathew's arguments, it can be concluded that with the identification with the greater whole – her notion of ecocosm – it shall entail the practice of conserving the environment and defending the biosphere when under attack. Conservation then, in this way, is entirely an issue of self-defense.

Self-realization, which Devall refers as one's own *ecological self*, as discussed in Chapter Three, is bound to the practice of identifying with one's personal environment and bioregion from an ecocentric point-of-view. Deep Ecology is more of a *practice* and *lifestyle*, than an actual movement. It is a lifestyle that is concerned with the metaphysics of nature, and of the relation of self to nature. Broadening and searching for our ecological Self is in part the development of refining our maturity as individuals. We as humans must recognize our human ignorance towards each other and the environment and cultivate our Earth wisdom, or ecosophy. From a Deep-Long Range Ecological point-of-view, what is lacking with our culture is that it presents us with an incorrect conception of the self by representing the personal self in a struggle with Nature and our environment. We as a society must make the 180-degree turn towards a worldview that supports a philosophy of community living that is centered on ecocentric values. Devall (N.D.) states that, "ecocentrism represents a shift away from viewing humans and the human-drama central to the history of the cosmos to viewing humans in the words of

ecologist Aldo Leopold, as plain citizens of the cosmos." Humans must demand to rectify our *conatus,* and to change our belief system to serve our ultimate interests. A strong *conatus* necessitates a strong, rich sense of self – which means a self that includes the widest possible circles of beings (Mathews, 1988).

Devall (1988) knows that finding the ecological Self in today's fast paced technological society is difficult task, but urges people to integrate the notions of theories and action - culture and person. The simple life is not easy - it is difficult. We as individuals must find the ability to empower ourselves with the strength to find what is truly significant in our lives and to stand up and to *practice,* to utilize that power, in our interactions with our environment. Deep Ecology sets out to create a model for humans as a basic fundamental structure of reality, which allows us to identify that all things that are logically interconnected with one another. Through the empowerment of our Self, it means, "recognizing and acting from our own source of power - right action includes words, acts and feelings, which are true to our intuitions and principles" (Devall, 1988: 122). We must make the shift in our theoretical analysis of the world.

Paradigm Shift:

Alan Drengson (1980) argues that our human culture is currently undergoing, and is in drastic need of, a major paradigm shift. Drengson (1980) illustrates two dominant paradigms that he sees in his worldview. These two models are the *technocratic* paradigm, and the *person-planetary* paradigm. Drengson (1980) states that society must shift from a technocratic paradigm to an emerging ecological paradigm, that he calls the person-planetary paradigm. The surfacing paradigm, if supporting the deep ecological

platform, shall be more sustainable and "appropriate to the unity and the interrelatedness of the Earth – with its limitations and its delicately balanced ecosystems" (Drengson, 1980: 79). The diminishing paradigm, which will rarely be totally rejected, shall give aspects of its characteristics and be incorporated into the new paradigm.

The first model in which Drengson discusses revolves around technocracy. Here technocracy refers to the "systematic application of technology to all levels of human activity, including governmental and economic policies which have growth as their central aim" (Drengson, 1980: 81). Here, positivism is embraced and sciences are narrowed in scope of theoretical activities and the principal emphasis is upon prediction, control, and applied science. Drengson (1980) explains that in the technocratic paradigm science it is expected to be value-free, and the aim is to reduce all phenomena to those features that can be quantified, controlled, and observed directly with the instruments produced by technology. Its aim then becomes the "control of life by means of management techniques that govern the application of the hardware and processes integral to technology" (Drengson, 1980: 81-82). Through this process, humans then objectify their empirical world – persons and non human nature. We begin to see that science, art, philosophy, and inter-subjective experiences become fragmented and separated. With the advancement of technocratic methods and means – impoverished ends are created, and the development of centralization, of capital-intensive, labor-poor industry is encouraged. With humans so overwhelmed with an increasing amount of information and highly specialized learning, technocracy no longer seems compatible with human insight and knowledge. Drengson calls for a paradigm shift – one that embodies the "spirit of inquiry and creativity" which comes alive during such a shift.

This shift is towards an ecological paradigm called the person-planetary model. During this shift, humans are more open to "novelty and the multifarious complexity of the world" (Drengson, 1980: 79).

The person-planetary paradigm sets out to explore the constraints on human activities in the light of ecology and the reality of particular ecosystems. The 'organic' model stresses the interconnectedness of the biosphere, and views the world as "intersecting fields of processes, rather than as separate individuals" and entities (Drengson, 1980: 87). Characteristics within the person-planetary model reveal that ecosystems are less like machines and more like organisms, in that ecosystems are not completely specifiable. Here, there are elements of unpredictability, and uncertainty. It is impossible for humans to have objectivity and to isolate their actions from the rest of society – nor from the rest of the ecosystem. Drengson (1980) describes an example of radioactive wastes that pollute ground water - which affects the rivers, the ocean, and ultimately the biosphere as a whole. Unlike a machine, the organism is a complexly interrelated whole of processes, with both internal and external principles of organization; the ecosystem is like a living body. Much like Joanna Macy and The Council Of All Beings, the person-planetary shift allows us, and helps us to look at the world through the eyes of ecological processes and relationships. Humans begin to understand and cultivate the need for the way of building our foundations so that they are compatible with the ideology and principles of ecology; and to design ways of living that will be consistent with a respect for living beings in an *ecosystematic* framework. Humans must embrace the paradigm shift that Drengson offers because the technocratic paradigm begins its

"control of nature with a control of our minds, which affects how we see the world and what we look for in it" (Drengson, 1980: 94).

Deep Ecology & Empowerment:

Through our spiritual connection with ourselves and with our environment, we as individuals must stay collective in character and with one another. We must find "clear thinking, commitment, confidence, and calmness - these are the attributes," Devall exclaims, "which engage our minds and bodies in the real work with centered charity" (Devall, 1988: 201) It is essential to clarify ecological consciousness and how it is illustrated through our actions. Arne Naess (2008, 1984: 140-141), in an essay on Deep Ecology lifestyle, offered various tendencies that he witnessed among collective supporters of the Deep Ecology Movement and Platform. Here are these points:

1. Using *simple* means. Avoidance of unnecessary complicated means to reach a goal or end.
2. Propensity to prefer activities most directly serving values in themselves and having *intrinsic value*. Avoidance of activities that are merely auxiliary, having no intrinsic value, or being many stages away from fundamental goals.
3. *Anticonsumerism* and minimization of personal property. This negative attitude follows from points 1 and 2.
4. Endeavor to maintain and increase the sensitivity and appreciation of goods of which there is enough for all to enjoy.
5. Absence or low degree of "*novophilia*" – the love of what is new merely because it is new. Cherishing old and well-worn things.
6. Efforts to dwell in situations of intrinsic value and to *act* rather than merely being busy.
7. Appreciation of ethnic and cultural differences among people, not feeling them as threats.
8. Concern about the situation of the Third and Fourth Worlds and the attempt to avoid material standard of living too much different from and higher than the needy (global *solidarity* of lifestyle.)
9. Appreciation of lifestyles that are *universalizable*, which are not blatantly impossible to sustain without injustice toward fellow humans or other species.

10. To go for *depth* and *richness* of experience rather than intensity.
11. To appreciate and choose, whenever possible *meaningful* work rather than just making a living.
12. To lead a *complex* (not a complicated) life; trying to realize as many aspects of positive experiences as possible within each time interval.
13. Cultivating life in *community*, rather than in society.
14. Appreciation of, or participation in, primary production – *small-scale* agriculture, forestry, fishing.
15. Efforts to satisfy *vital* needs rather than desires. *Resisting* the urge to "go shopping" as a diversion or therapy. *Reducing* the sheer number of processions, favoring the old, much-worn, but essentially well-kept things.
16. Attempts to live *in* nature rather than just *visiting* beautiful places, and avoidance of tourism (but occasionally making use of tourist facilities).
17. When in vulnerable nature, living "*light* and *traceless*."
18. Tendency to *appreciate* all life-forms rather than merely those considered beautiful, remarkable, or narrowly useful.
19. Never use life-forms merely as means. Remain conscious of their *intrinsic value* and *dignity* even when using them as resources.
20. When there is a *conflict* between interests of dogs/cats (and other pet animals) and wild species, a tendency to *protect* the latter.
21. Effort to protect *local* ecosystems, not only individual life-forms, feeling one's own community as a part of ecosystems.
22. Not only to *deplore* excessive interference in nature as unnecessary, unreasonable, and disrespectful, but also to *condemn* it as insolent, atrocious, outrageous, and criminal – without condemning the people responsible for the interference.
23. Try to act resolutely and without cowardice in conflicts, but to remain *non-violent* in word and deeds.
24. Participate in or support of *non-violent* direct action when other ways of action fail.
25. *Vegetarianism* – total or partial.

These principles that Naess put forth in this short paper extremely challenge the modern anthropocentric worldview and the highly consumerist lifestyles in First World industrious nations. The actions of First World countries are undeniably unjustifiable with regard to the living conditions of the world. To create solutions for the environmental crisis, individuals from industrial nations must undertake the task to drastically transform and reduce their consumption habits and levels. They must understand on ethically ground terms the "immense negative impact that they are causing

in the destruction of wild ecosystems and biodiversity throughout the world" (Sessions, 1992, 1995: 61). There must be a revolutionized lifestyle change, while at the same time, improving the standards of living in Third and Fourth World countries.

For individuals to be able to collectively adhere to basic Deep Ecological fundamental principles and ideals, they must be included in active discussion. By communicating what environmental challenges lay ahead, then planning and action will be the result in our everyday lives. To inspire such discussion, David Rothenberg, a professor of philosophy at New Jersey Institute of Technology in Newark, was asked by Arne Naess to develop a platform similar to Naess' "Basic Principles of Deep Ecology." In this exercise laid out in non-academic language to communicate unfamiliar ideas to all, Rothenberg (1987, 2008: 157) discovered that the Deep-Long Rage Ecology Movement is a way of "rethinking the relationship of humanity and/in nature that has critical implications for envisioning ideal societies, preferred ways of life, and the development of practical strategies for approaching these ideals." He explained that there are three clear purposes of this concept of rethinking: (1) it can provide a firm philosophical grounding for activism (2) it can encourage decision-makers to connect philosophical and religious assertion with concrete policy (3) it can be used to get as many people as possible to think about themselves and nature in a new way. The basic points below are laid out by Rothenberg to stimulate personal thought within individuals. Rothenberg (1987, 2008: 157) states that "if something appears vague (within the basic points), do not ask for greater precision, but think to yourself - Where does this value seem to come from for me? What are my interpretations?"

1. Life – There is intrinsic Value in all life
2. Nature - Diversity, symbiosis, and thus complexity explain the life of nature itself.
3. Human in/and Nature - Humanity is a part of nature, but our potential power means that our responsibility towards the Earth is greater than that of many other species.
4. No False Distance - We feel estranged from the Earth because we have imposed complication upon the complexity of nature.
5. Outside Change - On the outside, we should change the basic structures of our society and the policies that guide them.
6. Inside Change - On the inside, we should seek quality of life rather than higher standard of living, self-realization rather than material wealth.
7. Spread of Ideas - New kinds of communication should be found that encourage greater identification with nature. Only then will we see our part in it.
8. Action - CONCLUSION: Those who accept the above points have an obligation to try to implement the necessary changes (Rothenberg, 1987, 2008: 157).

Rothenberg concluded that anyone who accepts and agrees upon these basic points has a *direct obligation* to attempt to make and implement the necessary *changes*. Rothenberg (1987) suggests four extensive ways of involving oneself in this change - these changes are:

1. Living according to ecological ideals of self-reliance as an individual or in a small group. To do this at present requires detachment from the dominant system.
2. Encouraging compromise between the present and the ideal: a mix of centralized *and* local technologies and institutions, providing a realistic path of transition to a society that could exist in harmony with these ideals.
3. Trying to change the system directly. This means talking to people:
    a. The 'experts' and decision makers.
    b. The rest of us.

    Different languages and methods may be appropriate for each.
4. Artistic and philosophical reflection on the closeness of humans and nature for its own sake (Rothenberg, 1987, 2008: 157)

Rothenberg (1987) notes that there are many individuals working in different realms of change and being a supporter within the environmental movement, one must identify one's own place and space. It is important to concentrate only on tasks that can be mastered – those upon which one's labor will not be wasted. By having many forms and

different processes of change, the "symbiosis between them work together to enact a change greater than the sum of its parts (Rothenberg, 1987, 2008: 163).

Knowing that we as humans do not live in an ideal world, we must demand ideals to direct our everyday actions. Devall attempted to live his life in the ideal phrase of: *simple in means, rich in ends*. He strove to turn his philosophy of environmental ethics into a living practice – an evolving practice. His intellectual notions of Deep Ecology are intended to stimulate this practicing, not to be taken as a 'code of conduct' for everyone who accepts Deep Ecology and what it stands for. Devall (1988: 82) gives the example and the vision of - a simple meal. With a simple meal,

> "created with sophistication and presented with elegance to family and friends can provide a rich experience of aroma, taste, nutrition, and can stimulate rewarding conversation, companionship, and emotional resonance among those sharing the meal."

Many of us have been in similar situations like this before, and these situations end up being great documented memories. These are the moments that we strive for and are hungry for as human beings. To practice these simple means, and to end up with these rich ends, is what Devall says will keep humanity and it's environment glued together.

Simple living is not always so simple. It takes dedication and determination within our lives. Rothenberg (1987) argues that measuring quantities in our lives is easy – measuring quality is not. We must seek the values and principles of living richly before analysis and paths for change are sought out. Striving for self-realization is a development that unites the individual to the greater whole of humanity. Naess' notion of self-realization is a process that brings together the whole into one. Simple in means, rich in ends encompasses altruism and compassion as the foundation to truly seeking life quality.

Role of Experts in Deep Ecology:

Living in the anthropocentric dominant framework of today's culture, it is difficult for experts to acknowledge the ecological catastrophes of our biosphere without being ostracized from their field of study. In our modern culture the organization of policy making and defending an argument in the mass media, in public hearings of legislative bodies, in textbooks or scholarly/professional publications, in courtroom hearings – require experts to argue against experts. In most cases, it is usually judges, politicians, and political-economic elites that set the questions for experts to take in and argue. When the stage is set by these entities whose "values and perspectives are not deeply ecological, then (experts) become agents for furthering the purposes of centralized, dominant -and dominating - institutions, agencies and corporations" (Devall, 1988: p 91).

Arne Naess (1981), in a speech concerning the role experts have in the Deep Long-Rang Ecology Movement entitled, "Experts and Deep Ecology," made notion that,

> "Experts frequently make indirect contributions to the movement by providing information (sometimes undercover) for environmental activists, and legal services for cases brought by environmental activists for protection of their civil liberties in direct action" (Naess, Devall, 1988: p 95).

Naess (1981), in his speech listed eight causes for public silence of experts who, behind closed doors, are supporters of the Deep Ecology Platform:

1. Time taken away from professional work.
2. Consequent adverse effect of this on promotion and status.
3. Feeling of insufficient competence, outside "expertise."
4. Lack of training in repeating basic opinions in understandable language.
5. Lack of training in use of mass media and in facing non-academic audiences.

6. Negative attitude toward expressing "subjective" opinions, valuations, violating norms of "objectivity" and reluctance to enter into controversial issues.
7. Negative attitude of fellow-researchers, institute personnel and administrations. Decrease of status in the scientific community. Complaint of colleagues or bosses that there is a dabbling in irrelevant, controversial fields, that going public is due to vainglory, publicity seeking. Complaint that what is said in public is unscientific. Resulting low status in the scientific community.
8. Belief (sometimes well founded) that a public proclamation of support of Deep Ecology would be counterproductive: some experts with powers to modify policies in Deep Ecology direction would lose that power if they made clear how they felt.

Naess suggested that in order to neutralize the tendency of experts remaining publicly silent due to the fact of being ostracized from their field of studies, we must: (1) find the experts with scientific training, the journalist and other writers, and the lawyers, (2) listen to their concerns and motives for remaining silent, (3) find out whether they are willing, in principle, to expose themselves, (4) find a suitable public occasions and themes on which they can present their opinions, and (5) suggest themes upon which they can write which illustrate on deep ecology principles. By following these suggestions from Arne Naess, dialogue surrounding deep ecology may be inserted into public discussion focusing on city planning, development projects, and policy-making in our government agencies.

Much like the active poets and artists of the Deep Ecology philosophy, Devall was not silent in his philosophy within the Deep-Long Range Ecology Movement. He very much took a stand for what he believed in. Devall states that to the "credit of Deep Ecology poets and prose writers, they are willing to subvert the conventional worldview rather than pander to cultural fads or effete intellectual critics" (Devall, 1988: 55-59). Devall supports experts to convey any information or data to the community table. Brian

Martin, an affiliate at Australian National University encourages "experts to bring their research findings to responsible activists in the environmental movement if they feel it could achieve our goals and if they feel they have been suppressed" (Devall, 1988: 55-59). Experts who propose Deep Ecological arguments in their research and data encourage deeper thinking by policy and decision makers.

Devall (1988: 96) illustrates that there are many job related fields that provide opportunities and platforms for articulating a Deep Long-Range Ecology position. Some of these jobs are: politicians, businessmen, fisherman, agriculturalists gardeners, naturalists, forest workers, policemen (including fish and game rangers), and park rangers working for national, state or local parks. It is up to humanity to discover within ourselves the right values that we want to extend on our policy and decision making process.

Critics of Deep Ecology:

Deep Ecology philosophy has become a topic that is being critiqued by many people and groups. The followers of the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement have a difficult time defending their claims in an anthropocentric public educational setting. As stated in this thesis, the platform and principles of the Deep Ecology perspective drastically critique and question the dominant social model. As opposed to the modern worldview, Deep Ecologists ask deeper, more conscious questions, illustrating the major breakdown of advanced industrial nations. The world has entered an age and period where there has been growing and increasing attention towards the ecological crisis at hand. There are reports of climate change all over the world, rising sea levels, increased

pollution from toxic wastes to water and soil pollution, and the world's population has been rapidly escalating. Due to this rapid deterioration of the environmental world around us, Deep Long-Range Ecologists tend to "engage in the positive task of constructing different visions of reality and of presenting ecotopian visions of harmony between humans and the rest of Nature" (Devall, 1988: 55-59). Some critics of the Movement undertake the notion that Deep Ecology does not present a clear understanding of how economics plays a role in ecotopian society. Devall (1988: 55-59) states that yes – "it is true, however, that Deep Ecology theorist have been less interested in political ecology" but they are consistently more interest in the causes of anthropocentrism within the dominant worldview.

A key figure in the critique of Deep Long-Range Ecological philosophy comes from Murray Bookchin. Bookchin (1987) asserts that Deep Ecology is "so much of a black hole of half-digested, ill-formed, and half-baked ideas." He continues by stating that the words 'Deep Ecology' express that "we are not dealing with a body of clear ideas but with a bottomless pit in which vague notions and moods of all kinds can be such into the depths of an ideological toxic dump." Bookchin (1987) critiques Naess, Sessions, and Devall by saying that neither of them "has written a single line about decentralization, a nonhierarchical society, democracy, small-scale communities, local autonomy, mutual aid, communalism, and tolerance that was not worked out in painstaking detail." It should be highlighted that Bookchin's analysis of the Deep Ecology perspective is coming from a standpoint with anthropocentric ideas and statements. Deep Ecology stresses that those notions of thought must be changed from

the dominant worldview to an ecocentric outlook. Only then, when the shift has occurred, can the analysis of the ecological crisis be understood. Bookchin (1987) argues:

> "Human beings and their societies alter first nature at best in a rational and ecological way - or at worst in an irrational and anti-ecological way. But the fact that they are constituted to act upon nature, to intervene in natural processes, to alter them in one way or another, is no less a product of natural evolution than the action of any life-form on its environment."

In response to Bookchin, Deep Ecology argues that humans must adhere to the self-realization process that awakens our ecological Self, which, in turn, separates us from the anthropocentric values and ethics in today's world. Deep Ecology is a *practice* that actively takes part in the restructuring of the relationship that humans have with their natural world.

To additionally address the critiques of Deep Ecology, I turn to Janet Pivnik (1997: 1-9), an environmental educator at the University of Calgary, who states in a paper entitled "The Problem of Language in Deep Ecology Education," that in a "school system where rational thought and critical thinking are the hallmarks of knowledge, Deep Ecology is bound-to-be marginalized." She goes on to state that, "within modern rational discourse, contextual knowledge has no valid claim." Deep Ecology followers, as Pivnik claims, must change the language within Deep Ecology education. She argues that finding the right "language to speak otherwise poses a challenge for supporters of the Deep Ecology Movement raised in such a culture" (Pivnik, 1997: 1-9). In response to this argument, one may turn to the basic points laid out by David Rothenberg regarding the ways of rethinking the relationship of humanity in Nature and the means we possess for directing change in our lives. By undertaking the notions presented by Rothenberg,

language may develop within our lives for the change necessary and the shift within the modern paradigm.

Eco-feminists have frequently been critics of the Deep Ecological Movement and its evaluation of the causes of the environmental crisis from the standpoint of industrial culture. Eco-feminist perspective indicates that Deep Ecology has not taken into account and "have not explored the social-political causes of the environmental crisis" at hand (Devall, 1988: 55-59). Eco-feminists are quick to reveal the fact of the broad "exploration of the history of patriarchal society" (Kheel, 1990). Their claim is that the focus should not be on human-centeredness, but rather about male-centeredness, also know as *androcentrism*. Eco-feminists feel that to truly come from a "Deep" Ecology position, one should pay much more attention to the factors of gender as a critical variable in the environmental crisis. The argument from an eco-feminist point-of-view declares that woman and men experience the world differently. They indicate that woman are much more closer to the land and Nature than that of men (Devall, 1988: 55-59). In response to this argument, Devall (1988), in a paper entitled, "The Critics of Deep Ecology," stresses that different genders may have different ways of viewing Nature - but that does not mean that one gender is superior. The premise that women do not share all the same tendencies of emotions and views towards the environment may also be said in response to the feminist critique. Patsy Hallen (1987: 3-13), a lecturer in Environmental Philosophy and Ethics at Murdoch University in Australia, insists that Deep Ecology and Feminism both need one another to "bring a reversal to male-stream values, a revolution in economic priorities, a peace force for sustainable society, and the ecology reconstruction" of today's culture. It is of these deep issues that we must turn

and face together in the struggle to acquire the knowledge in order to change our modern industrial world-view.

One flaw that Annie Booth (2000: 1-11), an Associate Professor in Environmental Studies at the University of Northern British Columbia, illustrates from the Deep Ecology perspective is the Movement's quest for knowledge. Booth indicates that Deep Ecology is a knowledge that is based on "intuition "and that "seeing other forms of life," including a group life such as a tree, or river, "as of equal relevance as we are ourselves is an intuitive leap." In her argument, she specifies that this is irrational, and that Deep Ecologists do not fully understand the question of knowledge in "real" life terms. Another critique of Deep Ecology comes from the Marxist perspective. This outlook is found to come head to head with Deep Ecology and its principles because they take a materialistic viewpoint of Nature. The assertion from this standpoint is that Nature is a collection of natural resources, and "humans have the ability to manipulate these (natural) recourses with their technology" (Devall, 1988: 55-59). Marxist claim that humans are a part of Nature – and therefore human manipulation of Nature is a natural tendency and "human welfare is of more importance than the welfare of other species," and the idea that "we should develop natural resources to serve the needs of billions of people on Earth" is their argument (Devall, 1988: 55-59). Human beings must become aware and understand the harmful consequences of the notion of *resourcism*. Devall (N.D.) states that *resourcism* "is based on the premise that Nature is a collection of natural resources that can be exploited by humans with technology and labor." If we do not respect the environment and what it provides for us, we are abusing that relationship. In response to the Marxist's oversimplified argument, Deep Ecology stresses that Nature should be

experienced more deeply through the development of our ecological selves. As Arne Naess illustrates, as said before – we must be active in the process of cultivating our all-around maturity and discovering self-realization through our relationship with our biosphere, and ultimately, building upon our ecosophy. The Marxist perspective must incorporate the larger whole of the meaning of community that includes all plants, animals, and land forms of the Earth.

Also, some critics of Deep Ecology have come to be in opposition to the Movement's language of asserting "rights" to plants and animals. Some critics claim that if plants and animals had the same rights as human beings - then it would assert that when I go out and mow my lawn every week, I would be committing assault on my grass? In response, supporters of the Movement "recognize the inadequacies of the term 'rights' – but employ the concept" in their quest to transmit the meaning of *ecocentric* ideas (Devall, 1988: 55-59). Devall indicates that, "our language has so much baggage of anthropocentric philosophy that it is difficult to express the intuition of Deep Ecology without inviting misinterpretation." Some philosophers are cautious to use the term 'rights' and tend to discuss the notion of 'respect' for Nature, as in Aldo Leopold (1949) and his writings. Leopold's powerful statement indicates this by stating: A thing is right when it tends to protect the integrity, stability, and diversity of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.

Additionally, there are some critics who counter Deep Ecology supporters that advocate the world is in need of a population decrease and that humans should start to be very concerned with putting limits on population increase. Devall (1988: 55-59) has illustrated that Deep ecologists who advocate a decrease in human population have been

labeled "racists, Malthusians, and misanthropists." This is a very morally sound subject that is not to be taken lightly. Devall (1988: 55-59) has stated that, "reducing the rate of population by *humane* means is a correlate of compassion encouraged by the Deep Ecology Movement. By adding to this discussion, Deep Ecologist Arne Naess outlines what he describes as *ultimate goals of humankind*. These goals are classified as: individual, social (communal), and cultural. In an unpublished article to Devall, Naess states,

> "On the average no very great population is required in each culture; on the contrary, huge numbers tend to reduce the manifold, and there are no *ultimate goals* of mankind the realization of which needs reduction of the richness and diversity of life on Earth" (Devall, 1988: 55-59).

Through self-realization and cultivation of the ecological Self, humans will understand that to adhere to ecologically sound and sustainable communities, it requires that a smaller human population is necessary than the present number.

One aspect that can be agreed upon is that both Deep Ecology supporters and those who oppose what Deep Ecology stand for can "generally agree that major reconstruction of society is necessary" (Devall, 1988: 55-59). No one can dispute the poverty rates, the rising prison population, the crime, violence, and destruction of the environment. Deep Ecology argues that humans must demand for the restructuring of our society, the way we think and for the "reconstruction of meaning in an age of nihilism" (Devall, 1988: 55-59).

CHAPTER FIVE

Bioregionalism: A Sense of Place and Space

"Trees are benign beings, always giving shelter, shade, and comfort to those humans who enter the dark woods with respect."
Devall, N.D.

In this chapter I will discuss and cover the concept of *bioregionalism*. I will show further how we as humans are an integral part of our environment and how the environment is an integral part of us. Touch on the notion of *place* and *space* as sacred entities in our lives, I will show how individuals must battle to defend their place and space with different types of direct action, such as in the practice of community environmental restoration projects. I will articulate how the environmental movement has changed in the end of the 20th Century from a macro-national agenda to a micro-local agenda surrounding bioregionalism as the foundation. In this chapter I will also mention how Devall spent much of his latter years with awareness in, and in support of, his own *bioregion*. He expressed the idea of *conservation* as being actions based on our human consciousness and awareness. The chapter will explain how Devall believed that *bioregionalism* is one of the key factors to living in a sustainable society and how he firmly felt the concept was, and is, the future direction of the environmental conservation-preservation movement. It is the new "frontline" of direct political action for the "practice" of the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement.

Bioregionalism and Deep Ecology:

Drawing from Arne Naess' ecophilosophy of 'Ecosphy T,' Devall draws out bioregionalism by understanding that we as humans identify with the place of which we inhabit. The cultivation of the ecological Self, as discussed in Chapter Three of this thesis paper, is most accessible to us by *not* focusing on human-centered creations, but rather on our own bioregions as a whole. Devall's definition of bioregion is as stated: "*Bio* means life, and *region* means the territory, or life-world of experience. Literally, then, a bioregion is the territory of lived experience. It is the territory with which a person, or a community of people, identifies as part of their Self" (Devall, N.D.) The origin of the word is unknown, but in 1974, the Canadian poet Allen Van Newkirk used the term looking to connect the study fields of cultural and biotic regions. Van Newkirk (1975) had discussed bioregion in terms of a point-of-view, as well as *bioregional strategies* for the recovery process of the Planet's diverse spread of natural plants and animals within a specific *regional framework* and the cultural adaptation to specific bioregions. With the exploration of bioregional strategies and studies - ecology, language studies, poetry, myth, and cultural history are all tools to be highlighted and used (Parsons, 1985). These fields all give body and substance to the development of the ecological Self within one's bioregion. Similarly, biologist use the term *biome* or *biogeoclimatic zone,* which refers to the area in which people draw some necessities of life – water, crops gown in the soil, trees for building or other uses, carious raw materials for manufacturing, etc (Russ, 1995). However though, biologists may center their studies around a given locale in its purpose as a habitat for certain animals, bioregional studies never lose sight of the fact that *people* live in and interact with a region (Russ, 1995).

Don Alexander (1996), affiliated with the School of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Waterloo, infers that ecologist Raymond Dasmann and environmental activist Peter Berg are the "fathers" of bioregionalism. Alexander explains that the term developed as a product of biogeography and the California counter-culture through the joining of Berg and Dasmann who were interested in using counter-cultural movements as a vehicle for more ecologically oriented values. Alexander exemplifies that the first major statement of this new philosophy was illustrated in Berg and Dasmann (1977) "Reinhabiting California," published in the *Ecologist*, which referred to bioregion as both a *geographical terrain* and a *terrain of consciousness* – a place, and the ideas that have developed about how to live in that place. Berg and Dasmann (1977) go on to conclude that within a bioregion, the conditions that influence life are similar and these in turn have influenced human occupancy.

Bioregional studies and vision "are in direct contrast to our contemporary worldview that underscores the themes of globalization, technologization of life, and hyper consumption" (Chew, 2008: 28). Ralph Metzner (1995), a psychotherapist and professor at the California Institute of Integral Studies, regards bioregionalism as "*radical ecology*," or "*revolutionary ecology*," because it does not limit itself to advocating conservation or anti-pollution legislation – rather it critiques the very foundations of the modernist industrial worldview, its most cherished value systems and deeply engrained habits of thought. Bioregional studies are complex attentive observations of one's direct region wherein they inhabit that are adapted by ecocentric values. Through bioregional studies, humans may better understand the compassion and respect to work to develop localized human communities that are ecologically sustainable (Devall, 1988).

Bioregional knowledge allows one to take responsibility for his of her own actions, and ultimately his or her own home place. Bioregional studies are grounded in studies of ecology and conservation biology by using multifaceted fields of studies to understand one's home place in a far greater perspective. Bioregionalism is grounded in the determination to explore ecosophy more fully and "in our authentic, intuitive responses, with careful consideration of our emotional states of being" which "help up transcend dualism of materialism versus spirituality, of conservation versus preservation, and of people versus Nature" (Devall, 1988).

Devall (1988) says that we must defend our bioregion as if we were defending our own Self. To strengthen this notion, Gary Snyder (1990, 1995) states that our place is part of what we are, and that is how Devall understood his own personal interaction with *place* and the intimacy that came with that relationship. Devall discovered that *place* is more than landscape, and more than just description of landforms presented by scientists. *Place*, used in the context of this thesis, refers to the homeland of ecological Self. Place is not just an obscure name that is placed on a map by explorers – it is the act of encountering the land by "leading us to discover more essential names than those on any map" (Devall, 1988: 57). Devall (1988) states that bioregionalism is the action of taking the time and energy to learn the possibilities of place. This notion of place is a combination, and creation, of our existence and collection of experiences overtime. Devall (N.D.) illustrated in his last work that by exploring the *place* wherein we dwell, we discover paradoxes and questions, which draw us inward, into an affirmation of life that we are always in process of discovering" and rediscovering our ecological Self. Metzner (1995) describes bioregionalism as a consciousness-raising practice, or an

ecopsychological practice. A practice such as this, may affect our sense of identity, and/or our self-image. Prolific author and Kentucky farmer, Wendell Berry (1977) states that, if you do not know *where* you are - then you do not know *who* you are.

Spirit of Regionalism:

A sense-of-place, or what Jim Dodge (1981), a Northern-California rancher suggests as the "*spirit-of-place,"* is sacred to the human community and to the culture of that specific region. To reinforce what Dodge states, James Swan (1990) illustrates in his book entitled "Sacred Places in Nature," by describing sacred places as sites for ceremony and ritual healing, contemplation, and for rites of passage – they were seen and are seen today, as the very cornerstone for cultural renewal. These places in a bioregion may come about through common union with the community, or they may be encouraged and inspired through a religious leader. Sacred places are essential in the measure for bioregional consciousness, awareness and to the development of our ecological Self. An example of sacred places, we may turn to Devall's own bioregion of the Pacific North West. Here, high in the Siskiyou Mountains, or the "high country" as described in Native American cosmology, particular high rocks on certain ridges hold "prayer seats" where shamans, also know as medicine people, and others who have prepared for the journey, go to engage in certain rituals and to meditate deeply. Shamans - who go to the "high country" to make and gather medicine, do so for the whole community. Making this trip to the "high country" is not a recreational, or leisurely backpacking trip – it is part of the "real work" of engaging with the land and cultivating our maturity of our ecological Self (Devall, 1988: 62). Further, Devall (1988: 52) explains that by "exploring

the ecological Self, (it) can be partly described as discovering a sense-of-place or an ecological consciousness. Thus, the more we know a place intimately, the more we can increase our identification with it."

Human community life is fundamentally valuable to all. Alan Drengson (1995, 1980: 86-87) exemplifies that, "civilization cannot exist outside the realm of Nature – for natural laws provide the constraints within which society must exist." Drengson (1980: 87) adds that, "boundaries of community extend to include the other beings of our home places." We as community members of our own bioregion must act to defend our sacred places. In today's culture, to practice this it may be shown through the support of *community restoration projects* that help bring back the natural element in our local environments. *Restoration* means, " recovering the geography of hope and thinking over a longer timeframe than one's own lifetime" (Devall, N.D.). It is also the act of restoring, and recreating, a widely shared sense of regional identity with the community members within that which is founded upon a renewed critical awareness of, and with respect for, the integrity of our natural ecological habitats. Devall frequently took field trips to work on stream restoration projects where he and his students were educated about the forces that cut the valleys – the human changes in the valleys. These changes such as road building, ranching, and logging – all had direct effect on the changed load material of the stream called sediment. Devall and his students would learn from biologists about the *edge effect*,

> "Wherein creation of an opening such as a clearcut in the deep woods can affect the whole forest, including the survival ability of animals that live in the deep woods by reducing their range and living space and disrupting their foraging areas and feeding habitats" (Devall, 1993: 117).

Bioregionalism is discovered through the physical encounters that we as humans have with the land. Jim Dodge (1981) has offered four elements to exploring our bioregions. The first element is founded on the notion of *biotic shift* – which is the percentage of change in the plant and animal species from one region of the land to another. He affirms that at a percentage change of 15-25 percent, then it may be said that a biotic shift has occurred. Through the shifting of biotic communities there will be differentials between the landforms, climate, and soils of the land. Scientists debate over the exact boundaries of these biotic shifts. Devall (1988) offers that the notion of personal discoveries are more important in exploring our 'terrain of consciousness' than rigid definitions and boundaries defined by scientists. Bioregional identity does not come from the political lines drawn on maps designed and laid out by bureaucratic politicians. For Devall (1988: p 60) "boundaries of self-identification are those we walk through – what area am I attuned with? What area will I defend?" Kirkpatrick Sale (1985), an environmental scholar and writer, refers to individuals who defend their land and bioregion as 'dwellers of the land.' The love of a place and the ties to that place are what make up the bioregional identity for individuals.

The second element of bioregion is *watershed.* Through the discovery and outline of the water that we drink, we can define our watershed. Watershed may be said to "define basic hydrological units" (Devall, 1988: 61). There are some Native American tribes who identify themselves as "upper river" or "down river" peoples. Water is a source of life for all, and if water is polluted in one aspect of the region, it may, and very likely will, affect the surrounding region as a whole.

A third basis for bioregional studies and consciousness describes the notion of *spirit-of-place* – or sense of place. To further explain this idea, the examples from Australian aborigines and their cultural 'walkabouts' demonstrate the deep interconnection between Self and place. Through these transpersonal experiences, it may be said that the foundation of the ecological Self may be found. It may be difficult for modern science to provide explanations based on reason for the effects that sacred places have on our thoughts and experiences – but with the interaction with these places, they may "stimulate our dreams, myths, stories, and songs" (Devall, 1988: 63). It may be said that discovering and rediscovering these sacred places in our land may be one of the most vital needs and features of the 'real work' we must perform.

Another example of spirit-of-place can be found in the phrase from the old American West – "This is God's country." Through this phrase, it may be interpreted that the speaker senses closeness to the "Great Creator" of the land. From a Deep Ecology standpoint, the phrase – "This is God's Country' – is not a place to be subdivided and sold as property - it is a phrase for all to give back to, and to give thanks for, the spirit-of-place at hand" (Devall, 1988: 62).

Lastly, Dodge (1981) describes *cultural distinctiveness* as the fourth basis of bioregional consciousness. The way that people refer to specific landforms, weather, or the relationships with the landscape way be signs of a particular bioregional culture. There may be distinctive rituals that are performed, artwork created, or types of living that are tied to a specific region. An example of this can be seen in the Native American culture on the Pacific West Coast, prior to the involvement of Europeans in California. Native Peoples here were divided into over 500 distinct nations, where they lived in

virtual harmony with one another, having distinct languages and cultures but also living in harmony with the lands, rivers, and ocean bays that they inhabited. In an article entitled "The Native American Experience in California," Jack Forbes (1971) describes these tribes as applied philosophers, seeking not in theory, but in *practice* to act out in their lives the beauty and harmony of the Great Mystery – which takes form on two levels: (1) ordinary day-to-day sense participation and (2) on a mystical level – where all creatures participate in life both consciously and unconsciously. On this level, linear space-time relationships and physical boundaries are absent, and non-existent.

To further develop relationships with the land, and to cultivate our bioregional identities from a Deep Ecology perspective, humans must "get inside the landscape, rather than just observing from a detached scientific standpoint" (Devall, 1988: 65). To strengthen this notion, Yi-fu Tuan (1974), a Chinese-American Geographer, infers that these affected ties with a landscape include *topophobia*, hatred or strong dislike for a place, and/or *topophilia*, love for the region or place. To engage in these practices, we must get outdoors and experience the landscape, or what Alan Drengson (1980) refers to as *wilderness travel*. Devall promotes individuals to get out and experience wilderness travel through the activity of walking, or hiking. As John Muir once said, you can't see a landscape at forty miles an hour. Walking restores the native logic, and restores our physical connection with the ground beneath our feet (Devall, 1988). The act of walking has no purpose but to be in that place – at that time. The goal is not be get someplace – but to be in a good place, a *utopia*. Devall (1988: 104) states that, "we sustain our life and explore the fuller dimensions of Self by following Muir's advice, stopping to make friends with flowers or trees or rocks which attract our attention."

Deep Long-Rage Ecologists must follow the bioregional philosophy and ideas from Aldo Leopold (1949) who encourages us to "think like a mountain." We must develop deep affective ties with our river, or mountain, or our prairies. Dolores LaChapelle (1978), an independent scholar and leader in the Deep Ecology Movement, expressed in "Earth Wisdom," that a mountain is not a place to conquer, but rather a place to fall into awareness of the unity of life and death, of the interconnections of God and human. Within the activity of mountain climbing, the goal or aim is not just to reach the summit, or the top of the route, "but to know the sides of the mountain which sustain us and other living beings which make the mountain their home (Devall, 1988: 104). Devall (1988) illustrates that the summit of a mountain has powerful symbolic importance when all the ridges point towards it, and to encourage self awareness, Deep Ecology encourages that we should consciously follow the 'flow line,' with intense connection.

The cultivation of our bioregional consciousness is political in action and is a "social expression of our vital need to be part of, not apart from, the place wherein we dwell" (Devall, 1988: 67). An example of how bioregionalism is part of political and social expression is seen from The North American Bioregional Congresses, which is an organization, founded in 1984, that supports the Bioregional Movement and strives to educate the public on bioregional issues and language. The Congresses bring many people together from many different and diverse bioregions to discuss particular philosophies and practical skills for making a home in their own bioregions. Here is a mission statement that the organization expressed in 1984 that is consistent with the Deep Ecological Perspective:

> A growing number of people are recognizing that in order to secure the clean air, water and food that we need to healthfully survive, we have to become stewards of the places where we live. People are discovering that the best way to take care of ourselves, and to get to know our neighbors, is to protect and restore where we live.
>
> Bioregionalism recognized, nurtures, sustains and celebrates our local connections with: land; plants and animals; river, lakes and oceans; air; families, friends and neighbors; community; native traditions; and systems of production and trade.
>
> It is taking the time to learn the possibilities of place.
>
> It is a mindfulness of local environment, history and community aspirations that can lead to a future of sage and sustainable life.
>
> It is reliance on well-understood and widely used sources of food, power and waste disposal.
>
> It is secure employment based on supplying a rich diversity of services within the community and prudent surpluses to other regions.
>
> Bioregionalism is working to satisfy basic needs through local control in schools, health centers, and governments.
>
> The bioregional movement recreates a widely shared sense of regional identity founded upon a renewed critical awareness of and respect for our ecological communities.
>
> People are joining with neighbors to discuss ways we can work together to (1) Learn what our special local resources are (2) Plan how to best protect and use those natural and cultural resources (3) Exchange our time and energy to best meet our daily and long-term needs, and (4) Enrich our children's local and planetary knowledge.
>
> Bioregionalism and security begins by acting responsibly at home. Welcome home! (North American Bioregional Congresses, 1984, 2010)

Devall (1993: 163) states a characteristic of a bioregion in his unpublished work as having *soft boundaries*, as "opposed to the hard, political boundaries of cities, counties, states, and nations." Some consider their bioregion to be their local watershed, the region from where they receive their water from, or to expand and "include several watersheds that drain from a range of mountains." The place of origin from where one receives their water source is a very sacred place. For others, it may be a dessert region, island, mountains, or prairie land. To have a relationship with one's bioregion means to understand these elements of the environment around you. This incorporates

understanding the seasonal changes in one's region. For Devall, the Pacific North Coast would be considered his *ecosphy* and an example of the seasonal changes in Devall's bioregion of the Klamath-Siskiyou, are far different then those in the deserts of Southern United States. Each individual person physically being connected to the encounters with spiritual landscapes or with the whole watershed of the region – the 'veins of the landscape,' discovers a bioregion. For Devall (1996) the concept is illustrated through his discovery of his bioregion by the description he gives of the land:

> "Deep in the dark woods is the spirit, the breath of life. Rivers flow through my veins and the ocean swells with new storms in my body. Coming to my senses, deep in the dark woods, I know that I am home."

Devall felt that he must defend and give voice to his bioregion because he himself is a part of that bioregion and environment as much as the plants and animals within it.

Giving meaning to our lives is a direction that humans have always been attracted to. By deepening our connection with the ecological self, and dissolving the egotistical self, we may constitute the idea of what Devall (N.D.) calls *deep-bioregional culture*. This refers to the "roots of beliefs and code of conduct that determine how an individual, or a community, will give meaning to their relationship with the landscape and how the community will craft a way of life that is sustained within the limits suggested by *place."* This is the process of developing a way of life as *reinhabitation*. Reinhabitation requires "a spiritual commitment to the life-force of a place, a commitment to work in a community with other humans in ritual affirmation of the integrity of life and death" (Devall, N.D.). This is the "real work" that we must practice. Gary Snyder (1995) refers to re-inhabitory actions as the ability for humans to come out of the industrial societies and to begin to turn back to the land, to place. It is the action of being committed to a

place through a cultivated spiritual and moral choice. Reinhabitation has many surfaces and involves work over many generations. The stress is on community as a whole participating and contributing to such practices over many generations (Chew, 2008: 38-39). The idea of socialization and educating the younger generations is an important aspect of the work of those attempting to create a bioregional culture.

Gary Snyder (1995) supports the collectivity of community, and community members, to educate the younger generations that gives them pride in their culture and of their place and to further a spiritual education that helps children appreciate the full interconnectedness of life while encouraging a biologically informed ethic of non-harming. During the time Devall spent as a professor at Humboldt State University (HSU), he would frequently take his students out into the environment around them - the ancient Redwood forests, Pacific Ocean beaches, or the rocky river beds of the Northcoast- where the students would be able to physically interact with, and to build upon (or to just begin) a relationship with, their own bioregion (Devall, N.D.). Many students come from other regions to attend HSU, and they may not have fully understood the region in which they were dwelling. Devall would create exercises for the students so that they could think about and understand more fully this relationship that one has with their habitat. An illustration of this would be a fieldtrip where the students would go on Nature Hikes through the forest. He would have the students find a quiet place in the forest, a soft place on a log, or finding a sliver of sunlight through the canopy of trees and have them write to the trees. He would have them think: What would the trees say if they could speak? What have they seen in their lifetime? What do the trees have to look

forward to in the future? Destruction? Salvation? This exercise was very similar to Joanna Macy's Council Of All Beings.

Exercises like the one above would have the students think about anthropocentric ideas, creating a more ecocentric worldview and ultimately helping them develop their ecological Self on Deep Ecological Principles. Another example of an exercise that Devall would engage his students with is an exercise that helped students think about the future generations and the relationship that those generations would have with their bioregion.

The bioregional movement described as a "radical ecology," challenges to change our perception and understanding of the human role in the natural world (Metzner, 1995). Bioregionalism, like Deep Ecology, is a philosophy and practice that encourages humans to become aware of the native plants, animals, and landscapes in the region where in they dwell. With the linkage to place, there is a "cultural understanding of the historical relationship between human community and the land (that) is understood and remembered" (Chew, 2008: 40). Bioregionalism encourages the study of the historical and present-day indigenous people of the region, putting significance on how they sustained themselves. By learning about the Native Peoples of the region, it makes an overt connection and harmony with their culture, and if at all possible, practiced (Chew, 2008: 40). To exemplify these traits of bioregional studies, another Deep Ecological exercise that Devall encourages people to engage one's self in to develop self-awareness in his/her bioregion is to answer these questions below. Some of these questions may be answered easily while other may require a lifetime of intimate experience and mature understanding of your place:

What are the native plants of your region? What species have become extinct due to human interventions? What is the most endearing feature of the landscape for you? What do you fear the most in this region? Where are the headwaters of the river upon which you live? What is the history of human modification of the landscape in your region? Sometimes older residents of a region can tell of changes in rivers or mountains or forests can recount the old crafts and skills of dwelling in the place.

What is the nighttime like in your region? Can you see the stars on a clear night or are they obscured by smog or city lights? How much time do you spend outdoors rather than indoors?

Have you visited all the toxic waste dumps in your city region? Can you name all the chemical compounds that have been deposited in the dumps?

Who controls the major parcels of land? Who owns the water rights? Does the law of your region guarantee water rights for fish and wildlife, or is all the water appropriated for human use?

What was the drainage pattern of streams and rivers in your region before the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or other government agencies modified them?

What native plants have edible parts at what seasons of the year?

How much fossil fuel is used and how is it distributed in your bioregion?

Climb the highest hill or mountain in your region - what do you find there? How does it make you feel?

Take a walk in your neighborhood on the stormiest night of the year. Feel the currents of the wind, rain or snow. At what point in your walk do you feel danger, or fear? Can you become apart of the storm without suffering discomfort? Do you enjoy the storm or hate it?

Were there massacres of native peoples in your region? Try to recreate how these people lived with the land.

What are the remnant primeval forests or native grasslands or deserts in your bioregion? Visit them in every season and mood. Discover the quality of light and shadow.

Do you always walk on pavement? Or do you seek the sand, grass, and uneven terrain? Do you attempt to see undomesticated birds and animals every day? Do you listen to the noise of the city or to sounds of rain, wind, and birdcalls? Do the sounds of the city – loudspeakers, motorized vehicles – calm you? Do you breathe easier when listening to these noises?

What distinctive sounds can be heard? A specific birdcall, for example, can be distinguished and the answering call of a bird of the same species. Soundmarks are sounds that make a particular locality endearing, and keynotes are those sounds that occur and reoccur in a landscape created by physical geography or climate – including wind, insects or animal sounds, waterfalls, running water in streams or the coming and going of tides. What Soundmarks and keynotes identify your bioregion? (Devall, 1988: 71-72).

Human beings, like many other animals on this Planet, modify and transform their environments and habitats. The issue, although, is to the extent and type of

transformations humans make. Drawing from Deep Ecology theory and principles, bioregional communities can seek maximum coexistence with other species. Devall states (1988: 67) that caring for, and having an interrelationship with our place means leaving other creatures at peace in their own place. Much like John Muir who argued for the protection of forested regions at the close of the nineteenth century, Devall devoted much of his time and energy to saving, as well as, giving voice to, the ancient 2000-year-old old growth redwoods of Northern California. He practiced direct action that has come in many forms, which I will further explain in Chapter 6. As Naess (2005) had stated - supporters of the Deep Ecology Movement must try to emphasize the positive contents as part of the general fight for preserving what is left of the planet Earth in its unsurpassable splendor. We must stand up and fight against the oppression on our lands and territories around us. We must become more in-tune with our ecosphy, ecological wisdom and harmony. Deep Ecology must express that "we can reconnect, in our recovery process, with the roots of life, with our sense of place in the biosphere" (Devall, 1993: 59). Sing Chew (2008: 42), author and professor of sociology at Humboldt State University, states that, "bioregionalism is a response to the global socioeconomic and ecological crisis." Bioregional studies and action will be the new "*frontline"* in the environmental movement of the 21st and 22nd Centuries. It will no longer be the macro-national agenda that was given at the end of the 20th Century. Bioregional consciousness will be the foundation and base for this new forefront on the struggle to combat globalism, and the environmental crisis at hand. It is a new-age alternative philosophy to the current globalization-growth model that sits currently as the worldview (Chew, 2008: 43).

Chew (2008: 38) emphasizes that bioregionalism is most powerful through "localism and proposing a life practice centered around localism and self-sufficiency that is very different to contemporary accepted legitimate land use, ethics and practices." The political control of the region should rest with the community of inhabitants actually living in the given region. Through operating economic principles such as localization and conservation, bioregional communities may emphasize self-sufficiency as an economic practice. In addition, Chew (2008: 40) argues that a self-sufficient bioregion "would not only be economically stable, it would also mean that it will not have to be dependent on other regions or other parts of the world to ensure its economic reproducibility." Further stated, Chew (2008: 39-40) declares that by avoiding dependency on other regions for resources, "a bioregional economy would not be destructive to its natural areas and social-cultural lifestyles of other regions and parts of the world". From a Deep Ecology standpoint, a bearing on self-sufficiency would mean that, "issues, tragedies, and consequences of growth-based economy ranging from pollution, diseases, toxicity, and crime could be avoided" (Chew, 2008: 40). Bioregional strategies do not hold an emphasis on hierarchical efficiencies, but rather cultivate mutual exchange and complementary relationships that allow diversity of all life to be distinguished. Through bioregionalism, there is a "shared responsibility that becomes the norm of governance – which leads governance, communication, and networking to become necessary and important" functions of the system (Chew, 2008: 40).

Bill Devall lived his life practicing these bioregional philosophical ideas through the Deep Long-Range Ecological perspective. He would turn to his own bioregion, the Klamath-Siskiyou region, for fresh local produce, dairy products, seafood, and beer from

original local breweries. When contractor's labor was needed, Devall would search for local contractors, and when home furnishings were needed, he looked for furnishings made by local craftsmen/women and artists. Devall (1988) states that whenever possible, he reduced consumption of energy – oil, gas, and electricity. He acted politically by boycotting restaurants known to buy beef raised on former rain forests, and by protecting logging of old growth redwood. These are the everyday practices that follow the Deep Ecological perspective and support and sustain one's own bioregion. Bioregionalism movements encompass mindfulness of the local habitat, history, and community desires that can lead to a future of safe and sustainable life.

CHAPTER SIX

Impact on Environmentalism

"The gloomy record of human subjugation of Nature does not provide much hope that we can suddenly turn around and start managing forests and other lands in a truly sustainable way – but we have little choice but to try. We are truly on the brink of catastrophe."
- Bill Devall, 1993

"In wilderness is the preservation of the world."
-Henry David Thoreau, 1851

Through this chapter I will cover and examine the effect and impact that Bill Devall's writings has had on Environmental Action Groups (EAG) and Environmentalism in the late 20th Century. Devall contributed greatly to *The Trumpeter: Journal Of Ecosophy*, an online resource for many supporters of the conservation-preservation movement and Deep Ecology. This chapter of the thesis shall also document the inverse impact that EAG and Environmentalism in the late 20th Century had on Devall. I will briefly discuss the foundations of EAG in regards to: Direct Action, Monkeywrenching, and Ecotage. The means of political activism, which are rooted in non-violent demonstrations and protest from teachings of Gandhi, and figures like Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., are practices of the Deep Ecological perspective. I will explain the foundation of *Wilderness* more fully in its description as a social institution and I will address the depletion of natural resources that humans have had on our ecosystems. I

will also note the important parallel between the eco-feminist perspective and Deep Ecology within the Environmental Movement.

Bill Devall has had a tremendous impact on the Environmental Movement. Through Devall's intellectual articulation that he has contributed to the Deep Long-Range Ecological perspective, many people are able to learn and build upon his ideas and practices. Devall was a professor for 26 years educating the students and the community at Humboldt State University while publishing countless articles, book reviews and essays surrounding the Environmental Movement. He helped publish many different scholarly journals that include the early works of the *Earth First! Journal: The Radical Environmental Journal*. In addition, Devall also published in *The Journal of the Trumpeter*, which has 26 pieces of his work. The Trumpeter is "an environmental journal, now on-line, dedicated to the development of an ecosophy, or wisdom, born of ecological understanding and insight" (Trumpeter, 2010).

Acting through the practices of the Deep Ecology perspective illustrates the ultimate principles of the Environmental Movement stands on. Devall notes that, "the Deep Long-Range Ecology movement is only partly a political movement, but, political activism is one way of demonstrating solidarity with our bioregion, with some other species of plants or animals, and solidarity with each other in the (Environmental) Movement" (Devall, 1988: 67). Through the will of the people and the controls of society, we are able to set restrictions and boundaries to institutions and assert the importance of the places closest to us that we call home. As discussed in Chapter Five, Devall was actively involved, especially in his later years, with many restoration projects that were taking place in his bioregion.

In today's political spotlight, biologists, anthropologists, soil scientists, and other experts are beginning to realize that they must lobby in the political arena for protection of habitat. Devall, as I stated earlier, encouraged experts to speak out for what they believed in and to challenge the dominant global-industrial worldview surrounding anthropocentrism. Along with Alan Drengson, Devall assisted in the making of the Ecoforestry Institutes in the United States and Canada, which inspired the publication of an anthology called Ecoforestry: The Art and Science of Sustainable Forest Use (1997). The Ecoforestry Institute, as describes on its website is "dedicated to the art, science, philosophy, and practice of sustainable forestry in healthy forests." The institute reaches out and speaks to landowners, foresters, conservationists, workers, restorationists, academics, researchers, and professionals through its programs and communications.

Ecodefense:

Bill Devall was involved with and had contact with many Environmental Action Groups through which *direct action* was taken. Direct action is identified as:

> "Action that is taken in defense of a forest, river, or specific species of plants or animals, in which the protester has no monetary or private interest, but has a concern as part of his or her ecological self and makes a statement with his or her body" (Devall, 1988: 140).

Devall paraphrases Gandhi through the following: I serve no one but myself, but my *Self* is broad and deep. A protest march in front of a United States Forest Service agency or blocking public access to roads leading to a logging site is direct action when the protestors are attempting to call attention to the integrity of a primeval forest. Sailing a vessel into an area of ocean decreed by government as a "prohibited zone" to protest

government policies is direct action. So is the action of sitting in a small boat between whales and whaler's harpoons (Devall, 1988: 140).

Direct action can be seen through a variety of political tactics used in campaigns to achieve a specific goal. One form of tactic can be seen through *ecotage*, an act of resisting. Devall defines this term as "disabling a technological or bureaucratic operation in defense of one's place - it is self-defense. Ecotage, as used here, "means actions which can be executed without injury to life" (Devall, 1988: 140). Devall devoted much of his practice of Deep Ecology to standing up for his beliefs and principles to commit to the 'real work.' He was an active part of many groups who took a stance against perpetrators who were destroying their environment and bioregion. Others who took to defend their bioregion include Sam Love and David Obst, activists involved with antinuclear ecotage in New England. These men describe ecotage as an action that is directed, targeted, and within ethical boundaries in defense of living systems. It is not action that could be considered vandalism or random attacks on technology (Devall, 1988: 140; Love and Obst, 1972: 177).

Ecotage is the opposite of the term *ecocide*, which is a term that was developed from the Vietnam War when the United States government authorized aerial spraying of an herbicide known as "Agent Orange." This herbicide, made with dioxin - a highly toxic chemical, was sprayed over immense areas of forest regions in Vietnam in order to disallow military cover to the North Vietnamese in combat. The term ecocide, as described by Devall, means "the willful destruction of habitat" (Devall, 1988: 140). Ecotage then, is the nonviolent defense of landscape from immoral or destructive human

behavior by destroying the technology that can be used in the action of ecocide (Devall, 1988: 140).

Another form of action that is discussed in the Environmental Movement is the term *decommissioning*. This term is a "process of planned, purposeful actions intended to render harmless (or at least less harmful) some machine, factory, or structure" such as a logging truck, bull dozer, etc (Devall, 1988: 140). This form consists of a variety of political, bureaucratic, scientific, and citizen groups. After there is an informed opinion that is heard, based on a discussion from experts and citizen groups, there is a board of directors or a direct agency that agrees to develop and implement a strategy for decommissioning. Devall illustrates that here in the United States, there are forums for Deep Ecologists to express their concerns and strategies for decommissioning such structures as nuclear reactors, nuclear submarines, and uranium processing plants (Devall, 1988: 141). There is great debate and opinion over specific strategies of decommissioning such structures as the ones previously listed. The act of carrying out, or engaging in, the decommissioning of a compound such as a nuclear reactor, is extremely difficult for citizen groups. The discussion forums that allow the goals and means to be expressed to experts and public officials are mainly the only outlets that community groups have. Noted however, if boards or agencies decide to decommission certain property buildings or technology, then environmental activists have been successful.

Another term that is discussed when examining different forms of direct action is the action of m*onkeywrenching.* This term is described as "the purposeful dismantling or disabling of anti-facts used in environmentally destructive practices at a specific site –

such as: dismantling fishing gear or logging equipment" (Devall, 1988: 140). Many people oppose this form of action. Arne Naess is open about his reasons for opposing actions such as monkeywrenching and ecotage in his home country of Norway. The community of Norway finds objectionable the destroying of valuable materials. Even after their homeland was returned to them from the occupation of the Nazi Germany regime, the community was against the destruction of any Norwegian factories or property that were used by Nazi Germany to serve their needs during the war (Devall, 1988: 147). Naess supports strategies and concepts that favor nonviolent conflict resolution, and feels that activists should not deliberately damage or destroy any property of their opponent.

An additional example of monkeywrenching is the tactic that involves tree spiking. Through this concept, there has never been one case of a logger or mill worker that has been injured by an activist's spike. According to Forman (1985), there are two philosophies to this act. The first tactic is the idea for activists to drive large metal spikes in the base of trees, which do not hurt the trees. Through this process, the chainsaws from loggers are not able to cut the base of the tree – for if they tried, their chainsaws would hit the spikes, ruining their equipment. Through this philosophy, the concept is to create the logger to have to replace his equipment and deter him or her from cutting trees and by spiking enough trees in the area it would make logging operations very difficult and expensive.

The second philosophy of tree spiking is the idea of driving spikes into the tree that are well above the area where loggers will cut the tree. The objection through this tactic is to ruin the commercial mill equipment in the factory where the logs are being

processed. Once again, by spiking enough trees in the areas that are deemed to be cut, the activists are deterring timber sales from multinational corporations whose philosophy is to cut-and-run devastating the land and leaving local economies in shambles (Foreman, 1985).

Direct action, monkeywrenching and ecotage can be seen as "means for practicing Deep Ecology if they are based on authentic self-defense and are generally nonviolent. In this sense, the means are part of the end" (Devall, 1988: 141). Foreman (1985) states in his book, *Ecodefense: A field guide to monkeywrenching*, that the line of "attack" of strategic monkeywrenching is built on these following principles:

1) It is nonviolent. "It is not directed towards harming human beings or other forms of life."
2) A formal group does not organize it, "It is truly an individual action."
3) It may be a project of a small affinity group.
4) It is targeted. The focus of activity is specific; for example, stopping or delaying destruction in a specific area as part of a larger strategy to obtain official protection.
5) It is timely. It has a proper place in the total campaign. Monkeywrenchers make a clear and accurate assessment of the political situation.
6) It is dispersed. There is no central clearing house of information on monkeywrenching. No records are kept of operations.
7) It is diverse. Many kinds of people are involved. It is non-elitist. It is *not* paramilitary action.
8) It is fun. "There is a rush of excitement." It can also be very dangerous.
9) It is not revolutionary. "It does not aim to overthrow any social political or economic system. It is merely nonviolent self-defense of the wild."
10) It is simple. "Use the simplest tool and method."
11) It is deliberate and ethical, not vandalistic or unpremeditated. "They keep a pure heart and mind about it. They remember that they are engaging in the most moral of all actions, protecting life, defending the Earth. (Foreman, 1985; Devall, 1988: 148-149)

The term *nonviolent* creates problems for a number of Deep Ecology supporters because "they equate nonviolence with passivity or nonresistance" (Devall, 1988: 141). Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi are direct icons in the meaning of

nonviolence and nonresistance. Gandhi's nonviolent and nonresistance political action was referred to as *Satyagraha.* The translation to the English language is "soul-force" or "truth-force." Gandhi referred to nonviolence as *ahimsa.* This term is translated as: a way of acting that refrains from hurting others, or, a lifestyle based on compassion for all. Gandhi drew much of his strategies and concepts from his faith of Hinduism. Many people would vow that Gandhi could be seen in the same light as Buddha. Devall (1988: 141-42) points that communication is a key factor in Gandhian practices in (1) touch the brain and heart of your opponent (2) state your goals clearly, and (3) announce the intent of your actions. Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolent resistance "becomes most effective with more people involved and the more action performed" (Devall, 1988: 141). Arne Naess, when applying this philosophy to ecotage and monkeywrenching, claims that mass scale and frequent usage of ecotage would reinforce police-state tendencies and the practice of fascism. However though, Devall (1988: 141) asserts that "ecotage as an emergency action may be appropriate if it gives the protestors time to block destructive actions legally, as with a court order, for example."

Arne Naess determined several norms and hypothesis that were used by Gandhi. One of these general norms used was "act in group struggle and act, moreover in a way conducive to long-term, universal, maximal reduction of violence" (Naess, 1974: 60). The hypothesis that Naess connected with this norm is that "the character of the means used in a group struggle determines the character of the results" (Devall, 1988: 142). Illustrated by Devall, this is understood as there is "no acceptance of the statement that the ends justify the means. The means commonly used by the dominant culture to enforce its will is not conducive to deeper social change or the cultivation of Self-

realization" (1988: 142). The tendencies toward a nonviolent conflict must be reinforced through Gandhian rule that states: activists should never resort to violence against their opponent (but rather) choose the action(s) or attitude that most probably reduces the tendency towards violence of all parties within the struggle. This is why communication in any struggle, whether in the Environmental Movement, Peace Movement or Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement, opponents must understand each others motives so that they are less likely to use violence on one another. Devall (1988: 142) states that "if (opponents) see each other as people rather than as functionaries, then compassion may be encouraged."

To add to the discussion on nonviolent behavior and tactics, some environmental activists stray from the Gandhian philosophy of not intending harm to the property or technology of your opponent. Examples of divergence from this philosophy can be seen through ecological activists in the Northwest who engage in the act of dismantling bulldozers tractors and machinery so they may not cut roads through forest habitats, or like the Sea Shepherd Society, in 1986, where they were successful in sinking two industrial whaling vessels to the bottom of the sea floor and sabotaging an industrial whaling processing plant in Reykjavik Harbor and destroyed the computer communications room of the Icelandic whaling industry (Devall, 1988: 138).

Although there are many activists within the Environmental Movement that study nonviolence as their means of demonstrating, there can be serious consequences to nonviolent acts. For instance, when activist Brian Wilson was protesting against United States support for Contra rebels in Nicaragua by laying across a set of railroad tracks at Concord Naval Station in 1987, had his legs severed below the knees by an oncoming

train (Devall, 1988: 142). In addition, given the police-state in today's industrious nations, numerous protestors acting in nonviolent means are victims at rallies by getting hit with high-pressure fire hoses, rubber bullets, sound-waves, pepper spray and even taser-guns - that deliver an electric shock at a rate of 50-1000 kV.

Another intense incident that comes from nonviolence can be seen in the Fall of 1997, where Humboldt County Sheriff officers arrived at peaceful sit-in demonstrations where activists – ranging from ages 16 to 40 years old – locked their arms in metal pipes calling for the protection of Headwaters Forest in Northern California. The sheriff officers forcibly seized the head of each demonstrator and inserted cotton swabs that were saturated with the chemical agent pepper spray into their eyes. On two occasions, officers also sprayed the substance directly into their eyes at close range (Goodman, 2004). Individuals who are working in campaigns based on Gandhian philosophy and principles are encouraged to see the implications of their actions before they are committed to following through (Devall, 1988: 142).

Bill Devall was active in letting his voice be heard in the environmental struggle and movement. Devall (1988) asserts that the support of an affinity group is key to surviving the consequences of direct action. Within the Earth First! Movement, affinity groups are a very important piece to the overall picture. Devall views affinity groups as "truly anarchistic groups." According to Devall (1988) in an essay in the *Journal of the Trumpeter*, anarchy is a self-regulating system, and without central authority or hierarchy, a social movement relying on an anarchistic form of organization requires that each person and each affinity group work from and ethical basis and consider all consequences of their actions. The tasks of supporters of the ecological resistance

movement are to build ecologically aware communities and to educate the population on the effects that we as humans have on our plants and animals in our own bioregions.

With respect to affinity groups and activists contemplating nonviolent action, the guidelines from Oregon Earth First! should defiantly be considered. The following principles were developed for mass actions surrounding people who are not grounded in nonviolence as a way of life – but recognize it as a tactic for social change:

1. Our attitude will be one of openness, friendliness, and respect toward all people we encounter.
2. We will use no violence, verbal or physical, toward any person.
3. We will not damage any property.
4. We will not bring or use drugs or alcohol other then for medical purposes.
5. We will not run.
6. We will carry no weapons (Devall, 1988: 150).

Deep Ecology and Biotechnology:

Activists within the environmental community, and supporters of the Deep Ecology philosophy, are concerned with matters of environmental ethics and human involvement with domesticated plant and animals including human creations – creatures of *biotechnology*. Paul Taylor (1986), a philosopher known for his work in environmental ethics, argues that "institutions and practices which provide the ethical basis for relations between humans and domesticated and biotechnological creatures a society's *bioculture*" (Devall, 1988: 185). This bioculture includes such institutions as zoos, the pet trade, sports using animals (horse racing, rodeos, dog fighting), the breeding and training of animals, forest plantations, many forms of agriculture (genetically modified foods), scientific experiments using animals, some wildlife management practices and commercial endeavors such as: fish hatcheries, game bird farms, and game ranching, and exhibitions of animals like Sea World (Devall, 1988: 185). Within all of

these given examples of bioculture, plants and animals are used for human ends and purposes, which is in direct opposition to the Deep Ecological perspective.

Biotechnologists, as described by Mark Sagoff (1986), an environmental ethicist, believe that much of Nature can be improved – or enhanced – by human intervention. Biotechnologists are in favor of the process of cloning of 'superior' genes within animals or actual manipulation of DNA to produce larger animal species. Devall (1988: 185) argues that, "unless scientists stop experimentation (on plants and animals) and enforce restrictions on genetically altered organisms, within a short-time we will have novel organisms – including crosses between species." Issues and questions surrounding this debate concerning the cosmology of modern science should fundamentally be discussed. The Deep Ecology Platform, developed by Arne Naess, calls the human population to examine these questions thoroughly before irreversible policy decisions are made. The environmental community has gained strength with activists opposed to genetically altered plants. The issue to human health has become a serious matter.

We as humans affect the conditions of the whole ecosystem at large. We can see direct evidence of this affection with the changes induced by acid rain in areas of North America and Europe. Humans are rapidly altering the biomass of the Earth through transfer of genetic material from one continent to another, human-induced extinctions, intentional alteration of many types of ecosystems, genetic erosion resulting from habitat loss, mutations and biotechnology (Devall, 1988: 159; Anderson 1987; Elkington 1985).

Deep Ecology & Eco-Feminism:

Rachel Carson, an eco-feminist who received her MA in Zoology from John Hopkins University, has been widely known for her strong character in the ability to stand up to take on the fight and action against the use of pesticides and herbicides in agricultural use that challenged the way humans interacted with Nature around them. Carson was a major figure in the environmental movement, including her book *Silent Spring* (1962) that deeply confronted the practices of agriculture scientists and the government's intervention. Devall says that from the writing of this book, "you can probably date the beginnings of the *Age of Ecology*" (Devall, 1985: 94). *Silent Spring* discusses the widespread use of these man-made chemicals that were developed to further human control over the undesirable organisms in Nature. The synthetic chemicals were first introduced during World War II, without the public's knowledge and the full extend of the ecological effects and consequences. These devastating chemicals were directly applied over forested areas, agricultural lands, and even applied to populated metropolitan regions. Government agencies gave false information and scientists had affirmed that there would be no potential threat in using these means of control. Carson's *Silent Spring* played a key role in the Environmental Movement by gaining public awareness through the provision of direct research data findings and eyewitness accounts to illuminate the swift careless practices that were consequently affecting humans and the environment as a whole.

Within the environmental community and movement, there is much added debate from eco-feminist, like Carson. Eco-feminists frequently use the term *rape* when contrasting the domination of women and violence against women, as parallel to the

domination and exploitation of Nature itself. Devall states that "*rape* is an appropriate comparison to make – the forests have been seized and taken away by force, and they have been despoiled" (Devall, 1993: 10). There are very clear bridges between the Deep Ecology Platform and the feminist perspective.

Since the actions of government organizations and large corporations have become globalized, the Environmental Movement has become a worldwide network of movements and organizations using their sophisticated tactics and strategies to resist the devastation of the last wild areas on the planet Earth while beginning to act more locally in bioregional strategies. The Environmental Movement - consisting of supporters of the Deep Ecology perspective, as well as from all religious, philosophical, and political positions – are coming together to defend and protect the last Wilderness areas on this planet. To support what Henry David Thoreau said in 1851, as he witnessed America's industrial machine beginning to gain speed, "in wilderness is the preservation of the world" (Devall, 1988: 161; Thoreau, 1851). Bill Devall (1988: 161) declares that, "preservation is the highest priority of political activism, from a Deep Ecology viewpoint." The environmental community struggles to affirm that vast areas on the Earth should be "off limits" to "massive invasions of military, scientific and corporate raiders who seek to extract minerals, oil and gas, or any other resources from the Earth's last wild places" (Devall, 1988). Designated foundations of environmental habitats and Wilderness have become social institutions. There are several forms of this illustrated through: National Parks, Nature preserves, and biosphere reserves. Here in the United States, there are federally controlled land or water areas that have been deemed "wilderness status" by the United States Congress since 1964 when the federal

Wilderness Act was passed (Devall, 1988: 161; Allin 1982). Devall explains that designated and de facto – usually defined as roadless areas in the United States – Wilderness areas have been sanctioned as "islands of hope, ecological sanctuaries, sacred places, and areas of land health" (1988: 161). There are scientific ecologists who collect research samples in these Designated Wilderness areas to compare and contrast with research that is collected in Damaged Land areas to illustrate the direct effects that human beings have on the landscapes as a whole. Advocates and activists who seek to protect *Wilderness,* considered to be "relatively unstressed, untrammeled and undisturbed habitat for wild plants and animals," (Devall, 1988: 163) must fight to protect and defend all forms of ecosystems from the Artic to tropical rain forest and to maintain the centers of Earth's ecological diversity (Devall, 1988: 161-62). These areas of protection may be called *Big Wilderness*. Big Wilderness can be defined in several ways. One way, is from Dave Foreman (1986) a co-founder of Earth First!, as describing it as a minimum size of 100,000 acres (Devall, 1988: 162). Bill Devall (1988: 162) would illustrate the term as incorporating more criteria, such as, including entire watersheds, mountain ranges, river estuaries, continents, islands and the surrounding ocean. To add to the debate, Big Wilderness may be considered to include the biosphere as a whole. The *biosphere*, as defined by Russian mineralogist V.I. Vernadsky, is the "portion of Earth within which life exists – including the lithosphere (a layer of Earth approximately three kilometer deep), the hydrosphere (oceans), and the troposphere (lower atmosphere)" (Devall, 1988: 158; Vernadsky, 1945). The Environmental Movement is working hard to protect these remaining areas of Nature from human annihilation and to sustain them as ecological reserves and refuge.

Depleting our Ecosystems:

Human beings are depleting natural resources, destroying ecosystems in which they live and wiping out habitats of animal species of the Earth. An example of this can be witnessed from Devall's bioregion of the Klamath-Siskiyou. In this region, the redwoods have been logged since the year 1850. During that time, there were an estimated two million acres of old-growth redwoods growing. Throughout the last 150 years the forest has been exploited and mistreated. By 2007, the logging industry, being spearheaded by Pacific-Lumber Company (no longer an entity), had logged so much feet of lumber that only 5% of the two million acres remained. If it was not for the community members and citizens of that bioregion, along with political activists acting on their ecological awareness that spoke out against the powerful logging industry, that remaining 5% may not be here today.

Another example can be seen from *Clearcut* (1993), edited by Devall, where humans drastically alter the forests near Fundy National Park, New Brunswick, Canada. Here the industrial logging industry has mortified the natural habitat outside the National Park so badly that the ecosystem of the Park is now in jeopardy. A State of the Environment Report, from the Federal Government of Canada (1991), asserts, "New Brunswick's Fundy National Park, a 20,700 hectare 'island' surrounded by extensive forest, has been logged so much outside the Park's boundaries that it has degraded the quality and reduced the extent of the aquatic habitats within the Park as a result of sedimentation and contamination from insecticides and herbicides" (Devall, 1993: 164).

As mentioned before, it is the every day practicing of developing our ecological Self that we may become in-tune with our surrounding environment to determine what is

meaningful in our lives. By cultivating our ecological Self, we are enriching our future and our relationship between humans and the environment. Devall finds that some of the critics of resourcism, as discussed in Chapter 5, argue that, "old-growth redwoods (found on the Pacific North Coast) are not a renewable resource because humans cannot plant a seedling and grow a redwood tree two hundred years old, much less two thousand years old" (Devall, N.D.). It is up to the activists and individuals who want to make changes in the way human beings are managing the Earth. The cultivation of the ecological Self will encourage people to make a stand and fight to defend their bioregions and habitats. The Environmental Movement must state clearly its objectives, goals, tactics, and ideologies to further halt deterioration of the ecosystems as a whole. The Movement must incorporate the philosophy of Deep Ecology to battle the atrocities of Nature.

Cultivating the Deep Ecology Warrior:

Bill Devall argues that "practicing Deep Ecology is physical" in action (Devall, 1988: 198). Devall explains that supporters of Deep Ecology must become *warriors* to battle the implications of the ecological crisis. Devall asserts that the new warrior "who truly believes in life does not fight – in the usual sense – for this kind of fighting is actually losing because the world has then been defined by the old worldview – not by the Deep Ecology worldview" (Devall, 1988: 199). The warrior practices simple means - and in practicing, is the end in itself.

Devall characterizes the new warrior as remaining "sensuous, erotic, touching their place, active, fully committed, and alive to new possibilities" (Devall, 1988: 199).

The new warriors are individuals who seek ecological growth and stray from the egotistical lifestyles that are forced upon us from the dominant worldview.

The new warriors of the Age of Ecology are armed with two weapons. These weapons are *insight* and *compassion*. With insight, warriors are "connected with the net of life, that everything is connected and intermingled with everything else" (Devall, 1988: 200). With the weapon of compassion, the warrior "takes on the suffering of the world, feeling immense compassion" (Devall, 1988: 200). Devall explains that with these weapons, warriors of the Deep Ecology position "create ecotopian visions against which they compare the present situation" of the environmental crisis and create "statements of an ecological and ethical ideal towards which all can strive" (Devall, 1988: 200).

The defense of place, territory, and the living ecosystems of the world are tasks taken by warriors with a deep sense of self-identification. Devall says that Deep Ecology warriors "live in the midst of a war-zone" and "even when filled with suffering, they are calm," assertive, committed, and confident (Devall, 1988: 201). Devall strongly argues that these attributes are essential to "engage minds and bodies in the real work with centered charity" (Devall, 1988: 201). Deep Ecology warriors are ordinary people in communities growing and deepening their aptitude for suffering in extraordinary times.

Devall acknowledges that the new Deep Ecology warrior will most likely become witness to massive human-induced destruction – but they "do not despair – but simply live" (Devall, 1988: 201). The warrior is consumed with strength to perform the real work in their homelands, to change and reconstruct everything in the dominant industrial anthropocentric worldview. The Deep Ecology warrior politically stands on withdrawing

from the most violent and destructive elements of society. They do not support political regimes that are "encouraging warfare, development of nuclear weapons, and massive, destructive projects in the name of economic development" (Devall, 1988: 202). Devall additionally argues that the Deep Ecology warrior, in these destructive times, encourages the solidarity between movements and the broader identification with all living beings. Warriors each exemplifies and cultivates his/her own style of living within the Deep Ecology Platform and principles.

Devall also acknowledges that warriors will at time feel "frustrated, irritated, upset, and despairing" (Devall, 1988: 203). These feeling are normal, for warriors cannot deny their emotions, but must work diligently and precisely in their act of practicing.

Devall concludes that for Deep Ecology warriors, "practicing means sharing insights with others – but it also means realizing that those others must discover the insights of Deep Ecology for themselves – in their own place" and time (Devall, 1988: 203). By engaging in practicing in our every day lives, the process will continue to engage us in rediscovering self-realization and the process of settling into our own sense-of-place.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Concluding Discussion

"Practicing is subtle. Practicing is simple. Practicing is just practicing."
-Bill Devall, 1988

This thesis has shown how Bill Devall has contributed many intellectual pieces to the field of Deep Ecology. At the beginning of his career, Devall developed several interests that led him to write his doctoral dissertation on the environmental organization the Sierra Club. Chapter Two of the thesis examined Devall's intellectual journey with the Sierra Club. In Chapter Three, I have shown how Devall later found the philosophy of Deep Ecology to be most inspiring and began to develop and deepen his ecological awareness and interconnection with the Earth by nurturing his own ecological Self. Drawing much from his colleague, Arne Naess, Devall expressed that humans must begin to find the right form of practicing in our daily lives. In Chapter Four, we have seen how Devall's Deep Ecology: simple in means - rich in ends, has given individuals the tools and understanding to be able to empower themselves to practice a lifestyle that helps cultivate their ecological Self into 'practical activity.' Later, in Chapter Five, I have illustrated how the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement inspires grassroots movements to gain solidarity and effectiveness when standing up against social institutions and hierarchical organizations to find compassion with the ecosystems as a whole. This compassion, which stems from bioregionalism, gives the tools necessary for political

activists to take responsibility into their own hands and to be able to perform direct action techniques defend what is meaningful in their lives from a genuine nonviolent perspective. We have seen how Devall argued that the notions of *place* and *space* must become sacred entities within everyone's relationship with the given landscapes in their communities and home. Lastly, in Chapter Six, I showed how Devall's writings have impacted Environmentalism in the late 20th Century, and the inverse impact that Environmental Action Groups have had on Devall.

The Environmental Crisis & The Future:

Deep Ecology present s the foremost conscious thought for the current environmental crisis that is happening today. Deep Ecology allows us to take a journey – "a journey of the spirit during which we discover our purpose" (Devall, 1985: 205). It is the process that allows us to commit to the "real work" in our lives, "the 'real work' of becoming real and of doing what is real" (Devall, 1985: 205). Humankind must turn the mirror on ourselves and begin to analyze from a Deep Ecological Perspective. Devall illustrates that from a Deep Long-Range Ecology standpoint, "Whatever is to be done, we are the people to do it; the only people to do it" (Devall, 1985: 204).

Today, there is much debate over the terms "Global Warming" and "Greenhouse Effect," yet since the Industrial Revolution, this world has seen a drastic change in the consequences that humankind has put forth on this Earth. There is little debate that coal-burning power plants pollute the planet's atmosphere affecting habitats over many regions of the world. The emissions that these power plants put into the air are enormously harmful - yet these entities are not hold accountable for their actions - and

they continue to gain enormous amounts of profit, leaving the majority of the world's population living in extremely poor conditions. Energy consumption in First World nations continues to be ecologically unstable and must reduce in order for the human population to survive. From a Deep Ecology viewpoint, terminology describing a *developed* country, usually First World, needs to be altered to include the ecological sustainability of that country. If a nation is ecologically unsustainable, we must classify that country in a category as *underdeveloped*. Deep Ecology illustrates that by altering our language we may address the issues of pollution control, energy consumption and the additional variables that must be taken into account when addressing the environmental crisis.

Gigantic oil companies, as well as other big fossil fuel energy corporations, have an outstanding amount of control over the modern industrial worldview. These companies are involved with governmental policy by lobbying with an endless amount of resources to continue to halt any changes from occurring anywhere in the world while constantly reaffirming the modern industrial anthropocentric perspective. Energy sources such as oil, natural gas, and coal are limited resources in today's world. The supply of crude oil in the world is already beginning to peak - this is the point in time when humans have removed half of the supply of recoverable oil. Extracting these resources are very detrimental to the environmental habitats of the Planet. Fossil fuels require humans to drill, mine, and leech from the environment to extract the resource. In the Gulf of Mexico, the world has seen firsthand the effects of offshore drilling with the Beyond Petroleum – formally British Petroleum – oil-drilling rig that failed in April of 2010. This failure affected the world forever. People watched for over three months as

thousands upon thousands of barrels of oil were being spewed into the ocean. Experts perceived that there was an estimated 60,000 barrels or more of oil flowing per day into the waters.

A change that is required to address the environmental crisis may begin with the usage of renewable energy sources that are available. These resources are beginning to gain interest from investors and the public eye. Alternative energy sources continue to be confirmed as environmentally friendly while at the same time being just as efficient and effective as fossil fuels. Through the change over to alternative energy we begin to eliminate the carbon emissions that are polluting and damaging the ozone layer, as well as the destruction that is being done to the environment including deforestation, strip mining and off-shore drilling due to the locating and recovery of fossil fuels. Biodiesel and Hybrid vehicles are beginning to take the place of regular gasoline. Wind, Solar, and Hydro electricity are increasing in the public and private sectors. There is no mistaking that the environmental crisis has begun to escalate, but individuals and corporations can still begin to make the necessary steps for energy conservation.

There is an overwhelming population in today's world that is living in a distressed state of poverty and/or oppression. The vital needs of those people are not being met. Addressing this issue is a task that is enormous, especially when the population in poor nations may soon multiply, but the cultivable land for food will not. Now more than ever, the Deep Ecology perspective and theory is necessary to address human population growth and for the choice of intelligent policies.

The Deep Long-Rang Ecology Movement has much to offer to our future generations. It lays the framework necessary to develop the inherit goals for humankind

and the strategies necessary to carry out those given goals. Deep Ecology assists us to understand and watch out for the devastation of ecosystems and habitats. Additionally, Deep Ecology addresses the special obligations and requirements that are necessary to provide humans with their vital needs. Deep Long-Range Ecology is a process of developing maturity that is simpler than many think. Devall finds that, "like flowing water through the canyons, always yielding, always finding its way back – simple in means, rich in ends" (Devall, 1985: 205).

The actions of recycling our paper products, our aluminum, and our plastics are great - and turning the lights off in your house when not in use are wise decisions – but the fact-of-the-matter is that stronger and more bolder lifestyle choices and practices must be in order. We must begin to take responsibility for ourselves and deepen our ecological consciousness levels. We must begin to take into account all of the living beings around us and to take into account bioregional strategies. We must start to act locally and to politically take a stance against the anthropocentric values that are being pushed and weighed against us every day from mass media, our workplace, and even our communities. Devall argues that individuals must commit to direct action. It means giving "voice to Deep Ecological intuitions, encouraging more intuitive insights, as well as acquiring more knowledge and understanding of our bioregion, homeland, Nature and ourselves" (Devall, 1985: 204). Deep Long-Range Ecology is not a movement or lifestyle that is intended to be taken lightly. Devall states that "from a Deep Ecology perspective there is a fascination, a deep engagement with living, and yet a simplicity and joy in this serious undertaking" (Devall, 1985: 205). It is *practical activity* for our every day lives that is for today, tomorrow, and for centuries to come.

APPENDIX A

Deep Ecology Action Groups:

Devall (1993: 257-58) notes that there is no Deep Ecology groups or organizations. The following organizations and publications, however, provide information and suggestions for action that are relevant to many supporters of the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement:

- *Deep Ecology contacts in Australia:*

Buddhist Peace Fellowship
P.O. Box 368
Lismore, 2480, N.S.W. Australia
Rainforest Information Center
P.O. Box 368
Lismore, 2480, N.S.W. Australia

The Deep Ecologist
10 Alamein Avenue
Warracknabeal,
Victoria, 3393, Australia

- *Deep Ecology Direct Action Group In the United States of America:*

Earth First!
P.O. Box 5871
Tucson, AZ 85703

(Also, check out Earth First! branches in your local bioregion.)

- *Environmental Publication (published by Friends of the Earth) to keep abreast of political happenings:*

Not man Apart
1045 Sansome Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

- *Philosophical Journal providing continuing intellectual debate on the development of environmental ethics and ecophilosophy:*

Environmental Ethics
Department of Philosophy\University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

- *Bioregional networking facilitated by Planet Drum Foundation (published by Planet Drum Foundation):*

Raise the Stakes
P.O. Box 31251
San Francisco, CA 94131

- *Regional journal (published by Northcoast Environmental Center) for Northwest California showing the interplay between Reform and Deep Ecology:*

Econews
879 9th Street
Arcata, CA 95521

- *Center for Earth bonding rituals and experiential Deep Ecology:*

Way of the Mountain Center
P.O. Box Silverton, CO 81433

- *Journal of the Environmental History Society:*

Environmental Review
Department of History
University of Denver
Denver, CO 80208-0184

- *Deep Ecology contact for Japan:*

Earth First!
Chikyu Yusen
612 Kyoto-shi, Fushimi-ku
Fukakusa, Sanoyashiki-cho, 21-1
Kyoto, Japan

- *Deep Ecology perspective in Canada:*

The Journal of the Trumpeter
1138 Richardson Street
Victoria, British Colombia, Canada V8V 38C

- *Continuing lively discussion of the post-industrial age:*

The Ecologist
Worthyvale Manor Farm
Camelford, Cornwell, PL32 9TT
United Kingdom

- *A journal devoted to helping create a cultural shift to a sustainable society:*

In Context
P.O. Box 215
Sequim, WA 98382

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Don. 1996. "Bioregionalism: The Need for a Firmer Theoretical Foundation." *The Journal of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 13. No. 3.

- Allin, Craig W. 1982. *The Politics of Wilderness Preservation.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Anderson, Walter Truett. 1987. *To Govern Evolution: Further Adventures of the Political Animal.* New York, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

- Berg, Peter, and Raymond Dasmann. 1977. "Reinhabiting California." *The Ecologist*. Vol. 7. No. 10.

- Berry, Wendell. 1977. *The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture.* San Francisco, California: Sierra Club Books.

- Bookchin, Murray. 1987. "Social Ecology versus 'Deep Ecology': A Challenge for the Ecology Movement." *Green Perspectives: Newsletter of the Green Program Project.* Summer. 4-5.

- Booth, Annie. 2000. "Ways of Knowing: Acceptable Understandings Within Bioregionalism, Deep Ecology, Ecofeminism, and Native American Cultures". *The Journal of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 16, No. 1. p. 1-11.

- Carson, Rachel. 1962. *Silent Spring*. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin.

- Chew, Sing C. 2008. *Ecological Futures: What History Can Teach Us.* Lanham, Maryland: Alta Mira Press.

- Conesa-Servilla, Jorge. 2010. "Reflections on Humans: Nature and Education". *The Journal of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 26, No. 1.

- Devall, Bill. 1993. "Applied Deep Ecology". *The Journal of the Trumpeter.* Vol. 10, No. 4.

- Devall, Bill, ed. 1993. *Clearcut*: The Tragedy Of Industrial Forestry. San Francisco, California: Sierra Club Books and Earth Island Press.

- Devall, Bill. 1988. "Deep Ecology & It's Critics." *The Journal of the Trumpeter.* Vol. 5, No. 2, p. 55- 59.

- Devall, Bill, and George Sessions. 1985. *Deep Ecology: Living As If Nature Mattered*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Gibbs Smith.

- Devall, Bill. 1970. "The Governing Of A Voluntary Organization Oligarchy and Democracy In The Sierra Club" University of Oregon, Ph. D., Sociology, general. p. 1 – 398.

- Devall, Bill. 1996. "In A Dark Wood, Searching For Light In The Forest Debates: A Reply To Alston Chase". *The Journal of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 13, No. 1.

- Devall, Bill. N.D. "Place and Life: A Bioregional Journey"

- Devall, Bill. 1988. *Simple In Means, Rich In Ends: Practicing Deep Ecology*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Gibbs Smith.

- Devall, Bill. 2006. "Living In Mixed Communities". *The Journal of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 22, No. 1.

- Devall, Bill. 1993. *Living Richly In An Age Of Limits*. Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith.

- Devall, Bill. 1993. "The Philosophical Roots for Greening Our Life Styles: Self-Organization in Liberal Modernity and Ecology". *The Journal Of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 10, No. 2.

- Devall, Bill. 1994. "The Turnaround Decade". *The Journal Of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 11, No. 2.

- Devall, Bill. 1986. "Wilderness". *The Journal Of The Trumpeter*. Vol. 3, No. 2. p 22-23. May.

- Kheel, Marti. 1990. "Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology: Reflections on Identity and Difference." in *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*, ed Diamond, Irene and Orenstein, Gloria. San Francisco, California: Sierra Club Publishers. 128–137.

- Dodge, Jim. 1981. "Living by Life: Some Bioregional Theory and Practice." *CoEvolution Quarterly*. Winter.

- Drengson, Alan. 1995. *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*. Edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue. Berkeley, California: North Atlantic Books.

- Drengson, Alan. 1980. "Shifting Paradigms: From the Technocrat to the Planetary Person." *Environmental Ethics 3*.

- Drengson, Alan. 1980. "Wilderness Travel as an Art and as a Paradigm for Outdoor Education." *Quest.* Volume 32. Issue 1. January.

- Eckersley, Robyn. 2004. *The Green State*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. MIT Press.

- Elkington, John. 1985. *Gene Factory: Inside the Genetic and Biotechnology Business Revolution.* New York, New York: Carroll and Graff.

- Forbes, Jack. 1971. "The Native American Experience in California History." *California Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 50.

- Foreman, David, ed. 1985. *Ecodefense: A field Guide to Monkeywrenching*. Tucson, Arizona: Ned Ludd Books.

- Foreman, David. 1986. "A Modest Proposal for Wilderness Preserve System." *Whole Earth Review.* Volume 53. Winter.

- Matthew Fox. 1988. *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ.* San Francisco, California: Harper& Row.

- Fox, Warwick. 1984. "Deep Ecology: A New Philosophy Of Our Time?" *The Ecologist*, 14 (5 & 6): 194-200.

- Fox, Warwick. 1990. *Towards a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism*. Boston, Massatuchets: Shambhala.

- Goodman, Amy. "Pepper Spray-Soaked Cotton Swabs on Non-Violent Protestors in 1997." *Democracy Now! The War & Peace Report.* September 8th, 2004.

- Hallen, Patsy. 1987. "Making Peace With the Environment: Why Ecology Needs Feminism." *Journal of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 4. No. 3. p. 3-13.

- Harry, Joe. Gale, Richard. Hendee, John. 1969. "The Conservation Movement, Some Preliminary Data." *Journal of leisure Research*. Fall.

- Jones, Holway R. 1965. *John Muir and the Sierra Club: The Battle for Yosemite.* San Francisco, California: Sierra Club.

- LaChapelle, Dolores. 1978. *Earth Wisdom*. Los Angeles, California: Guild of Tudor Press.

- Leopold, Aldo. 1949. *A Sand County Almanac.* New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Lipset, S.M., Trow, Martin. Coleman, James. 1962. *Union Democracy: The Internal Politics of the International Typographical Union.* Doubleday Anchor. Garden City.

- Love, Sam and David Obst. 1972. "Ecotage!" New York, New York. Oxford University Press.

- Macy, Joanna. 1988. *Thinking Like a Mountain: Toward a Council of All Beings*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: New Society Publishers,

- Mathews, Freya. 1988. "Conservation and Self-Realization: A Deep Ecology Perspective." *Environmental Ethics 10*.

- Metzner, Ralph. 1995. "The Place and the Story: Where Ecopsychology and Bioregionalism Meet." *The Journal of the Trumpeter.* Vol. 12. No. 3.

- Michels, Robert. 1949. *Political Parties.*. New York, New York: Free Press

- Muir, John. 1912. *The Yosemite*. New York, New York: The Century Company.

- Naess, Arne. 1984. "The Arrogance of Anti-Humanism?" *Ecophilosophy*, 6. May.

- Naess, Arne. 2005. "Climbing and the Deep Ecology Movement." *The Journal of the Trumpeter.* Vol. 21, No. 2,

- Naess, Arne. 1984. "Deep Ecology and Life Style." *The Paradox of Environmentalism.* Edited by Neil Everden. Downview, Ontario: York University, Faculty of Environmental Studies. June.

- Naess, Arne. 1984. "A Defense of the Deep Ecology Movement." *Environmental Ethics*, 6.

- Naess, Arne. 1986. "The Deep Ecology Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects." *Philosophical Inquiry,* 8.

- Naess, Arne. 1989. *Ecology, Community, and Lifestyle*. Translated and edited by David Rothenberg. New York, New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

- Naess, Arne. 1986. "Intrinsic Value: Will the Defenders of Nature Please Rise?" *Conservation Biology.* Edited by Michael E. Soule. Sunderland: Sinauer.

- Naess Arne. 1987. "Self-realization. An Ecological Approach to Being in the World." Keith Memorial Lecture, Murdoch University. March 12, 1986. *The Trumpeter.* Vol. 4. No. 3. p. 35 - 41. Summer.

- Naess, Arne. 2008.*Ecology of Wisdom: Writings By Arne Naess*. Edited by Alan Drengson and Bill Devall. Berkeley, California: Counterpoint.

- Naess, Arne. 1974. *"Gandhi and Group Conflict: An Exploration of Satyagraha Theoretical Background."* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

- Parsons, James J. 1985. "On 'Bioregionalism' and 'Watershed Consciousness'." *The Professional Geographer 37*. February.

- Pivnik, Janet. 1997. "The Problem of Language in Deep Ecology Education." *The Journal of the Trumpeter.* Vol. 14, No. 2. p. 1-9.

- Rothenberg, David. 1987. "A Platform of Deep Ecology." *The Environmentalist 7*.

- Russ, Joel. 1995. "A Bioregional Perspective on Planning and Regional Economics." *The Journal of the Trumpeter.* Vol. 12, No. 3.

- Russell, Constance L. 1994. "A Sense of Place: Conservation's Common Ground." *The Journal of the Trumpeter*. Vol. 11, No. 1.

- Sagoff, Mark. 1986. "Process or Product? Ethical Priorities in Environmental Management." *Environmental Ethics*. Volume 8. Summer.

- Sale, Kirkpatrick. 1985.*Dwellers in the Land: The Bioregional Vision.* San Francisco, California: Sierra Club Books.

- Sessions, George. 1992. "Arne Naess and the Union of Theory and Practice." *The Journal of the Trumpeter.* Vol. 9, No. 2.

- Sessions, George. 1980. "Shallow and Deep Ecology: A Review of the Philosophical Literature." *Ecological Consciousness: Essays from the Earthday X Colloquium.* Edited by Robert Schultz and J. Donald Hughes. University of Denver. April.

- Snyder, Gary. 1995. *A Place in Space.* Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint Press.

- Snyder, Gary. 1995. *The Old Ways.* San Francisco, California: City Light Books.

- Snyder, Gary. 1990. *The Practice of the Wild*. San Francisco, California: North Point Press.

- Snyder, Gary. 1969. *The Real Work: Interviews and Talks, 1964-1979*. New York City, New York: New Directions Books.

- Spinoza, Benedict de. 1951. *Ethics.* Translated by R.H.M Elwes. New York, New York: Dover Publications.

- Sutton, Phillip W. 2004. *Nature, Environment and Society*. New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Swan, James. 1990. *Sacred Places In Nature: How the Living Earth Seeks Our Friendship.* Santa Fe, New Mexico. Bear and Company.

- Taylor, Paul W. 1986. *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

- Thoreau, Henry David. 1996. *In Wilderness is the Preservation of the World.* Introduction by David Brower. Edison, New Jersey: BBS Publishing Corporation. December.

- Tuan, Yi-fu. 1974. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Van Newkirk, Allen. 1975. "Bioregions: Towards Bioregional Strategy for Human Cultures." *Environmental Conservation 2*.

- Vernadsky, V.I. 1945. "The Biosphere and the Noosphere." *American Scientist.* January.