Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of American Culture and Literature

AMERICAN RADICAL ENVIRONMENTAL FICTION: DEEP ECOLOGY AND ECO-DEFENSE IN EDWARD ABBEY'S *THE MONKEY WRENCH GANG*, PAUL CHADWICK'S *CONCRETE: THINK LIKE A MOUNTAIN*, AND T.C. BOYLE'S *A FRIEND OF THE EARTH*

Mustafa Eray EREN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2019

AMERICAN RADICAL ENVIRONMENTAL FICTION: DEEP ECOLOGY AND ECO-DEFENSE IN EDWARD ABBEY'S *THE MONKEY WRENCH GANG*, PAUL CHADWICK'S *CONCRETE: THINK LIKE A MOUNTAIN*, AND T.C. BOYLE'S *A FRIEND OF THE EARTH*

Mustafa Eray EREN

Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of American Culture and Literature

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2019

KABUL VE ONAY

Mustafa Eray Eren tarafından hazırlanan "American Radical Environmental Fiction: Deep Ecology and Eco-Defense in Edward Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Paul Chadwick's *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and T.C. Boyle's *A Friend of the Earth*" başlıklı bu çalışma, 14 Haziran 2019 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından yüksek lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Prof. Dr. Nevin ÖZKAN (Başkan)

Prof. Dr. Ufuk ÖZDAĞ (Danışman)

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Z. Ayça GERMEN

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Özge ÖZBEK AKIMAN

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Merve ÖZMAN KAYA

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. Musa Yaşar SAĞLAM

Enstitü Müdürü

YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI

Enstitü tarafından onaylanan lisansüstü tezimin tamamını veya herhangi bir kısmını, basılı (kağıt) ve elektronik formatta arşivleme ve aşağıda verilen koşullarla kullanıma açma iznini Hacettepe Üniversitesine verdiğimi bildiririm. Bu izinle Üniversiteye verilen kullanım hakları dışındaki tüm fikri mülkiyet haklarım bende kalacak, tezimin tamamının ya da bir bölümünün gelecekteki çalışmalarda (makale, kitap, lisans ve patent vb.) kullanım hakları bana ait olacaktır.

Tezin kendi orijinal çalışmam olduğunu, başkalarının haklarını ihlal etmediğimi ve tezimin tek yetkili sahibi olduğumu beyan ve taahhüt ederim. Tezimde yer alan telif hakkı bulunan ve sahiplerinden yazılı izin alınarak kullanılması zorunlu metinleri yazılı izin alınarak kullandığımı ve istenildiğinde suretlerini Üniversiteye teslim etmeyi taahhüt ederim.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan ***"Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge"*** kapsamında tezim aşağıda belirtilen koşullar haricince YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi / H.Ü. Kütüphaneleri Açık Erişim Sisteminde erişime açılır.

- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. [1]
- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren ..... ay ertelenmiştir. [2]
- Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. [3]

12/07/2019

Mustafa Eray EREN

ETİK BEYAN

Bu çalışmadaki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, kullandığım verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı, yararlandığım kaynaklara bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu, tezimin kaynak gösterilen durumlar dışında özgün olduğunu, Prof. Dr. Ufuk ÖZDAĞ danışmanlığında tarafımdan üretildiğini ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Yönergesine göre yazıldığını beyan ederim.

Mustafa Eray EREN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support and assistance of a number of special people. Thus, I would like to take this opportunity to show my sincere gratitude to those to whom I am greatly indebted for their help in the process.

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ufuk Özdağ, for providing advice and critical insights, and for her continuous encouragement and enthusiasm. I admire her love of nature, endless devotion to land restoration, and ecocriticism, all of which have inspired me since my undergraduate years. This thesis would not have attained this shape without her constructive feedback and guidance.

I would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayça Germen, my supervisor during my master's classes, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Barış Gümüşbaş, for their generous help, support, guidance, and understanding.

I am also thankful to my AKE Family, all the members of the Department of American Culture and Literature, for broadening my horizons and sharing their knowledge and experiences.

I also would like to thank Ezgi İlimen for answering my questions and sharing her experiences with me. I also wish to thank John Michael Flynn, my friend and colleague, for proofreading my thesis in a very short period of time.

My sincere gratitude goes out to my friends and colleagues, Erdem Çuhadar, Fatih Ekinci, Renan Güney, Sercan Çelik and Serkan Yıldız. They helped to keep up my motivation and encouraged me to complete this work.

Finally, I especially want to thank my wonderful parents who have supported me unconditionally with their endless love throughout all of my academic and personal endeavors. They have always been my most significant source of motivation, encouragement and success.

ABSTRACT

EREN, Mustafa Eray. *American Radical Environmental Fiction: Deep Ecology and Eco-Defense in Edward Abbey's The Monkey Wrench Gang, Paul Chadwick's Concrete: Think like a Mountain, and T.C. Boyle's A Friend of the Earth*, Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2019.

The fictional works of American authors Edward Abbey, Paul Chadwick, and T.C. Boyle present a reaction principally to the depletion of the wilderness, destruction of the land, and other environmental ills. Edward Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Paul Chadwick's *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and T.C. Boyle's *A Friend of the Earth* reflect the significance of the protection of the natural world through the writers' radical environmentalist characters who possess an ecocentric worldview which leads to an ecological self. They are in a process of increasing their Self-realization and are ready to defend the natural world in self-defense which evolves into eco-defense because any harm on nature means harm to their greater Self. Their concept of community encompasses all the living and nonliving entities on earth.

The radical environmentalist movement, with its deep ecological ideas which they adhere to and act from accordingly, came into being as a result of disillusionment with the inability of mainstream environmentalism to offer long-lasting solutions to current environmental problems. The authors studied in this thesis all believe in some form of radical environmentalism, and created radical environmentalist characters who resort to actions that go beyond mainstream anthropocentric environmentalism. Monkeywrenching, a form of action used by radical environmentalists, targets only inanimate machines and tools which harm nature. This thesis attempts to explore the worldviews and activities of radical environmentalist characters created by Abbey, Chadwick, and Boyle in their attempt to create a better world. The characters they have created focus on the diversity and richness of different forms of interconnected life, and they seek to increase self-realization for all in their pursuit to reach an ultimate Self-realization which aims at the well-being and health of the planet as a counter to the characters of the megamachine, or current anthropocentrist system.

Keywords: Radical environmental fiction, deep ecology, ecological self, eco-defense, Edward Abbey, Paul Chadwick, T.C. Boyle.

ÖZET

EREN, Mustafa Eray. *Amerikan Radikal Çevreci Kurgusal Yazını: Edward Abbey'nin The Monkey Wrench Gang, Paul Chadwick'in Concrete: Think like a Mountain ve T.C. Boyle'ın A Friend of the Earth İsimli Eserlerinde Derin Ekoloji ve Eko–Savunma,* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2019.

Amerikalı yazarlar Edward Abbey, Paul Chadwick ve T.C. Boyle, kurgusal eserlerinde çoğunlukla yabanıl alanların tükenmesi, toprak tahribatı ve diğer çevresel sorunlara yönelik tepkilerini ortaya koyarlar. Edward Abbey'in *The Monkey Wrench Gang,* Paul Chadwick'in *Concrete: Think like a Mountain* ve T.C. Boyle'un *A Friend of the Earth* adlı eserleri doğal dünyanın korunmasının ne kadar önemli olduğunu, yazarların çevre merkezli ekolojik benliği de beraberinde getiren radikal çevreci karakterleri vasıtasıyla yansıtırlar. Kendini gerçekleştirme / tanıma aşamasını güçlendirme sürecinde, doğal dünyayı korumak için eko–savunmaya dönüşen bir meşru müdafaaya hazırdırlar, çünkü doğaya verilebilecek herhangi bir zarar, kendi büyük benliklerine verilebilecek bir zarar olarak addedilir. Onların topluluk kavramı insanların sıradan vatandaş oldukları dünyadaki canlı ve cansızların tümünü kapsamaktadır.

Derin Ekolojik fikirlere sahip olan ve buna yönelik bir davranış sergileyen radikal çevreci akım, anaakım çevreciliğin güncel çevresel sorunlara uzun süreli çözümler getirememesinin yarattığı hayal kırıklığının bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıktı. Bu tezde eserlerinden faydalanılan yazarların hepsi radikal çevreciliğin bir biçimine inanarak, insan merkezli anaakım çevreciliğin ötesinde metodlar kullanan radikal çevreci karakterler yaratmışlardır. Sözkonusu radikal çevrecilerin kullandığı bir tür teknik olan ekolojik sabotaj sadece cansız makineleri ve doğaya zarar veren aletleri hedef alır. Bu tezin amacı, daha iyi bir dünya yaratmak üzere Abbey, Chadwick ve Boyle tarafından yaratılan radikal çevreci özelliğe sahip karakterlerin dünya görüşlerini ve buna yönelik faaliyetlerini derinlemesine incelemektir. Yaratılan bu karakterler, birbirine bağlı çeşitli yaşam biçimlerinin farklılık ve çeşitliliğine odaklanarak herkesin kendini gerçekleştirme / tanıma seviyesini arttırarak yeryüzünün refahını ve sağlığını hedefleyen en yüksek kendini gerçekleştirme / tanıma düzeyine megamakina ya da mevcut insan merkezli sisteme karşı ulaşmaya çalışırlar.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Radikal çevreci kurgusal yazını, derin ekoloji, ekolojik benlik, eko–savunma, Edward Abbey, Paul Chadwick, T.C. Boyle.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

What is wrong with our culture is that it offers us an inaccurate conception of the self. It depicts the personal self as existing in competition with and in opposition to nature. [We fail to realize that] if we destroy our environment, we are destroying what is in fact our larger self.

Freya Matthews, "Conservation and Self-Realization: A Deep Ecology Perspective" 132

The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land.

Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There* 204

Beyond the wall of the unreal city, beyond the security fences topped with barbed wire and razor wire, beyond the asphalt belting of the superhighways, beyond the cemented banksides of our temporarily stopped and mutilated rivers, beyond the rage of lies that poisons the air, there is another world waiting for you. It is the old true world of the deserts, the mountains, the forests, the islands, the shores, the open plains. Go there. Be there. Walk gently and quietly deep within it.

Edward Abbey, *Beyond the Wall* XVI

With Edward Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang* (1975), Paul Chadwick's *Concrete: Think like a Mountain* (1996), and T.C. Boyle's *A Friend of the Earth* (2000) in the viewfinder, this thesis will examine the ecological self. The deeds of the radical environmentalist characters in these novels depict how they work towards transforming the human-centered world into an ecocentric earth by using the philosophy of deep ecology as their point of reference. They act on behalf of nature as self-defense and try to overcome the domineering ideology of man's greed-oriented perspective of seeing the world.

The radical environmentalist characters in the novels studied in this thesis are the ones who see the attack/invasion against the natural world and assume its salvation as their duty on the grounds that they themselves are the threat. These radical environmentalist characters function as activists performing resistance against atrocities towards nature/wilderness, and they are at the same time models for spreading the idea of an ecocentric world which is closely related to the concept of ecological self, introduced by Arne Naess, the Norwegian philosopher, in his ecophilosophy.

The novels that will be discussed in this study are about radical environmentalist characters attempting to make other people in the novels realize the difference between *home* and *Home*. These characters are in an active process of making others understand the significance of *Home*, the globe, and they act on behalf of it. The characters act in the novels with the intention of enlarging the boundaries of home.

In this thesis I will try to elucidate how, through the philosophy of deep ecology, authors Edward Abbey, Paul Chadwick, and T.C. Boyle create radical environmentalist characters who steer a paradigm shift from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism in which the idea of community is not human-centered but includes human and nonhuman environments/entities. I will employ the philosophies of Arne Naess, George Sessions, Bill Devall and the writings of Edward Abbey and Dave Foreman.

THE ANTHROPOCENE

The term "anthropocene" is used for the current geological age since the effect of human beings on the environment became obviously visible. Anthropocene is said to have started in the second half of the eighteenth century with the rise of the Industrial Revolution. The word "anthropo" comes from Greek and it means "human being" or "man," and "cene" is a combining form in geology denoting a recent geological period. It can be said that the present epoch is human-dominated, and nature is principally modified by different actions of mankind.

It was the Dutch chemist Paul Crutzen who coined the term "Anthropocene" in 2002. For Crutzen the world has altered significantly since the geological age of Holocene

("Geology of Mankind"). Ackerman states that human beings became very effective forces of global change, so the geological age should be renamed (9). According to Gaia Vince, geologists call this era the Anthropocene because humanity acts as a geophysical force like the asteroids and volcanoes which had a deep impact on shaping the earth in the past (4-5). Now it is humanity which shapes the world and that is why it is called the Anthropocene—the Age of Man.

The Anthropocene age has had adverse effects on the environment because humans, willingly or unwillingly, have been altering their habitats. To mention some historical facts, John James Audubon, an ornithologist and naturalist, related that in 1830 he witnessed a flock of passenger pigeons darken the sky from horizon to horizon on the banks of Ohio River and guessed that several billion birds were in the sky. Less than a century later, the last passenger pigeon died in the Cincinnati Zoo in 1914 (Foreman, *Confessions* 109-110). Carolyn Merchant writes that of the 2.3 million square miles of tropical forests covering the earth's surface, 100 acres are destroyed each minute and the rate of destruction is increasing more and more (*Radical Ecology* 21). Clive Ponting in *A New Green History of the World* argues that species extinction is a natural phenomenon for many reasons and relates that the background rate of extinction[1] is one to three species per year. This rate has increased due to human activities between 1600 and 1900. The present extinction rate is 1,000 times higher than the natural rate. The last 400 years have witnessed the extinction of 83 mammals, 113 birds, 288 other animals and 650 plants and most of these happened in the twentieth-century. Since 1700, of the twenty-one marine species, sixteen became extinct starting in 1972. In the twentieth century the extinction rate for mammals is forty times and for birds it was about 1,000 times more than the background rate (169-170). As Holmes Rolston III states, it has been reported by a multi-national consensus of experts called the *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment* that "[o]ver the past few hundred years, humans have increased species extinction rates by as much as 1,000 times background rates that

[1] Holmes Rolston III states that species always go extinct and the percentage of the species that went extinct constitutes ninety-eight percent of the species that have lived on earth (138). He points out that the great extent of anthropogenic extinction, man-made extinction, destroys biodiversity and ecosystem, whereas natural extinction is a normal turnover in the natural lifecycle which leads to new species (139).

were typical over Earth's history" (126). Rolston III explains that natural extinction occurs when a species is no longer able to survive in the habitat it lives in, and in its place some other species emerge, a natural order. On the other hand, speciation ceases artificially, which is called "anthropogenic extinction" (139). The International Union for Conservation of Nature keeps "a *Red List of Threatened Species*, which documents the extinction risk of 47,677 species, of which 17,291 are threatened, including 12% of birds, 21% of mammals, 30% of amphibians, 27% of reef-building corals, and 35% of conifers and cycads (2010)" (130). The Living Planet index records that since 1970, wild species populations have dropped by 30% (130). Biologist E. O. Wilson states that 27,000 species per year are lost from a maximally optimistic conclusion with the current amount of habitat loss (280). The numbers here show how huge the result of human interference on nature is. These all give evidence to the present environmental crisis.

ANTHROPOCENTRISM

The destruction of nature by man has been accelerating for the past two centuries. The foundation of destruction is deeply rooted in the idea of anthropocentrism, which according to Dave Foreman, "places human beings at the center of the universe, separates them from nature, and endows them with unique value" (*Confessions* 27). Mankind becomes the measure of valuing living and nonliving things.

Although the adverse effects of the anthropocentric view of life has been visible for the past two hundred years, for Paul Shepard the environmental crisis is not a new concept but it has been in the making for ten thousand years: "As agriculture replaced hunting and gathering it was accompanied by radical changes in the way men saw and responded to their natural surroundings. . . . [Agriculturalists] all shared the aim of completely humanizing the earth's surface, replacing wild with domestic, and creating landscapes from habitat" (*The Tender Carnivore* 237).

Arthur O. Lovejoy in his *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* writes that ancient and medieval philosophy was influenced by the idea of "the Great Chain of Being" or "Scala Naturae (Scale of Nature)" (184). He asserts that this idea promoted the hierarchy of all beings from the highest to the lowest. As George Sessions

relates, according to Aristotle, "Nature made plants for the use of animals, and animals were made for the sake of humans" ("Ecocentrism" 160), which summarizes the idea of "Scala Naturae." The higher a creature or a thing is on this chain, the more value it holds. This means that creatures having a higher level possess more authority or power over the lower ones. The idea of the great chain of being is influential in Christian thought. According to K. Baier, Medieval pinnacle and a Greek and Christian synthesis of thinking is that "[t]he medieval Christian world picture assigned to man [humans] a highly significant, indeed the central part in the grand scheme of things. The universe was made for the express purpose of providing a stage on which to enact a drama starring Man in the title role" (596). Humans used this view as a basis for their actions to dominate the natural world. At that time, the natural world was in a lower status than man, according to the Great Chain of Being. The influential thought that guided the Roman culture was the idea of human domination of nature. In *An Unnatural Order*, Mason summarizes the ideology of this view of thinking with the outstanding Roman writer Cicero's depiction: "We are absolute masters of what the earth produces. We enjoy the mountains and the plains. The rivers are ours. We sow the seeds and plant the trees. We fertilize the earth. We stop, direct, and turn the rivers, in short, by our hands and various operations in this world we endeavor to make it as it were another nature" (34). These writers and philosophers thought that the earth belonged to humans and they had the right to shape the earth in the way they wanted for their own sake. The power to change nature in the way they desired was in their own hands. Mankind thought that he was the leading actor in the shaping and reshaping of the planet.

Humans acted as the judges of all things, and they became the moral touchstone, especially with the Renaissance (Bergesen 116). The Renaissance inherited *scala naturae* and turned it into a symbol of man's dominion over the natural world (Manes, "Nature and Silence" 20). Renaissance humanism depicts man as having unlimited powers to alter the course of nature. Christopher Manes, a former radical environmentalist activist and associate editor of Earth First! Journal, in "Nature and Silence" claims that *scala naturae* was inherited by the Renaissance and was turned into a symbol of supremacy over the natural world (20). David Ehrenfeld in *The Arrogance of Humanism* argues that humanism in the Renaissance era put emphasis on progress, reason and intellect, which became the foundation of the modern technological age (12).

He adds that the approach toward nature by man as the lower life form on earth gave man the idea that he could conquer earth for his own sake. Humans claimed superiority over the rest of nature, which led to the distinction of man and nature as two separate entities in the world.

During the Scientific Revolution, the image of the world was seen as a mechanistic clockwork. Throughout this era, the world was transformed into a machine. According to Capra and Luisi, the age of science viewed knowledge as a force "that can be used to dominate and control nature" (21). The two prominent figures of the Scientific Revolution, Francis Bacon and René Descartes, influenced Western thought profoundly in the seventeenth century and paved the way to the more human-centered world of our present age. As Lewis Mumford relates in *The Pentagon of Power*, Bacon emphasizes his materialistic outlook while explaining the real target of science: "the endowment of human life with new inventions and riches" (111). Jim Mason in *An Unnatural Order* describes how Bacon accentuates the existence of human beings: "Man, if we look for final causes, may be regarded as the center of the world, insomuch that if man were taken away from the world, the rest would seem to be all astray, without aim or purpose" (36). Mason adds that Bacon's thought is of a master/slave model about which he wrote, "I am come in very truth leading to you Nature with all her children to bind her to your service and make her your slave" (36). This thought sees man as the sole power on earth and he commands it as he wishes for his own benefit. This idea of the master/slave model resulted in treating nature as an object to be possessed and used only at mankind's disposal. Thus, knowledge was used to control nature in the service of man. William Leiss in *The Domination of Nature* claims that "Bacon's great achievement was to formulate the concept of human mastery over nature much more clearly than had been done previously and to assign it a prominent place among men's concerns" (48). According to Jim Mason, "Descartes cut humanity loose from the rest of nature by reclassifying other living beings as insensible, soulless machines" (37). Descartes in "Animals are Machines" argues that animal movements resembled clocks animated mechanically as in the case of machines (3). For Descartes "[n]ature worked according to mechanical laws, and everything in the material world could be explained in terms of the arrangement and movement of its parts. This mechanical picture of nature became the dominant paradigm of science in the period following Descartes"

(Capra and Luisi 25). According to Capra and Luisi, "the Cartesian view of the universe as a mechanical system provided a 'scientific' sanction for the manipulation and exploitation of nature that became typical of modern civilization" (25). The ideas of Bacon and Descartes became the pillars of the human domination of nature. The concepts of man's "dominion," "mastery," or "conquest" of nature became the ideals of the age.

The term "anthropocentrism" is entitled differently by various writers. It is called "technocentrism" by Timothy O'Riordan, "technocratic paradigm" by Alan Drengson and "homocentric environmentalism" by Joseph Meeker. All these terms emphasize a human dominated view of the world. O'Riordan draws attention to the arrogant nature of technocratic ideology in its assumption that "man is supremely able to understand and control events to suit his purposes. This assurance extends even to the application of theories and models to manipulate and predict changes in value systems and behavior" (O'Riordan 1). Drengson pays attention to the "technocratic paradigm" in which the world is controlled and used as if it were a machine for human interest (Fox, *Toward a Transpersonal* 29). Meeker asserts that the idea that man thinks he is the key figure in creation originates with the concept of "homocentric environmentalism" (254-255). According to Meeker, "Unfortunately, the same rationale has historically been used to support the thoughtless exploitation that has brought about drastic environmental imbalances. From the origins of agriculture to the destructive technologies of the modern industrial system, the highest humanistic goal has been to use the natural world in the service of human interests" (254-255). Using the world entirely for the benefit of humans is the common feature of these concepts that explain privileged thought, the anthropocentrist view of the world, throughout the Western world. John Seed, the Australian environmentalist, equates anthropocentrism and homocentrism with "human chauvenism" and he explains it as "the idea that humans are the crown of creation, the source of all value, the measure of all things, [which] is deeply embedded in our culture and consciousness" ("Anthropocentrism" 243). This equalization of a human centered view of the world clearly demonstrates the separation between human culture and the natural world.

After the Industrial Revolution, the domination of the natural world is justified through industrial and technological processes. Andrew McLaughlin in "For a Radical Ecocentrism" argues that there is an expanding amount of nature altered as commodities and resources by the industrialized societies and progress only for economic growth is cancerous (257). Moreover, as the Australian philosopher and ethicist Warwick Fox relates, George Santayana, the philosopher, essayist, and poet, argues that the thought systems since Socrates' time can be identified as "egotistical . . . anthropocentric, and inspired by the conceited notion that man, or human reason, or the human distinction between good and evil, is the center and the pivot of the universe" (18). However, according to Fox in *Toward a Transpersonal Ecology*, everything would have been different "if the philosophers had lived among your mountains, . . . [for] the mountain and the woods . . . suspend your forced sense of your own importance not merely as individuals [i.e., your egotism], but even as men [i.e., your anthropocentrism]" (18). This idea concerns our present paradigm, the anthropocentric world view. The world would have been a more livable place if the presiding perspective towards the earth had been ecocentric.

ECOCENTRISM AND THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY

The current ecological crisis is the result of the long lasting anthropocentric view which puts mankind in the center of the world, and leads man to think that s/he is the sole authority and everything in the world is created so that s/he can use them for his/her own benefit. The abiding and influential idea of anthropocentrism should be transformed into a non-anthropocentric view that is ecocentric, one in which human beings are not the central figures in changing the course of time but only among the ordinary members of the earth, since there is no hierarchy of importance in ecosystems except for interrelations of different webs of life affecting each other. The paradigm shift from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism, deep ecologists believe, alters the way mankind thinks and thereby lives in the world. Besides, for ecocentrists, this shift in thought will result in living in a better world.

As Mason states at the end of the sixteenth century, Bacon said "Knowledge is power" (37). Science is knowledge and the means of creating power. The power generated by human beings is used to display human arrogance toward nature in different ways. The power taken by the domination over the rest of nature is not utilized for building a harmonious cycle in which the human and the nonhuman world live together, but for destruction of the harmony created by the natural order by man himself in the name of forging a so-called convenient land for himself. The insistence on anthropocentrism made the natural world a slave of man. The idea of a separation of the natural world from man causes the environmental crisis. As Demarco relates, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, the German Romantic author, states "Nature has neither core nor skin: she's both at once outside and in" (17). Goethe sees man and nature nested within each other, eventually making them inseparable.

The mechanistic view of the world has led to human dominance over nature throughout the last two centuries. The alteration of the natural world became disastrous especially in the second half of the twentieth century. According to Dave Foreman, "Human beings have stepped beyond the bounds; we are destroying the very process of life" (*Confessions* 4). This destruction is related to the concept of community and how humans perceive it. Published in 1949 posthumously, Aldo Leopold in his "The Land Ethic" explains what community means from an ecocentric point of view. For him, "[t]he land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land" (204). He adds that "a land ethic changes the role of *Homo sapiens* from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it. It implies respect for his fellow-members, and also respect for the community as such" (204). He has a non-anthropocentric view of community. However, in sociology, community refers to " people having something in common . . . [which] precisely . . . relates to people sharing a geographical area" ("Community" 74). Sociology puts people in the center of the definition of community, while Leopold puts all members of the land, both animate and inanimate, in the center of his concept of community. Leopold has an expanded community concept. He dethrones man from his place on earth and now man is a "plain member" of the land community (204). Leopold explained his community concept in the 1930s and 1940s, and almost a century ago, between 1851-1860, Henry David Thoreau, the American philosopher and author, wrote

in his essay "Walking" for the first time in American history that he regards a human being as "an inhabitant, or a part and parcel of Nature, rather than a member of society" (592). For Thoreau, a human being is a citizen of nature having equal value with the citizens of the nonhuman world. He advocated the idea that humans and the rest of nature constitute a large community.

FROM "home" TO "Home"

The idea of a community is related to the concept of home where one feels safe and sound. Leopold claims that when land is perceived as a community to which we belong, then "we may begin to use it with love and respect" (*A Sand County* VIII). The expanded sense of community in which there are humans and nonhumans will lead to an extended sense of home. In this fashion, home will not only mean the place where one lives, but it will have a broadened meaning as the globe. Moreover, the word "ecology" originates from the Greek *oikos* "referring originally to the family household and its daily operations and maintenance" (Worster 192). Therefore, *oikos* means home and signifies the whole earth.

Arne Naess in *Ecology, Community, and Lifestyle* argues that "our lack of a definite biological place to call home allows us to feel at home everywhere" (166). This is closely related to the definition of the word *saunterer* which originates from *sans terre*, without land or home, and in Thoreau's words it is explained as "having no particular home, but equally at home everywhere" ("Walking" 593). In this way, one feels at home anywhere one goes. There is no specific place to call home. For Naess and Thoreau, there is no distinction between the human and the nonhuman world, since they believe that the idea that represents home includes all that lives on earth. Max Oelschlaeger claims in *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology* that Paleolithic hunter-foragers believed nature was home regardless of place. They did not have a concept of wilderness. "They could not become lost in the wilderness, since it did not exist" (14). Therefore, the idea of wilderness is a creation of the human dominionist ideology which demonstrates a human centered attitude towards the natural world. According to Oelschlaeger, "the Paleolithic mind did not distinguish the human

enterprise from the natural world" (12), since it "envisaged nature as alive and responsive, nurturing humankind much as a mother nourishes her baby at her breast" (16). A man who perceives nature as alive and as a mother to him sees the world as his home. The globe becomes the home of these people unlike the anthropocentrists who view humans as the masters of nature. Thus, Peter C. van Wyck, professor of environmental and ecological sciences, posits that the concept of wilderness is "created the moment there is a place to call 'home'. To have a location one calls 'home' is to conceptually require a place that isn't. Settlement—to have a place where one is settled—constructs wilderness, and the resultant boundary becomes a highly charged epistemological zone that marks the inside from the outside" (90). The term wilderness arises in response to calling a place home. One is either in or out of one's home as one thinks of the ideas of wilderness and home. However, Thoreau states that "in Wildness is the preservation of the World" ("Walking" 609). Gary Snyder, while agreeing with Thoreau that wildness is a significant factor in the conservation of the earth, writes that "[w]e need a civilization that can live fully and creatively together with wildness" (*The Practice* 6) because "[n]ature is not a place to visit, it is *home*" (7). Snyder reflects on his idea of home, and the planet as a whole where there are no boundaries between nature and civilization since they form one body of life in which we live in harmony.

The most crucial concern is how the concept of *home*, signifying the place where one lives and belong to is transformed into the concept of *Home* (h is capitalized) referring to a broadened sense of place, the globe. According to Snyder, "the 'home' is . . . as large as you make it" (24). If a person enlarges the boundaries of his/her concept of home, s/he himself/herself will come to understand the earth as a place which "has been the one home for all of its evolving processes and for all of its inhabitants; from hydrogen to man" because "the planet contains our origins, our history, our milieu—it is our home" (McHarg 28). Nevertheless, the realization of Home only by one person will not be enough to make the world a better place.

"Home," with the capital h meaning "the planet," is against anthropocentrism since humanism, which brings the human subject into the forefront as the only value, results in a self-destructive environmental crisis. In other words, humans are in the process of destroying their Home, the place they live in and belong to. Until now, the

anthropocentric world repeatedly came across the same vicious circle which Leopold describes as: "man the conqueror *versus* man the biotic citizen . . . land the slave and servant *versus* land the collective organism" ("The Land Ethic" 223). In order to break this cycle of recurring paradoxes, a human will perceive that this planet is his/her Home and enlarge the boundaries of his/her *self*, that is, the concept of *I*.

The relationship between man and the natural world is elucidated both by John Muir, the nineteenth-century American conservationist, and by the science of ecology in general. It is the notion that "all things are connected, interrelated, that human beings are merely one of the millions of species that have been shaped by the process of evolution for three and a half billion years" (Foreman, *Confessions* 3). Foreman concludes that "all living beings have the same right to be here [on earth]" (3). Not only living things but also nonliving things in the world have the equal right of life. This idea denounces the anthropocentric view. Expanding the notion of self from the narrow point of the individual self to a broader sense of the world as self is best seen in John Seed's life. He came to the realization of having a larger self while participating in the protests to protect rainforests in South Wales, Australia:

> I was able to embody, to bring to life, my intellectual knowings in interaction with other beings—protestors, loggers, police, and with the trees and other inhabitants of these forests. There and then I was gripped with an intense, profound realization of the depth of the bonds that connect us to the Earth, how deep are our feelings for these connections. I knew then that I was no longer acting on behalf of myself or my human ideas, but on behalf of the Earth . . . on behalf of my larger self, that I was literally part of the rainforest defending herself. ("Introduction" 6)

The way human beings experience the world defines how they act. As Manes relates, according to Bill Devall, "If we experience the world as an extension of ourselves, if we have a broader and deeper identification, then we feel hurt when other beings, including nonhuman beings, are hurt" (*Green Rage* 148). When Dave Foreman writes "I am an animal" or "we are animals" he emphasizes the idea that an animal is equal to a man, or a sentient being is equal to a non-sentient thing such as water or soil, since they are all equal and there is no hierarchy of significance among them. Foreman explains why he states he is an animal:

> A living being of flesh and blood, storm and fury. The oceans of the Earth course through my veins, the winds of the sky fill my lungs, the very bedrock of the planet makes my bones. I am alive! I am not a machine, a mindless automaton, a cog in

> the industrial world. . . . When a chain saw slices into the heartwood of a two-thousand-year-old Coast Redwood, it's slicing into my guts. When a bulldozer rips through the Amazon rain forest, it's ripping into my side. . . . I am the land, the land is me. (*Confessions* 4-5)

He objects to being a mechanical device of the Industrial era and emphasizes that he feels whatever happens in nature. Contrary to the concept of nature as a machine, Foreman has a broadened understanding of the self, and because of that a crime against the natural world is a crime committed against him. Any harm to nature harms him. There is a constant flow of energy between him and nature since they share the same body, the earth.

SELF-DEFENSE AND ECO-DEFENSE

The idea of enlarging the boundaries of self is closely related to the concept of self-defense. Edward Abbey in his article "Eco-Defense" uses the metaphor of a person's home under attack. The person whose house is threatened with deadly weapons has the right to protect it from the attack. This is called self-defense. Like the home under threat of vandalism, Abbey writes that

> [t]he American wilderness, what little remains, is now undergoing exactly such an assault. With bulldozer, earth mover, chainsaw, and dynamite the international timber, mining, and beef industries are invading our public lands—property of all Americans—bashing their way into our forests, mountains, and rangelands and looting them for everything they can get away with. ("Eco-Defense" 29-30)

As in the case of defending our home against threats as a right "if the wilderness is our true home" states Abbey, "then we have the right to defend that home . . . by whatever means necessary" (31). Self-defense in the case of protecting one's home turns into eco-defense guarding one's Home, the globe, which one cares for. By safeguarding the broadened self, one acts on behalf of the natural world which encompasses one's self/ego, too, because, as Arne Naess argues "the destruction of Nature (and our place) threatens us in our innermost self. If so, we are more convincingly defending our vital interests, not merely something 'out there.' We are engaged in self-defense" ("Self-realization" 232). Nature is not a place "out there." It is an inalienable part of the self. There is an assault upon our Home, that is our self, so, as Foreman and Haywood write in *Ecodefense* "it is our duty to resist invasion and to defend our planet" (25).

In an interview with Jack Loeffler, Abbey says that he considers himself an egalitarian, which for him means that respect for humans should be extended to animate and inanimate beings like wild animals, plants, rocks, air, and water. Respect for all the beings in the world embraces love for all of these since each is a part of a whole. Abbey asserts that human beings should "learn to live in some sort of harmony with [nature]" (Loeffler, *Headed Upstream* 6-7). Living in harmony in nature with respect to and love of nature is the keystone of deep ecology.

DEEP ECOLOGY

In his book *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* Arne Naess proposes a new standpoint in which humanity and nature are inseparable. The study of this connection is called *ecophilosophy*, which is the "utilisation of basic concepts from the science of ecology – such as complexity, diversity, and symbiosis – to clarify the place of our species within nature through the process of working out a total view" in the words of David Rothenberg (3). Naess calls his reasoning process for explaining the connection between humans and nature *ecosophy T*.

Naess's philosophy of deep ecology, according to Warwick Fox, is based on asking "deeper questions about the ecological relationships of which we are a part" and this questioning process finally discloses bedrock suppositions which Naess indicates as fundamentals from which deep ecological ideas are originated, whereas shallow ecological ideas are not (Fox, *Toward a Transpersonal* 92). Naess in his article "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary" states the differences between shallow and deep ecology and asserts that the primary purpose of shallow ecology is to "fight against pollution and resource depletion" for the well-being and prosperity of humans in developed countries. On the other hand, he puts emphasis on the essential objective of deep ecology as a "rejection of the human-in-environment image in favor of *the relational, total-field image*" (3). Organisms, in their relations, are seen as knots in the biospherical net. The deep ecologist has a respect for "ways and forms of life," "diversity and symbiosis." They take an "anti-class posture" which refers to the "diversity of human ways of life" because certain groups are exploited or

suppressed. Deep ecologists also "fight against pollution and resource depletion" not as it is in the shallow ecology movement, since a deep ecologist's drive is for the good of all, whereas shallow ecology favors only certain groups (3-9).

In order to live in an ecocentric society, ecosophy is required. As Bill Devall explains, the meaning of ecosophy is "wisdom of the household, or the place within which we dwell" ("Deep Ecology" 53). In addition, Alan Drengson states that

> "Ecosophy" for humans means ecological wisdom, which is not just discursive knowing, but a state of harmonious relationship with Nature. The Earth has wisdom, and each species has a wisdom peculiar to it, which is exemplified in continued flourishing, beyond bare survival. "Flourish" means an optimal state of self-fulfillment and self-realization. . . . Ecosophy is the wisdom of dwelling in a place and it is also the wisdom to dwell in a place harmoniously. ("In Praise" 101-102)

Living in harmony with all the members of any community constitutes the basic idea of deep ecology.

There are two directions that ecophilosophy leads to. The first one is that deep ecological philosophy can be developed and elaborated on by philosophers. Secondly, an active energetic effort to reform or reshape the anti-ecological structures in both political and social life can be created by the support of an international deep ecology movement. In 1984, Arne Naess and George Sessions agreed on a deep ecology platform which has eight points and asserts that technical solutions to the current ecological problems will not solve them. The platform principles list, in general, the most common ideas among deep ecologists on which they agree the most. These Eight points of the Deep Ecology Platform are:

> 1. The flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth has intrinsic value. The value of non-human life forms is independent of the usefulness these may have for narrow human purposes.
> 2. Richness and diversity of life forms are values in themselves and contribute to the flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth.
> 3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.
> 4. Present human interference with the non-human 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 human life requires such a decrease.

> 6. Significant change of life conditions for the better requires change in policies. These affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures.
> 7. The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of intrinsic value) rather than adhering to a high 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. (Naess, *Ecology* 29)

DEEP ECOLOGY AND SELF-REALIZATION

Naess's system starts with the norm "Self-realisation!" Rothenberg explains what Naess means by *Self*: "we are not meant to narrow this realisation to our limited egos, but to seek an understanding of the widest 'Self', one with a capital "S" that expands from each of us to include all" (6). Naess emphasizes the self and does not want humans to associate the self with one's own narrow ego since "[h]uman nature is such that, with sufficient comprehensive (all sided) maturity, we cannot help but 'identify' our self with all living beings; beautiful or ugly, big or small, sentient or not" ("Self-realization" 225). He puts emphasis on the concept of maturation of the self where "[n]ature is largely left out" (226). He adds that "[o]ur immediate environment, our home (where we belong as children), and the identification with non-human living beings, are largely ignored" (226). At this point, he introduces the concept of ecological self which is related to the self of a person "with which this person identifies" (227). "Increased self-realization implies a broadening and deepening of the self" and since there is "an inescapable process of identification with others with increasing maturity, the self is widened and deepened" (226). This will lead humans to see their selves in others.

In the introduction to *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, Rothenberg summarizes a definition of self-realization. It is not self-centered, which means that one's own self is not totally forgotten in the larger Self. In the concept of a greater Self, altruism becomes futile on the assumption that a person actually enlarges his/her self to include other humans, species and nature. The expanded planet becomes a part of one's own concern. It is "[a] direction, starting from the self, moving towards the Self" (Naess, *Ecology* 9). In this way "[the] distinction between *ego* and *alter* is, in a way, transcended" ("Self-realization" 235). Therefore, the identity of a Self is formed of humans and nonhumans at the same time, and the objective of this bigger Self is to act on behalf of itself erasing

the boundaries between self and other, since there is no other in the current state of the Self.

Bill Devall and George Sessions explain what deep ecology strives for and how it links human beings and the natural world together in the formation of a greater Self:

> Deep ecology is emerging as a way of developing a new balance and harmony between individuals, communities and all of Nature. It can potentially satisfy our deepest yearnings: faith and trust in our most basic intuitions; courage to take direct action; joyous confidence to dance with the sensuous harmonies discovered through spontaneous, playful intercourse with the rhythms of our bodies, the rhythms of flowing water, changes in the weather and seasons, and the overall processes of life on Earth. (*Deep Ecology* 7)

The connection between the human and the nonhuman world creates a harmonious existence through the cycles of life in the world. Shepard names the ecological self the "relatedness of self" because for him "ecological thinking . . . requires a kind of vision across boundaries. The epidermis of the skin is ecologically like a pond surface or a forest soil, not a shell so much as a delicate interpenetration" ("Ecology and Man" 132). When humans start to extend the borders and the perception of their self and get rid of their egos, they realize that they are inseparable from the great web of life, and they will come to the understanding that they are a part of nature. This new understanding of the world will lead, in the words of Bill Devall, to the idea that "we are part of the evolutionary journey and contain in our bodies connections with our Pleistocene ancestors" ("The Ecological Self" 104). So, the past and the present are interconnected. The relationship with the past and the relationship with nature cannot be separated.

In the course of the discovery of one's ecological self, one will happily defend and interact with one who identifies one's self with and will not impose environmental ethics on people. One will naturally respect, love, honor, and protect that which is of our self (104-105). The process of realization of ecological self will lead naturally to love, respect and self-defense. Since the identification "with an other and [realization of] one's own potential is relational and is bound to that of others, . . . to promote the other's flourishing is to promote oneself" (Diehm 28). Interconnection between humans and nature brings with it mutual gains and losses for the two, creates the condition that whatever is good for one is good for the other, or what is bad for one is bad for the other. In other words, when one acts on behalf of the other's benefit (in fact there won't

be an other since there is the bigger Self acting on behalf of the whole) this will lead to a greater good for all.

The modern world promotes the idea of self-centered consciousness through various kinds of devices. The division between self and nature and the present environmental crisis are the results of this way of life in our era. Deep ecologists target a world devoid of self but Self. This is done in an attempt to eradicate the narrow consciousness of self towards the world, and to act on behalf of the larger Self because they believe that people who have a narrow definition of self are alienated from the natural world. At this point Naess argues that in the Western world "self-realization is the term most often used for the competitive development of a person's talents and the pursuit of an individual's specific interests" ("Identification" 31). In this case, a person forms a self "in opposition to the world" which is indifferent in its relation to others, resulting in actions solely egoistic. Alienation from the natural world is an anthropocentric way of living. Albert Bergesen calls it eco-alienation, which refers to "the environmental argument positing a deeper, more real, ecological-self that we are out of touch with because of our false identification with the above nature status as human beings" (111). The self-centered, self-obsessive ego gratification in the pursuit of social status and hedonistic pleasures of the modern world is called "minimal self" by Christopher Lasch (16). The minimal self is primarily concerned with an egotistical way to survive with an interest on certain important people surrounding his/her life, retreating from the outer world and creating his/her own small world. The minimal self aims at survival rather than the growth of the self and it excludes its self from the rest of the world and by doing so alienates its self from the natural world too. Val Plumwood claims that in opposition to the Western anthropocentric view that separates the human and the natural world with clear walls, deep ecologists propose a self with an identification which dissolves the notion of difference between them which "rejects boundaries between self and nature" ("Nature, Self" 12). The delusional boundaries created by human centered thought are erased with an ecocentric view. Embracing the human and the nonhuman world, Bergesen argues, is humanity's absolute character "shifting from the theory of human beings to that of eco-beings" (116).

The Native American view of the world, in general, is that of eco-beings. When indigenous Americans of any tribe state "What a man does to the earth, he does to himself" they are talking about the interconnectedness of the web of life, which indicates that they have an understanding of the Self, rather than its narrow meaning. This idea of an extended self is best manifested in a remark by Chief Standing Bear of the Oglala Sioux excerpted by McLuhan:

> Kinship with all creatures of the earth, sky and water was a real and active principle. For the animal and bird world there existed a brotherly feeling that kept the Lacota safe among them and so close did some of the Lakota come to their feathered and furried friends that in true brotherhood they spoke a common language.
>
> The old Lakota was wise. He knew that man's heart away from nature becomes hard; he knew that lack of respect for growing, living things soon led to lack of respect for humans too. So he kept his youth close to its softening influence. (6)

Here the significance of the bond between humans and the natural world is seen clearly, and when the connection between humans and nature is broken, the result is alienation from nature and at the same time from humans. From this point of view, minimal self limits one's way of seeing the world and erects a wall between the person and the outer world. N. Scott Momaday, half Kiowa Indian writer and poet, relates how his Native American name, Tsoai-Talee, was given:

> Pohd-lock [an old man who is a paternal relative meaning 'old wolf'] . . . gave me the name when I was very young, less than a year old. Tsoai-talee means 'rock-tree boy.' It commemorates my having been taken, at the age of six months or so, to Devil's Tower, Wyoming, which is a sacred place in Kiowa tradition. And the Kiowas call it 'rock tree.' (*Conversations* 105)

In Native American culture, even name giving is connected to the natural world as in the case of Tsoai-talee who was named after the place called "rock tree." Momaday thinks that his name originates from a place in nature because "a man's life proceeds from his name, in the way that a river proceeds from its source" (*The Names*, sec. Beginning). N. Scott Momaday, in his poem "The Delight Song of Tsoai-talee," writes about his identification with the living and nonliving members of the natural world and he declares that he is "alive" embracing his ecological self. He becomes an *eco-being*. In the poem, Momaday writes: "I am the fish that rolls, shining, in the water . . . I am a field of sumac and the pomme blanche" (*In the Presence* 16). He identifies himself with animals and other entities on earth which are symbolic of his embracing the idea of

Home. Only then, Momaday implies in his poem that, one can act on behalf of one's larger Self.

In the case of the concept of a greater Self, all humans and nonhumans become a part of one's Self and interest. Although one can try to reach Self-realization, it cannot be achieved since it requires the realization of all (Naess, *Ecology* 9). Self-realization in Naess's original Norwegian book is *Selv-realisering* meaning Self-realising which is "an active condition, not a place one can reach" (9). The concept 'Self-realization' "is used to indicate a kind of perfection" in Naess's *Ecosophy T*, which is "conceived as a process, but also as an ultimate goal, in a rather special usage of 'ultimate'" and the concept encompasses "personal and community self-realization, but is conceived also to refer to an unfolding of reality as a totality" (84).

People who nurture an ecological self are aware of the current environmental crisis and they are conscious of the fact that destructive acts against nature are in fact devastating people and other species, all of which are interconnected. On the other hand, as Devall explains, "[People having minimal self] literally close their eyes to toxic wastes, deforestation, and other environmental ills" ("The Ecological Self" 120). These people who remain silent to atrocities, and actions against the natural world, and who are essentially destroying the world should be made aware of the interconnected web of the earth, and of the ecologist Barry Commoner's idea of the first law of ecology that "Everything is connected to everything else" (33). This idea summarizes the point that whatever one does to the earth will affect everybody and everything.

DEEP ECOLOGY AND DIRECT ACTION

When a person in the process of Self-realization identifies his/her self with other species of the natural world, he/she defends them from destruction because he/she feels that they are a part of him/herself. This act becomes self-defense in the process of Self-realization. Naess asserts that the deep maturity related to the Self-realization of a human guarantees "beautiful action." He adds that "[w]e need not repress ourselves; we need to develop our Self. The beautiful acts are natural and by definition not squeezed forth through respect for a moral law foreign to mature human development. [Increasing

maturity] results in acting more consistently from oneself *as a whole*" (*Ecology* 86). For Naess, although this process is somewhat difficult, it is the most meaningful and enticing experience (86). From the perspective of a mature Self, it is natural to act on behalf of the earth since one is a part of nature, and nature is a part of one's Self. J. Baird Callicott clarifies such an identification process in this way:

> The injury to me of environmental destruction transcends the secondary, indirect injury to the conventional, constricted ego encapsulated in this bag of skin and all the functioning organs it contains. Rather, the injury to me of environmental destruction is primarily and directly to my extended self, to the larger body and soul with which "I" (in the conventional narrow and constricted sense) am continuous. (*In Defense* 173-174)

Neutral identification with all beings is asserted through the identification of the larger body of the Self, the "I." The defense of Nature, in other words the defense of the larger Self, is self-defense, and according to Naess it guarantees a "beautiful action" to act on behalf of the Self (*Ecology* 86). Foreman justifies this kind of defense and says that it is not an "arrogant defense." By saying arrogant, he does not mean human beings who are the conquerors of the earth defending the rights of entities which have lower value, since he denies any anthropocentric view. He continues that this defense is rather

> a humble joining with Earth, becoming the rain forest, the desert, the mountain, the wilderness in defense of yourself. It is through becoming part of the wild that we find courage far greater than ourselves, a union that gives us boldness to stand against hostile humanism, against the machine, against the dollar, against jail, against extinction for what is sacred and right: the Great Dance of Life. (*Confessions* 9)

Having a greater Self is the pivotal point of finding courage in defending yourself against the ills destroying the planet, because in this case you act on behalf of the greater whole.

Every entity has a right to live on its own sake, and nothing and nobody is superior. In order to protect the natural world and defend it against destruction by the anthropocentric world, Foreman argues that they need new tactics rather than the old ones such as bleak environmental condition statements, letter writing to members of parliament, uttering political statements in the streets, and civil disobedience. For Foreman, action is the key; it is more significant than theory (20). For Devall and

Sessions, they must act; direct action must be taken instead of solely listening to others in order to change consciousness (8-9).

Naess proposes direct action using nonviolent visible methods by which grassroots environmentalists attempt to fight in public, collectively. There have been many different ways of direct action regarding environmental conflicts. Most actions regarding environmental protection can and should be made within the framework of existing laws. The target of an action should be clear and concrete, and the ideological objective of the action should be expressed precisely to the opponent. The opponent is rarely the police but often those in power. The success of the action does not depend on only a single action, but of many in which the fundamental feature is to get the attention of the people. The achievement of the action depends on the tenability of the idea that, as Naess states, "if the public *only knew*, the majority would be on the right side" (*Ecology* 146-147). For Foreman, passion and vision are two crucial elements of defending the earth against destruction. Action is the core and it is more serious than theory. He thinks that they have been too reasonable and calm, so it is time to "let rage flow at what the human cancer is doing to Earth, to be uncompromising" (*Confessions* 20).

As Bill Devall states "the paradigm of deep ecology is revolutionary in its metaphysics, epistemology, and cosmology, but deep ecologists do not seek to overthrow governments by force of arms or to issue anything like a comprehensive, all-embracing political program for bringing about the new order" ("The Deep Ecology Movement" 316). He adds that "[f]rom ecological consciousness will naturally flow an ecological resistance" (317). Direct action is related to eco-defense with the larger Self. People who are in the process of acquiring Self-realization act on behalf of the natural world, though it is under the siege of anthropocentrism. These people act on the side of "equal rights of all fellow beings" (*Ecology* 167) and believe that they are only plain members or citizens of the land to which they belong. Thus, monkeywrenching is a form of direct action used by radical environmentalists.

MONKEYWRENCHING[2] AS A CONCEPT AND RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISM

Direct action, as explained to this point, is manifested in American literature firstly in Edward Abbey's 1975 novel *The Monkey Wrench Gang*. The means and methods used by the characters in this novel to defend nature are called "monkeywrenching." Monkeywrenching is used for self-defense and eco-defense. In his article "Eco-Defense," Abbey explains eco-defense as "fighting back," "sabotage," "risky but sporting," "unauthorized but fun," "illegal but ethically imperative" (31). For him, direct action might be illegal, but at the same time it is an ethical obligation since nature/wilderness is under the attack of the "industrial megamachine." He justifies eco-defense through the use of monkeywrenching since he thinks that

> wilderness is our ancestral home, the primordial homeland of all living creatures including the human, and the present final dwelling place of such noble beings as the grizzly bear, the mountain lion, the eagle and the condor . . . waterfalls, rivers, the very bedrock itself of our hills, canyons, deserts, mountains. . . .[T]he wilderness is more our home than the little stucco boxes, wallboard apartments . . . in which the majority are now confined by the poverty of an overcrowded industrial culture. ("Eco-Defense" 30-31)

Abbey's idea of Home is a drive for his own thoughts and actions, since he has a sense of a larger Self. Abbey in "A Writer's Credo" argues that "[w]e are befouling and destroying our own home, we are committing a slow but accelerating race suicide and

---

[2] Monkeywrenching is also called "ecological sabotage," "ecotage," "ecodefense" or "night work" (*Confessions*, Foreman 118). There are two more kinds of monkeywrenching. One is called "modern monkeywrenching," which Tim DeChristopher performed. As bidder number 70, he participated in auctions where public land was being leased to oil companies, and he bid on 116 parcels of land. He did not intend to pay for what he bid on, but the land was taken off the books for a while until the lease was declared illegal (Gessner 222-223). The other is called "paper monkeywrenching," which operates within the system. The most significant achievement of paper monkeywrenching was the Wilderness Act of 1964. This legislation was a monkeywrench in the gears of the goverment. According to the Wilderness Act, the Forest Service, with its framework of management, is not capable of protecting the values of wilderness, and therefore decisions regarding the wilderness must be taken out of its authorization. Designation of a piece of land as wilderness is meant to stop standard agency management. The National Environmental Policy Act gave permission for legal appeals of lawsuits against agency decisions. In this way, conservationists enter into the branch of the government and overrule agency decisions in courts with legal paper monkeywrenching (*Confessions*, Foreman 145-146). This thesis does not focus on "modern monkeywrenching" and "paper monkeywrenching."

life murder—planetary biocide" (171). Monkeywrenching, according to Foreman, "includes such acts as pulling up survey stakes, putting sand in the crankcases of bulldozers, rendering dirt roads in wild areas impassable to vehicles, cutting down billboards, and removing and destroying trap lines" (*Confessions* 118). Foreman argues that nonviolence is used in monkeywrenching, inanimate objects are the sole target of action and humans are never the object of physical harm (118). It is very important to note that monkeywrenching is

> defensive in that it is used to prevent destructive development in wild places and in seminatural areas next to cities. . . . The goals of monkeywrenching are to block environmentally destructive projects, to increase the costs of such projects and thereby make them economically unattractive, and to raise public awareness of the taxpayer-subsidized devastation of biological diversity occurring throughout the world. (118-119)

The monkeywrenchers' drive for action is self-defensive. They act on behalf of their greater Self, the globe. The first target in Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, published in 1975, is Glen Canyon Dam, which is also the target of the first public action of Earth First!, a radical environmentalist movement, founded in 1980. As Daniel J. Philippon relates, Abbey delivered his speech entitled "Remarks, Glen Canyon Dam, Spring Equinox 1981" to explain the aims of this protest-action. This action is known as the "cracking" of Glen Canyon Dam. On March 21, 1981, three hundred feet of black plastic was unfurled down the side of the dam, which gave the effect that there was a growing crack. The protestors shouted "Earth First!" because they had a belief in Earth first (*Confessions* 22-20). Abbey emphasizes that "all creatures, great and small, animal and plant, have the inherent, basic, self-evident right to exist, to be, to live out their lives in their own manner, to produce posterity and pursue happiness in their own individual way" ("Remarks, Glen Canyon" 165). He adds that "human life is a part and only a part of the great web of life; and that all life depends, first and foremost, upon the preservation of a livable earth" (165). He asks whether, in the case of a ravaged and polluted world, human beings can create a planet for themselves. He answers his own question: "[t]he domination of Nature leads to the domination of human beings" (165). For Foreman, the dam drowned the most astonishing canyon in the world and it became an emblem of the devastation of wilderness, of the technological rape of the west. Therefore, the collapse of the dam meant the emancipation of the Colorado river, which in a way meant the liberation of human beings.

Naess asserts that ultimate Self-realization indicates "a kind of perfection," and as the primary norm it includes personal and community self-realization in a process, in total (*Ecology* 84). Thus, for Foreman, it is the responsibility of each person to move in the direction of a deep ecology life-style (*Confessions* 33). He claims that Earth First!ers, all radical environmentalists, are "fighting for beauty, for life, for joy" and they "smile at a flower and a hummingbird" (33). They enjoy life in the wilderness, life itself, and therefore oppose its spoilers and defend nature against destruction.

Although eco-defense is something obligatory for eco-defenders and deep ecologists, from an anthropocentrist view it might seem illogical. Monkeywrenching may also appear illegal. Moreover, Foreman claims that the people who place human beings and economic profit at the center of their value system, and see the world as a storehouse of resources for human use, will not see any intrinsic value in nature, and as a result will not see any consistent idea to support eco-defense or monkeywrenching (119).

The most important aspect of monkeywrenching, or ecotage, is that, according to Foreman, it is used when different methods are deemed ineffective; it is the last resort to defend wilderness (120). For the supporters of eco-sabotage, biological diversity on earth is regarded as more important than inanimate private property. As for breaking the law when the higher values of the whole region, or the planet, have a conflict with the law of a political entity/state, they are simply broken (Foreman 121). This is a form of civil disobedience, and its goal is to reform society. Nonviolent violation of the law, as in a blockade, is appealing to the public and the authorities, because it is the right of a person to express both one's principles and personal integrity (130). Monkeywrenching is delightful, and without it they would only sit in a world where the political system is under the servitude of the economic elite (139). Even though stronger environmental protection is the desire of the people, governments do not undertake the responsibility of the people, but are more influenced by rich corporations and elites (141). Besides, the media are owned by corporate concerns, and presentation of the news is controlled by them. Therefore, owing to the fact that protecting the land as people desire is ignored by the government, then, people will have, through monkeywrenching, a right to hinder the earth's devastation (142). This is the kind of institutional disregard that Edward Abbey wants the people to "[o]ppose. To oppose the destruction of our homeland. . . . And if

opposition is not enough, we must resist. And if resistance is not enough, then subvert ("Remarks, Glen Canyon" 165-166). When a person fully identifies with a wild place, monkeywrenching becomes self-defense, which is a basic right since nature/wilderness becomes an antibody of the land in self-defense (*Confessions* 140). Thereby, the idea of "home" transforms into *Home*, the globe, and the notion of "self" into *Self*, embodying all the entities on earth. Accordingly, people who have an ecological self will act on behalf of their Self and thwart destruction against the globe which is their larger Self.

The methods monkeywrenchers use to thwart destruction against the natural world are regarded as radical. That's why monkeywrenchers are also called radical environmentalists. Carolyn Merchant in *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World* explains radical ecology as challenging the misconception of people that they are free to exploit nature and to develop society for their own benefits, with a fresh consciousness of responsibilities to humans and nonhumans together (1). She asserts that it urges the already established systems in society and ecology toward new ways of production, reproduction, and consciousness which will ameliorate the quality of life for all beings (9). Thus, by taking these stands, Merchant states that, the movement tries to achieve greater equality with an alternative view of the earth where the confines of race, sex, class, and age will be removed and fundamental human needs are attained (235-236). She concludes her book with the idea that radical ecology will carry on to confront mainstream environmentalism and it will continue to be at the forefront of social transformation providing ideas and action to "search for a livable world" (240). This sums up the drive of the actions of the monkeywrenchers quite adequately.

The monkeywrencher characters, George Washington Hayduke in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Concrete in *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and Ty in *A Friend of the Earth* all engage in radical environmentalist self-defense on behalf of their extended selves. Hayduke fills the crankcases of bulldozers with Karo syrup, drives them off cliffs, harms oil well drilling equipment, pulls up survey stakes. Concrete, with the strong encouragement of other radical environmentalist characters in Chadwick's graphic novel, opposes loggers with his large body. Ty, like Hayduke, acts as a monkeywrencher against loggers and their selfish view of the world to stop logging in California. These characters all oppose the ruinous acts of the antropocentrist ideology

in order to stop the destruction of wilderness. None of these monkeywrenchers harm any humans or living things for whom or which they pay utmost attention, since their only target is the machinery used in the annihilation of nature. The most substantial objective of the monkeywrenchers is the defense of Mother Earth, for which they are eager to die to ensure a harmonious existence with all "plain members" of the community on earth.

A LIVABLE WORLD WITH ABBEY, CHADWICK, AND BOYLE

The Age of Anthropocene has witnessed staggering amounts of damage to the natural world by humans. From an ecocentric view, the destruction of nature or wilderness means the destruction of human beings. In this case, people who believe in the idea of a larger sense of Self or Home take action in order to protect their extended Self, that is, the planet. Abbey, Chadwick, and T.C. Boyle create radical environmentalist characters who have an idea of Self and Home and who take action to defend the globe against people who destroy wilderness and act only for their own sake. The drive of the radical environmentalist characters is to secure the blue planet to prevent an imminent ecological tragedy and to sustain a livable world now and for the future.

The following three chapters of this thesis will explore how the philosophy of deep ecology is manifested through eco-defense in the direct actions of the radical environmentalist characters in each novel. With a focus on the process of the making of Self-realization of each radical environmentalist character, this study will reveal the strategies for the transformation of the anthropocentric view of the world into an ecocentric Earth. This thesis will attempt to answer the question how monkeywrenching is justified through the deeds and ideas of these characters.

In the first chapter, Edward Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang* will be studied as the foundational work of radical environmentalist literature in America in its relation to the platform of the deep ecology movement formulated by Arne Naess and George Sessions in 1984, with a focus on the change of life conditions for the better which will affect fundamental economic, technological, and ideological patterns (Principle 6 of the Platform) and a focus on the thorough awareness of the profound difference between

"big" and "great" (Principle 7). By using monkeywrenching, the radical environmentalist characters George Washington Hayduke, Doc Sarvis, Seldom Seen Smith, and Bonnie Abbzug try to alter the way people live better, and make a distinction between big and great while trying to achieve ultimate Self-realization through which every member of the Earth community reaches the awareness of the concept of Home, the globe.

The second chapter will focus on Paul Chadwick's graphic novel, *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and how mainstream environmentalism fails to achieve the goal of protecting the wilderness, and how there is a need for direct action to thwart the destruction of an old-growth[3] national forest in northern Washington state. The radical environmentalist characters Penelope, Terry, Roland, and Stephen are in search of Self-realization through the support of the notion that, except for satisfying vital needs, humans do not have a right to diminish the richness and diversity of life on Earth (Principle 3) and these characters, who try to enlarge their sense of Self-realization by convincing Concrete, first a moderate environmentalist later a radical, act on behalf of their larger Self to justify their cause by emphasizing the idea that current forms of human interference are enormous and the situation is deteriorating rapidly (Principle 4).

In the third chapter, T.C. Boyle's *A Friend of the Earth* will be analyzed in terms of its effort to render past actions with the use of flashbacks and the future-present. Boyle depicts how Tyrone O'Shaughnessy Tierwater (Ty), Andrea Knowles Cotton Tierwater, Teo Van Sparks, and Sierra Tierwater struggled to defend the natural world by using civil disobedience tactics which did not help them achieve their ends, and why they resorted to monkeywrenching to achieve their objectives, that is, to stop the destruction of the forests in the Siskiyou Mountains located in southwestern Oregon and northwestern California. The focal point of this chapter will be how T.C. Boyle envisions the future through what he deems the greedy outlook and actions of those who value the usefulness of nonhuman life forms, their richness and diversity in support of the blossoming of human and nonhuman life in the world for their own gain instead of

[3] Old-growth forest is a term used to refer to "the forests along the West Coast that had not been logged since the European conquest of the Americas" (Speece 12).

valuing the intrinsic value of nonhuman life, and, in addition, what life would be like if these radical environmentalist characters failed to achieve their desired goal to sustain a livable world (Principle 1 and 2). Moreover, Principle 5, which focuses on the idea that the flourishing of human life is directly related to a considerable diminishing of the human population which the nonhuman life also demands, will also be studied.

Deep Ecology was criticized fiercely due to it not being a mainstream concept. In this current environmental crisis, an ecological self helps to establish a more livable world, since a wide and deep ecological self hears and feels the voices of nature and communicates with the nonhuman world to become a mediator between nature and humans. With a wide and deep ecological self, the radical environmentalist characters in these three novels act as mediators, and become significant voices of the deep ecological self in order to reveal that the plain members and citizens of the land community, humans and nonhumans together, all possess their consciousness, and any form of action they take will affect the Self, that is, the globe. The authors, through these conscious radical environmentalist characters, convey the message of the great Self, the planet.

All three authors of these novels, each one written during the last quarter of the twentieth century, express their disillusionment with the anthropocentric world view which puts human beings at the center of the value system and sees the world through the lens of mankind working for his or her own benefit. Notwithstanding the presiding idea of anthropocentrism, deep ecology offers an ecocentric look of the world where humans and nonhumans are members of the same community in the ecosphere.[4] The radical environmentalist characters use the methods of monkeywrenching as a last resort to defend themselves, as self-defense, since the notion of self is broader for them. Self-defense means defending the globe which has evolved into eco-defense. These characters are all in the active process of reaching complete Self-realization because it requires the realization of all. The thesis will end stating that although the radical environmentalist characters become monkeywrenchers in the process of Self-realization

[4] Bill Devall states that Naess uses the term "ecosphere" instead of using "Mother Earth," or "the biosphere" since "this term implies a broader definition of living beings" ("The Ecological Self" 107).

as the last means to protect nature, they fail to achieve their objective to make the world a better place to live. Yet, this does not mean that they are totally unsuccessful because, as Dave Foreman says, "[a] monkeywrench thrown into the gears of the machine may not stop [the destruction]. But it may delay it, make it cost more. And it feels good to put it there" (*Confessions* 23). For the monkeywrenchers, it is always better to act for the creation of a better and livable world at the risk of becoming criminals in the eyes of the law, rather than being confined to one's comfort zone. They are putting their lives on the line because the well-being of the planet is at stake.

CHAPTER 1: *THE MONKEY WRENCH GANG* (1975) BY EDWARD ABBEY: TRAILBLAZERS IN ECO-DEFENSE

Those who would truly walk away, who aim to abandon the dominant culture completely, clearly recognize that this culture is fundamentally irredeemable. And they presumably recognize that civilization's voracious industrial appetite is eating up the planet at an ever increasing rate. So why do they view walking away as an adequate strategy? If this culture is not going to change, where do they expect to be safe? What do they expect will happen as industrial society exhausts its last remaining resources? If this monstrosity is not stopped, the carefully tended permaculture gardens and groves of lifeboat ecovillages will be nothing more than after-dinner snacks for civilization.

Derrick Jensen and Aric McBay, *What We Leave Behind* 381

This chapter focuses on the sixth and seventh principles of Arne Naess and George Sessions's Deep Ecology Platform through the ideas and deeds of George Washington Hayduke, the protagonist of Edward Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang* (1975), and three other monkeywrencher characters. The sixth principle emphasizes a momentous shift toward a better life which creates a shift in policies that alter fundamental economic, technological, and ideological designs. Naess in "The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects" asserts that the current way of thinking favors material items because of their scarcity and because they have an economic value, and that the application of "deep changes" thus demands more and more worldwide action in contrast to the limited interests of regional communities (70).

The seventh principle of the Deep Ecology Platform focuses on an ideological change aiming for the complete awareness of the serious contrast between "big" and "great" which welcomes life quality instead of observing a high level of material comfort. Naess and Sessions in their "Platform Principles of the Deep Ecology Movement" criticize the term "quality of life" for being vague, according to some economists. For Naess and Sessions, quality of life cannot be measured appropriately and it is not necessary to do so (53). Naess argues that Point 7 of the Platform restricts its

effectiveness regarding wealthy nations since he has different formulations for the non-industrialized societies, and he happily declares that none of the proponents argued that he overestimated the significance of political transformation as a crucial qualification and prerequisite to overcome the ecological catastrophe ("The Deep Ecology" 220-221).

Humans and their relations with the nonhuman world constitute the very basis of the Platform. It accentuates a non-anthropocentric ideology that brings about "radical social change," according to Andrew McLaughlin (*Regarding Nature* 173). He adds that the root of the idea of radical social change is expanding industrialism, which causes the extermination of species and ecosystems endangering the biosphere as a whole (*Regarding Nature* 172). According to this new outlook on life on earth, industrialism is part of the problem which contributes to the destruction of the natural world. Therefore, transformation of the anthropocentric world view is vital. This will lead to the creation of a new society that supports the *cri de cœur* of a world in despair. The monkeywrencher characters in Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang* resist the destructive deeds of this industrialist structure and try to protect the natural world in their own way through direct action in the form of Self-realization, and defending the whole Earth, since it is their Home. These monkeywrenchers have also inspired many real monkeywrenchers, especially in the United States.

The seventh point of the Platform is dependent on the sixth point since the improvement of life conditions will lead to fundamental changes in economic, technological, and ideological systems which will attach importance to life quality rather than a wealthy life. This will contribute to a deeper understanding of the difference between big and great. Abbey understood that the current ideology of modern man, the anthropocentric world view, is wrong. He had a distinct mindset regarding land, which remains untouched, deemed germane to his Self, in the sense of an ecological self which encompasses humans and nonhumans. This was of utmost importance to him. Abbey witnessed the momentum of industrialism and the idea of "great" upheld by the system after the World War II, until his death. He resisted this through his actions and, more importantly, with his books. His job, life, and deeds reflect his personality.

Edward Abbey (1927-1989) served intermittently as a ranger and a fire lookout for the US Forest Service and National Park Service. He was an author, and an essayist who achieved renown for his ardent advocacy of environmental issues. He wrote eight novels, fourteen nonfiction books, and a volume of poetry. Abbey published his first book *Jonathan Troy*, a novel, in 1954. It was not considered a successful work. *Fire on the Mountain* (1962) dealt with the issue of a New Mexico ranger, John Vogelin, who rejects the sale of his ranch to the government for a new White Sands missile range. His last book *Hayduke Lives!*, a sequel to *The Monkey Wrench Gang* (1975), was published posthumously in 1990. *Desert Solitaire*[5] (1968) was his first nonfiction work, based on notes he took during the two seasons he worked as a ranger at Arches National Monument in Utah, in 1956 and 1957. Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, which is about the deeds of four eco-saboteurs, came to serve as the foundational philosophy of the radical environmentalist movement Earth First! whose motto was "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth," which was founded in 1980. The term "monkeywrenching" is coined by Abbey in this novel. In the introduction of his nonfiction work *The Journey Home: Some Words in Defense of the American West* (1977), he expresses his admiration for the works of Thoreau, Muir, Leopold, Beston, Krutch, and Eisely. His idols regarding literary skills are Rabelais, Knut Hamsun, B. Traven, Theodore Dreiser, Louis-Ferdinand Céline, and John Steinbeck (xii). For Abbey, his nonfiction books, although they are classified as nature books, should be filed under the title of personal history (xiii). His goal in writing nonfiction works was to explore connections and contradictions between "wildness and wilderness," "community and anarchy," and "civilization and human freedom" through his personal experience (xiv). Larry McMurty, the novelist and essayist, named Abbey as "The Thoreau of the West," and the environmentalist author Bill McKibben called him, as Bishop, Jr. states, "Thoreau's successor as the American philosopher of nature" (142). Nonetheless, Abbey did not consider himself an environmental writer or a nature writer and acknowledged himself as "a savage, vicious, embittered, utterly irresponsible critic of [the] society" (Bishop, Jr. 143-144). In his essay "A Writer's Credo" published in

[5] This book was translated into Turkish entitled *Çölde Tek Başına: Yabanıl Doğada Bir Mevsim* by Ufuk Özdağ and Demet Sökezoğlu Çakır in 2018.

One Life at a Time, Please, Abbey explains why he writes: "To oppose, resist and sabotage the contemporary drift toward a global technocratic police state whatever its ideological coloration. I write to oppose injustice, to defy power, and to speak for the voiceless" (177-178). He lived in defense of Home, and the globe, in his prose and his actions throughout his life. According to Ufuk Özdağ, Edward Abbey's fight for a land ethic

> was transformed into radical environmentalism in the face of the devastated land. In his works, Abbey is a sharp tongued and a fierce critic of the "techno-industrialist state" aiming at raising awareness of people against it. . . . His nature writing, irrespective of offending his readers, is a fierce critic of American society, government, politicians, big corporations and modern industrial culture. (*Literature and Land Ethic* 85)[6]

In *The Monkey Wrench Gang* (1975), four "eco-raiders" (45), George Washington Hayduke, former Green Beret in the Vietnam War from Tucson, Arizona, Seldom Seen Smith, a jack Mormon in the river-running business from Utah, Doc Sarvis, a rich surgeon from Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Bonnie Abbzug, a Jewish exile from Bronx, New York come together on Smith's riverboat on the Colorado river in Glen Canyon and form a gang whose sole target is "to keep it [the wilderness] like it was" (20). Hayduke is dissatisfied with "so many power lines" (26) in the Indian country in the American Southwest, Smith complains about the Glen Canyon Dam which "plugged up the Glen Canyon, the heart of his river, the river of his heart" (66). They all decide to take action against the agents of the megamachine befouling and destroying the land: mining and logging companies, developers and politicians. Although Hayduke is for a violent and illegal defense of the earth, Doc Sarvis and the others hold that their actions will not possess any violence or bloodshed. Their ammunition is Karo syrup, sand or emery powder. The Gang's first operation is in Comb Wash, Utah, where they fill in the fuel tanks of bulldozers, haulers, tankers or other vehicles with these substances in order to deactivate the machines in the new road-building project. Their final objective is the destruction of the Glen Canyon Dam which the monkeywrenchers know is impossible. The Gang engages in more acts of monkeywrenching on behalf of the natural world by breaking more machines at construction sites and pushing bulldozers into canyons, and pulling up survey stakes; thus they draw the attention of Bishop Love, the captain of

[6] All translations into English in this work are my own.

"Search and Rescue Team" (130) in Blanding, Utah. The Team, with their helicopters, dogs, and heavy weaponry, is in search of the monkeywrenchers who get trapped in the Maze which is a dead end in the Canyonlands. The Gang is faced with capture. Doc Sarvis surrenders with Bonnie Abbzug to help Bishop Love who had a heart attack. Smith gets caught in Green River and Hayduke succumbs to "a dozen or more automatic rifles in rapid fire" (407). At the end of the novel, Smith, Doc Sarvis, and Abbzug are put on probation all living close to each other in Green River. Hayduke appears as an apparition, reunites with his friends and says "I start work as a night watchman next week" (420).

In the epigraph of the novel, Abbey writes, "IN MEMORIAM: *Ned Ludd*" to commemorate the British historical figure General Ned Ludd of the early 1800s, sharing brief information about him from *The Oxford Universal Dictionary*. Malcolm I. Thomis in *The Luddites: Machine-Breaking in Regency England* states that

> stocking mill workers in Britain calling themselves followers of "General Ludd" or "Luddites" rose up against the machinery that was the tool of their oppressors. Legend obscures the true origin of "Luddite," although there is some evidence that it was adapted from the name "N. Ludlam," a Leicestershire youth who became enraged at his tiresome job one day and took a hammer to his needles. (159)

Under the epigraph for Ned Ludd is a line from "Song for the Luddites" by Byron, the English Romantic poet and a member of the House of Lords, which reads "Down with all kings but King Ludd." Abbey concurs with Byron when he writes, "the tree shall renew / Of Liberty, planted by Ludd!" (67) Epitomizing Ned Ludd as the radical disobedient leader of the early years of the Industrial Revolution in Britain, Abbey makes a connection between Ludd and Hayduke and his Monkey Wrench Gang (the Gang)[7] who destroy the machinery of the opportunists and developers as a necessary part of their effort to protect the environment. Ludd and his followers damage the machinery to protect their livelihood. Ludd was a symbol of the liberation of working class members who were made redundant due to the introduction of machinery. The Luddites claimed what they lost: their jobs. Work is a necessity like food, water, and air, the principal needs for subsistence. The system has a habit of destroying the natural

[7] "The Monkey Wrench Gang" as the name of the eco-saboteur party is abbreviated as "the Gang."

world, to which the Gang reacts by retrieving wilderness, the source (not in a materialistic sense) of vital needs for the Earth.

The other epigraph is the last two lines of a poem entitled "Requiem for Sonora" by Richard Shelton, a poet and writer from Arizona whom Abbey admired, which reads "but oh my desert / yours is the only death I cannot bear." Shelton, like Abbey, was in love with the desert and he calls himself a "lover" of the desert in his poem. He also asks a question in the same poem: "what will become of those who cannot learn / the terrible knowledge of cities" (73). These lines justify Shelton's sense of holding the desert or wilderness dear to himself because he thinks that most of the places have been damaged and the last place to be destroyed will be the desert whose death is imminent under current conditions. In 1956 and 1957, Abbey worked as a seasonal park ranger at Arches National Monument in Utah for the US National Park Service. In *Desert Solitaire* (1968) Abbey relates his experiences and his ideas about the canyon country as a park ranger. He preferred the desert and called himself a "desert rat" to express his attraction and desire to live in the desert (*Desert Solitaire* 298). The love of the desert means the love of wilderness, which for Abbey is a manifestation of "loyalty to the earth," our only home and paradise at the same time where the original sin is "the blind destruction for the sake of greed of this natural paradise" (208). Abbey's idea of paradise not only encompasses "apple trees and golden women" but also "scorpions and tarantulas . . . sandstorms, volcanoes . . . bacteria and bear . . . ocotillo and mesquite . . . disease and death" (208), that is, everything on earth. This makes him an "earthiest" which is the belief in the preciousness of the Earth and the reason why one should be "true to earth" (231). In order to be true to earth and protect it as a paradise, one should "Resist much. Obey little." This one line taken from Walt Whitman's poem "To the States" is used by Abbey as the third epigraph of the novel. The next epigraph by Henry David Thoreau complements Whitman's lines by saying "Now. Or never." This quote is taken from Thoreau's journals dating back to April 24, 1858. In his journal, Thoreau examines the changing conditions of nature and seasons as a human being's moods and thoughts do, and for him "Nothing must be postponed" (*Nature's Panorama* XVII) because, otherwise, life will pass and there will be no action regarding the present circumstances, which in the future will be impossible to turn back.

The last note by Abbey before he begins the novel is Webster's *New World Dictionary* entry for the word "sabotage." Here the author focuses on the origin of the word. *Sabot* means "wooden shoe" in French and *–age* comes from the word "damage done to the machinery by sabots." Paul Lindholdt makes the connection between sabots and the Luddites in history in *Explorations in Ecocriticism: Advocacy, Bioregionalism, and Visual Design*,

> [t]he plebeian wooden shoe, the clog or sabot, thrown into machines historically to break them, lent its name to the activity and became the second [the first being the sledgehammer or blacksmith's hammer] and arguably the most widely recognized of several objects to represent such sabotage. The sabot is a fit icon, inasmuch as it was the common shoe of the working classes. (63)

Abbey pondered the idea of the sabot for a long time before he wrote his novel. He listed the books he wanted to write in his journal entry of January 19, 1963, among which was *The Wooden Shoe Gang* or *The Monkey Wrench Mob*. In this journal, the author wrote that the novel would be about the "Wilderness Avenger," who is to be George Washington Hayduke and his desperate band, made up of Doc Sarvis, Seldom Seen Smith, Bonnie Abbzug, all of whom will eventually become *The Monkey Wrench Gang* in 1975 (*Confessions of a Barbarian* 185).

The Luddites of the early nineteenth century evolved into monkeywrenchers during the last quarter of the twentieth century. According to Steven E. Jones, the legend of the very idea of the omnipresence of the Luddites and their leader Ned Ludd implanted fright and uneasiness across Britain (54) just as the Monkey Wrench Gang did. Although the Luddites and monkeywrenchers, who are ecological saboteurs, shared similarities, the most salient difference between them is that monkeywrenching used its own method of direct action and it does not seek to harm humans or other forms of life. The sole objective of the monkeywrenchers, Hayduke, Doc Sarvis, Smith, and Abbzug is to save the paradise, as used in Abbey's sense, by reacting to and resisting the current barbarity of the greed oriented system. According to David Gessner,

> [Abbey] helps to pull our heads out of the sand and shows us, through his life and work, that a counterlife is still possible. A life against the prevailing current. He believed that so much of what we think right is emphatically wrong and that therefore we must live according to our own dictates. And just as important: he

> believed that a life with some sort of freedom from the usual dictates *can* still be lived." (255)

This counterlife, a noteworthy change in his approach to living, was his aim and became a guide that inspired many through the help of his characters in the novel. In his real life, it became a means of standing up to and battling the system.

1.1. EDWARD ABBEY AS GEORGE WASHINGTON HAYDUKE: THE CONCEPT OF A GREATER "SELF"

Naess's concept of a greater Self is equal to his idea of ecological self in which one's self is much "richer in its constitutive relationships" ("Self-realization" 226). Relationships are not only limited within the human community but among other living beings. According to Naess "[t]he meaning of life . . . is increased through increased self-realization [which] implies a broadening and deepening of the self" (226). During the process of self-realization there is an inevitable course of identification with others, both living and nonliving entities. All living beings are closely connected through the expanded Self and this closeness leads to identification. With increasing maturity "the self is widened and deepened" (226). As a result, one starts to see himself/herself in others (226). One's self-realization is blocked when the self-realization of others, with whom one identifies oneself, is blocked. One's love of oneself will resist this blocking action by helping in the self-realization of others according to the dictum "Live and Let live!" With the expanded self, "ego" and "alter," the opposites of a wide and deep self, are gradually eradicated. According to Naess, "the more one's nature and potentialities are realized, the more self-realization there is" (238). Therefore, self-realization is a process in which there is a move from self towards the Self. One realizes that parts of nature are parts of oneself. One cannot have an isolated existence with them (*Ecology* 9-10).

Edward Abbey and his character Hayduke shared many common personality traits. Hayduke was a reflection of Abbey, his creator. They both had a greater Self in Naess's understanding of "being in Nature" which means "living in community with all other living beings" ("Self-realization" 238-239). Naess's idea of living beings is also broad,

comprised of a human and nonhuman world. In *Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness,* Abbey asserts his idea of kinship with all living things by stating, "all living things on earth are kindred" (25). He explains that "all of us, killer and victim, predator and prey, me and the sly coyote, the soaring buzzard, the elegant gopher snake, the trembling cottontail, the foul worms that feed on our entrails, all of them, all of us" (42). According to Abbey, all living beings are kindred and at the same time one's "furred and feathered and hairy hided cousins" (206). In the *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Abbey, the narrator, addresses Hayduke and says "[y]ou're among friends [bats, great blue heron] now, George" (29). Since he possesses an extended understanding of the Self, friends are the animals in this case, nonhuman members of his community in the Leopoldian sense.

Because Abbey and Hayduke have a broadened Self, they can change their perspectives and look from a snake's angle. In Abbey's case, it is to "study the world of the flowers from ground level" (31). In Hayduke's case, it is to see things from an ant's point of view; to see "[d]ust. Spider webs . . . a pair of ants climb[ing] up the barrel of his revolver" (260). From their viewpoints as two living beings on earth, Abbey (and his friend Ralph Newcomb) is used to sand "in [their] food and drink, in [their] teeth and eyes and whiskers, in [their] bedrolls and underwear. Sand becomes a part of [their] existence which, like breathing, [they] take for granted" (204). For Hayduke, sand is also a part of existence. He "takes up a pinch of red sand" deliberately and "[e]ats" it for which Abbey remarks, "(Good for the craw. Rich in iron. Good for the gizzard)" (29). The act of eating sand benefits and empowers him, thus bringing him closer to his fellow members of the earth community. He embraces each member of the community with his hands wide open facing the sky. He is "among friends," living and nonliving entities of the world, and a member of the whole. When one part of it is hurt, he notices it immediately and takes action to heal the body's wound.

Moreover, Abbey realizes parts of nature as parts of himself, his expanded Self, because he identifies himself with each member of the landscape:

> I feel myself sinking into the landscape, fixed in place like a stone, like a tree, a small motionless shape of vague outline, desert-colored, and with the wings of imagination look down at myself through the eyes of the bird, watching a human

> figure that becomes smaller, smaller in the receding landscape as the bird rises into the evening. (271)

He becomes one with the land and feels unison with all other beings of the community. Like Abbey, Hayduke also becomes one with the earth. His oneness is portrayed clearly: "With cheek and ear pressed against the canyonland bedrock he feels, hears, shares the beating of some massive heart, a heavy murmur buried under mountains, old as Mesozoic time. His own heart" (371). Wilderness and Hayduke do not have separate hearts. They share only one heart which gives them life. He has a Self which encompasses all, the globe and deep time.[8] He knows that his (metaphorical) umbilical cord still strongly attaches him to the land.

A life without the nonhuman world is impossible. So, being part of the community in the Leopoldian sense requires seeing, as Naess states, "the vital needs of the ecosystems and other species as our own needs," thus promoting one's self-realization and "fullness of life" (*Ecology* 11). Therefore, one's idea of self encompasses all the human and nonhuman world. Since acts of degradation of nature abound, which render the extinction of wildlife, destruction of habitats, air and water pollution, the monkeywrenchers resort to direct action as a means to defend both human and nonhuman life. All acts committed directly against natural cycles have a negative impact on them. It is self-defense transforming into eco-defense, or vice versa as a result of having a broader sense of Self, the globe. Any kind of assault on the wilderness is an assault to the monkeywrenchers. They consider it an attack to a part of their body. To make this idea more concrete, a Laplander herdsman in Norway when arrested by the police because of refusing to leave the banks of a river which was going to be dammed, was asked why he was so eager to break the law for the well-being of the river. He responded, "It is part of myself" (Manes, *Green Rage* 139). This is how they perceive the natural world: a part of their Self. This point refers to Whitman's lines used as the third epigraph of the novel: "Resist much. Obey little." If a person's Self is under attack by one of the institutions of the megamachine,[9] one has the right to resist any violation

[8] Deep time dates back to the formation of the earth (McGrath and Jebb 59).

[9] According to Mumford, the beginning of the megamachine dates back to the rise of ancient Egyptian civilization. More precisely, the megamachine arose from "a radically new type of

or assault under the terms of self-defense. The wilderness is under the invasion of the megamachine, like the arms of Kraken, a mythical gigantic sea monster used as a metaphor by Abbey to portray the megamachine, damaging the ecosystem.

Throughout his life, Abbey was against society's encroachment on the wilderness. His sole *raison d'être* was to thwart the ills of the industrial structure both through his writings and in his actions. The note by Abbey at the very beginning of *The Monkey Wrench Gang* also proves that the actions in the novel are historical, that they all "actually happened" although the book is a work of fiction. Jack Loeffler, one of Abbey's best friends, relates in *Adventures with Ed* that in the 1950s Taos, New Mexico was teeming with developers. Ed (Abbey), Loeffler himself and two of their friends said "Enough" to this manifestation of excessive development, and with a chain saw knocked down all the billboards there. In addition to this, they destroyed some of the machinery the developers were using by pouring sand into the crankcase, as do the monkeywrencher characters in the novel. It was the first time Abbey remarked, "We really ought to throw a monkey wrench in it." They talked about the "sabot, the root of the word sabotage" and the Luddites (71-72). On December 13, 1966, Abbey wrote in his journal that he was determined to do many things including "razing more billboards" (*Confessions of a Barbarian* 20). In his preface to *Beyond the Wall*, Abbey examines the destructive effects of the mining industry in Moab, Utah, the uranium mines in the Grand Canyon, a radioactive-waste dump in the Canyonlands, all of these putting the American West, which is the home of the wilderness, under heavy onslaught "by the industrial armies of Government and Greed" (xvi). The author then sums up what kind of people are needed and how the reaction should be to this kind of an assault. "What we need now are heroes. And heroines. About a million of them. One brave deed is

---

social organization: a type of myth, magic, religion, and the nascent science of astronomy" (*Technics and Human* 11). In this new order, the authority of the organizers of the megamachine had a deep impact on "regimentation of human components" which were "once autonomous human activities," (12) and they were crushed under the weight of mass culture and mass control. The individual is dominated by the megamachine and becomes "a passive purposeless, machine-conditioned animal whose proper functions . . . [would] either to be fed into the machine or strictly limited and controlled for the benefit of de-personalized, collective organizations" (3). Under the authority of the megamachine, the individual is reduced to an instrument which becomes "a standardized servo mechanism: a left-over part from a more organic world" (Mumford, *The City* 430).

worth a thousand books. Sentiment without action is the ruin of the soul" (xvi). Therefore, George Washington Hayduke, Doc Sarvis, Seldom Seen Smith are the heroes and Bonnie Abbzug the heroine who form the novel's Monkey Wrench Gang. According to Paul Lindholdt, Abbey felt that "our convictions must be not only actively realized, by destructive force if necessary, but that attacking the tools of technocracy constitutes a viable middle ground between surrendering to its proponents on the one hand and practicing a violent anarchy on the other" ("Rage against the Machine" 108). The heroes and the heroine in the novel choose a violent course of direct action as a last resort to stop the devastation of the environment. In other words, the development of one's broadened and deepened Self.

The Monkey Wrench Gang features autobiographical gleanings from Edward Abbey's life. It depicts his personality as a trailblazer, mostly through the character of Hayduke, the most radical monkeywrencher in the Gang, and other monkeywrenchers. These characters grew extremely agitated by the troubling activities of the system and used direct action to save humanity from itself and to speak for the voiceless in the fight for improving the health of the planet. In the prologue entitled "The Aftermath," the narrator depicts the bridge over the Glen Canyon as "a compact arch of steel" and "concrete" and the Colorado River as "tame and domesticated," released from Glen Canyon Dam. The narrator focuses on the transformation of the color of the Colorado River from golden-red to green and the "greater" dam in the words of Abbey is "a gray sheer concave face of concrete aggregate, impacable and mute" (2). With the construction of the dam, silence prevails as if reflecting the death of the area's natural cycle. The ghost of the river, the spirits of the sea gulls, pelicans and blue herons float about, and only the phantoms of the deer wander the shores of the canyon now. In "Down the River," Abbey describes Glen Canyon "before it was drowned" and his long-time dream that the dam will never be finished, or, as in the prologue of the novel, where the bridge is destroyed. He describes the destruction of the dam:

> some unknown hero with a rucksack full of dynamite strapped to his back will descend into the bowels of the dam; there he will hide his high explosives where they'll do the most good, attach blasting caps to the lot and with angelic ingenuity link the caps to the official dam wiring system in such a way that when the time comes for the grand opening ceremony . . . the President . . . will ignite the

> loveliest explosion ever seen by man, reducing the great dam to a heap of rubble in the path of the river. (205-206)

The dam, signet of how the balance of nature is broken by man, aroused the ire of the monkeywrenchers in disguise—the heroes of the wilderness. The politicians, the figures of the system are shown raging against them at the dreamy scene of the destruction of the dam in the beginning of the novel. Thus, the symbol of the demise of nature attracts the attention of monkeywrenchers who act on behalf of wilderness to change life conditions toward a better world to live in. The resistance and opposition to the annihilation of wilderness is an act committed by the unknown heroes who will be named in the following chapters: George Washington Hayduke, Doc Sarvis, Seldom Seen Smith, and Bonnie Abbzug.

The four members of the Gang who came together accidentally on Smith's river boat are protectors of the land despite their differences in terms of occupation, social status and economic background. The bond that ties them together is the ecological awareness they possess. In Abbey's words, they are all "the earthiest," which means that they value the cycle of nature now unbroken. They have adopted defiant actions from the past and synthesized them with Leopold's idea of prioritizing usefulness for the land community including the nonhuman world. Özdağ states that "[t]he four characters in the novel gather to prevent the 'techno-industrial' disturbances to the wilderness in the west, engage in actions of 'ecotage' against the mining corporations, road, bridge and dam constructors who damage the unspoiled land" ("Introduction for the Turkish Edition" 21).

Doc Sarvis has a "hobby" of burning billboards along the highway, which he calls his "neighborhood beautification project" (9), reflecting the author's own deeds. Abbey was involved in these kinds of "beautification" projects that were small and quiet acts of sabotage. These acts became a habit for the doctor since he did not believe in what was written on the billboards and called those who wrote them "[l]iars" (15). Furthermore, one of Doc's bumper stickers reads "GOD BLESS AMERICA. LET'S SAVE SOME OF IT" (15), a slogan which Abbey employs in his article "A San Francisco Journal" (68). This is an indication that Doc will continue his acts of resistance against changing

cultural conditions which affect nature negatively, because he hears the message of the river mumbling "Come flow with me" (12).

George Washington Hayduke, the ex-Vietnam Green Beret, finds his hometown Tucson, Arizona changed "by someone or something" when he returns from the war. He recognizes the differences between the city and the land, comparing its past to its present state. Hayduke especially pays attention to the once clear skies:

> Even the sky, that dome of delirious blue which he once had thought was out of reach, was becoming a dump for the gaseous garbage of the copper smelters, the filth that Kennecott, Anaconda, Phelps-Dodge and American Smelting & Refining Co. were pumping through stacks into the public sky. A smudge of poisoned air overhung his homeland. Hayduke smelled something foul in all this. . . . Hayduke *burned*. (16-17)

Like the skies polluted by toxic gases and power lines in his hometown, the Indian country close to his city had been turned into a desiccated region with "new power lines, sky smudged with smoke from power plants, the mountains strip-mined," and the list continues with "the range grazed to death" ending up with the reality of erosion (26). The deterioration of the land and community was spreading across the country. At this point, Hayduke stresses his idea that Indians are not any better than the rest of the whites with regard to stupidity and greed compared to their old ways of living without harming the land to which they were attached through strong feelings of belonging.

In *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*, William Cronon discusses the two very different parties of ecological contacts challenging one another in colonial New England: Indians and Europeans. They started to reside in the same region and the land was transformed briskly into a shape that would not allow Indians to continue to interact with it in the same way (15). For Navajos, an Indian tribe of the Southwest, "the earth is the giver of life," and for Indians, in general, the principal sustenance of life for people is the natural environment which supplies food, clothing and shelter (Fixico 32-33). From an Indian's perspective, one's relationship with the earth depends on admiration and respect.

Hayduke stops at a gas station on his way, and once there he signs two petitions, one of which is “Save Black Mesa” and the other “Stop the Strip Miners” (25). The Black Mesa Defense Fund was founded by Jack Loeffler in 1970 in Santa Fe, New Mexico to resist the strip mining project of the Peabody Coal Company in the Indian territory of the Navajos of Black Mesa. The ensuing destruction of the region was found “disgusting” both by Abbey and Loeffler (Calahan 138). The Central Arizona Project of the early 1970s took up the lands of the Navajos and Hopis to whom Black Mesa was the sacred female mountain from which coal was strip-mined. The coal, thereafter, would be shipped by railroad across the Indian land to the Navajo Generating Station to be built. With the construction of this structure, power lines would be erected (Loeffler, *Adventures with Ed* 103-104). The reason why Abbey and Loeffler found strip mining an insult to the land and people is shared by Hayduke representing one part of anarchistic Abbey who opposed the destruction because he saw it as an assault to his own broadened body or Self. It is also considered a rape of the land and the wilderness since the fouling of one specific place will, in one way or another, negatively affect other places close to the area.

The power magnates and developers were cheating the Indians once again (the first time during the colonial period) in the name of growth, power, and greed. As McLuhan argues, the announcement made by the officials of the company was that mining in the area would not harm the Indian lands and would thus better the lives of the Navajos and Hopis dwelling there (170). Although some Hopis made a deal with the company to strip-mine their land, in 1970 a letter was written to then President Richard Nixon about the issue by the concerned Hopi Traditional Village Leaders. In their letter, they drew attention to the idea of “insensitivity to the way of Nature” which “desecrated the face of Mother Earth” by white men. They added that the white man’s craving for material possessions and natural resources not only caused pain to Mother Earth, but also made many Indians adopt the white man’s anthropocentric world view.

According to McLuhan, Hopis believe that if ashes fall to the ground it means many people will die, which will cause the end of that way of life. They interpret the falling of ashes as the “dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki” (170-171). In “Our Homes are not Dumps” Grace Thorpe writes that Navajo traditional spiritual

leaders warned people for hundreds of years that the earth would become unbalanced and hence destroyed. In one of the origin stories of the Navajos, they caution against the perils of uranium. In the story, they are offered two yellow powders, one of which is dust from the rocks, the other corn pollen. They choose the yellow corn pollen, to which the gods nod in consent, and leave the yellow dust on the ground. If it is removed from the ground, as the story goes, it will bring disaster to the earth. Many of the uranium mines were on Navajo lands (Thorpe 50-54). The ideas and ways of concerned Hopi Indians and Navajos distinguish the two different perspectives of looking at the land: white man's land full of natural resources, and Indians' Mother Earth. Hayduke's understanding of the land is close to the Indians', for he does not see the land as a material possession to take advantage of. In Abbey's novel, "[t]he public sky," which belongs to the biotic community, is contaminated by the smoke from the smokestacks of the station. The smell of something foul in the air, both literally and metaphorically, makes Hayduke "burn" to change the existing destructive, corrupt system of the machine which hurts his greater Self.

The bumper sticker that Hayduke replaces read, at first, "☺ HAVE A NICE DAY SCHMUCK ☺" (26). It reads now as "THINK HOPI," and "RED POWER" (25). These phrases reflect Hayduke's inner world. The Hopi way of thinking values the balance of life on Earth with which Hayduke agrees because the current acts damaging the earth, to a great extent, break the balance of life leading to "koyaanisquatsi," meaning "life out of balance" in the Hopi language (Weaver 123). In Abbey's *Black Sun* (1971), the contrasting worldviews of whites and Indians are clearly depicted in the conversation between Will Gatlin and a Hopi Indian. When the Indian says "The sun will eat the earth," Gatlin says "No" and adds, "[b]ecause we shall eat the sun," to which the Indian replies, "You'll eat anything" (56). Tom Pilkington in "Western Philosopher, or How to be a 'Happy Hopi Hippie'" states that Gatlin's desire to eat the sun comes from the instinct to integrate himself with nature to get the instinctual sense which, according to Abbey, modern man has lost. Gatlin's Hopi friend finds it pointless to eat the sun since he sees the truth that naturally "one cannot conquer or control the sun, one can only coexist with it in the actual world" (31). White man's insatiable desire to have more will in the end lead to devouring the land on which we live since that desire breaks the balance which the Indians value most and causes a catastrophe. The other bumper

sticker “RED POWER” takes its significance from the color of the desert sand which Hayduke eats in unison with the land he belongs to.

Seldom Seen Smith, the Jack Mormon river guide, is also an inborn “earthiest” from Abbey’s point of view. Glen Canyon City is a place where no one visits any longer. It promises hope for its inhabitants to become “a hive of industry and avarice” (31), all of which is opposed by Smith, Hayduke, Doc Sarvis, and Abbzug. This is, in fact, the voice of the author. Smith recalls the old landscape of the region before Lake Powell, “the blue death” in his words, formed. As described in the past, it was a golden river and there were many canyons with names and also nameless ones and amphitheaters which once lay under water and were now gone. As in the case of Hayduke, who burned with anger against the smell of foul air, Smith’s heart was filled with “healthy hatred” (32), a motive for his actions to transform the unhealthy sides of the system into something healthy for the whole. The dam is described as a “glissade of featureless concrete” which craved attention because it was a “magnificent mass of cement” (32). Smith wants to pray for an earthquake because the dam broke the balance of the river’s flow and the landscape. He longs for the “fat and golden river” from Junes of the past, which in Smith’s words “bastards from Washington moved in and ruined it all” (33). Like Hayduke, Smith, too, directs attention to the “smokestacks of the coal-burning Navajo Power Plant, named in honor of the Indians” who were filling their lungs with many different types of poisonous gases and particles coming from the plant. Although he earns at the level of poverty, Smith does not have a problem with this. His sole trouble is “the U.S. Government, the Utah State Highway Department and a consortium of oil companies, mining companies and public utilities [which] were trying to destroy his livelihood, put his livelihood, put him out of business and obstruct the view” (35). Moreover, Smith has a yearning for the past when there was a balance of human intervention on the environment, and he is against the banks and all kinds of institutionalized establishments including religion, business, and government.

Bonnie Abbzug, the only female character and Doc Sarvis’s mistress at the beginning of the novel, came to the Southwest from the Bronx, New York, and when she arrived, it was love at first sight with the mountains and the desert. She helped Doc Sarvis’s “night beautification projects” which the papers wrote about as “organized bands of

environmental activists" that was shortened as "eco-raiders" (44-45). When Doc Sarvis and Abbzug cut down or burned up billboards, which Abbey labels as mutilation, Doc Sarvis finds it a very easy job and remarks "[w]e are meant for finer things" (51). This foresees his drive for direct action. He clearly depicts, through Abbzug, the terrible present condition of the different parts of the country by asking consecutive questions:

> Have you thought about where all that smog is coming from that blankets the whole bloody Rio Grande valley? . . . Did you know that a consortium of power companies and government agencies are conspiring to open more strip mines and build even more coal-burning power plants in the same four-corners area where all that filth is coming from now? . . . Did you know that other power companies and the same government agencies are planning even bigger things for the Wyoming-Montana area? Strip mines bigger than any that have devastated Appalachia? (51-52)

Doc Sarvis is aware of the clear change in the landscape and he remembers the lost image of the country which has become unbearable to live in now. Smith still remembers "the real Colorado" before the dam was built, when the river flowed "unchained and unchanneled" joyously (58). In fact, the time when the real Colorado flowed was not that many years ago.

For Hayduke, Doc Sarvis, Smith, and Abbzug there is an intolerable transformation in the land which is leading to environmental degradation. Theirs is not the anthropocentric view that values the change of life conditions for better by developing life with an emphasis on human's dominion over nature. Theirs is the ecocentric point of view, which focuses on equal value between humans and nonhumans. For them, transformation of life conditions for the better means causing harm to all forms of life on earth. These characters are not in opposition to the change of life conditions for the better. They primarily object to what Doc Sarvis explains as the condition of being caught "in the iron treads of a technological juggernaut" which for him is "[a] mindless machine. With a breeder reactor for a heart" (64). This kind of a state in Britain drew the direct attention of the Luddites in the early eighteenth century in the early stages of the Industrial Revolution. They attacked the machines with their hammers in defense of their livelihood. A century and a half after the Luddites who opposed the machines in a small region in England, Doc Sarvis strongly criticizes "a planetary industrialism" which grows "like a cancer" just "[g]rowth for the sake of growth" and "[p]ower for the

sake of power" (64). He draws a parallel between cancer and planetary industrialism because in the case of cancer, healthy cells stop dividing while unhealthy cells reproduce. They can also spread to other parts of the body. Doc Sarvis is attacking expansionist industrialism which for him is unhealthy, a cancer cell, spreading all over the country and the world. Abbey in "Arizona: How Big is Big Enough" sums up the discourse of growth analogous to cancer since its purpose is the demise of the host (21).

The cancer cells that Hayduke identify are the coal-burning Navajo Power Plant, the Four Corners and Shiprock plants, and strip-mined Indian country in the Southwest. Shared with Abbzug by Doc Sarvis is a long list of cancer cells among which are the biggest strip mine in the United States, near Shiprock, New Mexico, more coal-burning power plants in the four-corners area, more roads, power lines, railways and pipelines, strip-mines bigger than those which devastated Appalachia, the big logging companies, and so on. Owing to Smith's job, a river-running business, his attention is on the Colorado River and its environs. In Smith's view, the most crucial cancer cell is the Glen Canyon Dam and man-made Lake Powell. All these unhealthy cells multiply and expand across the country damaging the well-being of all forms of life, from water and animals to plants and humans. On the other hand, from an anthropocentric perspective, all these are done in the name of progress by different government organizations or a consortium of power companies and magnates. Nevertheless, although the structures built by these circles strengthened the power they had, they did more harm than good to the environment. The characters address the ills of the new industrial complex which are the symbols of development for the system. To illustrate, the sky in Tucson, Hayduke's hometown, became a "dump" ground of gaseous garbage, the big companies poisoning the region. Again, the sky in the Indian country in the Southwest is smudged with smoke from power plants, and the mountains are strip-mined there. The Glen Canyon Dam changed the color of the Colorado River and submerged many natural places that were once habitats for many different species of animals and plants.

The four characters, who are well aware of the "technoindustrial juggernaut," form a gang named "the Monkey Wrench Gang," by the author in defense of the land. They burn with "healthy hatred" of the machine to do "constructive work" (68). They are *vis à vis* agents who resist the encroaching culture. In Abbey's explanation, the wild river is

civilization while 592,000 tons of cement is culture. Civilization is at the same time self-defense and the judge, the lawbooks are culture (*Desert Solitaire* 308). He places emphasis on the term civilization which is about the reality of the free flow of the river and free reign of ideas going against the Machine, which may seem omnipotent according to Abbey. In "Shadows from the Big Woods" Abbey states that "[h]uman bodies . . . everywhere, united in purpose, independent in action, can still face that machine and stop it and take it apart and reassemble it—if we wish—on lines entirely new. There is, after all, a better way to live (226). Thus, the four environmentally conscious characters unite with the intent to dismantle the destructive industrial regime in a way that does not harm any living entity. They care about the equality of all, not only that of human beings.

Abbey's four characters in opposition to the agents of the system clearly reflected his own character traits in real life. Brian Allen Drake in *Loving Nature, Fearing the State: Environmentalism and Antigovernment Politics Before Reagan* writes that Abbey was certain of his enemies whom he called "the Power Combine" which is comprised of

> the interlocking corporate monopolies of oil, coal, the energy industries, the road & plant construction companies, the land speculators and developers. . . . Big Business in general-all those, in short, who tend to get very emotional where making money is concerned. The Power Combine also includes those public agencies and public officials who serve it. (160)

All the above mentioned institutions of the system, whether governmental or private, have the principle of a cancer cell serving only one purpose: to grow and make more money for themselves, whatever the consequences. Both the purpose and the consequences were significant for Abbey, and his characters in the novel attack them. The characters' ideology of resistance and their attack on the industrial culture does not involve guns and violence but, rather, peanut butter, Karo syrup, sand or emery powder. They use these in the process of a growing global struggle in pursuit of better life conditions in a country without fences where wilderness offers freedom and sanity, vegetation and animals, clean air and water.

Through its institutions spread all over the country, the Power Combine consumes what nature offers. The narrator shows the combine's distinct way of seeing the world through the character of the engineer, whose dream is of the mirage of an exemplary

ideal sphericity of Earth erasing its entire unevenness with roads designed to run as smooth as glass. He thinks their enemies are the mechanical failures, downtime due to broken machinery, poor weather conditions, problems related to workers but not the "the band of four idealists," nothing they had ever imagined before. The other resistant party consists of four ecological rebels who are against the power combine's anthropocentric greed oriented ideology. The embodiment of the power combine's agents are bulldozers, power shovels, draglines, and earthmovers. In short, machines. They are depicted as metal monsters, dragons "puffing black smoke in to the yellow dust" or a herd of iron elephants (80) which symbolize the great power they have in uprooting what is on the ground. This structure of power forms a body of dominion over nature, of which humans are one part. According to Drake, what was critical for the domination of human beings was the domination of nature (160), as he relates, which Abbey in 1981 explained to the people of Arizona: "The great drive by the power institutions to transform our land, our planet . . . is also a war on people. Tyranny over nature will lead to tyranny over human beings [and it] is already doing so" (160-161). In "Arizona: How Big is Big Enough" Abbey makes it clear that growth in numbers does not help settle the long lasting troubles of unemployment, crime, corrupted politics, air and water pollution. He adds what politicians claim about their dedication to endless growth in Arizona: "without sacrificing the quality of the Arizona environment" with its clear skies and ample wildlife, there should be a never ending development. For him, there is a trade-off in all forms of industrial development (21-22). Thus, when there is industrial growth it comes with its positive and negative sides, but from the four eco-raiders' perspective, the disadvantages outweigh the advantages and that's why their motto is "*Keep it like it was*" (82). They want to experience the land without roads and people living in the wilderness.

In their first act of monkey wrench business, Hayduke reminds the team of the first rule of the gang, pulling up survey stakes, which Abbey himself also performed. They are the symbols of the conquest of land by man. In order to halt this conquest, they use their own way of overcoming it. They perform happily without harming any living being, just focusing on the machines:

> Doc . . . [and] his three comrades entertained themselves cutting up the wiring, fuel lines, control link rods and hydrolic hoses of the machine, . . . Caterpillar 330 diesel engine. . . . [Hayduke] unscrewed the oil-filler cap, took chisel and hammer and punched a hole through the oil strainer and poured in more sand. Smith removed the fuel-tank cap and emptied four quart bottles of sweet Karo syrup into the fuel tank. . . .The engine should seize up like a block of iron, when they get it running. If they could get it running. (86)

It is "[t]he murder of a machine. Deicide." (86) from the gang's perspective since the machines are the most flagrant spreaders of man's new religion: endless growth. At this point, machines are the emblems of gods whom modern man worships. Hayduke thinks that cutting wires, pouring sand and Karo syrup in the crankcases of the machines will not stop them, but only slow them down, which is a waste of time. He had suggested blasting the machines or burning them up to which Smith objected and defined as arson which he believes will make their choice of reaction misunderstood. They continue to "mutilate" and "humiliate" (90) the "great" machines (92), which start to bleed, one after the other in their own way as if the machines are their "patients" (91). It is the commencement of wreaking "earth's vengeance on the cylinder walls of the despoilers of the desert," (94) "doomed dinosaurs of iron" (95) which symbolize the Gang's targets. They are the "master machines" which the Gang is against in its pursuit of happiness.

The Gang does not aim at destroying technologies or industries which people require for their sustenance. They only indicate and draw society's attention to the difference between big and great. The crucial goal for them is people's needs. While walking around on a construction site, performing his routine of pulling up survey stakes, Hayduke comes across another work site, a bridge over a canyon. He is seeing this for the first time. Although the canyon is small and very little is known about it, there is work being done to build this bridge across it. Hayduke does not want a bridge to be built there since, for him, it is needless. He writes notes in the sand to the highway construction contractors which read, "Go home" and "No fucking bridge, please" (106). This shows his manner of speech and the Gang's attitude towards development. Abbey in the "Water" chapter of *Desert Solitaire* expresses the case of water in the Southwest:

> There is no shortage of water in the desert but exactly the right amount, a perfect ratio of water to rock, of water to sand, insuring that wide, free, open, generous spacing among plants and animals, homes and towns and cities, which makes the

> arid West so different from any other part of the nation. There is no lack of water here, unless you try to establish a city where no city should be. (159)

He adds that the developers and politicians complain about serious water scarcity in a region where there should not be any cities. The doubling of populations in Phoenix and Albuquerque will not bring them better facilities (159-160). Although there are no boundaries in nature, the drive to conquer, and the own it all ideology reigns. People trespass on wilderness areas where there is a strong challenge to survive as modern humans because the natives of that land, plants, animals, and some people, have grown accustomed to living there for a long time. It is useless to build a city where there are hardly any resources, in a materialist sense, for a metropolis to flourish. If done, the current situation harms wilderness and leads eventually to environmental degradation.

Progress and growth, according to Abbey, do not have the same meaning. In his understanding, progress is the word that stands for "change for the better." He supports progress, as do Hayduke and other gang members. Growth, however, means "change for the worse" ("Water" 60), which he opposes strongly. The implication of the word "growth" for Glen Canyon Dam, both in real life and in the novel, stands as its most salient symbol. In *Epitaph for a Desert Anarchist*, James Bishop, Jr. writes that for Abbey, Glen Canyon Dam was "nothing more than a great—and unnecessary—holocaust that insulted [Abbey's] soul and also moved the anarchist within him to action" (122). Bishop, Jr. describes "the huge dam" as the most outrageous exemplification of dominance of government authority at a catastrophic level (122). Therefore, the dam remains as an example of the monstrosity of growth in the middle of the Colorado River. In Abbey's novel, the greatness of the dam's size and the three new bridges linked to it are the focal point of the characters' attention. One of the three new bridges to cross the river is the White Canyon Bridge which "like the other two, was of arch construction and massive proportion, meant to last. The very bolt heads in the cross members were the size of a man's fist" (119). The first thing to be noticed is the bridge and its enormous span and the plain truth that the river is no longer there because "[s]omebody had removed the Colorado River. . . Instead of a river [Hayduke] looked down on a motionless body of murky green effluent, dead, stagnant, dull, a scum of oil floating on the surface" (120). The greatness of the bridge devoured the life giving river. Moreover, with the help of man-made Lake Powell, which has become a "storage pond,

silt trap, evaporation tank and garbage dispose-all, a 180-mile-long incipient sewage lagoon," transformed the river into a body of water with "a few dead fish float[ing] belly up on the oily surface among the orange peels and picnic plates (120). The enormity of this man-made lake, and other constructions such as the dam and the bridges stood as pillars of greatness for human beings, thus bringing contamination and death to the area. It was not the old Colorado River. It did not bring regeneration any longer. It brought filth. Furthermore, the narrator is astonished with the number of bridges on the river. He says: "Three bridges to cross one river?" (119). He stresses that the excess of the number of bridges crossing only one river is too many for an area where so few people live. As David N. Cassuto argues, restoring the river to its previous state "advocates the return of the Colorado River ecosystem, as well as that of the arid lands in the river basin, to their pre-dam states" (16). This means the ills of the monstrous man-made constructions will be eliminated and the broken balance of nature will be restored.

Bishop Love is the mouthpiece of the growth discourse. Although he is a bishop, a senior priest in charge of other priests of lower ranks. As Smith narrates, he works in the church only on Wednesdays and Sundays during church-study nights. The rest of the days Bishop Love is "neck deep in real estate, uranium, cattle, oil, gas, tourism, most anything that smells like money. That man can hear a dollar bill drop on a shag rug. Now he's running for the state legislature" (117). He is portrayed as the representation of a person having the ideals of what Alan Drengson calls "technocratic philosophy" in the Southwestern town of Blanding, a small prototype representing bigger ones in the capital. As Drengson explains, the technocratic philosophy is dominant. This gives direction to policy and technological control that is mechanistic. In "Shifting Paradigms: From Technocrat to Planetary Person," Drengson explains the concept of technocratic philosophy, a seeing of nature as a resource for the complete control of human interests, and how it endangers wilderness by changing the integrity of the world's ecosystems (74). Technocracy is the systematic operation of technology in every degree of human enterprise, involving governmental and economic policies whose pivotal target is growth (81). This is where Bishop Love stands as his sole aim is growth but only for growth's sake and his own profit.

Bishop Love is the mouthpiece of the established state authority. As the Captain of the Search and Rescue Team (the Team)[10] and as the only religious authority figure, he can influence people easily. In the society, the associations of his position as a bishop imply positive connections. However, the Gang, as the word suggests, lives with the word's negative connotation as a group of criminals or a group causing trouble all the time. This is just the appearance of the two parties who have opposing mindsets and world views. As a matter of fact, the Gang's precedence is community in the Leopoldian understanding, and the integrity of the ecosystem which renders the continuance of a healthy life on Earth. The methods that the techno-industrialist corporations, or individuals, use in the name of growth have proven detrimental to the natural world, and to humans, as well. The great transformation of the land by way of constructing dams, bridges, power stations, roads, and by strip-mining, and oil drilling is superfluous. The rationale behind their drive to act is to alter the present conditions of the environmental malaise inflicting the globe. The Gang does it by using the techniques of direct action without giving harm to any living being. They do this with the monkey wrench by preventing the destruction of wilderness by the human-made machines which are the agents of the megamachine, as the Luddites did with "*les sabots*" in the past. It is their rebellion against the concept of greatness, and the change of life conditions for better which, in fact, is for worse. Hayduke, as the most radical member of the Gang, expresses his view of coping with the system as "sabotag[ing] the world planetary maggot-machine" (151). The Gang understands the greatness of Mesa Power Plant's conveying coal at a rate of fifty thousand tons per day. Smith says that "It's a mechanical animal" to which Doc Sarvis adds, "We're not dealing with human beings. We're up against the megamachine. A megalomaniacal megamachine" (167). Doc Sarvis's statement justifies the fact that they are not against people but the megamachine. As Abbey states in his article "Eco-Defense," the American wilderness, which is Americans' ancestral home, is under the attack of the industrial megamachine (30). Lewis Mumford in *The Pentagon of Power* defines the megamachine as a set of hierarchical institutions, a machine using human beings as its elements. He asserts that a huge bureaucracy of humans that serve the system, operating without an ethical

[10] "The Search and Rescue Team" is abbreviated as "the Team."

engagement, is essential for the creation of the megamachines (269-71). He further emphasizes that "[c]onsistently the agents of the megamachine act as if their only responsibility were to the power system itself. The interests and demands of the populations subjected to the megamachine are not only unheeded but deliberately flouted" (271).

The idea of serving as an agent of the megamachine is what Bishop Love and his Search and Rescue team do. Their urge for action derives its impetus from only being parts of the megamachine working only to meet its own goals. Hayduke's "maggot-machine" and Smith's "megalomaniacal megamachine" are the same as Mumford's "megamachine" which, in Smith's words, is a mechanical animal. The idea of a mechanical animal is a reference to Descartes's "Animals are Machines" article and his metaphor of animals operating like machines which do not have feelings. Thus, without emotions and the idea of a Self, or embracing the planet, the megamachine works only for its own end to satisfy those few who are its servants. It does not regard the well-being of humans and nonhumans. Nonetheless, Hayduke, with an ecological self that cares about the well-being of the Earth, does not forget the coal companies strip-mining the Black Mesa. He thinks about the future of the region: "Who cares if five years from now you can't see fifteen miles across the Grand Canyon because the air is so fucked up by these motherfucking new power plants?" (168). The focal point of the megamachine's idea of a shift of life conditions for the better is symbolized in the novel by the presence of the character Bishop Love, who aims at a transformation and improvement of life conditions that will serve the prosperity of the megamachine, whereas the aim and dream of Hayduke and other members of the Gang is the welfare of the whole planet.

1.2. THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST AS HOME

Naess's idea of feeling at home everywhere is achieved through one's not having a specific residence to call home (*Ecology* 166). Abbey calls wilderness "ancestral home" or "the primordial homeland" of human and nonhuman world ("Eco-Defense" 30). For Abbey, the Southwestern wilderness was his home. As he writes in *Desert Solitaire*, the

time he spent as a ranger in the Arches National Monument, "the one true home" for him was "the Canyonlands. The slickrock desert," (1) the garden was the place "all around [him], extending from here [the trailer in which he lives] to the mountains, from here to the Book Cliffs, from here to Robert's Roost and Land's End," (27) and he had a "33,000-acre terrace" (52). As for Hayduke, when he was released from captivity in Vietnam, he could only think about "home," but not his home in the city of Tucson, Arizona. For him, the idea of home was that of "something clean and decent" which reminded him of "the canyons," "the desert down along the Gulf Coast," and "the mountains, from Flagstaff up to the Wind Rivers" (359). He did not have a specific place he called home. His home was the wilderness which he revered. Abbey asserts that love of wilderness is "an expression of loyalty to the earth, the earth which bore us and sustains us, the only home we shall ever know, the only paradise we ever need—if only we had the eyes to see" (*Desert Solitaire* 208). Hayduke and other gang members had eyes to see what paradise is and to take action in order to protect it. Because he sees wilderness as his home, Hayduke is one with all beings animate or inanimate. Hayduke describes the American Southwest as the "home of the free creatures: horned toads, desert rats, Gila monsters and coyotes" (16). He includes himself in his list of free creatures because he dreams of home "[w]herever that is" like the nonhuman beings (25). He does not have a definite place in mind, and simply labels the Southwest as his Home. Like Abbey, Hayduke does not want his country, which he calls home in an extended sense, to be "fuck[ed] up" by being polluted, etc. In such a situation, as Hayduke remarks, "they [the despoilers] are in real trouble" (366-367). He defends his extended Self at Home, the globe.

The most significant initiative regarding why the monkeywrenchers resort to direct action arises from the way they perceive "Self" and "Home." Hayduke explains this state using the example of Hopi elders, who also had an idea of Self and Home, to protect Black Mesa. He says "[Hopi elders, the American Indian Movement, the Black Mesa Defense Committee] tried lawsuits, big fucking propaganda campaigns, politics" (169). All these methods of protecting the region which belonged to them did not help the Hopis to save their landscape of being strip-mined and their air polluted with the smoke from the power stations. Doc Sarvis voices their primary rule as "no violence to human beings" (170). What they saw in the Indian country first were "ridges of

overturned earth—spoil banks in parallel formation, windrows of rock and inverted soil never again to nourish the roots of grass, bush or tree (within the likely lifetime of the sold-out, deceived and betrayed Navajo Nation)" (171). Then they saw "a Euclid earthmover with cab twenty feet high bearing down on [the monkeywrenchers], headlights glaring, stack belching diesel fumes, air horn bellowing like a wounded dinosaur" (171). The landscape was uprooted in such a way that nature would not be able to recover. For Abbzug, it was like a "Martian invasion" or "the War of the Worlds" (171). Smith remembered "Kennecott's open-pit mine ('world's largest') near Magna, Utah." Doc Sarvis recollects,

> the plain of fire and of the oligarchs and oligopoly beyond: Peabody Coal only one arm of Anaconda Copper; Anaconda only a limb of United States Steel; U.S. Steel intertwined in incestuous embrace with the Pentagon, TVA, Standard Oil, General Dynamics, Dutch Shell, I. G. Farben-industrie; the whole conglomerated cartel spread out upon half the planet Earth like a global kraken, pantentacled, wall-eyed and parrot-beaked, its brain a bank of computer data centers, its blood the flow of money, its heart a radioactive dynamo, its language the technetronic monologue of number imprinted on magnetic tape. (172)

Hayduke thought of Vietnam (172). The monkeywrenchers all thought of all places as hell wherever the megamachine worked at full steam. From their point of view, the system was like a gargantuan "factory walking" (172) for which Abbzug felt, on behalf of the Gang, so small in comparison with the size of the machines. For Hayduke, it was like a battle ground where the dead or wounded lay helplessly, and the land was under fire of the machine like it had been in the Vietnam War where he served as a sergeant. The futility and the disastrous effects of war are equated with "all that heartbreaking insult to land and the sky and human heart" (173). Doc asks why it is so and answers his own question himself:

> to light the lamps of Phoenix suburbs not yet built, to run the air conditioners of San Diego and Los Angeles, to illuminate shopping-center parking lots at two in the morning, . . . to charge the neon tubing that makes the meaning (all the meaning there is) of Las Vegas, Albuquerque, Tucson, Salt Lake City, the amalgamated *metropoli* of southern California, to keep alive that phosphorescent putrefying glory (all the glory there is left) called Down Town, Night Time, Wonderville, U.S.A. (173)

All these are done for the sake of the megamachine, to ensure its power and maintenance rather than the comfort of people and the health of nature. In Ann Roland's

words "[t]o defile [Great Basin's] landscape is to damage Abbey himself; to take away its wildness is to subtract a crucial portion of Abbey's soul" (*Reader of the Purple* 80). Thus, the defilement of the landscape symbolizes the destruction of Abbey and Hayduke and their kinship with the land, and other forms of life on Earth.

Doc Sarvis pays attention to the ills that the megamachine has brought in the name of growth: lung cancer and increasing numbers of acute leukemia cases which have become a plague for young people. He thinks that "the evil is in the food, in the noise, in the crowding, in the stress, in the water, in the air" (180). He reports that he has seen much of this kind of harm and believes that it will be considerably worse "if [the monkeywrenchers] let *them* [the agents of the megamachine] carry out their plans" (180). In Sarvis's opinion, the Southwest was once the place where Eastern doctors sent their patients with severe respiratory ailments. Now it has become a region where "the developers—bankers, industrialists, subdividers, freeway builders and public utility chiefs—had succeeded with less than thirty years' effort in bringing the air of Southwestern cities 'up the standard,' that is, as foul as any other" (233). Doc Sarvis ironically finds the megamachine "successful" in contaminating the Southwest as it did in other parts of the country. Doc now thinks of the times "when schoolchildren were forbidden to play outside in the 'open' air, heavy breathing being more dangerous than child molesters" in Albuquerque, New Mexico (233).

One of the moments they realized what they were doing was right and the morals they held dear were ethical was the moment when they saw clear-cut logging operations east of the North Rim District of Grand Canyon National Park. For forty miles the monkeywrenchers looked out on green meadows, aspens, spruce trees and an uncut, intact forest, but it was only a façade. Inside was where the logging operations continued at full speed. Abbzug and Hayduke looked around dumbfounded. It was a

> scene of devastation. Within an area of half a square mile the forest had been stripped of every tree, big or small, healthy or diseased, seedling or ancient snag. Everything gone but the stumps. Where trees had been were now huge heaps of slash waiting to be burned when the winter snows arrived. A network of truck, skidder and bulldozer tracks wound among the total amputees. (227-228)

It was like a battlefield or a crime scene where the dead and the wounded lay ignored. When Abbzug asks if loggers pay the citizens for every tree they cut, Hayduke answers by explaining how this kind of a clear-cutting operation works as part of the megamachine. He criticizes the way the Forest Service, a governmental institution, acts for the favor of logging companies because he says that it takes "the money, [the citizen's] money, and spends it building new logging roads . . . all banked and graded for the loggers to run their timber-hauling rigs on" (229). In Hayduke's opinion, the devastation caused by the logging companies was promoted by the Forest Service building new roads for logging to serve the megamachine.

When Hayduke talks about mining the bridge over Kaibito Canyon to destroy the bridge, the railroad tracks and trains at the same time, Doc Sarvis rejects this idea by saying "We are a law-abiding people" (176). To this, Hayduke responds, "What's more American than violence?" He adds, "Violence is as American as pizza pie" (176). He finds violence natural when a part of his Self is confronted with it because this is called self-defense. Hayduke thinks that somehow or other the Gang will "slow if not halt the advance of Technocracy, the growth of Growth, the spread of the ideology of the cancer cell" (225). He remembers and paraphrases Thomas Jefferson's words, "eternal hostility against *every fucking form of tyranny*" (225) which, from Hayduke's perspective, puts emphasis on the equality of all forms of life from an ecocentrist outlook. Abbey in his conversation with Loeffler explains when self-defense is in need:

> When all other means fail, I believe the true patriot has the right, is obligated to defend his country against the government. When a government terrorizes its people and, by extension, terrorizes living creatures to serve its own ends, I believe violence is justified. The violence of self-defense. . . . And you can extend that protection to include creatures who live free in the wild. To include all life. All life is kindred, and all life belongs to this living organism that is the Earth. You defend the Earth from exploiters who want to turn its life and its so-called resources into money. (*Adventures with Ed* 205)

The violence of self-defense, which is called monkeywrenching, is legitimized under the condition that government, institutions or individuals commit acts against the well-being of the people and the land. When asked how he can make a difference between terrorism and sabotage, Abbey makes a clear distinction between the two:

> [T]errorism is the act of threatening or committing violence against living creatures. Could be planting a bomb in a plane. Could be strafing villages in Vietnam. Could be chaining piñon or juniper trees to make way for cattle grazing or strip mining. Could be settling cyanide traps to murder predators that pose a threat to ranchers. These are all forms of terrorism: terrorism against life, terrorism against the planet. Sabotage is the dismantling of the tools of terrorism. I believe that the government commits great acts of terrorism. And they justify these acts of terrorism through legislation, calling what they do legal. (*Adventures with Ed* 205)

He has a broad vision of seeing violence committed against all living creatures which reflects his idea of Self embracing the globe. Violence against any kind of living thing can be seen as terrorism. He equates planting a bomb in a plane with an assault upon a piñon or a juniper tree. Both are acts of terrorism from Abbey's and the four members of the Gang's point of view. Abbey criticizes the governments', in other words the megamachine's legitimized terrorism of the state attitude as being self-centered though legal justifications, and causing ecological havoc. Whereas the so-called illegal methods used by monkeywrenchers seek to resist the agents of the megamachine and defend wilderness. Abbey, like his monkeywrencher characters in the novel, reverses what terrorism means from the government's point of view and calls what the government and its agents do in the name of growth by harming the environment, directly or indirectly, to living things and people, terrorism. Violence from an ecocentrist view in Rik Scarce's words means "*inflicting harm on a living being or a non-living entity*, such as a mountainside" (12). The concept of violence has been changed by the earthiests who hold the idea of Earth as being the broader Self of a (human) being. For David Rothenberg, Abbey's novel is "a rousing adventure of true believers fighting for the public good, long before having to answer to the scourge of being labeled 'eco-terrorists' and the like" ("Who is the Lone Ranger?" 80).

From an ecocentric point of view, the deeds committed in defense of Self aim at a shift in life conditions towards the better. This way of thinking opposes the anthropocentric view which prioritizes great over big, megamachine over the individual, humans over nonhumans. According to Calahan, it proposes, as Abbey did in 1982 at Round River Rendezvous in the Gros Ventre mountains of Wyoming, an "Equal Rocks Amendment, or equal rights for rocks, and trees and grass and clouds and flowing streams and bull elk and grizzly" (204). In "A Walk in the Desert Hills," he states the idea that it is an

ethical issue to defend wildlife and he declares his own ecocentrist *Declaration of Independence*: "All beings are created equal, I say. All are endowed by their Creator (call that God or call it evolution) with certain inalienable rights; among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit—each in its own way—of reproductive happiness (*Beyond the Wall* 39). In Abbey's *Declaration of Independence*, the emphasis is on the equality of "all beings" not only on "men" as it is in the original U.S. Declaration of Independence. His world view embraces the rights of all forms of life on Earth and requires love of every entity, outside of man-centeredness, and anthropocentricity, which puts human beings at the center of all accepted value systems. Abbey's *Declaration of Independence* also reflects the outlook of the monkeywrenchers which Hayduke voices as his job "to save the fucking wilderness" (229) in the "oceanic unity of things" (274) at Home.

The wilderness is under the attack of the megamachine. Having a broader sense of Self embracing the planet means a person must accept the responsibility of acting on behalf of any form of life on Earth, since the well-being of one affects the well-being of another in an endless cycle. Moreover, it is also an "inalienable right" for every being on Earth to live and to pursue its own happiness. The tactics the monkeywrenchers use as a last resort to defend the wilderness are ethical because they are in fact defending themselves. Michael Branch in "One Man's Terrorist: Reclaiming Edward Abbey for the Post-9/11 Era" asserts what shaped his idea of writing about nature: "[M]oral outrage in response to environmental exploitation is warranted and necessary" (37). Branch makes a distinction between the murderer of bystanders at the 2013 Boston Marathon and an activist occupying an old-growth redwood to defend and stop its destruction. He makes this differentiation because both acts are called terrorism by the state, and gives examples of significant struggles the U.S. has gone through like "[w]hen, in 1773, the Sons of Liberty destroyed the property of the East India Company by dumping it into Boston Harbor, they engaged in a form of direct activism that powerfully asserted American rights and freedoms" which triggered the American Revolution (41). Another example by Branch is the radical abolitionists of the 1850s, who by "stealing slaves" from their masters and helping them be free by breaking the law, gained an important achievement. His last example is the civil rights protestors of the 1950s and 1960s who violated segregationist laws in such numbers that at the end

they achieved their goal of racial justice. Branch considers Abbey "a patriot whose radicalism is absolutely in the American grain" (41). On the other hand, Thomas C. Shevory in "Monkeywrenching: Practice in Search of a Theory" asserts how monkeywrenching will be considered one of several different traditions of radical political action demanding valuable attention. He asks whether, like different sections of abolitionism, civil rights, women's, and gay rights movements, the environmental form of "civil disobedience," will be legalized in the future (189).

As Abbey portrays in the novel, behind the superstructure the most significant message murmured, *sotto voce*, not to be heard, is "Power . . . profit . . . prestige . . . pleasure . . . profit . . . prestige . . . pleasure . . . power" (256). He uses the terms he associates with the superstructure or the megamachine twice in order to emphasize the importance of these concepts for the system for which the megamachine operates. The megamachine, against which the Gang is fighting for the well-being of the planet as a whole, is constantly in the process of destroying the land in the name of changing life conditions for the betterment of the people on the surface, whereas its sole aim is the megamachine not the people. The monkeywrenchers were aware of this fact and the destruction going on in the name of growth. Thus, they used direct action in their own way, thwarting destruction, using violence on behalf of the Earth. Their method of using violence shunned harming humans and living creatures. In *The New West of Edward Abbey*, Ann Roland states that Abbey has an intention of turning the conventional notions of violence upside down. She says that "[i]f so-called civilization can violate the land, as it did in Glen Canyon, for example, then so-called violence can be used to stop it" (195). Moreover, John R. Knott asserts that "[t]he gospel according to Abbey is an ironic one, promising that the engineers and developers and politicians will be defeated in the end by natural forces that they only imagined they controlled" (129). It seems obvious that nature will take its revenge and cause destruction.

The Gang's violence is never willingly aimed at humans or any other living creatures. This is a cardinal rule for the monkeywrenchers. Their target is always the machines which are the agents of the megamachines. During the long chase along the Maze, the Search and Rescue Team headed by Bishop Love is the party which uses more violence than the Gang members. Hayduke, who has been depicted as the most radical and

violent member of the Gang, never shoots as long as no one shoots at him. He only shoots in self-defense, not to kill or hurt anyone. On the other hand, the Team is described as extremely brutal, shooting at Hayduke "to kill and maim" (351). When Bishop Love had a heart attack, Doc Sarvis and Abbzug, although they knew they would be arrested by the Team, got out of the Maze and tried to help Bishop Love without hesitation, who in such a critical condition asked if he would be the governor of Utah. According to David Thomas Sumner, when a person's life is at risk, no matter who it is, Doc Sarvis and Abbzug will rescue that person regardless of its consequences, which is the novel's moral standpoint (171). This act once again confirms that they are not opposed to people, but the ideology of the power regime.

Hayduke "find[s] it hard to learn to love cement" in Abbey's words, and both Abbey and Hayduke believe that "a fully industrialized, thoroughly urbanized, elegantly computerized social system is not suitable for human habitation" (*Beyond the Wall* 96). He further states that this condition is "[g]reat for machines" while it is "unfit for people" (96). That's the reason why Hayduke opposes the Glen Canyon Dam. It is good for the megamachine but not beneficial for the people and the wilderness. Hayduke says that with the construction of the dam, it would "flood more canyons, suffocate more trees, drown more deer and generally ruin the neighborhood" (157). It brings destruction and death to the land, to their Home. Man-made things like the dam or the machines do not have a heart to take care of the globe. Moreover, the agents of the machines do not possess a heart. Bishop Love, even right after having a heart attack, reminds Doc Sarvis of the Utah's state motto *Industry* which means growth, but from the monkeywrenchers' perspective means fighting destructive progress by hard work. He also pays attention to the Utah state symbol, "the golden beehive" (381), which for Bishop symbolizes "solid gold forty-karat" valuing of material worth. From an ecocentrist view, it symbolizes fertility and hard work to produce more for the health of living beings. From Hayduke's point of view, Bishop Love, and the Governor (of Utah) and people like them lack a conscience: "They'd sell their own mothers to Exxon and Peabody Coal if they thought there was money in it . . . Them's the kind of folks we got running' this state, honey" (358). These kinds of people lead the ecocentrists to only one way of making themselves heard in the choir of the megamachine: mending their fences with their own tactics of self-defense evolving into eco-defense.

Bill Devall and George Sessions propose the need for a technology which is suitable for the development of self-governing, self-sufficient persons in societies where there are no hierarchies. They assert that there is a need for regulations which will be beneficial for people and keep them from falling into the ambush of a technocratic society in which technology is the essential establishment (35). Technology will serve the good of the people and the environment where the ethics of deep ecology reside in the hearts and actions of individuals. In the use of technology, as Langdon Winner writes in *Autonomous Technology*, "If one lacks a clear and knowledgeable sense of what means are appropriate to the circumstances at hand, one's choice of means can easily lead to excesses and danger" (325). The decisions taken and the methods used by the megamachine described in the novel led to "excesses and danger" which the Gang was aware of. The Monkey Wrench Gang, clearly seeing the difference between conditions of the landscape before and after its devastation, could not stop themselves from acting against the system which contributed to the degradation of the environment, directly affecting the health of the planet, and supported by a political system which failed to represent the people. The quality of life which Hayduke and other gang members value and pursue can be reached through an ecocentric way of life which demands the use of technology without harming the processes of nature and living in harmony on Earth.

At the end of the novel, although Doc Sarvis, Smith, and Abbzug have been arrested and are now playing poker with the probation officer in Doc Sarvis's house in the town of Green River, Utah, Hayduke comes as an apparition still free. Smith is "[s]till working on the dam plan," (419) Abbzug, Doc Sarvis's present wife, is pregnant to a new generation of monkeywrenchers. Hayduke will start working "as a night watchman" anywhere the megamachine operates poorly. Doc Sarvis still assures them he will act any time for "finer things" (51). It is quite clear that these eco-warriors will continue to act on behalf of their broader Self unless there is change towards a non-anthropocentric world because for these ecological rebels an ecocentric world is healthy for the planet. As Robinson Jeffers writes in his poem "Carmel Point,"

–As for us:
We must uncenter our minds from ourselves;

> We must unhumanize our views a little, and become confident
> As the rock and ocean that we were made from. (676)

The Leopoldian concept of community, in which human and nonhuman beings are parts, requires them to "think like a mountain," which demands one to have a greater Self in order to consider the well-being of Home, the planet, to embrace all kindred spirits on the planet and to get rid of the narrow definition of self that focuses only on humans.

CHAPTER 2: *CONCRETE: THINK LIKE A MOUNTAIN* (1996) BY PAUL CHADWICK: MOUNTAIN CONSCIOUSNESS AND MOUNTAIN SELF

To feel at home in life requires both moving toward a goal and simply being. The possibilities in this landscape are unimaginable, but anything can happen along the way. The journey is undefined. When we are faced with a critical choice of path, there is a vital challenge in listening to reason and emotion at one and the same time.

Arne Naess, *Life's Philosophy: Reason and Feeling in a Deeper World* 2

The creator of *Concrete: Think like a Mountain* (1996), Paul Chadwick, (1957-) moves from reform environmentalism to radical environmentalism in his works. An artist, cartoonist, and writer, Chadwick is most celebrated for his *Concrete* graphic novel series. *Concrete* appeared first in 1986 as a short story and continued as a series of short stories (*Concrete: Complete Short Stories 1986-1989* and *Concrete: Complete Short Stories 1990-1995*) which were considered as the best introduction to the story of the character Concrete and mainly as graphic novel series (*Concrete Volume One: Depths* (which was first published in 1986 with new additions to the story until 2000), *Concrete Volume Two: Heights* (first published in 1986 with new additions until 1995), *Concrete Volume Three: Fragile Creature* (1991), *Concrete Volume Four: Killer Smile* (1994), *Concrete Volume Five: Think like a Mountain* (1996), *Concrete Volume Six: Strange Armor* (1997), *Concrete Volume Seven: The Human Dilemma* (2006)). Concrete appears in different characters such as a bodyguard, a rock star, a spokesman for a foundation dedicated to population control, a radical environmentalist, and a travel writer. In 1990, Chadwick created *Concrete Celebrates Earth Day* for the twentieth anniversary of Earth Day. Chadwick relates that this issue celebrating the Earth Day of 1990 forced him to research the environmental crisis and led him to continue concern for the health of the environment (Chadwick, "Publishing History"). Ronald Lithgow, the character who is transformed into Concrete, was a senatorial speech writer whose brain was transplanted by aliens into a gigantic rock-coated body. "Lith" is the Greek root for rock from which the name Concrete originates. Concrete is the name of the

protagonist who is, in Chadwick's words, "the gentlemanly environmentalist" (Chadwick, "Think like a Mountain"). Concrete was transformed into a radical environmentalist, a monkeywrencher, in *Concrete: Think like a Mountain* (1996) influenced by the radical environmentalist group Earth First!. Chadwick states that although he is not pleased with the rhetoric of the movement, "Fight Korporate America!," he appreciates Earth First!ers (Chadwick, "Think like a Mountain") since the movement is committed to overcome the despoilers of the natural world in their eco-defense. Chadwick adds that the environmental movement will gain strength just because the growing devastation of nature is unavoidable, and in the following years more lives will be affected (Chadwick, "Think like a Mountain").

Concrete: Think like a Mountain (1996) reflects its creator's support of mainstream environmentalism transformed into radical environmentalism by the portrayal of the protagonist Concrete. At the beginning of the graphic novel, Concrete is depicted in his house in L.A., California, where his biologist friend Maureen introduces him to her radical environmentalist friends Penelope, Terry, Roland and Stephen. They talk about the radical environmentalist movement, Earth First! which Concrete knows through the eyes of Audubon, a mainstream environmentalist organization. Concrete thinks that radical environmentalists are on the extreme fringe of environmentalism and, for most people, they are "fanatics" or "eco-terrorists" (18), whereas Penelope is concerned about disappearing wilderness, biodiversity, and ecosystems. She tells about the fight the radical environmentalists are involved in for Hidden Valley, the last big roadless area in northern Washington where road building has started. Environmental groups are looking for other ways to protest Pacific Max which is getting prepared to log the area as fast as possible. For Penelope and her companions, they can save the forest in Hidden Valley by attracting the attention of the world by using monkeywrenching as the last resort; environmental groups have tried to stop logging operations within the system before and they failed. Penelope, Terry, Roland and Stephen want Concrete to join them and write their struggle. However, Concrete does not want to get involved or write their struggle because he describes himself as a "moderate environmentalist" (24). With the help of these radical environmentalists, fire on Concrete's roof is put out and a kind of bond is formed. With this bond, Concrete agrees to write about their struggle but it will be pseudonymous. They take Concrete to a very similar place like Hidden Valley in

Canada to make him understand what is at stake. The loggers notice them and they run away from the loggers and return to the state of Washington. They watch a documentary which depicts human-induced calamities like chemical pollutants, detergent additives, drift nets, nuclear reactors, etc. Concrete comprehends the magnitude of the clearcut and the devastating consequences of these by humans. He starts to think in an "environmentalism track" (57) and vows "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth!" (96). In Hidden Valley, "the most ecologically precious, unprotected forest in Washington," (97) Concrete and other radical environmentalist characters try to stop logging operations with monkeywrenching acts. They perform this by spiking old-growth trees and with a Sasquatch hoax to attract the attention of the public to the clearcut area in Hidden Valley. The Sasquatch hoax arouses the interest of the people to the Hidden Valley, but the Forest Service timber guards are not content with this since it reveals the logging operations there to a number of people. The timber guard shoots Stephen in the Sasquatch costume and he dies. Roland gives a "Farewell Steve" speech in which the participants agree to save Stephen Beller's forest which is named after him. Hidden Valley will be officially protected as a result of radical environmentalists' unending effort to defend the last roadless area in Washington because they are able to "think like a mountain."

Aldo Leopold in his work *A Sand County Almanac and Other Sketches Here and There*,[11] published posthumously in 1949, stated his ideas about deep ecology long before the concept was coined by Arne Naess and George Sessions in the early 1970s. The title of Paul Chadwick's graphic novel *Think like a Mountain* (1996) alludes to Aldo Leopold's essay "Thinking like a Mountain." Leopold writes in the essay that "[o]nly the mountain has lived long enough to listen objectively to the howl of a wolf" (129). A mountain has a consciousness of understanding the state of living and nonliving things since a mountain is the symbol of the larger Self which, for Seed, consists of "all the creatures and plants and landscapes of the world" ("Invocation" 3). Besides, the mountain is another symbol of the evolution of the Earth for more than four billion years. Therefore, "thinking like a mountain" means having the knowledge and sensibility of the Earth we live in.

[11] This book was translated into Turkish entitled *Bir Kum Yöresi Almanağı* by Ufuk Özdağ in 2013.

The moment Leopold came to the realization of an expanded sense of his Self on the mountain was the time he saw "green fire" dying in the eyes of the old wolf he himself had hunted. Like Leopold, Chadwick's first chapter, entitled "Green Fire," acts as the first step where the protagonist Concrete, a mainstream environmentalist at the very beginning of the novel, takes one step further in his self-realization. When Concrete's roof is on fire, all his radical environmentalist friends help him to extinguish the flames and he "feels the bond—forged in flames and fumes, hissing water and hard work"[12] (*Concrete: Think like a Mountain* 30).

The process he undergoes in having an enlarged Self is a long one. At the beginning, it was not easy for the radical environmentalist characters in the novel to convince Concrete, who labels himself a "moderate environmentalist," to see the harsh realities of environmental havoc and to "think like a mountain," although he is made of rocks and he is depicted lying on a hill and becoming a part of that hill. Bill Devall calls this kind of reality "ecological realism" which he explains as "deeper and broader perception of self" ("The Ecological Self" 106). At that point, Concrete says "[W]ish I could bury myself. Be a part of this hill, aloof. See the pain of the world as transitory, trivial. . . . Just lie here, thinking mountain thoughts" (14). His brain is buried in a stone body by the aliens and he thinks he is drawn to the earth he is attracted to. However, he ends his story with the word "maybe" which means he is not sure where he really belongs. He has doubts about his sense of belonging because he does not have a deeper and broader understanding of his Self at the beginning of the novel. With the help of the novel's radical environmentalist characters, he starts to explore his ecological self which is, according to Devall, "part of the transforming process required to heal ourselves in the world" (104). He continues to explain how a person practices one's ecological self:

> Practicing means breathing the air with renewed awareness of the winds. When we drink water we trace it to its resources—a spring or mountain stream in our bioregion—and contemplate the cycles of energy as part of our body. The "living waters" and "living mountains" enter our body. We are part of the evolutionary journey and contain in our bodies connections with our Pleistocene ancestors. Extending awareness and receptivity with other animals and mountains and rivers

[12] All the narrative in the graphic novel is written in capital letters. I have kept the author's original language; however, I put the capital letters into small case letters for the sake of the readers.

> encourages identification and engenders respect for and solidarity with the field of identification. (104)

The process of exploration of one's ecological self is, that is to say, the first stage of "thinking like a mountain" is to get rid of one's "minimal self" which is self-centeredness. At the beginning of the novel, Concrete is criticized by Penelope, a botanist and radical environmentalist, as being a "facile, articulate hand-wringer" and she wants him to sit in his armchair where she thinks he is "most comfortable" (19). The radical environmentalist characters Penelope, Terry, Roland, Stephen, and Maureen tell Concrete about the fight they are in and about the story of Hidden Valley, which is a part of the national forest in the northern part of the state of Washington, one of the last big roadless areas. It will be logged soon and road-building has started. They want to act as quickly as possible because Pacific Max, the company which will be logging the forest there, wants to operate fast. Penelope says that environmentalist groups are seeking reasons to charge the logging company since "the last injunction was dropped" (22). She adds that the only way to halt the loggers is to "draw the attention of the world to the place" which is known by very few people and hard to get to. For her and her friends "demonstrations, civil disobedience, and perhaps some strategic monkeywrenching" will attract the attention of the public (23). Having said this, all the eyes of the radical environmentalists were on Concrete, owing to the fact that they wanted him to join their cause and at least write about their struggle. Concrete, being a writer and a well-known public figure in the country, replies "You prefer to live on the fringe. It's different for me. I'm famous. . . . If I was so much associated with you, I'd be typed as a radical environmentalist. I'm not. I'm a moderate environmentalist, one who hates confrontation" (24). He states that he agrees with the group's objectives, except for their techniques. He finds them too risky. In front of one of his paintings from his art collection, he responds, "I like my quiet life here . . . with my art" (25). This point of view reflects his minimal self which only focuses on his reputation in the public eye. The center of Concrete's minimal self, as Bill Devall describes, gets prepared for the siege of its self, hides itself to its own self amusement bubbles and retreats from public service or other forms of engagement with peace or environmental movements ("The Ecological Self" 112). Concrete is content with his life as long as he is personally not affected by anything negative in the small world around him.

Moreover, his passive state is related to his having a minimal self. Roland, one of the radical environmentalist characters who "thinks like a mountain," is enraged by Concrete's inactivity and says, "We all know we're raping this planet, turning it into a pile of piss. And we deplore it. But we don't act 'cause we love our damn *COMFORT!!*" (26). Roland and other radical environmentalists are well aware that the health of the world is deteriorating and they should thwart this development and act on behalf of the voiceless, in the name of one's enlarged Self, the Earth. What Roland criticizes is that if one is aware of environmental degradation and does not try to halt it, then that person is also responsible for acts committed against the world.

Concrete's defense of his minimal self as a moderate environmentalist makes him indifferent, in Devall's words, to "toxic wastes, deforestation, and other environmental ills" ("The Ecological Self" 115). Since Concrete is withdrawn, his shell makes him concrete at the beginning, his focus is only the self-interest that is his home, along with his paintings at home. The ego, defined by Devall, is "what we think we are, not what we experience as our self" (103). Thus, a person's ego builds a border wall around one's emotions and experiences "to deny [one's] vulnerability and deny [one's] interconnectedness with watersheds, forests, and rivers, then the ego becomes a prison guard and not a voice [of the self]" (103). This leads to the alienation and separation of the self from the natural world. Berman explains this state as follows:

> [T]here is no ecstatic merger with nature, but rather total separation from it. Subject and object are always seen in opposition to each other. I am not my experiences, and thus not really a part of the world around me . . . everything is an object, alien, not me; and I am ultimately an object too, an alienated 'thing' in a world of other, equally meaningless things. This world is not of my own making: the cosmos cares nothing for me, and I don't really feel a sense of belonging to it. What I feel, in fact is a sickness in the soul. (3)

One's self-consciousness is healed if "we must know ourselves and accept ourselves before attempting to manipulate ourselves for the purpose of changes we think are desirable" (Vaughan 56). Concrete's myopic self-awareness will, in the course of the time he spends with the radical environmentalist characters, evolve into an ecological self. He will act more effectively, resulting in standing up for life on earth. Concrete, who "tends to confuse his 'self' with his narrow ego" (Naess, "Self-realization" 225) at the beginning, will conclude his understanding of the self transformed into experiential

identification with his environment. In the novel, his conception of a self-aggrandized worldview will be eliminated by his radical environmentalist friends and he will actively become part of a journey to promote his new ecological self. This journey will pull him towards an act that can only lead to worthwhile consequences for his enlarged Self.

As an active condition, Self-realizing is not a reachable point because thorough Self-realization demands the realization of all (*Ecology* 9). Since Penelope, Terry, Roland, Stephen, and Maureen possess a developed sense of Self-realization, they are trying to enlarge their Self-realization by trying to make Concrete one of them because once Concrete possesses Self-realization, the well-known public figure and writer will try to spread the struggle of the radical environmentalists and speak for the larger Self. These characters are on a crusade to enlarge their Self-realization to achieve complete Self-realization, as seen in the end of the first chapter, "Green Fire," when the radical environmentalists seek a universal bond. Concrete feels this bond and metaphorically sees the green fire which is the first stage of his Self-realization. Therefore, dealing with the problem of environmental destruction and saving our planet requires breaking the shell of one's minimal self and developing an ecological self. Naess defines the ecological self as one's self with which a person identifies. As the Self enlarges, the number of one's identification with one's self expands and at the end of this process one's Self equals to what Naess calls "ecosphere" since this term indicates an expansive definition of living things and there is not any artificial boundary of Self-realization (Devall, "Ecological Self" 107). Whatever happens to the world is in one's close self-interest and when something negative happens, one reacts as if that thing hurts one's self because the ecosphere becomes the person's larger Self. In short, one comes to the realization that parts of nature become parts of one's own great Self, and one cannot survive separately from them.

Ecosophy T, in which Naess expresses his ideas about deep ecology, is named after his mountain hut Tvergastein in Norway. He spends some of his time there, which he thoroughly enjoys. In "Living in the World: Mountain Humility, Great Humility" Richard Langlais remarks on his experience with Naess in the hut in Tvergastein. He

elaborates on how Naess lives peacefully and in clear and full communication with the mountain:

> Arne pursues his ideas of living in a way which does not harm or insult the mountains which he knows are his true home. The mountains have given him so much and he is fully aware of his impact. . . . [H]e could live in a materially more consuming manner and he realizes that few others would want to live as he does; the important thing for him, however, is that he wants to live as faithfully as he can to his own idea of a mountain ethic. (198)

It is clearly understood from these lines that Naess is not self-conscious and he identifies with the mountain of which he considers himself a part and acts accordingly. He knows that he is part of nature and nature is a part of him. As in the case of Leopold, for Naess, a mountain has a consciousness and it never fights against humans. Only human folly and arrogance lead to human-induced disasters. According to Naess, "the smaller we come to feel ourselves compared to the mountain, the nearer we come to participating in its greatness" ("Living in the World" 202). As one abandons one's self-centered world view, one moves a step closer to one's ecological self. Daniel G. Deffenbaugh explains thinking like a mountain as the state of being conscious of the whole in addition to the different parts it is made of (252). Moreover, Bryan G. Norton argues that "learning to think like a mountain was to recognize the importance of multiple temporal scales and the associated hidden dynamics that drive them" (222). Thus, when one learns to think like a mountain, one will have "mountain consciousness," one will be aware of one's own self in a larger sense.

Having achieved mountain consciousness, the radical environmentalist characters move towards a greater Self, encompassing all, through the protagonist Concrete. He believes that his moderate environmentalism is enough to solve the environmental problems, but the radical environmentalist characters now think reform environmentalism[13] fails to achieve adequate protection of the environment. These characters challenge Concrete's egotistical ideas, assist in his enlightenment regarding the destructiveness of a human-centered lifestyle and make him cement an ecological self through identification with

[13] Reform environmentalism, mainstream environmentalism, and moderate environmentalism are used interchangeably and refer to the same meaning.

the environment, since when one comes to the realization that one's "identity is interconnected with the identity of other beings then [one's] experience and [one's] existence depend on theirs" ("Ecological Self" 120). Then their interests become that person's interest, ultimately. Therefore, the meaning, importance, and reality changes for Concrete from a deeply entrenched anthropocentrist view to an ecocentrist outlook on the world.

2.1. RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISM VS. REFORM ENVIRONMENTALISM

At the very beginning of the graphic novel, Concrete is shown sitting in a comfortable armchair watching his favorite TV show. In the show, heads show up and start telling the story of an environmentalist group who were "heavy into Gandhi, civil disobedience" (10). They were blockading a munitions train carrying gator bombs. The train did not stop and killed some of the environmentalist protestors. They thought that what they had was their "bodies" and their "resolve" (10). One of the heads of the dead protestors in the show says that he is at peace since he did not compromise (12). This is a reference to the radical environmentalist movement Earth First!'s motto "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth" that was founded in 1980. The radical environmentalist characters in the novel clarify and justify why they became so in tune with references to the ideas of Earth First!

Dave Foreman, co-founder of Earth First!, argues that the environmental movement before the early 1970s was effective in the U.S., and the environmental groups were the "pillars of American society" (*Confessions* 11). To illustrate, Sierra Club, one of the most politically effective environmental groups, by blocking Echo Park Dam in 1956 helped the Wilderness Act of 1964 get passed. During the early 1970s, Foreman was a member of the Wilderness Society and he found out that "compromise seemed to work best" within bureaucracy. He relates that,

> A suit and a tie gained access to regional heads of the U.S. Forest Service and to members of Congress. We learned to moderate our opinions along with our dress. We learned that extremists were ignored in the councils of government, that the way to get a senator to put his arm around your shoulders and drop a Wilderness

> bill in the hopper was to consider the conflicts—mining, timber, grazing—and pare back the proposal accordingly. (12)

Foreman emphasizes how environmentalists attach importance to both wilderness and the public. Moreover, he draws parallels between their cause and the well-being of the people and the nation. He asserts that

> [o]f course we [environmentalists] were good, patriotic Americans. Of course we were concerned with the production of red meat, timber, and minerals. We tried to demonstrate that preserving wilderness did not conflict all that much with the gross national product, and that clean air actually helped the economy. We argued that we could have our booming industry and still not sink oil wells in pristine areas. (12)

However, throughout the 1970s and early 1980s there was a distinctive transformation in the environmental organizations. According to Christopher Manes, the environmental movement was evolving into a "career endeavor for professionals rather than a calling for those committed to the environment" (*Green Rage* 55). He asserts that because environmental organizations began to bundle in Washington D.C. in the early 1970s, contacts with people in higher ranks offered environmental leaders another motivating urge in the environmental movement regardless of any devotion to take care of nature: the expectation to seek for office which required to seem friendly to the environmental cause (58).

Foreman states that David Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club in the 1950s and 1960s, who was seen as contributing much to the modern environmental movement, was fired from the Club's board of directors in 1969 after having started to ask crucial questions about the power and course of industrial society (*Confessions* 12). Manes relates that after the dismissal of Brower, the new board was open to restructuring the Sierra Club in the way they desired, a "consumer-oriented corporate bureaucracy" (*Green Rage* 55). Most of the serious changes in the environmental organizations took place through the end of the 1970s. Foreman resigned from his position in the Wilderness Society in mid-1980 as the governing committee tried to add wealthy people with an ambiguous concern for the environment to the council (*Confessions* 15). The national environmentalist organizations like Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council and others took relatively similar

middle-ground steps on most salient points. President of the Conservation Foundation, Sydney Howe, was ousted in 1973 after he aroused the anger of the businessmen in the governing board who tried to make the organization more reactive to grassroots advocacy (*Green Rage* 55).

The moment that triggered the breaking point for most environmentalists was when in 1979 the Forest Service announced its unsatisfactory ruling on the second Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II) that regulates which National Forest lands will be protected in their own natural state (*Confessions* 13). Consequently, Foreman, as an environmentalist following the disappointing result of RARE II, wrote "[b]ut we had lost to the timber, mining, and cattle interests on every point. Of 80 million acres still roadless and undeveloped in the 190 million acres of National Forests, the Department of agriculture recommended that only 15 million receive protection from road building and timber cutting" (13).

In 1980 some disappointed environmentalists like Howie Wolke, former member of Friends of the Earth, Susan Morgan, former educational director of the Wilderness Society, Bart Koehler, former member of the Wilderness Society, Ron Kezar, former Sierra Club activist, and Dave Foreman concluded that "the time for talk was past" (*Confessions* 18). They set up a new national movement which they called Earth First! whose method, stand, ideology, and system were deemed radical in order to be effective and, thus, in order to avert the traps of "co-option and moderation" which they had already encountered (17-18). For Foreman, environmentalists like himself had been "too reasonable, too calm, too understanding" and they believed it was time "to get angry, to cry, to let rage flow at what the human cancer [was] doing to Earth, to be uncompromising because for Earth First!ers the principle was "a belief in Earth first" (20-21). As Manes relates in *Green Rage*, Nancy Morton, a former member of a mainstream environmental organization, expresses her disillusionment with the reform environmentalism in this way:

> I've been an environmental activist for eight or ten years. And I was doing everything. I was writing letters, I was talking to my congressman, I was reading environmental impact statements, I was leading hikes to introduce people to the woods. And I was losing. Being reasonable just didn't seem to be getting

> anywhere. The trees were still being cut, the rivers were still being dammed, the air was dirty. And then I met Earth First!" (18-19).

Bored and disappointed with the methods they used in the past, such as reviews of environmental impact statements, and writing letters to the members of the Congress, they needed more active involvement for and on behalf of the nonhuman world. For the Earth First!ers these methods included politics in the streets, civil disobedience, publicity stunts and making fun of the villains publicly (*Confessions* 20).

Foreman portrays one of Earth First!'s principal aims as "to inspire others to carry out activities straight from the pages of *The Monkey Wrench Gang*," but the founders agreed they would be supposedly "law-abiding" (18). According to Keith Makoto Woodhouse, Earth First!'s case was that "mainstream organizations, by emphasizing the interests of people and accepting the limitations of conventional politics, shirked environmentalism's basic commitment to the nonhuman" (6). Foreman describes why they chose the name Earth First!: because they believed that in any kind of decision, "consideration for the health of the Earth must come first" (*Confessions* 19). Therefore, wilderness protection will be the cornerstone of this Earth-radical movement (19). Foreman in a speech at Grand Canyon stated that theirs was not an environmental organization since environmental organizations are concerned with environmental health risks to humans, clean water and air for the sake of people; he questioned why they were too involved in a matter as unrelated, erratic and elitist as the wilderness and he answers this question himself by saying "a wolf or a redwood or a grizzly bear doesn't think wilderness is elitist." He added that "[w]ilderness is the essence of everything. It's the real world" (*Green Rage* 72). Naess in his "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Rage Ecology Movement: A Summary" states that the shallow ecology movement "fight[s] against pollution and resource depletion" whose fundamental goal is "the health and affluence of people" in the industrial nations (3).

Consequently, the focus of mainstream environmental organizations is anthropocentric, whereas for the radical environmentalists it is not. Their focal point is the health of the Earth where one's ecological self cherishes a larger Self that encompasses solidarity between the human and nonhuman world. Devall in "The Ecological Self" explains how the discovery of one's ecological self instinctively leads to the defense of that with

which one identifies, and naturally brings about "respect, love, honor" thus protecting that which is a part of one's expanded Self (104-105).

In Chadwick's graphic novel, the radical environmentalist characters Penelope, Maureen, Terry, Roland, and Stephen represent people who have discovered their ecological self and who willingly and without hesitation defend and interact with what they identify themselves with. In their own words, they are a "peace group," but in time they turned into radicals. Although their perception of the world remained the same—a real commitment to the earth—their tactics to pursue the changes they desired had changed. One of the most important events which paved the way for this change was Penelope's dismissal from the Forest Service. Penelope, a botanist, was hired by the Forest Service for locating rare plants found in the Appalachian Hardwood Forest. Her managers found the directive to conserve species living there as bothersome, a burden. They stalled her until there was some snow on the ground and then they allowed her to inventory rare species. She accomplished locating "some rare and vulnerable water lichens" and had long arguments about "will be affected" versus "might possibly be affected" while writing a report (16) because if she wrote that water lichens would be affected, this would halt the Forest Service's projects related to logging. In the end, she was discharged officially for not attending a training meeting "which she'd been told not to attend" and failing to complete a report due date "which was two weeks after her firing" (17). Christopher Manes recounts how the Forest Service, an institution of the state, fail to follow the advice of its own biologists to record the spotted owl as a threatened species that is dependent on old-growth forests. Recording this would have halted a great number of logging operations. Therefore, in *Green Rage*, Manes claims that "pressure on Forest Service biologists to manipulate data to indicate that increased harvesting is called for is not uncommon" (98). These kinds of conflicts of interest result in mistrust, rage, and defensive behavior for a person with an ecological self, thus leading to direct action on behalf of water lichens, the spotted owl, or any kind of tree. They are all Mother Earth. Penelope says that they "sometimes succeed when all the compromising and kissing up the corporate environmental outfits do has failed" (17) which means they use a compromising attitude to find a way to protect their Self within a system which has become dysfunctional. The system is at the service of the powerful.

Hidden Valley, part of a national forest in Northern Washington state, is one of the last big roadless areas and it is about to be logged because, according to Penelope, "the last injunction was dropped, and road building has started" (22). She adds that "Enviro groups are frantically looking for other grounds to sue on, while Pacific Max gears up to log it as fast as possible" (22). It is understood that environmental groups are done with all the compromising within the system because if there is an injunction that means the following steps have been taken: First, the Forest Service has made a decision to start a project or logging in an area. Then, there has been a period of 45 days for appeals, which are generally grounded in arguments based on the opinion of a higher official in the same agency. Lastly, in order to file a lawsuit over the proposed action against the Forest Service in a federal court, one should have lost the appeal ("Making a Difference"). So there was a big court fight, which Concrete was aware of. Moreover, according to Penelope, the changes in the Congress affected them adversely, made them desperate and put them in the losing party (26). Therefore, Penelope thinks "it is time to move on to the next battle" (22) which encompasses "demonstrations, civil disobedience, and perhaps some strategic monkeywrenching" (23) to save the forest and a very old cedar tree that is symbolic. The radical environmentalist characters all know that they can save this only if they can hamper the logging operations while they attract attention to Hidden Valley (23).

Concrete, on the other hand, is a moderate environmentalist at the beginning and does not want to be associated with the radical environmentalist characters, although he concurs with their aims. He thinks that these characters live on the fringe and he disagrees with their methods (24). He has heard of Earth First! through the lens of Audubon, a mainstream environmental organization, whose position, according to Penelope, is more "moderate" and "prudent." She adds that "if not for [Earth First!/radical environmentalists], [Club of Rome/moderate environmentalists] would be the radicals" (18). Concrete, however, believes that radical environmentalists "squander the moral authority of their arguments—which do have appeal—by resorting to terrorism" (18). Concrete claims that a logger whose saw hit a spike is about to die, something toward which Penelope shows no empathy because it is happening in an area where Earth First! is not protesting. Earth First! spikes old-growth trees in order to keep them from getting cut and they always inform the loggers that the trees have been

spiked and nobody gets hurt (18). Concrete's moderate environmentalism or, in other words, reform environmentalism, according to Christopher Manes,

> has already failed, both on its own political terms and on the more exacting terms required to maintain ecological stability, big wilderness, and the continued existence of countless threatened species. Reform environmentalism had a chance in the early 1970s to embrace the kinds of comprehensive changes that might have averted the present crisis, but it squandered that opportunity. The ecological militancy of the 1980s was a consequence, not merely an antagonist, of the mainstream's moral timidity. (*Green Rage* 188-189)

Parallel to Manes, John Wade in his article "Radical Environmentalism: Is There Any Other Kind?" argues that "[w]e are now well past the point where anything but a radical change in the way we live can save the earth and ourselves from destruction" (280). The emphasis here is not only on the natural world but also on human beings who in consort with nature form one's expanded Self. This is one of the characteristics that Concrete fails to notice while he supports mainstream environmentalists who are for "the unborn" humans and criticizes Earth First!ers for advocating biodiversity that is in his perception equal to wilderness only (18). Wade claims that throughout the history there have been many successful social movements which wouldn't have happened without radical action (281). Thus, reform environmentalism becomes redundant in its way of focusing on only human interests which for Arne Naess reflect the developed nations' concept of people and society that are controlled by certain policy makers in the central administration who decide on behalf of the society (*Ecology* 158). Since moderate environmentalism does not help to solve the problems of disappearing wilderness, biodiversity and sublime ecosystems which here taken millennia to produce, it becomes a necessary step to carry out direct action, a more radical stance in one's self-defense.

Penelope and other radical environmentalist characters try to explain to Concrete that they are not eco-terrorists. Radical environmentalist direct action, strategic monkeywrenching is, for them, the last resort to defend the world's ecosystem. According to Scarce, Earth First! activist and organizer Darryl Cherney justifies the radical environmental movement as not being the aggressor. He argues that radical environmentalists are "in the role of defenders of the environment. [They] are being attacked and [they] are engaging in as non-violent a manner of self-defense as [they] can possibly manage" (13). This is why Roland argues that the Earth First!ers are the

ones who get beat up at demonstrations, get run off the road, and again they are the ones whose houses are burned down, citing an incident in which Dave Foreman in Kalmiopsis was dragged a hundred yards under a truck (82).

The radical environmentalist characters uphold the fact that the natural world is under attack by an anthropocentric world view which has been created by human beings. These characters are well aware of the ravaging impact of it on their Self. In order to make Concrete understand why they are using direct action to defend a forest which is about to be logged in the U.S., they take him to a forest like Hidden Valley in Canada, to show him "the very 'after' picture [they]'re trying to prevent" (37). They want Concrete to see plenty of clearcuts, an ecological reality, with his own eyes. As Devall states, people identify with immediate landscapes quicker than with distant or abstract ones ("Ecological Self" 110). This is the primary reason why they bring him to this logging area in the Canadian forest. The more a person knows a specific place closely, the more that person knows his or her ecological self (110). Besides, closely related to Devall's idea is what Naess calls "felt nearness of different living beings" ("Equality, Sameness" 224). This kind of sensitivity activates one's ability to fully "identify with a certain kind of living being, and to suffer when they suffer" (224). The radical environmentalists' drive to take Concrete to the logging area is to make him grow extremely agitated with the magnanimity of logging operations, to make him increasingly concerned with the health of that scarred area, to inspire him to strongly identify with countless dead trees and stumps, to feel their suffering, and as a result start a defense which, in time, will evolve into self-defense from Concrete's side. Moreover, through the end of the novel, with Concrete's help, their Sasquatch hoax to display the serious encroachment upon Hidden Valley draws people's attention there. When people come to the valley, they see extensive logging operations, and giant trees falling to the chain saws.

In the clearcut area in Canada, which shows how Hidden Valley will look like if it is being clear-cut, the Self is under attack and something needs to be done in self-defense. One is in a position of injustice and all the legal instruments have been used in the search for justice on behalf of the enlarged Self. At this point, Thoreau, asserts in "Civil Disobedience" that "[i]f [the injustice of the machine of government] is of such a nature

that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. Let your life be a counter friction to stop the machine" (8). He concludes by saying "I do not lend myself to the wrong which I condemn" (8). So, along the same line of thought, monkeywrenching, regarded as breaking the law (in a nonviolent way from a radical environmentalist point of view), becomes the only possible method to reach goals in the process of a defense against human-centered catastrophes. Foreman and Haywood believe that it may be an efficient practice of safeguarding wilderness from the devastations of "industrialism gone berserk" (*Ecodefense* 4). Moreover, Derrick Jensen modifies and applies John F. Kennedy's idea that a peaceful revolution made impossible will eventually lead to an inevitably violent revolution: "Those who make peaceful protection of our landbases impossible make violent defense of our landbases inevitable" (*Endgame II* 550). The exploitation of mountains and forests demonstrates a lack of ecological vision which results from ignorant disregard of nature's laws, whereas deep ecological thought is constructive in its self-defense and holds an understanding of the self that identifies not only with the human but the nonhuman world. This perception of the world leads to an identification of the ecosphere into one's sense of self. Thus, the core role of Naess's deep ecological thinking has a constructive feature if it is understood and implemented for the benefit of living beings and specific values, hence ultimately combatting "antagonisms, not antagonists" (*Ecology* 148-149). The radical environmentalist characters try not to allow antagonistic actions to force the world to move even faster toward its own extermination.

As a result, in the novel, the movement's effectiveness lies in the characters' fights against antagonisms which are symbolized by the Forest Service timber guards' actions and attitudes, the actions of the machine of government. The radical environmentalist characters' interminable struggle reflects their resolve and commitment to their goals. Their striving for Self-realization in the process of reaching a greater Self through people's self-realization of interconnectedness and engagement with nature encourages movement towards the Self, essentially the aim of radical environmentalism. It is a critical point when Penelope shows Concrete how man diminishes biodiversity by clearcutting old-growth forests which are concealed behind the "Beauty Strip" (45). It is a very important instance of the great extent of human interference with the natural world that far exceeds the level of satisfying vital human needs.

2.2. CONCRETE'S "SELF-REALIZATION"

Concrete's process of Self-realization is concurrently a step for the radical environmentalist characters' progress in attaining universal Self-realization. In the graphic novel, the gradual transformation of Concrete from a mainstream environmentalist into a radical environmentalist displays an example of the transformation of an average moderate environmentalist. However, the shift from being a reform environmentalist towards a radical is not effortless from the radicals' side. The reason is manifested when Roland Sagner utters "because what we fight for is so hard to understand. Watersheds, biodiversity, riparian microclimates. The way, as Muir put it, 'Every thing in the universe is hitched to every other thing.' It's too big. Too complex" (142). The predominant factor which makes this idea complicated is the prevailing understanding of the self whose concern is limited to its own self-interest or minimal self. In *Environmentalism and the Future of Progressive Politics*, Robert Paehlke emphasizes why environmental movement does not attract masses, stating that it "is not an ideology of self-interest, and because self-interest is deeply ingrained in our society, economy, and polity, environmentalism does not easily attract an intensely committed mass following" (7-8). For radical environmentalism, this idea is more valid since it requires more commitment and direct action. Furthermore, Naess makes a distinction between wide and deep ecological self in defense of Nature, which is perceived within rich industrial societies as protecting "beauty, recreation, and other non-vital interests for ourselves" ("Self-realization" 232). Whereas environmental degradation endangers us "in our innermost self," resulting in "defending our vital interests, not merely something 'out there'" which is, in fact, self-defense (232).

Penelope, Terry, Roland, and Stephen are in a state of constant Self-realization in an attempt to enlarge their Self by persuading Concrete, who already shares the same cause but uses a different method, to act with them. They become successful in convincing him of the futility of his own method. In the first part entitled "Green Fire," Concrete, when asked to write about their struggle, without hesitation, thinks about his reputation and his home where he is comfortable with his art collection. He is obsessed with how people might judge him as a radical environmentalist violating the law, and how long it

may take him to restore his fame in the public eye. On the other hand, Roland stresses that human beings are "raping this planet, turning it into a pile of piss" which they deplore (26). He criticizes Concrete for his stance on comfort rather than joining the radical environmentalist movement. Nevertheless, like Aldo Leopold in "Thinking like a Mountain," where he had an epiphany when he saw "green fire" dying in the eyes of a female wolf that he not only killed but spoke to him, the fire—a symbolic "green fire"—in Concrete's roof which all of the radical environmentalist characters put out, collectively, as soon as possible, became the starting point for Concrete's bond with the radical environmentalist characters.

2.2.1. Current Human Interference with the Natural World

The amount of limitless destruction of the natural world by humans is the result of industrialism's ideology of nature because, according to Andrew McLaughlin, nature, from an industrialist's point of view, is believed to be "a conglomerate of resources. Forests are thought of as so many board feet of lumber, lakes, rivers and oceans are viewed as fisheries or sources of water or dumps, in which case they are analyzed in terms of their 'assimilation capacities' to absorb pollution" (*Regarding Nature* 67). This notion of the world is severely criticized by the radical environmentalist characters, and manifested clearly in Roland's "Farewell, Steve" speech given right after the death of Steve at the hands of the Forest Service timber guard: "See a river, dam it. See a forest, cut it. See an animal, an unknown animal…Kill it. Kill it dead." (143). He calls this "the land rapers' ruthless code" (143). This is the code of capitalist economic practices using natural resources, according to Paul Shepard, which "is not interested in either human or natural well-being" whose "claims of altruism are made by hired publicists and its sole purpose is to convert the 'resources' of the earth into money for its investors. The 'trickle-down' benefit for the mass of humanity and for the order of nature is one of the great lies of our time" (*Coming Home* 138). As Manes relates, for instance, a forest-products spokesman, Joe Hinson, says that "[w]ilderness is like herpes. Once you got it, it's forever" (*Green Rage* 92). The president of Louisiana Pacific, Harry Merlo, states that "It always annoys me to leave anything on the ground when we log our own land. . . . We log to infinity, because it's out there and it's ours and we want all of it now" (93).

These ideas reflect industry's anthropocentric and greed oriented attitude, which results in environmental havoc. However, from Naess's point of view, provided that one enlarges oneself to include other human beings and the natural world, altruism becomes needless because the Earth becomes part of one's own interests. In this case, increasing our Self-realization means increasing others' Self-realization since ultimate Self-realization depends on the realization of all (*Ecology* 9). Devall, in addition, emphasizes humans' "cosmic self-realization" whose "own self-realizing ecological self embraces more and more of the 'other' into ourself. The more open, receptive, vulnerable, adventurous we are, the more we affirm the integrity of being-in-the-world" ("The Ecological Self" 121). This is what Roland, Penelope, Steve, and Terry are trying to achieve. Their perception of Self is corollary to their idea of an enlarged Self, since altruism is embedded in them. They do not have a sense of otherness since their Self embraces both humans and nonhumans. As Louise Glück writes in her poem "Mutable Earth," "the boundary, the wall / around the self erodes" (392), and hence the division between ego and otherness is transformed in the process of the formation of a wide and deep self. As Warwick Fox writes "to the extent that we perceive boundaries, we fall short of deep ecological consciousness" because in reality there is no bifurcation of "the human and nonhuman realms" ("Deep Ecology" 157). Plumwood asserts that self "rejects boundaries between self and nature" since it is interconnected with nature and indistinguishable from the nonhuman world (*Feminism and the Mastery* 176). Therefore, the boundaries are eradicated between one's self and nature in the formation of an enlarged Self which embraces both human and nonhuman alike.

Contrary to industrialism's view, Leopold asserts in his article "Wilderness as a Form of Land Use," that wilderness is more than an economic material and ought not to be used primarily for economic reasons. He adds that the pioneers of American thinking acknowledged this idea in theory. He concludes his article with a question: "Are we too poor in spirit, in pocket, or in idle acres to recognize it likewise in fact?" (142). This question, without any doubt, refers to the difference between theory and practice. Therefore, it requires the idea be put into practice. The radical environmentalist characters are the ones in the novel who carry out actions to implement the idea that the natural world is valuable not only because of its economic worth but for the world's well-being. That is, for the sake of the Self.

Concrete remains a moderate environmentalist who is unaware of the great extent of current human interference in the natural world until the second part of the novel entitled "Hidden Graveyard," when it becomes apparent to him that the immense extent of clearcutting is camouflaged by a large area of forest called the "Beauty Strip." Penelope describes this strip as "a mask of trees along the highway, hiding what would end clearcutting overnight if people saw its true extent" (45). Here, Concrete faces the stark reality of the forest's present condition. He sees the enormity of clearcutting in the old-growth forest. He uses a simile to label this state of the forest: "It's like Sherman's march[14] . . . by Klingons.[15] Nothing left" (45). This indicates the infinite number of old-growth trees slaughtered, the size of havoc wreaked by humans themselves, an ecocatastrophe which is detrimental to the health of the Earth, the Self. Chadwick portrays logging the entire forest as a massacre, showing it from a bald eagle's point of view far above an area where not a single tree is left uncut. The forest, once a place filled with life, different species living together, is now a graveyard, a place of death in which lies dust, bones and stumps, hidden from human sight. The year each tree was born—each in different years, a long time ago—and the year of their death—all in the same year—is written on all the tombstones, namely their stumps.

Clearcutting on a large scale is a huge problem. When Penelope explains why she was fired from the Forest Service, she stresses the data which shows "we're cutting too much, too fast. But the pressure to meet the cutting target is enormous" (17). She continues explaining its effect on the Forest Service budget which she says "shrinks if we fall short . . . although, perversely, the roads we build and the sale processing cost more than we can get for the timber. Taxpayers cover the differences" (17). Chadwick in "The Weight of the World" section, draws the readers' attention to the technical trick played in the definition of a forest with an example from Seattle, Washington. He portrays Seattle from a bird's eye view showing clearcuts everywhere which he describes as "checkerboard" where "every salable stick removed up to the surveyed

[14] Union General William T. Sherman and his 62,000 soldiers took up arms and destroyed the area from Atlanta to Savannah in Georgia from 15 November to 21 December 1864 (Marszalek 345).

[15] Klingons are a humanoid warrior civilization in the science fiction *The Star Trek* films and TV series.

edges" (75). The beauty strips hide the "scars" from motorists and these are still "technically forests, counted that way statistically" (75). It is indicated that the forests which remain do not have any old-growth trees and "no owls" (75) since the ecosystem has been destroyed. At the end of the novel, when Concrete runs away from people in order to cover their hoax in a Sasquatch costume in Hidden Valley, he makes it to a "clump of trees surrounded by a clearcut" (137) which makes the Forest Service deny clearcutting in the new forestry code. The Forest Service's role in ecological devastation is seriously questioned.

Other environmental problems that have a significant impact on the environmental degradation stressed in the novel are sewage pumped into the sea, overfishing, and ghost nets. Concrete, while in water, realizes "the sewage pumped into the sea from Victoria" is an "environmental horror story" (67). He remembers what Roland said about the decreasing salmon stocks, about which "Canada and U.S. are at each other's throats over quotas" and the fact that "their spawning streams are silting up from all the clearcutting" which Concrete calls "a war against the world" (67). Moreover, one of the worst forms of damage done to the marine life is by ghost nets which are "drift net[s] that somehow got away. Miles long, [their] fine nylon strands rendered invisible in the water, still catching fish . . . which attract sea birds, which become entangled . . . as do sharks . . . and recently, seals. All die and rot" (67). This becomes crystal clear for Concrete when he sees all these under water. They make him really pessimistic, engineering a bleak picture of the sea suffering all these devastating effects. He describes his passive state as "the insult of being repeatedly shot" (68). The image of drift nets hanging afloat over Concrete while he is under water is disturbing. Entangled sea creatures die and rot in nets, the fish varying in size from small ones to sharks. Concrete thinks this image depicts "a mysterious vision of corruption" by humans (69). Finally, Concrete comes to understand that everything in nature is "tainted, toxic, dying," so he becomes angry and disillusioned and asks a question to highlight the extreme point that deterioration has reached in the environment: "Why not wreck it all? Done with it" (70). He earlier states that "Nowhere is untouched," quoting Bill McKibben, author and environmentalist, adding that it ranges from "[p]articulate pollution locked in arctic ice" to "[r]adioactive satellites in orbit" (66). So, hazardous substances seem to be everywhere. In the "Foreword" of *Diary of an Eco-Outlaw*,

author and radical environmentalist Derrick Jensen states the reason behind this extent of destruction, the state of no single part of the earth left unharmed, is "this [capitalist/anthropocentric] culture" which "is killing the planet. It is murdering oceans, cutting forests, scalping prairies, poisoning water and soil and air and bodies" (x). At this point, Jensen asks a critical question which is related to the self-destructive effects of the great extent of human interference in the natural world. He asks, "Who could be insane enough to intentionally put poison on our own food, in the air we breathe, the water we drink?" (x). Furthermore, Jensen in the "Preface" of *Deep Green Resistance* asserts that these results are due to the fact that "[w]e never question the logic that leads inevitably to clear-cuts, murdered oceans, loss of topsoil, dammed rivers, poisoned aquifers," and he concludes arguing that "we certainly don't act to stop these horrors" (14). We bear witness to the continued crimes against Earth by humans.

2.2.2. "Vital Needs"

The third principle of the platform of the deep ecology movement places emphasis on the idea that other than satisfying vital needs, humans do not have a right to decrease the richness and diversity of life forms on Earth (*Ecology* 29). This point stresses the satisfaction of vital needs of people living in different societies, climates, and conditions. It is further discussed by Naess with an example of a whaler. He writes that in an industrial country, if a whaler quits whaling he may run the risk of being unemployed because of the economic conditions, since whaling is a crucial way of satisfying vital needs, though it is not a vital one in a rich country where people have a high standard of living (30). In "The 'Eight Points' Revisited," he also makes the distinction between what people in rich countries need and what they are drawn to desire in contrast with the people who live in extreme poverty and whose vital needs are not satisfied whether they decrease richness and diversity of life or not (217). This idea primarily leads to Mahatma Gandhi's notion that "There are enough world resources for everyone's need, but not everyone's greed" as Merchant states in *Radical Ecology* (21). Paul Watchel asserts in *The Poverty of Affluence* "the way the growth economy has been constructed, it creates more needs than it satisfies and leaves us feeling more deprived than when we had 'less'" (16). In this case, in industrialized countries "[t]he

goal of persons is personal satisfaction of wants and a higher standard of living as measured by possession of commodities (houses, autos, recreation vehicles, etc.)" (Pirages and Ehrlich 43). Therefore, the documentary in the graphic novel emphasizes the population[16] of the world (5,75 billion), the fact that it is increasing and that all have their desires and wants (87). The world will not be able to quench the thirst of all human wants and desires on a planet where the dominant ideology is satisfying human greed.

Roland, the novel's radical environmentalist character, thinks that ecotage is an effective way to stop humankind from logging old-growth forests with their "root networks, holding glacial meltwater and rich, tunnel-laced soils" (75) which are vital for the ecosystem. On the other hand, Concrete, while putting up a sign on which he writes "No one more ancient tree" on a logging road where behind him lies road building machinery twisted and torn up in his daydream, is still critical of his daydream and says "People need wood" (83). Roland's reply to this is "if it's so sustainable, then let 'em cut *second growth*. If that's not enough, let 'em admit it *isn't* sustainable." Sustainability is crucial in the ecosystem. Roland has an idea about sustainability: what to use in home building like old tires and rammed earth since, for him, people should adjust to this idea because in forty years there will be "no more old-growth [trees left] except in a few *parks*" (83). Like Roland, Hayduke, in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, when Bonnie Abbzug in a logging area says America is in need of lumber and "people need some kind of shelter," responds that people can build houses out of rock, mud and sticks or "out of bricks or cinder blocks. Out of packing crates and Karo cans" (229). He concludes that "we won't have to strip the forests" (229). As a result, rather than cutting old-growth forests, there are other options for humans which Roland and Hayduke offer because clearcutting is not a vital need and humans do not have a right to reduce the richness and diversity of life on the earth.

Even though Roland tries to show Concrete the reality of clearcutting and the effectiveness of their radical tactics, this time he says "it is not going to happen" (83), which means he is not going to act like a radical environmentalist because he says he respects private property. According to Abbey in *Confessions of a Barbarian*, in

[16] The issue of population will be discussed in the third chapter.

American culture, private property is sacrosanct, a substantial concept which Gary Snyder in a letter to Dave Foreman stresses: "In our culture, property is sacred, valued far above human life" (280). Nevertheless, Roland emphasizes that Hidden Valley is not private property but public land, and he emphasizes that "taxpayers pay for its management, for road building . . . and the Forest Service sells the cutting rights for less than what those cost!" (84). Edward Abbey in *The Monkey Wrench Gang* addresses the same issue from Hayduke's perspective:

> "The loggers bid for the right to log an area, sure. The top bidder writes a check to the U.S. Treasury. The Forest Service takes the money, our money, and spends it building new logging roads like this one, all banked and graded for the loggers to run their timber-hauling rigs on to see how many deer, tourists and chipmunks they can kill. A deer is ten points, chipmunk five, tourist one." (229)

Roland asks Concrete whether private property is absolutely paramount as he explains that a great deal of forest land was granted to railroad companies which, according to him, symbolize "big money, talkin' big" (84). This is also seen in *Beyond the Wall*, when Abbey writes about southeast Alaska where industrial tree farmers are running the US Forest Service and granting permission to logging companies to clearcut and decimate massive areas of the Tongass National Park, home of the national bird of America, the bald eagle, "the legal property of the American public—all of us" (193-194). The government-owned lands, which belong to the public, have been laid bare due to the greed of corporations. Roland makes their objective clear by saying "[w]e want the values outside economics recognized, ecosystems that aren't fractured into 'islands'" with an emphasis on species having no commercial value recognized and preserved "just because they should be" (85). They care about all the living and nonliving things regardless of their economic value, and they want everybody to hold this idea against the disastrous effects of human actions on the land and different kinds of natural species because in nature everything is interconnected.

The bald eagle, whose home is under attack by loggers, as Abbey explains in *Beyond the Wall*, is the national emblem of the U.S. It is symbolic of long life and great power. The flying single bald eagle image is quite often used by Chadwick in the graphic novel to draw attention to the diminishing number of them, a direct correlation to the symbolic future of the country. The disappearance of the natural world has a relation to the

disappearance of a country. As George P. Marsh argues, the decay of the prosperous countries of the past happened, without doubt, as a result of partly "direct violence of hostile human force" but in greater extent as a result of "man's ignorant disregard of the laws of nature" (5). Thus, environmental degradation can lead to the fall of strong countries; moreover, most probably it can bring about the destruction of the earth.

The radical environmentalist characters might seem to be in opposition to progress; they are not. However, they are only against growth which, according to Abbey, is "the ideology of the cancer cell" whose sole purpose is growth which results in the death of the host (*One Life* 21). Besides, radical environmentalist characters are opposed to the massive extent of human interference in the natural world since satisfying only vital needs is also possible with a less negative impact on one's enlarged Self. The amount and range of human interference is substantial. As Bill Devall asserts "[h]umans, of course, will continue to modify some ecosystems, as do many other organizations, to suit their own vital needs. The issue is not human interference versus pristine nature but the rate, extent, and scale of modification" (*Simple in Means* 17). Aric McBay, who further explains this idea, posits that "[i]ndustrial civilization is heavily dependent on many different *finite resources* and materials, a fact which makes its goal of perpetual growth impossible" (43). There is a limit to the extent of growth which is the finiteness of natural resources. While humans are trying to find an answer to the extent of human interference in the natural world, according to McLaughlin, "[t]he ecosystem disappears behind the question of how much human abuse it can absorb" (*Regarding Nature* 130).

Radical environmentalists, since they have an enlarged Self, have an answer to this question. Peter C. List states it as the condition in which "we should live with minimum rather than maximum impact on other species and on Earth in general" (41). This is, in short, called "simple in means, rich in ends" by Bill Devall, which is also the title of his book. This kind of world view is manifested in Native American lifestyle. According to Jack D. Forbes, their system of thought has an understanding of "the right of every living creature to life and to live its own life without interference" and because of this, they "traditionally avoid the killing of living trees, avoid trampling on plants and seldom, if ever, kill any creature except for food" (13). Gary Snyder describes this kind of Native American philosophy through the Pueblo hunting practice where they make

sure that there is a need and they do not hunt except for this necessity. He adds that they ask a deer (which is the prey) to forgive them for their having killed it, and ask for understanding of their need to eat (*Turtle Island* 109-110). Furthermore, Abbey upholds the killing of an animal, provided that there is a need and it must be performed "in a spirit of respect, reverence, gratitude" (*One Life* 39) in the way the Native Americans practice it. This kind of attitude is what the radical environmentalist characters in the novel cherish. By depicting clearcuts at multiple junctures in the novel, and only once describing overfishing, the characters iterate that human beings far exceed the level of satisfying their vital needs, and that this situation induces environmental deterioration. When Concrete thinks about the extent of the things that people consume and the changes and havoc that people wreak, he remarks "collectively, we are like a giant" (93) who "turn[s] this inland strait [in the state of Washington where Concrete is now] into a cesspool" (94). This emphasizes the growing scale of human impact on the environment.

"Humankind's heavy steps on the world" (*Think like a Mountain* 68) relate to the devastating impact of humans on the natural world. This disastrous effect is clearly visible in the environmental documentary shown to Concrete by the radical environmentalist characters. The documentary demonstrates clearcutting on every kind of terrain, legal and calculated fires which wipe out rainforests full of different kinds of species no one will ever know, chemical pollutants killing frogs all around the world, pesticides causing behavioral anomalies in seagulls, seals perishing in Europe's North Sea with images of floating carcasses (which stirs something awful in him), decreasing human sperm counts by fifty percent in the post-war dawn of the chemical revolution, drift nets and ghost nets which remind Concrete of his underwater experience of the "rotting zodiac" when he saw sea creatures get caught there regardless of their size, rotten and dead, Soviet's dumping nuclear reactors in the ocean, chain saws annihilating Siberia's fragile forests, the harvesting of wild animals, trade in gorilla body parts, the demand for tiger penises, which appears to doom the species to extinction in seven years by one estimate (86-88). The depiction of nature veering toward catastrophe is achieved with vivid clarity in the documentary which troubles Concrete who moves one step closer for action on behalf of his Self.

Roland asks Concrete a question, giving an example emphasizing when it is the right time to act, specifically while there is still a massacre of forests: "Would you break the law if it was people being massacred?" (84). Jensen in the preface of *Deep Green Resistance* takes this example to an extreme point stressing the seriousness of when to act:

> What would you do if space aliens had invaded this planet, and they were vacuuming the oceans, and scalping native forests, and putting dams on every river, and changing the climate, and putting dioxin and dozens of other carcinogens into every mother's breast milk, and into the flesh of your children, lover, mother, father, brother, sister, friends, into your own flesh? Would you resist? If there existed a resistance movement, would you join it? If not, why not? How much worse would the damage have to get before you would stop those who were killing the planet, killing those you love, killing you? (14-15)

Jensen continues with real life examples, showing the urgency to act against atrocities committed against the earth, and showing the present situation of the world by giving the percentage of the large fish now extinct: ninety percent. Then he asks, "Where is your threshold for resistance? . . . How about 100 percent? Would you fight back then?" (15).

This is the epitome of what was in danger when ecological reality seemed unbelievable to most people. As Speece relates, Greg King, an environmental activist, believes that "we have degraded so much of the planet that reality seems unreal" (121). Concrete, after watching the documentary, is moved and he thinks that "we're wounding this planet like a guy hacking a melon with a buck knife" (89). For Concrete, this reality becomes clear and now is the time to move towards his identification with his immediate environment and his feeling of suffering as a result of his larger Self. Concrete comes to this realization of his ecological self, which Devall argues, is not "a forced or static ideology but rather the search for an opening to nature," and he adds that "[i]f a person can sincerely say, 'If this place is destroyed then something in me is destroyed,' then that person has an intense feeling of belonging to the place" ("The Ecological Self" 108). Devall relates that whenever he saw a truck full of old growth logs rolling along on the highway to the timber mill, he felt "physical pain, a kind of suffering" (*Simple in Means* 7). This feeling clearly shows how his identification with the natural world makes him feel as if one part of his body has been wounded. His sense

of self crosses the boundaries of humans and nonhumans to form an expanded Self. What Concrete feels is the same type of suffering which stirs him into action.

In the novel, the documentary ends with a quote by Abbey: "Belief without action is the ruin of the soul" (88). This emphasizes the significance of taking action for what you believe in. Concrete, a mainstream environmentalist, believed what the radical environmentalist characters believed was right, except for their tactics. Now that he realizes that without taking action, it is impossible to defend one's self, it is time to step into action. Jensen in *Endgame II* states that action, according to Lierre Keith, "comes, not from thought, but from a readiness for responsibility" because "your thinking will be confined to your responsibilities in action" (883). There is a direct connection between a feeling of responsibility and taking action, since one feels responsible for something one cares about, and then one acts. Moreover, Jensen argues that "the readiness to act is born from two sources: rage and love. We need to have the stamina to keep loving even when what we love is being destroyed, and we need to have the courage to make that love be an action, a verb" (*Endgame II* 884). Concrete's identification with the nonhuman world and his sense of caring for what he loves now makes him responsible for his enlarged Self and encourages him to act on behalf of his ecological self. Naess states that Erich Fromm's idea of love of persons turns into, from an ecosopher's view, "care, respect, responsibility, knowledge" which are "applicable to living beings in the wide sense" ("Self-realization" 228). Fromm explains genuine love as "an expression of productiveness and implies care, respect, responsibility, and knowledge. It is not an 'affect' in the sense of being affected by somebody, but an active striving for the growth and happiness of the loved person, rooted in one's own capacity to love" (59).

Radical environmentalist characters, and now Concrete, enlarge the boundaries of human love to include all living and nonliving beings for whose growth and happiness they strive now that their expanded Self encompasses the ecosphere. Provided that the self is expanded, caring moves naturally in order to feel the protection of free nature and perceive it as a protection of ourselves ("Self-realization" 236). This leads to self-defense in the form of eco-defense, since the self is no more a narrow self, but Self, in

the expanded sense. Devall explains self-defense with a person's perception of sense-of-place:

> If I, as a part of this wider connection, also have individuation and a will-to-live, then I can act, in self-defense when my broader and deeper interests are threatened. Conservation is thus self-defense. When I identify with primeval forests of redwood trees I want to defend them from logging because they are part of my sense-of-place. ("The Ecological Self" 120)

The radical environmentalist characters already have a sense of Self and are acting in self-defense. Concrete commences acting in self-defense when he feels the trees are part of his sense-of-place, in addition to feeling each tree as a part of his greater Self. The radical environmentalist characters in their active journey of Self-realization tried to make Concrete join them and act in defense of the ecosphere so to experience more self-realization. Chadwick, in support of Abbey, writes that "[a] choice isn't real when it's merely in your mind" because "[y]our body makes it real. An action" (95) and Concrete realizes this. His "self" moves towards "Self" and he vows "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth!!" (96). As a result, his bond with his radical environmentalist friends becomes stronger and the interconnection of his identity deepens with the nonhuman world. He recovers from his position of apathy, gets out of being "facile, articulate hand-wringer," gets out of his comfort zone, and his armchair "where [he is] most comfortable" (19). He was once a moderate environmentalist who hated confrontation, and now he is a radical environmentalist who is ready for confrontation in self-defense.

From the moment Concrete realizes his greater Self, he sets out to undertake direct action to illustrate Earth First!'s "no compromise" stance, one which he vows to follow. In Hidden Valley, Concrete becomes one of the radical environmentalists, both in thought and in action. He says "Let's cost these boys some money" (104). He puts this idea into action by spiking[17] the old-growth trees while feeling "a twinge of pride" because his nail sack is almost empty at the end (106). Roland praises him for being "a virtual nail gun" locking up "a million bucks' worth of old growth, easy" (108).

[17] Radical environmentalists generally hammer nails or rods into the trunk of a tree at or above the level where the tree would be cut by a chain saw. The monkeywrenchers mark the spiked trees as spiked, and then inform the appropriate organization or the Forest Service about the spiking. Tree-spiking does not harm trees.

Moreover, Concrete helps Roland destroy the loggers' machines by using their own fuel, an act which astonishes him. Concrete feels "more fully alive than in any time he can remember" (112-113) because he is acting for what he is responsible for: to staunch the hemorrhaging of the forest that is part of his greater Self. The first phase of direct action has ended. In the radical environmentalists' self-defense of Hidden Valley, Concrete professes he is as ready as "he'll ever be" (123) to take active participation in the second phase. To attract the attention of the public to the logging area in Hidden Valley, they organize a Sasquatch hoax, for which they also get help from his friends to make use of television coverage. Concrete wears a Sasquatch costume and tries to draw people's interest to the clearcut in the forest. Their primary objective is to make people come to the forest and see what's happening there.

According to Devall, "a person expressing ecological self would say, 'I'm a forest being" ("The Ecological Self" 101). In Hidden Valley, Roland, when caught by the Forest Service timber guard who points a rifle at him, says "I'm a spirit of the forest. There're thousands of us. You'll never destroy our home" (114). This reflects his idea of ecological self, and his understanding of Home in a larger sense. Contrary to his understanding, is the machine's idea which is expressed by the Forest Service timber guard who concentrates on "millions of dollars' worth of equipment" destroyed by the radical environmentalist characters (115). The radical environmentalists never resort to violence even in moments of heated confrontation because their stance is a non-violent one. They believe in the oneness of all life. They try to enlarge their self-realization by attracting more and more attention to Hidden Valley. When people flocking there are led to a gigantic clearcut with the help of the radical environmentalists' hoax, people see, with their own eyes, the ecological reality the characters wanted them to witness.

Although Concrete wears the Sasquatch costume, when Stephen implies that he might be seen and videotaped in a clump of trees, Concrete does not want to take responsibility. Stephen wears the costume and is killed in an old-growth tree by the Forest Service timber guard. Stephen's is an enlightened self-interest, in which his "ego sacrifices its interests in favor of the other, the alter" (Naess, "Self-realization" 235), but because there is no "other" anymore, his enlarged Self includes all the motivation to defend his Home out of duty: "It is said that we ought to love others as strongly as we

love ourselves" (235). This eager and unquestioning self-defensive action which resulted in Stephen's death, reflects his ecological self, ready to act without any hesitation in defense of his larger Self.

Roland gives a speech in front of many people in Hidden Valley to memorialize Steve. He asks the protestors whether they are going to let "Steve's gnawed bones rest in that temple [the forest], guarded by giants," or let his bones "be bleached by the sun amid stumps, crushed by the tread of a bulldozer" (143). He concludes his speech with a final question: "Are we gonna SAVE STEPHEN BELLER'S FOREST?" (143). Everybody present responds with a strong "YES" (143), since they are the thousands of spirits of the forest. Furthermore, they start to feel a connection with Steve, now dead but still alive on earth. Those cut trees feel pain themselves. A larger bond is forming among the people who have joined the protest. It becomes an eye-opening journey to realize their larger Self. The strength of a larger Self is achieved ultimately since "it'll be an officially protected wilderness area" which will bear Steve's name (144). Steve, dead but still alive, can be seen as personified in Robinson Jeffers's lines from "Big Sur:"

> I entered the life of the brown forest,
> And the great life of the ancient peaks, the patience of stone,
> I felt the changes in the veins
> In the throat of the mountain, and, I was the stream
> Draining the mountain wood; and I the stag drinking; and I was the stars (113)

On the other hand, Concrete listens to Roland make his speech under a tree without being seen by the other protestors. He is regretful, but he suffers anguished losses: slaughter of the trees and guilt over Steve's death due to his own inability to take responsibility. However, he is ready to act now. More ready than ever, since in the last frame of the graphic novel he is depicted standing in front of his armchair, whereas at the beginning he was depicted seated on it where, for the radical environmentalist characters, he was most comfortable. At the very end of the novel, Concrete says to Penelope: "If you get something going, land-based . . . and you think I could make a difference . . . CALL ME" (144). This is a clear utterance of his commitment to the cause and his readiness for action. It reflects his increasing concern as an inevitable result of his feeling his expanded Self. It is implied at the end of the novel that Roland, whose sole *raison d'être*, much like Hayduke's, is to ameliorate the present condition of

the natural world, is now in Norway in pursuit of defending his fellow "spirit" of the seas, placing his body between whalers and whales.

Consequently, a people heavily dependent on concrete, bricks and an everlasting desire to consume more and more pointlessly, results in disconnection from the natural world. This causes an impression, a footprint: as Concrete utters "collectively we are like a giant;" (92) what a giant can do with its heavy steps on earth?: cascading ecological degradation. It is the purpose of the radical environmentalist characters to uncover one's ecological self, bring to light one's attitude of walking gently upon the earth,[18] and averting human-induced disasters.

[18] *Walk Gently Upon the Earth* is originally the title of a book by Linda Hogan.

CHAPTER 3: *A FRIEND OF THE EARTH* (2000) BY T.C. BOYLE: A LOOK FROM THE FUTURE-PRESENT TO THE PAST

If my tree is dying, I notice. But the earth slowly dying is not obvious, not something I can see at a glance out of my window. . . . There is a gap between what I can see and what may really be happening.

David Wood, *The Step Back: Ethics and Politics After Deconstruction* 167

Rachel Carson's "A Fable for Tomorrow" narrates the story of an American town, full of people leading a healthy lifestyle living in harmony with nature, has been transformed into a place where the "shadow of death" and a "strange stillness" start to dominate. The spring is silenced. Carson contrasts past springs, which were full of the "dawn chorus of robins, catbirds, doves, jays, wrens, and scores of other bird voices," (14) with the now voiceless spring. This state of the stricken planet with "new kinds of sickness" and silence was no wizardry but a natural result of their own actions: "The people had done it themselves" (14). Carson created this imagery in 1962 to demonstrate a present-future picture for twentieth century readers. Her intention was to warn that if people living then continued to go on with their practices, using hazardous chemicals on land, it would have disastrous effects on human bodies (157) and thus on planetary life. In 2000, at the very end of the twentieth century, T.C. Boyle constructed a narrative in which he intertwines past and future-present to depict how past actions bring about future-present consequences. Future-present is shaped when Boyle's autodiegetic narrator, Tyrone O'Shaughnessy Tierwater, that is Ty, tells about his present days, between November 2025 and July 2026, which is the readers' near future, and the third person narrator, with flashbacks, tells about his past, between July 1989 and December 1997. In this way, the focus does not concentrate on the present but on the past, future and present together. This presentation emphasizes the hazards of tomorrow "already in present today" and the significance that the present is not "unbound from past or future" (Mehnert 94). Thus, past and present directly affect the extended Self now and tomorrow.

The future-present depiction of the world Ty makes is like Carson's depiction of tomorrow with a "grim specter" ("A Fable for Tomorrow" 14). However, in the narrative, the world Ty lives in experiences Carson's "imagined tragedy," which becomes the "stark reality" (15) of their present and the readers' future. In November 2025, Ty lives in Santa Ynez, Santa Barbara County, California on a "worn-out" (3) and "blistered" (88) planet. Through Ty, apocalyptic scenes abound in 2025 and 2026, and he lives through them: Although it is past three in the afternoon "[t]he sky is black" and Ty puts emphasis on the color of the sky, saying "not gray, black" (3). He smells "death, the death of everything" (3) hopelessly, and he recounts the death of most of the people he "knew" none of whom having "died a natural death:" He has had "friends succumb to cancer, and Lori—Lori died in [his] arms, both of [them] wearing gauze masks" (92). For Ty, things are obviously "a mess" (7) at the moment, and these are the environmental consequences of the past permeating the present. He describes his surroundings: "the shrubs tattered like old sails, the trees snapped in two and then snapped in two again . . . though with all the topsoil running off and the grass gone to seed, I can see we'll be living in the middle of a desert here in the dry season. If it ever comes" (7). Since it is the rainy season and the amount of rain is like "all the rain in the universe dripping" (5-6) forming a deluge, it is nearly impossible to get accustomed to the living conditions in *this* world. Ty, like Carson, contrasts his present and not far-off past, that is twenty-five years ago:

> This [Santa Ynez Valley] used to be open country twenty-five years ago—a place where you'd see bobcat, mule deer, rabbit, quail, fox, before everything was poached and encroached out of existence. I remember stud farms here, fields running on forever. . . . Now it's condos. Gray wet canyons of them. And who's in those condos? Criminals. Meat-eaters. Skin-cancer patients. People who know no more about animals—or nature, or the world that used to be—than their computer screens want them to know. (9)

This is the state of the world for which Ty says, "Welcome to life in the twenty-first century" (151). Moreover, he goes on contrasting the time he was born, seventy-five years ago, with conditions he lives in now: "I was born in the richest country in the suburbs of the biggest city in the world, in a time when there were no shortages, at least not in this country, no storms (except the usual), no acid rain, no lack of wild and jungle places to breathe deep in" (9).

The objective of climate change fiction, to which *A Friend of the Earth* also belongs, is to provide a meaningful connection between the human activities of the past and their consequences in the present and near future. Antonia Mehnert states that Boyle's aim in his work is to put together "present and future" and to "trace and expose the stories that lie beneath the scientific graphs of climate change scenarios, refuting the notion that the future is unbound from the present or past" (96). The narrative achieves this by creating a timeframe of a lifetime of seventy five years—Ty is seventy five years in the future-present in 2025—and to demonstrate his past actions and the living conditions of the past and the future-present alternately throughout the novel. The most salient issue of the depiction of changing living conditions is to describe them in one's lifetime because only then one can care about and be wary of what one does. How they do so in terms of their ecological footprint on the world is significant. Moreover, the questions such as how one thinks about an "intangible and invisible thing as climate change" which may not show its effects in a person's lifetime but sometime in the future and if a person cannot see the effects of it in his/her lifetime, "why should one act on them" are of utmost importance (Mehnert 93).

"Giddens Paradox" or "future discounting" is about "the wide knowledge gap between the familiar preoccupations of everyday life and the abstract future of a climatically changed world" (Giddens 2). Because, in general, as Paul Ehrlich argues, "we perceive sudden changes readily, slow changes with difficulty" (37), one with an ecological self, will with "sufficient comprehensive (all-sided) maturity 'identify' [one] self with all living beings" (Naess, "Self-realization" 225), which will result in a more humble and caring perception and lifestyle both for the present and future. This humble and caring attitude towards nature and life leads to respect for human and nonhuman life. Ecological self puts emphasis on richness, diversity and the intrinsic value of nonhuman life for the blossoming of humans and nonhumans, and for which the decrease of the human population becomes an important issue for the flourishing of both human and nonhuman life at the same time, all of which T.C. Boyle believes and obviously reflects and examines in his novel *A Friend of the Earth*.

In *A Friend of the Earth*, written in 2000, Boyle constructs two frames of reality: one in the past which portrays the radical environmentalist characters Ty, Andrea, Ty's wife,

Teo, founder of an environmentalist action camp, and Sierra, Ty's daughter and Andrea's stepdaughter whose direct actions are mainly against the logging operations in the Siskiyou between 1989-1997. The other is in the future-present of the protagonist Ty in the period from November 2025 to July 2026, in which a hellish world is depicted. The novel starts with the disillusioned monkeywrencher Ty's description of his future-present in 2025 in Santa Ynez, California where he works as an "animal man" taking care of the rock star Maclovio Pulchris's private menagerie, "the last surviving one in this part of the world" (1). The changing climate leads to the catastrophic future-present with deluge, mucosa plague, and the extinction of many different animals and plants. Besides, rain and wind deteriorates the situation and thus causing the death of more animals in Mac's menagerie. Mac is killed by one of the lions which escape and the rest of the lions are killed as a precautionary act leading to the extinction of a species. Ty and Andrea are forced to leave Mac's mansion. They go back to the cabin in the Sierra Nevada where "the shoots of the new trees [are] rising up" (348) out of this apocalyptic future-present. On the other hand, in the past, Ty was an Earth Forever!" activist who was engaged in acts of monkeywrenching in the Siskiyou. Ty, Andrea, Teo, and Sierra carried out a protest in the Siskiyou to stop road building in the forest by standing erect in concrete trench holding hands. They are the ones arrested by the sheriff in a "federally designated roadless area" (45) where they tried to stop the man on the Cat bulldozing the dead zone. Besides, Ty is labeled as a corrupting influence on his daughter, Sierra, because she was also involved in the protest. He spends a couple of years in prison and escapes. Ty, Andrea and Sierra live in an isolated cabin in the Sierra Nevada. Ty engages in direct action targeting Penny Pines Plantation, growing "artificial" (168) hybrid engineered trees there.

Thomas Coraghessan Boyle (1948) known as "T.C. Boyle," a prolific author, has written sixteen novels and more than one hundred and fifty short stories. He believes in being an environmentalist, and he is trying to protect other species (Gottlieb). For him, all the environmental writers scream annihilation and their drive is the idea that they are a part of nature and that they love it (Gottlieb). He supposes that the beautiful creatures in nature will die in five years and because of this everybody rebels. There is only awful news about nature, and he finds his attitude honest but subversive in some ways (Gottlieb). As a young man of the 1960s, Boyle resisted the established authority

(Gleason 6). In an interview with David L. Ulin he stated that "[he] can't stand the idea of authority, and [he] think[s] it's detrimental to the character of people to give themselves over blindly to authority" ("The Science"). His fiction is about particular social and political concerns, and many of his works take up the issue of relationships between human beings and nature (Gleason 7). In an interview with Robert Birnbaum, Boyle asserts that he wrote *A Friend of the Earth* much inspired by Edward Abbey's work ("Author Interview"). It is understood that the source of inspiration for Boyle's novel is Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang*. In addition to *A Friend of the Earth* (2000), Boyle's most significant works concerning environmental attention are *World's End* (1987), *Tortilla Curtain* (1995), and *When the Killing's Done* (2011). *World's End* focuses on the Hudson River and the Industrial Revolution which affected many families' lives profoundly. *Tortilla Curtain* is about illegal immigration, at first glance; however, the implication is that the environment is being destroyed by overpopulation. *When the Killing's Done* is about the protagonist Dave Lajoy, a passionate animal rights activist who tries to block the National Park Service from removing rats and pigs from the Channel Islands of California.

3.1. RICHNESS AND DIVERSITY OF LIFE

In Ty's account of the future-present, environmental deterioration and mass extinction have become much more than a harbinger of an apocalyptic world, in addition to being a tipping point for ecological collapse as a result of human-induced disasters. To avert this disastrous state of the world, Boyle privileges the importance of diversity and richness of different life forms that support the ecosystem and cultivate a healthy life for all. On the other hand, the loss of biodiversity and richness of flora and fauna leads to a quickly accelerating pace of extinction rates and natural habitat decline. On the points of diversity and symbiosis, Naess states that "Diversity enhances the potentialities of survival, the chances of new modes of life, the richness of forms" which leads to the attitude that attaches significance to what he calls "Live and let live" rather than "Either you or me" (Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep" 4). This attitude presumes that life, being a process of evolutionary time, signifies an "increase of diversity and richness" (4).

This "Live and let live" attitude is the reflection of an ecocentric look at life that celebrates every living being on the planet, since they are closely interconnected with each other, and each and every one of them contributes to the flourishing of the other. Ty is an ardent believer of this maxim, in his own capitalization it is "Live and Let Live," (8) which he fearlessly puts into action in his defense of the natural world together with another motto "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth," the maxim of Earth First!. This is "Earth Forever!" (10) in Boyle's narrative. As Foreman argues, the decision of the founders of Earth First! was "a belief in Earth first" (*Confessions* 20). Ty is in full agreement with the founders of Earth First! and the name of the radical environmentalist movement has evolved into Earth Forever! symbolizing the abundance of life on Earth. Like the Earth First!ers in real life, Ty is in opposition to anything that endangers biodiversity and, as the Earth First!ers put it, he also supports the idea of "No logging in roadless areas, period" (Roselle and Mahan 51).

In the Siskiyou Mountains, Ty identifies a logging road which he describes as "a scar, a gash, an open wound in the body corporal of the forest" on which trucks, "big D7 Cats, loaders and wood-chippers" pound during the day (25). For Ty, a period was a period and since he believes in "Live and Let Live" which shapes his outlook towards life, and acts as a point of action, it is the moment to step into the fray. As he walks in the forest, it is understood that his sense of smell and taste are both acute because he can with ease smell and taste the damp of the woods in the air. This also shows his oneness with nature. Moreover, he does not want to let the forest become logged because logging, as he is fully aware of, is equal to "being raped" (29). As a result, the world will be "stripped right on down to the last twig" (29). Jack D. Forbes takes it a step further and states that the rape of a woman, a land and a people are all the same as "the rape of the earth, the rape of the rivers, the rape of the forest, the rape of the air, the rape of the animals" because "[b]rutality knows no boundaries. Greed knows no limits" (xvi).

The brutality against one part of the forest directly affects the other parts of the forest because of its gestalt character. Naess explains it with an example:

> a proposal is made to build a road through a large forest. Preservationists reject the proposal. But the proponents say, in all honesty, that the area spoiled by the road itself will be less than a tiny fraction of the forest. But they are neglecting the

> gestalt character of the forest. A quantitative abstract structure is taken to be identical with the contents.
> The preservationist answer that the heart of the forest, or the forest as a whole, would be destroyed. (If you are deep in the forest and encounter a road, the forest as spontaneously experienced is no longer the same. The greatness and majesty, the dignity and purity, etc., is lost). ("Ecosophy and Gestalt Ontology" 244)

One's having an ecological self results in protecting the gestalt character of the forest or any kind of wilderness, and one eventually sees the logging road as a means which brings machines to the trees that "have to be stopped," and where "the line has to be drawn" (33). Therefore, the drive of a person with an ecological self is toward the health of the whole planet whose well-being is dependent on the diversity and richness of life forms. On the other hand, as Naess states, the forest, from an atomistic view, is valued in terms of its "market prices, of extrinsic parts, and tourism" and from this perspective "[a] tree is a tree. How many do you have to see?" ("Ecosophy and Gestalt Ontology" 245). However, according to Naess, "no tree is identical to any other. Each tree is a mighty presentation of the drama of life" ("Metaphysics of the Treeline" 247). The narrator describes a doomed Douglas fir as if to prove what Naess states about the mightiness of its life history: "a tree that took root here five hundred years before Columbus brought the technological monster to a sunny little island in the Caribbean" (32). If the five-hundred year old Douglas fir is cut, it will mean "stopping the historical vitality of life" according to Holmes Rolston III, who focuses on human wrong doings that threaten Earth's biodiversity (154). In addition, Thomas Berry in "The Viable Human" argues that, "any damage done to the tree will be experienced through the entire organism" (17). This clearly demonstrates that any kind of logging will be disastrous for the forest in a particular area and for the planet as a whole.

Ty and his companions are the ones whose purpose in defense of the Siskiyou is to protect its organic unity. For "every bird alive in every tree," Ty says to himself, "[s]*omebody's got to do it*" (37-38). Thus, Ty, Andrea, Sierra, and Teo, the radical environmentalists, try to carve out a sustainable future to save "the world into which she [Sierra, who is thirteen years old then]'s awakened" which is "the ancient one, the imperturbable one" (39). The world in which eco-radical characters want to return is not a distant past, but one in which the world is not vandalized by a variety of environmental hazards. Their ideal forest is the one Muir describes in his work *The Mountains of California*:

> I drifted on through the midst of this passionate music and motion, across many a glen, from ridge to ridge; often halting in the lee of a rock for shelter, or to gaze and listen. Even when the grand anthem had swelled to its highest pitch, I could distinctly hear the varying tones of individual trees,—Spruce, and Fir, and Pine, and leafless Oak,—and even the infinitely gentle rustle of the withered grasses at my feet. Each was expressing itself in its own way,—singing its own song, and making its own peculiar gestures,—manifesting a richness of variety to be found in no other forest I have yet seen. (182)

It is a forest rich in diversity and full of the sounds of different birds. It is alive. Another ideal representation of a redwood forest, where wilderness is in full bloom, and which Ty and his team want to protect, is demonstrated by Darren Frederick Speece:

> To walk into a stand of two-thousand-year-old redwoods is to enter deafening silence. It is rare to hear songbirds, or the sound of a squirrel scampering in the canopy, or the condensation of the thick fog dripping off redwood needles like rain. It's not that those noises are entirely absent; it is just that the shade, the moisture, the fog, the deep bed of soft needles on the ground, and the ropy red bark of the trees seem to absorb all sounds before they can radiate outward from their source. A redwood grove is also visually striking. It has no visible horizon, just giant trees situated in a variable field of human-size ferns with periodic skunk cabbage in low-lying areas near creeks and the occasional western hemlock. The odor of the skunk cabbage is noticeable. In the creeks Pacific giant salamanders await their prey, while flying squirrels and spotted owls in the trees invisibly watch and wait. Occasionally, a black bear or a herd of Roosevelt elk might wander through the grove, the elk headed for the coast or a nearby pasture. (27)

In contrast to the portrayal of idealized forests rendered by Muir and Speece, the woods Ty and his companions have entered are filled with loggers and logging machines. Moreover, the narrator focuses on one logger's T-shirt, in a drawer at home, which depicts "a spotted owl in a frying pan" (40). The Northern spotted owl is a symbol of a threatened species in California, Oregon, and Washington and this T-shirt represents the world view of loggers' bosses who for Ty, are the real enemies of the radical environmentalists. Besides, for these loggers and their bosses, "all members of the Sierra Club are 'Green Niggers' and that Earth Forever! is a front for Bolshevik terrorists with homosexual tendencies" (40). Therefore, the bosses and their workers have an understanding that the people who act in defense of the natural world are all outcasts, whereas the radical environmentalists are in favor of diversity and a variety of life forms. As Edward O. Wilson writes, the issue of biodiversity is not only about saving nature but also it is equally about saving humanity (312).

Their protest on the encroachment of the natural world that focuses on the resources of the finitude of the Earth takes place "in the middle of a concrete trench in a [logging] road in the middle of nowhere, wearing diapers and giving a speech—at seven thirty in the morning" (41). They are the ones with an ecological self fully aware of their expanded Self in self-defense. Their conversation with the loggers centers upon what the loggers will do when all the trees are cut down, which is of utmost importance from the loggers' point of view since for them trees are precious simply because they create jobs. However, as Friedman relates, the biodiversity in the world, as the Harvard and Woods Hole environmental scientist, John Holdren, states, is a one-of-a-kind invaluable library which has been on fire unwaveringly before all the books are catalogued, not even all are read (142). If this happens, the entire organism, that is the Earth, including all human and nonhuman world, will directly upset the balance of nature, which will eventually signal the end of life on the planet.

If a forest falls victim to human rape, the trees and thus all the animals and plants living in it will become extinct. Ty states this in the future-present part of the narrative. His account of Frank Buck's animal trade of elephants in Ceylon ninety years ago clearly demonstrates what natural life was, and what man has done to the earth with his own hands. Ceylon was once full of jungles that were "full of sights unseen and sounds unheard, raffalii and dorango in the trees, chevrotains, tapirs and yes, pangolins poking through the leaves" (101). The jungles *were* teeming with life in the past, whereas now "the elephants are gone, and the forest too" (101). As Ty has heard, it *is* "100 percent deforested" (101). Therefore, deforestation means that the richness and diversity of life forms become extinct with the death of jungles. Moreover, the loss of biodiversity in one part of the world directly or indirectly affects other parts of the world. In short, it has a global effect. Thomas L. Friedman relates that "the team in Conservation International likes to say: 'Lost there, felt here'" (153).

Maclovio Pulchris' (Mac) private menagerie is an outcome of this biodiversity loss and its impact on the planet. In 2025, the menagerie is "the last surviving one in this part of the world," a "vital—reservoir for zoo-cloning and the distribution of what's left of the major mammalian species" (1-2). This state of Earth of the future-present has become the stark reality of an imagined tragedy of the past. Every last one of the lions in Africa

have been, in Ty's words, "flagged, skinned and eaten right down to the bone by the pullulating masses of our own degraded species" (103). Africa has become a place where "[n]ature doesn't matter anymore" and the humans are made out of "a witches' brew of fossil-fuel emissions and deforestation" (103). Thus, in 2025, Santa Ynez Valley, California has become the "natural habitat" of the lions, which is, in fact, "Maclovio Pulchris' twelve-thousand-square-foot basement" (103). For instance, "[the] [l]ions [were] in the basement, vultures round the indoor pool, the hyena in the gift-wrapping room on the second floor" (141). The animals had to be relocated and were stripped of their natural habitat. The most peculiar example is the spectacled bear which "poisoned herself after she broke through the wall into the garage and lapped up a gallon of antifreeze" (236) According to Adam Trexler, Ty "observes [that] there is no such thing as 'natural' habitat anymore" (139). Rolston III argues that "A species is what it is where it is" (146). In addition, he states that "habitats are essential to species, and an endangered species often means an endangered habitat" (146). Loss of biological diversity, symbolized by the endangered species of animals Mac owns, is the consequence of what Edward O. Wilson calls "the despoliation of the physical environment" (282).

The tipping point of this loss of biodiversity has already been passed leading to a picture which portrays outdoors and indoors as the same. This is the point in time which McKibben describes as "[t]he world outdoors will mean much the same thing as the world indoors, the hill the same thing as the house" (40). It is the future-present when "everbody [is] indoors all the time" (88) because of the mucosa plague and the constant flood. Moreover, through the end of the novel, Ty wants to write a book for Ronnie Bott, the boss of the biggest publishing house in New York, about what he has been trying to do to "save this woebegone planet" and the animals. He wants to talk to him about

> extinction, about how we're at the very end of the sixth great extinction to hit this planet, caused by us, by man, by progress, and how speciation will occur after we're gone, an explosion of new forms springing up to fill all the vacated niches, a transformation like nothing we've known since the Cambrian explosion of five hundred seventy million years ago. (281)

Although he has all these in his mind, Ronnie is "not listening" (281) because he is not interested in the environment. In 2026 "the environment is all indoors," (282) like the

"domed fields that produce the arugula for his salads" and, more importantly, "[t]he environment is a bore. Nobody wants to read about it—nobody wants to hear about it" (282) because, as it was in the past, people still do not pay attention to nature and what kind of a place it has been turned into. For Ty, most people have always borne witness to what they have lost only on the continent he was living in: "bonytail chub, Okaloosa darter, desert pupfish, spot-tailed earless lizard, crested caracara, piping plover, the Key deer, the kit fox, the Appalachian monkeyface pearly mussel" (337) and it was the forest that was gone which looked like "Mount St. Helens[19] after the blast" (338). This was what humans rendered the world to its present state of a planet like "Mars" (339). Therefore, as McKibben notes "[a]n idea, a relationship, can go extinct, just like an animal or plant. The idea in this case is "nature," the separate and wild province, the world apart from man to which he adapted, under whose rules he was born and died" (41). As it is the case here, the future-present lacks the idea of a place called "nature" since wilderness is erased due to the loss of biodiversity and the richness of life forms in contrast to the idea of prehistoric human beings who "thought of themselves as one with plants and animals, rivers and forests, as part of a larger, encompassing whole" (Oelschlaeger 11-12) which made them care about the environment around them as much as possible, much like Ty and his companions with their extended sense of Self.

When natural wealth and diversity is evaluated as a market commodity rather than pure life-sustaining biodiversity and richness of different forms, the problems related to environmental degradation start. This originates from humans' failure to understand that "biological wealth" is vital for human survival and it "is taken much less seriously" than the three forms of wealth each country has when the other two are material and cultural, according to Edward O. Wilson (311). Wilson also argues that not attaching importance to biological wealth is a "major strategic error" which will in time be "increasingly regretted" (311). Ty is one of the people who understands this and wants to put an end to the kind of lifestyle which he calls "criminal life, the life [he] led before [he] became a friend of the earth," (56) the life he regrets. After he sees the light, he sells "the house,

[19] Mount St. Helens is an active volcano which in May 1980 erupted violently in the state of Washington, releasing tons of rock, along with poisonous gases. Fifty-seven people lost their lives, and the eruption caused massive losses of wildlife in "what would prove to be the greatest volcanic disaster in the history of the [United States]" (Bredeson).

the cars, the decrepit shopping center my father left me, my wind surfer and Adirondack chair and my complete set of bootleg Dylan tapes" (55-56) all of which bear witness to his past criminal life. His motivation for life became "[f]riendship for the earth. For the trees and shrubs and the native grasses and the antelope on the plain and the kangaroo rats in the desert and everything else that lives and breathes under the sun" (56). This reflects his ecological self, encompassing all life.

Ty bears the guilt of his past, which is, for him, the guilt of the western world: "enviro eco-capitalistico guilt" (135). He is, in his own words, guilty of creating "approximately two hundred fifty times the damage to the environment of this tattered, bleeding planet as a Bangladeshi or Balinese" (55). Well aware of this, he changes his past lifestyle of guilt into one which now privileges "friendship for the earth" (56). He embraces life with all its diversity and richness, not its material wealth. Ty comes to realize the negative impact of excessive consumption on the environment, proven by numbers and also supported by a PBS Special news report excerpted by Angus and Butler:

> Even though Americans comprise only five percent of the world's population, in 1996 we used nearly a third of its resources and produced almost half of its hazardous waste. The average North American consumes five times as much as an average Mexican, 10 times as much as an average Chinese and 30 times as much as the average person in India. (136)

Although Ty knows that the numbers showing the state of the world are the result of excessive use of natural resources for a luxurious lifestyle in the West, the system criminalizes and puts him into jail just because his daughter Sierra participated in their protest of a logging road blockage in the Siskiyou. Besides, he is, as the system symbolized by the judge, sheriff and his deputies, has told him "too evil and corrupting an influence" on his daughter, thirteen at the time. In addition, they label him "a monster. A criminal. A freak" (106). Furthermore, he was imprisoned by "[t]he machine. Progress" (255) who have found him guilty. However, from Ty's point of view, he himself "hadn't done a thing to deserve it" (254).

While Ty and his companions are in the concrete trench for the protest of the logging road in the Siskiyou, they are handcuffed by the sheriff in "a federally designated roadless area" which is being bulldozed by a man on the Cat. Although it is legally authorized as a roadless area by the federal government, the radical environmentalists

who did not wreak any kind of havoc on anyone or to anything in the forest are the ones who fall victim to the system. That is, they are seen as criminals from the system's point of view. Moreover, while they are handcuffed in the middle of nowhere in the forest, and while Ty is in prison, "all the trees of the world [were] under the ax" (46) and "[t]he animals were dying, the forests falling" (265). This is the point where the irony lies. That is, the question revolves around who the *real* criminal is, and from whose perspective.

In the name of progress, the end product becomes, as Ty thinks, "[t]he world [which] has been transformed to shit" (97). It is the "era of so-called progress: the age of creative *self*-destruction" in which we altogether find ourselves (Wright and Nyberg 1) that is in fact Ty's future-present world where the humans are in the process of self-destruction. Ty questions what progress has contributed in its making of the world of 2025. He criticizes Ronald Reagan with the motto he shilled for a company: "*Progress is our most important product*" because it makes way for overconsumption. Ty uses the example of Reagan's house, built for him in the Pacific Palisides, with its excessive use of devices and sources: "An intercom in every room, electric switches to close the drapes, electric barbecue and hedge clippers, three TVs, two ranges, two ovens, three refrigerators, two freezers, heat lamps, electric eyes, washers, dryers, a retraceable canopy roof for alfresco dining. That's progress" (135). The fruits of progress are also reflected in the standard of the judge's lifestyle as he "lived well, in a big colonial style place that stood on the crest of a hill, surrounded by lawns and flowerbeds, and with a swimming pool and clay tennis court out back" (268). Ty thinks that these are the gains of being "a tool of the machine" and for him with the good grace of timber company" the judge will "convert all that ponderous legal activity into something tangible, the yacht in the harbor, the white Mercedes 500 SL, the condo in Aspen" (268-269). This is what the system calls "progress" and what it brought in the late eighties and early nineties before transforming the world into a "pizza oven that's just exploded" (327) in the mid-2020s. It's Mac's house, from Ty's perspective, "his Versailles,"

> his pleasure dome, his city under a roof—was built during the nineties, the last age of excess in a long line of them. It has three dining rooms, eighteen bedrooms, twenty-two baths, the aforementioned gift-wrapping room, a theater, spa, swimming pool, gymnasium and bowling alley, not to mention the twenty-car

> garage and a scattering of guesthouses set amongst the remains of what were once formal gardens. (150)

His palace-like house is the reflection of the idea of progress and a way to show the excesses of the era which have turned the world into an unlivable place. In the future-present, although the conditions are "a little extreme" because of the constant rain and because they can't get out to anywhere and although Mac is away, he is still obsessed with decorating his house with "lights in parallel strips up and down the walls of the house so the whole place looked like a gift box on a hill" (181). This demonstrates his gluttony for showing off. This is the mentality which, Ty thinks, "rape[s] the planet all over again" (183) because he comes from a world where there was hope for the future and for which he is motivated to act on behalf of his enlarged Self to make the world a better place with "the beasts and the plants and everything else" that are "all gone now. Long gone" (183).

As David Rothenberg writes in the Introduction of Naess's *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* "economic growth for its own sake is rejected, but not growth or progress if redefined in a more ecological manner" (17). This is reminiscent of Abbey's growth and cancer cell metaphor which Ty shares. It motivates him in his self-defense against the ideology of "growth for the sake of growth." Foreman, as well, writes that he respects the idea of property, though the biological diversity of life on the planet is much more substantial (*Confessions* 121). This is what Ty completely agrees with and it motivates his acts of defense in the name of human and nonhuman life. The starting point, or, in other words, the beginning at the end that sets Ty and other radical environmentalists into motion, is "the meltdown of biological diversity" (Manes, *Green Rage* 22) by the industrial culture. Moreover, as Donella Meadows states, the logging roads and the logging activities in these old-growth forests are the consequence of the idea that the world is "divisible, separable, simple, and infinite," although it is a system which is "complex, interconnected, finite, ecological-social-psychological-economic" and the problems related to the planet originate from this mismatch ("Systems Paradigm" 101). Ty and his companions' target becomes the logging roads and logging activities in the Siskiyou[20] and Sierra Nevada,[21] due to their "deeper perception of reality and deeper

[20] The Siskiyou Mountains are located in northwestern California and southwestern Oregon in the United States.

and broader perception of self," labeled "ecological realism" by Devall ("The Ecological Self" 106). This deeper perception of seeing the world cultivates a deeper identification with one's environment and results in direct action against the logging process.

Whereas Ty and his radical environmentalist companions value the organic unity of the old-growth forests and their biodiversity, logging companies focus on the potential profits they will bring since they are worth the most in their industry. According to Speece, "[a]n old-growth forest anywhere is one where trees are allowed to grow old and the forest is allowed to develop a complex canopy and a rich biodiversity" (12). He adds that the roots and trunks of these old growth trees are "living artifacts of an ancient world," concluding that "once gone, they are gone forever, along with the connections to that ancient past" (13). This is why, for Ty, the "artificial trees, hybrids engineered for rapid and unbending growth and a moderate branching pattern" do not constitute a forest. Furthermore, these trees are in "[n]eat rows" which "fan out along both sides of the road, as rectilinear as rows of corn in the Midwest" (168). They look like crops and they are not the old-growth "yellow pines, the Jeffreys, ponderosas, cedars and sequoias that should have been here" which are native to these forests and living connections to the past world before being "sacrificed" (168) for the timber market. Ty calls it "[t]ree farming" deep in the woods, "in the national forest, mono-culture, and to hell with diversity" (168) by Penny Pines Plantation. Ty, with all due respect for diversity and richness of life forms, does his job by taking a match to the sawmill trees in their bio-engineered uniformity. A year after the burn, there are "fields of wildflowers, rose everlasting, arnica, fireweed, mountain aster and a dozen others their field guide had no illustrations for" which are, both for Ty and his wife Andrea, "nature as it was meant to be (214). There is no Penny Pines Plantation and nature was in full blossom with all its biodiversity and richness.

---

[21] The mountain range Sierra Nevada is in the western United States, specifically in California and Nevada, acting as a border between both states.

3.2. INTRINSIC VALUE OF NATURE

The radical environmentalist characters, including the protagonist Ty, believe in the concept of "intrinsic value." This is clearly understood from Ty's explanation of why people preserve the environment: "We don't preserve the environment for the benefit of man, for progress, but for its own sake, because the whole world is a living organism and we are but a humble part of it" (194-195). Ty's emphasis on the preservation of nature "for its own sake" makes the distinction between *usefulness for humans* which is an anthropocentric view. Naess calls this concept *naturens egenverdi*, which is translated as "the intrinsic value of nature." As explained by Rothenberg, "[g]estalt entities in nature are things to be respected for their own sakes, simply because they are there" (*Ecology 11*). Moreover, Foreman argues that "[a]ll things have intrinsic value, inherent worth" and he focuses on the fact that the value of things cannot be determined by how much they "ring up on the cash register of the gross national product" whether they are good or not since "[t]hey are good because they exist" (*Confessions* 3-4). Sierra, Ty's daughter, holds to the idea of "the ethical treatment not only of plants and animals, but even rocks and dirt" (193). This is a reflection of her ecological self.

Muir thinks that civilization distorts humans' perceptions of relationships with other living things, and he asks this question: "What are rattlesnakes good for?" It implies the benefit of humans from the modern man's understanding, but, for Muir, snakes are "good for themselves" and "the universe would be incomplete without man; but it would also be incomplete without the smallest transmicroscopic creature that dwells beyond our conceitful eyes and knowledge" thus leading to the sense that human beings identify themselves as "part of the wild Nature, kin to everything" ("Cedar Keys").

Ty and Andrea's naked entrance into the wilderness of the Sierra Nevada is like going home. As Muir put it, "[g]oing to the woods is going home" to which he adds that "we came from the woods originally" ("The Forests of the Yosemite" 767). Getting rid of all the burden of the capitalist society and the "living dead" who yield to it, gives Ty a "feeling at peace with himself, feeling fulfilled, feeling lucky" (223) in the wilderness. However, it is more than a home, a "paradise" for them (221) although "[w]ilderness had no place in the paradise myth." With progress "[m]en dreamed of life without

wilderness" which places paradise "on an island or in some other enclosed area" as a result of which the threat of the wild backcountry is eradicated for the first communities (Nash 9). Boyle states that "[t]o go out into the wilderness with nothing" is in every environmentalist's "atavistic heart" (223) because as Abbey explains in *Desert Solitaire* wilderness implies "the past and the unknown, the womb of the earth from which we all emerged" which indicates "something lost and something still present, something remote and at the same time intimate, something buried in our blood and nerves, something beyond us and without limit" (208). The idea of wilderness is embedded in one's being and in one's extended Self which flows in one's blood cells and connects that person with the heart of the earth. According to Abbey, "[l]ove of wilderness" is a reflection of one's "loyalty to the earth, the earth which bore us and sustains us, the only home we shall ever know, the only paradise we ever need—if only we had the eyes to see" (*Desert Solitaire* 208). As Rothenberg argues, "[i]n love one loses part of one's identity by gaining a greater identity, something that in its truest sense cannot be spoken of" (*Ecology 11*). Therefore, love of wilderness comes to mean having a greater identity with all the parts of it constituting a whole with one's own body. Moreover, Foreman argues that heaven is where when one "walk[s] through an aspen grove on a bright autumn day" (*Confessions* 52). In Abbey's paradise, there are "rattlesnakes and Gila monsters," "cactus" and "yucca" and other living and nonliving beings (*Desert Solitaire* 208) which are "here and now" (209). Moreover, in Foreman's understanding of heaven, if one pursues "total union with the cosmos," then one should "float a river, drift into river time, let the rich red of the San Juan or the crystal of the Salmon make you part of All" (*Confessions* 52).

In the narrative, Ty's total union with the cosmos strengthens and becomes more tangible with his welcoming of "scorpions," "ticks," "mites," "[c]ougars, bears, rabid skunks" that is all the living beings in the wilderness which dwelled there. Furthermore, his oneness with nature is furthered at night "as insects crawled over him and fragments of leaves worked their way into his private parts" (227). As for Andrea, Ty's wife, she is also in unison with the earth on which she lies: "bits of leaf mold stuck to her lips and forced up her nostrils, a scurry of insects frantically hopping and burrowing" (228). This union with all living and nonliving beings of the wilderness is an "expression of the love affair he was having with these mountains [the Sierra Nevada]" which Andrea is

"as much in love with these mountains and this moment as he" (154) because they both embrace the mountains, which for them, in Foreman's words, are "the real world, the arena of evolution; because it's our home" (*Confessions* 191).

Since Ty is in love with the mountains, from his perspective, the place in the mountains with "the naked legs of the trees" without needles, pine cones, but only dirt is labeled as a "wound" (155). From Ty's point of view, his ethics which "embrac[es] plants and animals as well as people," demand that this wound should be healed in order to have a harmonious life with the natural world whose survival depends on the health of all. (Naess, "The Deep Ecological Movement" 66-67). As Naess argues, a new ethics which welcomes plants, animals and humans at the same time to live in harmony with nature for the well-being of the world would be more efficient "if it were acted upon by people who believe in its validity, rather than merely its usefulness" (67). At this point, Ty's criticism of this world view is heard:

> Try telling that [the fact that "the whole world is a living organism"] to the Axxam Corporation when they're clearcutting thousands of acres of old growth to pay down the junk-bond debt accrued in their hostile takeover of Coast Lumber, and you find yourself in a philosophical bind. They're going to cut, and Earth Forever! is going to stop them, any way they can. Hence Sierra, up in the tree. (194)

Ty and all the other radical environmentalists' drive for action derives from a feeling of responsibility they have towards their extended Self. Any kind of wound on earth means a wound on their own body, which thrusts them into taking action in order to heal that wound. Thus, for these radicals, any kind of "opposition constitutes a defense of the natural systems to which man is committed as an organic being" (Shepard, "Ecology and Man" 140). This is also what Sierra, Ty's daughter, is doing one hundred and eighty feet above the ground in a redwood tree which she calls Artemis in the Headwaters Forest. She is in the tree because the grove that it is in is scheduled for clearcutting next (241) and Sierra is determined to stop Coast Lumber, the logging company. She feels a sense of responsibility towards her extended Self, and tries to prevent the logging company from clearcutting the grove in a form of protest called *tree-sitting*[22] for over

[22] Tree-sitting is a method of civil disobedience used by radical environmentalists to stop logging. A protestor sits on a platform in the tree for potentially a very long time. The protestor can keep to his or her protest for a day, or for two years (as in the case of Julia Butterfly Hill in the Headwaters Forest in northern California). Generally, loggers try to scare or threaten protesters to climb out of the tree.

three years. Although Sierra spends all her days aloft "with the birds her companions," (331) there are the Coast Lumber men who almost always try to bring her down using different techniques such as "log[ing] the trees on all sides of her, the screech of the saws annihilating the dawn and continuing unabated till dark" and "shouting abuse" (332). Moreover, the most intimidating method Coast Lumber uses is to dissuade Sierra from her protest by bringing in helicopters and turning the scene into a hellish Vietnam War atmosphere: "the helicopters hovered there beside her tree, beating up a hurricane with the wash of their props" and she can see the pilots who have a feeling of "let's see if we can blow you out of there" (332). As a tree-sitter, Sierra becomes a liability for the logging company since their sole objective is to get the maximum profit from the trees. Sierra stands for the idea that the preservation of the natural world should be for its own sake "[b]ecause it's right. Because it's the real world, the arena of evolution; because it's our home" (Foreman, *Confessions* 191). The logging company's outlook towards the trees creates an atmosphere of war in the Headwaters Forest. van Wyck relates how this state is explained by Joseph Shapiro in "Imperialism" in which he argues that both the ecological crisis and the Vietnam War have the same roots:

> Both are products of a highly technological, mechanistic, dehumanized society; in the one case ruthlessly expanding its interests in southeast Asia, in the other, ruthlessly expanding its interests at home; in the one case, economic imperialism; in the other, ecological imperialism. One can't fight one without the other. (27)

Ecological imperialism is what turns Abbey's paradise of the 1960s, Foreman's heaven of the 1970s and 1980s, and Ty and Andrea's paradise of the early and mid-1990s into Ty's future-present in the mid-2020s where "the whole world is Africa now, and India, Bloomington, Calcutta and the Bronx, all wrapped in one. The megafauna are gone, the habitat is shrunk to zero, practically no animals left anywhere" (295). It becomes a world where the natural world is stripped bare of animals, plants and trees, all as a result of an anthropocentric greedy lifestyle.

Perspectives of Sierra and other radical environmentalists are clearly explained by Peter Wenz, who focuses on the idea that respect for nature also creates respect for people, concluding that to serve people in the best way is "to care about nature for itself" (169). As a result, this leads to the well-being of all. Sierra's respect for and identification with

the redwood tree, Artemis, the squirrels and chickadees, results in her oneness with Artemis, the squirrels and chickadees which are "her companions" there (333). She *is* a "plain member and citizen" of the "land-community" to use Leopold's words rather than a "conqueror" like Coast Lumber which harms the land, the human and nonhuman inhabitants directly or indirectly (*A Sand County* 204). Her identification with the tree she is living in, and the animals around her, implies an increase of identification with other beings, an enlarged Self. This identification is formed with respect to every being in nature, living and nonliving, which Snyder asserts as the feeling that "all living beings are my brothers and sisters," and that "the unknown evolutionary destinies of other life forms are to be respected" (Sessions, Introduction 102). This is how Sierra feels and what leads to Peter Wohlleben's focus on the lives of trees which "should be allowed to fulfill their social needs, to grow in a true forest environment on undisturbed ground, and to pass their knowledge on to the next generation. And at least some of them should be allowed to grow old with dignity and finally die a natural death" (243). This implies less of a negative impact on the natural world, which leads to a more harmonious life, one which Ty emphasizes when he says "[he] didn't want more. [He] wanted less, much less. [He] wanted to live like Thoreau"[23] (334).

In contrast to Ty who "wanted less," and who was in love with the mountains, at the far end stands Ratchiss, an individual other than corporations like Coast Lumber and Axxam. Ratchiss is a man who is obsessed with hunting, especially in Africa, who "killed whole herds of animals" (156) there, and finally wanted to "go down in history as the agent of extinction of a given species, one barely hanging on by a thread" (290). He chose "the California condor, of which there were then a hundred and ten individuals extant, some fifty of those released into the wild from a captive breeding program at the soon-to-be-defunct L.A. Zoo" (290). Ratchiss is the living symbol of what Paul Ehrlich in the *Population Bomb* states as the reason that the conservation battle is being lost. One explanation he offers is that "most Americans clearly don't give it a damn. They've never heard of the California condor and would shed no tears if it

[23] Henry David Thoreau spent around two years living on Walden Pond near Concord, Massachusetts. From 1845 to 1847, he built a cabin for himself there, seeking a simple way of life.

became extinct. On the contrary, many Americans would compete for the privilege of shooting the last one" (43). Ratchiss is an extreme example of this sort of person and his attitude arises from his lack of a sense of self which identifies itself with the living and nonliving beings that are interconnected with the experience and existence of all. Ratchiss does not feel a connection to the natural world and sees the animals as objects to be hunted and exhibited in his house and cabin. For instance, the inside of his cabin "it was Africa" (157):

> There was a lion rug on the floor instead of the orthodox bear, and the walls bristled with spears, shields, tribal masks and the mounted heads of kongoni, sable, orynx, leopard and bushpig—and one monumental rhino that looked as if it had burst through the paneling directly over the fireplace. But the pièce de résistance was the rearing lion—eight feet tall at least, with drawn claws and a stupefied snarl—that stood guard over the entrance to the kitchen. (157)

Ratchiss identifies himself as the lion called "the Maneater of the Luangwa" which killed and devoured "seventeen hapless men, women and children" (157). Putting an end to the existence of the lion is a symbolic act in the sense that the lions are considered to be the kings of the jungle, and they stand at the top of the food chain in Africa. Thus, this act makes him the conqueror, the king of the jungle. In contrast to Leopold's idea that Homo sapiens no longer reside as conquerors of the land-community but are plain members of it, Ratchiss acts as the conqueror of the jungle. He is fond of being the conqueror in the natural world. He does not identify with the wilderness which originates from love of wilderness first, whereas Ty identifies with the wilderness and the result is his embrace of the living and nonliving members of the land-community with which he becomes one, like Andrea and Sierra. As Naess states, the *alter* is eliminated as one gives up one's interests for the sake of the other. This takes place out of responsibility for the other and as Naess states because "we ought to love others as strongly as we love ourselves" ("Self-realization" 235). Ty's love and identification with the natural world eradicates the other in his unison with it.

On the other hand, Ratchiss is full of hate towards the natural world, especially animals. When he was a boy, his sister was killed by a bear, and his father was seriously wounded. As a result, he puts the blame on the bear, which is not the case in reality, and which he realizes later on, but he never recovers from its effects. The natural world is the other for Ratchiss and he does not embrace it. As Sylvia Mayer puts it, "Ratchiss's

experience with a violent, indifferent 'nature' forbids any idealization of the wilderness experience, it rejects a simplistic reading of the deep ecological call for identification with nature. The notion that an environmentalist identity has to rest first and foremost on a love of wilderness is dismissed" (231). Therefore, his ego is in denial of humans' interconnectedness to all the living and nonliving beings on Earth, unlike Ty's self which is open to welcome all.

Without a wide and deep ecological self, which embraces the other and makes it one part of one's self, Ratchiss becomes a person who harms the other, the animals, that are the natural world. Because everthing is connected including himself, he is in the process of self-destruction. In the near future, this brings about inescapable consequences. As Ty relates from April 2026, he sees "dead lions, dead peccaries, jackals, vultures, living flesh converted to so much furred and feathered meat, extinction in a wheelbarrow" (278). This is Ty's world, what it turns into as future-present, the result of all past actions. It wouldn't have been transformed into an apocalyptical world if all the people had reached ultimate Self-realization, the point when all people feel that they have an enlarged and enlightened Self, from which peace and harmony prevails. Leopold embraces Draba, a very small creature "of no importance" (*A Sand County* 26) found in the mud and not eaten. Muir likewise embraces *calypso borealis*, a rare orchid, "on a bed of yellow mosses" on the bog which he calls "the most spiritual of all the flower people" ("The Calypso Borealis") of the land-community. So does Ty, from snakes to skunks (225) in the wilderness, since they are good just because they exist, for their own sake.

3.3. THE IMPACT OF POPULATION GROWTH

As Devall states, Naess in his article "Population Reduction" written in 1987, argues that an ecologically sustainable society in which people reach ultimate targets calls for a lesser human population than at present (*Simple in Means* 17). Moreover, in 1995, Snyder asserts that the number of people is too many now, and it is leading to a rapidly growing problem. This situation is possibly detrimental both for humans and other life forms at the same time (Snyder, "Four Changes" 142). This idea is reflected in Ty's

words uttered in the mid-1990s: "[t]here were too many people in the world, six billion already and more coming, endless people, people like locusts, and nothing would survive their onslaught" (306). He is also critical of the high number of people which he emphasizes by using a simile, "people [are] like locusts," concluding that they have a negative impact on the planet.

As Manes relates in *Green Rage*, Foreman, in the late 1980s, focuses on the dire effects of high population growth, specifically in relation to humans' anthropocentric lifestyle. He states that

> [t]here is no way to take five billion people in the world today, with the worldview they have, and the economic and industrial imperatives they live under, and turn it into a sustainable Earth-harmonious culture. That's just not going to happen. What is going to happen is that the system is going to collapse of its own corruption. The next several decades are not going to be a very pleasant time to be alive. (232)

From Ty's future-present, which is the year 2025, there are eleven and a half billion people living on earth[24] and sixty million of them in Ty's native California[25] (19). The population has nearly doubled between the mid-1990s and mid-2020s, essentially over a thirty year span. Thus, with the increase of the world population, Ty and the others experience the unfavorable and damaging effects of an existence in which the word ecology becomes a joke (54) because the natural world has almost been destroyed. This is the point when Ty expresses himself, saying "Let's eat each other, that's what I propose—my arm tonight and yours tomorrow—because there's precious little of anything else left" (54). What Foreman foresees is projected in Ty's future-present.

As a man in his mid-seventies in 2026, Ty draws a picture of the world which is "overpopulated" and "resource-stressed" (329). He thinks that young people are expecting him to die in a short time (329) so that they can live in better conditions. This is because the constantly increasing human population is closing in on Earth's limited

[24] According to the United Nations, in 2000, when the novel was published, the world population was 6.1 billion (81). Moreover, it has been projected to grow to around 8 billion by 2025 (National Intelligence Council 19).

[25] It is stated that around 33.9 million people lived in the state of California in 2000 (Hobbs and Stoops 24). According to the Public Policy Institute of California, the population of California in 2025 is expected to reach about 43 million (sec. Population).

resources and people are using nature as ammunition for economic, political and cultural battles among themselves. These directly attack and outmaneuver the world on every side (Tobias xxi). A smaller rate of population growth means less of a negative impact on the earth, less "contaminated lives" and less waste (159). From the future-present, Ty criticizes the Western consumerist lifestyle he once had, and one which he now calls "my life [when] I was a criminal" before he developed an ecocentric lifestyle. He gives an example from his "criminal" life:

> I lived in the suburbs in a three-thousand-square-foot house with redwood siding and oak floors and an oil burner the size of Texas, drove a classic1966 Mustang for sport and a Jeep Laredo (red, black leather interior) to take me up to the Adirondacks so I could heft my three-hundred-twenty-dollar Eddie Bauer backpack and commune with the squirrels, muskrats and fishers. I went to the gym. Drank in fern bars. Bought shoes, jackets, sweaters and hair-care products. (54)

He labels a person with a consumerist style of living a "criminal" since that person uses a lot of resources and leaves a large ecological footprint which is hazardous for the health of the earth. According to Fred Pearce, an ecological footprint is "the amount of the planet's surface needed to provide him or her with food, clothing, and other consumables, and to soak up his or her pollution" and an average U.S. citizen leaves 23.5 acres as an ecological footprint, whereas Canadians leave 17 acres, Europeans 10 to 12 acres, Indians and most Africans lower than 2.5 acres (203). The growth of population, especially in overdeveloped countries, means the rise of the consumption of resources, and at the same time the production of waste that makes an ecological footprint leading to potentially irreversible devastation. This is the real rationale behind Ty's labeling of these people as "criminal." These *criminals* lack an expanded sense of Self, emphasizing a life that is incompatible with the natural cycles, unlike the others who live as "a friend of the earth" (163).

From Ty's future-present, the actions he thought he took to save "the poor abused corpus of old mother earth" (54) during his *criminal* life did no good. He criticizes his own actions now: he recycled twice a year, he thought too much about packaging, he wore a "sweater in the house in winter to conserve energy" (54). These were choices he made then. Ty's criticism of his *criminal* life is at the same time the criticism of mainstream environmentalism. He was also a member of the Sierra Club which, via mail, invited him "to attend meetings, swim with the dolphins, save whales and

remember the Himalayas" (79). He did not accept any of these invitations and felt guilty, which from Ty's perspective, now, never changed anything and made no contribution to saving the environment. Moreover, what Ty and his monkeywrencher companions did to save the natural world also failed. However, they did not bear witness to what was lost on the planet, but they took direct action against it because a wound on the earth's surface meant a wound on their bodies, so they were in defense of their enlarged Selves.

From the future-present of the year 2026, in the Sierra Nevada, Ty notices "how colorless the forest is" and the apocalyptical picture of the forest is obvious: "the skeletal brown stalks of the dead trees outnumbering the green a hundred to one" (336). The number of dead trees is much higher than the green *one* because humans have turned the forest into a city: full of condos and traffic. Ty compares its future-present condition with the past:

> This was once a snaking two-lane country road cut through national forest lands, sparsely populated, little-traveled. Now I'm crawling along at fifteen miles an hour in a chain of cars and trucks welded into the flanks of the mountain as far as I can see, and I'm not breathing cooling drafts of alpine air either—wind-whipped exhaust, that's about it. Where thirty-five years ago there were granite bluffs and domes, now there is stucco and glass and artificial wood, condos banked up atop one another like the Anasazi cliff-dwellings, eyes of glass, teeth of steps and railings, the pumping hearts of air-conditioning units, thousands of them. (337)

This is the result of the increase in population because as Ty relates, in 2025, sixty million people live in California (19). Ehrlich draws the same conclusion in which he traces the effects of too many people and their impact on the natural world. He writes, "[t]oo many cars, too many factories, too much detergent, too much pesticide, multiplying contrails, inadequate sewage treatment plants, too little water, too much carbon dioxide—all can be traced easily to too many people" (44). Ty, well aware of this, wants to live in a world "the way it was" in the past, which means "all the doomed and extinguished wildlife of America" are "put back in their places" (330). He wants the past, along with his daughter, his parents and the natural world, to be *restored* (330).

In the mid-1990s, Ty fought against General Electric or the DWP, which were "rearranging the earth in the name of progress," (306) whose sole aim was to "bring more electricity" (307) to the San Fernando Valley for more homes and more

homeowners, meaning more profits. Ty was astonished when he saw the Valley because it "spread out below him like a dark pit into which all the stars in the universe had been poured," (307) symbolic of the excessive use of electricity and the high number of people living there. In order to supply electricity at such a great extent to such a high number of people, the power company "sheared off the top of a hill" (309). They slaughtered all the trees as far as the eye could see, and a chain of steel towers was erected.

Therefore, as in the case of the power companies in the Valley, from Ty's perspective, the ideology of growth forever, without any limits, will eventually, according to Ian Angus and Simon Butler, "hit the biosphere's buffers" either because a natural resource is exploited excessively until it is exhausted or the ecosystem is filled with more waste than it can absorb without any harm (177). This is what Ty is trying to prevent on the earth; what he is fighting for is the sustainability of the richness and diversity of life forms which are interconnected on the planet, bearing in mind the idea that one thing is good just because it exists. As Snyder writes in "Spel [*sic*] Against Demons" in *Turtle Island*,

> the man who has the soul of the wolf
> knows the self-restraint
> of the wolf
>
> aimless executions and slaughterings
> are not the work of wolves and eagles (16)

They possess, instinctively, an organic wholeness of life in which they live harmoniously within the cycles of the earth.

Although Ty's future-present abounds in negative effects due to the past actions of humanity, hope comes to life again. First, with "a solitary cricket," which from Ty's perspective, is an "incurable optimist" (296) in the Santa Ynez Valley and then with "the shoots of the new trees" which sprout (348) "wildflowers on fire in the fields," and "toads and tree frogs in full song" (349) in the Sierra Nevada. This rejuvenation creates an atmosphere of optimism. Ty yearns to smile after a long period of experiencing a hellish world created by humans.

Consequently, the richness and diversity of life forms are in the process of springing up once again at the end of the novel. However, for ultimate Self-realization to become actualized as the Self-realization of all, an apocalyptic planet where humans and nonhumans suffer cannot be created. From the point of view of not only Ty but the monkeywrenchers, as well, in order to avoid forthcoming catastrophes, a person should believe in the maxims “Live and Let Live” and “No Compromise in Defense of Mother Earth,” (8) acting on behalf of his/her greater Self.

CONCLUSION

Why so many want to read about the world out-of-doors, when it's more interesting simply to go for a walk into the heart of it, I don't fully understand. I suppose it is because the natural world, as we call it, has already become remote, out of reach, mysterious, in the minds of urban and suburban Americans. They see the wilderness disappearing, slipping away, receding into an inaccessible past. But they are mistaken. That world can still be rescued. That is one reason why I myself am still willing to write about it.

Edward Abbey, *Abbey's Road* xxi

Edward Abbey's, Paul Chadwick's and T.C. Boyle's novels explore why characters who possess an ecological self become radical environmentalists and employ monkeywrenching as a last resort in eco-defense. Their drive for action is their greater Self for which they use to try to thwart the destruction of the natural world; and their radicalization derives from their discontent with the prevailing anthropocentric world view and the mainstream environmentalist movements, which they believe fail to answer the needs of the (natural) world that is under fierce attack from humans. The characters these novelists create possess an ecocentric view of the planet, which deep ecology requires and which derives from Leopold's concept of "land ethic." It embodies the feeling that humans and nonhumans alike belong to the same community, and they are all citizens of the same planet. Monkeywrenchers in their various narratives fight against a human-centered view symbolized by corporations and government organizations whose sole aim is to satisfy their greed whatever the consequences. However, the monkeywrenchers, in their attempt to make the world a more livable place, are perpetually involved in an active process of expanding their Self through the use of their own unique tactics.

Arne Naess and George Sessions, primary formative figures of the deep ecology movement, agree upon eight points which constitute "a platform of the deep ecology movement" (Naess, *Ecology* 29). They focus on the following: the significance of the intrinsic value of non-human life forms regardless of their usefulness for humans; richness and diversity of life forms; satisfaction of vital needs without a diminishment of diversity in nature; reduction of the excessive human impact on the earth; a need to control human population growth; changing political perspectives for the betterment of life conditions; emphasizing life quality rather than a high standard of living which prioritizes "great" over "big;" and as a last principle, those who believe in these eight points have a responsibility to adhere to them and implement necessary changes directly or indirectly (*Ecology* 28). Thus, the radical environmentalist characters, mainly Hayduke in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Roland in *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and Ty in *A Friend of the Earth*, possess an ecocentric look, and assume responsibility to carry out crucial changes needed to avert disasters caused by human hands.

The Deep Ecology movement, with its eight principles, strives for encouraging a maturity of one's self, which is the broadened and deepened sense of self. This refers to the "ecological self," introduced by Naess, in which one identifies one's self with others, and as a result, "we see ourselves in others" leading to the maxim of "Live and let live!" and the understanding of care, respect, and responsibility for nonhumans in a deeper and wider sense. This leads to the conclusion that "everything is interrelated," the dictum of ecology, and it is applied to the concept of self where one's self is interrelated to other living and nonliving beings, to the planet itself. As a result, when nature is destroyed, it means our inner self is under threat. In order to defend our vital interests and not something "out there," we take part in self-defense and act on behalf of our enlarged Self (Naess, "Self-realization" 226). Radical environmentalist characters in these novels identify themselves with the natural world, so the other is eliminated in their concept of Self, leading to the sacrifice of their bodies for their extended Self, since a threat to nature is considered a threat to their greater Self. Along with this, the wilderness, for Abbey, is "our true home" and when it is threatened we have the natural right to defend it ("Eco-Defense" 31), so any defense of the natural world, our true home, our enlarged Self transforms into an eco-defense. The shallow ecology

movement, which Naess refers to as the most mainstream environmentalist movement, focuses on the well-being and prosperity of people in the industrialized countries ("The Shallow and the Deep" 3). This idea encompasses what corporate and governmental bodies take care of, but only with regard to their own self-interest, which at the same time views the natural world as a resource to be exploited. The monkeywrenchers, however, fight this kind of an ideology. Their objective is to protect the health and contentment of human and nonhuman beings.

Taking these ideas into account, Abbey criticizes in *The Monkey Wrench Gang* the dominant idea of an industrialist society which favors an anthropocentric view. He does this through his use of monkeywrencher characters who possess an ecological self and take actions on behalf of their enlarged Self, which they believe, actions of self-defense. In the novel, for him, this human-centered view leads to the "bleeding" of the young to death just because of basic needs such as food, water, and air, and blaming acute leukemia and lung cancer (180) whose ideological existence is as a growth only for the sake of growth, at the end leading to the death of its host. Each of the monkeywrencher characters acts in self-defense for their enlarged Self to transform the presiding economic, technological, and ideological system so that they may live in better conditions which are healthier for all. These characters, especially Hayduke, who utters their aim in his own style, are for a "counter industrial revolution . . . to save the fucking wilderness" (229). Hayduke is well aware of the interconnectedness of ecosystems which affect one another. Moreover, Abbey relates the sound of a machine as if it is murmuring its real message: power, profit, prestige, and pleasure as if the machine reveals the system's target (256). Hayduke's account of his uneasiness about the Indian country, Black Mesa, Arizona, which has been "overdeveloped" and "hypercivilized" (271) focuses on the thorough contrast between the big and the great that has a negative impact on both the land and Hayduke himself. To emphasize the magnanimity of the "metal monsters," (80) he uses phrases such as "a herd of iron elephants" (81) and "dinosaurs of iron" (95) to describe the machines which master human beings and despoil nature. Therefore, Hayduke believes that people like him belong to the canyons (271) where he is literally in touch with nature and where his heart beats in unison with

the "canyonland bedrock" (371) for which he and his Gang struggle to conserve and restore the natural world.

In *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, Penelope, Terry, Roland and Stephen are the radical environmentalist characters who are dissatisfied with the mainstream environmentalism whose methods they used to save the natural world, though failing to achieve their ends. Now, as a last resort, they have become monkeywrenchers, each of whom engage in direct actions on behalf of the Self. Their principal aim is to protect Hidden Valley, one of the last roadless areas in a national forest in northern Washington state (22). In order to make Concrete, a mainstream environmentalist at the beginning of the graphic novel, join their cause, increase their Self-realization, and make him believe in their legitimacy, they take him to a place in Canada to show the very after picture of Hidden Valley. There, Concrete, after passing the beauty strip, which is "a mask of trees along the highway" (45) to hide the clearcut, faces the stark reality of a large area full of dead stumps, what Chadwick calls a "hidden graveyard" (31). This graveyard of trees is concealed from public view. These radical environmentalists, by showing the great extent of the clearcutting to Concrete, want to persuade him to join and act in consort with them to protect their enlarged Self, the globe. With the help of monkeywrenchers, Concrete identifies with the trees and starts to feel the suffering of them; as a result, he comes to the understanding that human interference with the natural world is enormous, and the current condition of the world is deteriorating. Clearcuts, fires, chemical pollutants, ghost nets in the waters, the dumping of nuclear reactors in the ocean, and the harvest of animals for trade affect the world negatively to a great extent. So, to prevent all these and protect his enlarged Self, Concrete, still hesitant to become one of them, joins because he believes in the cause. Moreover, throughout the graphic novel, he becomes an increasingly radicalized environmentalist fighting against the loggers, who are the symbols of the system, devastating the forest. He believes that except for satisfying vital needs, humans do not have a right to decrease the richness and diversity of the natural world since these affect the well-being of all.

In *A Friend of the Earth*, Boyle narrates the condition of the world from Ty's future-present state during the years 2025 and 2026. This allows the reader to understand what

the state of the world would be if present anthropocentric attitudes were to continue. This future-present depicted by Ty is an apocalyptic world which has been transformed into a place that gives one the feeling of a "pizza oven that's just exploded" (327) or, worse than that, "Mount St. Helens after the blast" (338). In this hellish world of the future-present, "the elephants are gone, and the forest too" in Africa and other places. Ty bears witness to the extinction of many last remaining species which he describes as "extinction in a wheelbarrow" (278). These are the consequences of the lack of a sense of an ecological self which values richness and diversity among different life forms and, at the same time, the intrinsic value of human and nonhuman life which respects the importance of all forms of life irrespective of their usefulness for humans. Ty, Andrea, and Sierra's identification with the natural world, and their feeling of being at home in it, symbolizes their getting rid of the burden of the capitalistic society which dominates and leads to Ty's future-present world. Moreover, population growth has an unfavorable impact on the earth, as reflected in Ty's focus on the world population of 2025, eleven and a half billion, with sixty million living in California alone. From Ty's point of view, the reduction in human population will have a constructive influence on the life conditions. Ty believes the young think that the old should "die" and this should take place "quickly" in an "overpopulated, resource-stressed world" (329). In 2026, he wants to restore the past with "all the doomed and extinguished wildlife of America" along with his parents and daughter (330).

The radical environmentalist protagonists have a broader and deeper sense of self and when their larger Self is threatened, they act in self-defense. They identify with a first growth forest, a polluted river or land because they are part of their "sense-of-place" (Devall, "The Ecological Self" 120). This strong identification with living beings and a sense of suffering when they suffer is the sense of "felt nearness of different living beings" (Naess, "Equality, Sameness, and Rights" 224). The radical environmentalist characters in these novels are in defense of their larger Self, that is, in eco-defense. In "Eco-Defense," Abbey describes self-defense as an act "against attack [which] is one of the basic laws not only of human society but of life itself, not only of human life but to all life" (29). Since these monkeywrenchers have an enlarged sense of Self, they engage in acts of eco-defense through the use of monkeywrenching techniques. These

characters believe what Abbey states as the little amount of wilderness left in America being under the "assault" and "invasion" of "the international timber, mining, and beef industries" with "bulldozer, earth mover, chainsaw, and dynamite" (29). Thus, their sole target is the agents of the megamachine which are the machines used by the loggers and road builders, and never human beings. In *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Hayduke, Doc Sarvis, Seldom Seen Smith and Bonnie Abbzug take part in acts of eco-defense by pouring Karo syrup or sand into the crankcases of road building machines, cutting wires, and pulling up survey stakes in construction sites in the American southwest. In *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, Concrete, Roland Sanger, Stephen Beller, Terry Caloveglia and Penelope take action by spiking old growth trees, using a machine's own fuel to destroy it without harming any living being, organizing a Sasquatch hoax to attract people's attention to the clearcut in the forest, all in their eco-defense in the state of Washington. *A Friend of the Earth* depicts eco-warriors Ty, Andrea, Teo and Sierra acting in eco-defense to protect "what's left of [the wilderness]" in the late 1980s by blocking a road building site "in the middle of a concrete trench . . . in the middle of nowhere, wearing diapers" (41) in the Siskiyou. Ty's pouring sand into the crankcases of heavy machinery, and Sierra's three-year tree-sitting reflect their eco-defense via different types of direct action. All the radical environmentalist characters know what Abbey in *The Monkey Wrench Gang* states about their struggle with the megamachine in defense of their greater Self: "One way or another they were going to slow if not halt the advance of Technocracy, the growth of Growth, the spread of the ideology of the cancer cell" (225).

The radical environmentalist protagonist Ty in *A Friend of the Earth* goes one step further in eco-defense. What Ty is proposing from his apocalyptic future-present world, is land restoration[26] which, nearly three decades ago in the suburbs of Los Angeles, his neighbors opposed. In the mid-1990s, he transformed the small pool in front of his house into a garden, creating "a xeriscape of native plants" (300). For him, "[h]e was doing his part to restore at least a small swath of the ecosystem, even if nobody else was

[26] Land restoration is the process of restoring habitats to their uncultivated natural states through the reintroduction of native species of animals and plants that have been driven out or damaged.

doing theirs" (300). Restoring an ecosystem is a pivotal and exemplary act which should be put into practice by everyone for the protection of the ecosphere. The idea of conservation, as Curt Meine relates from Leopold in "Building 'The Land Ethic,'" springs from "a sense of individual responsibility for the general health of the land" (174). According to Scott Freeman, who takes part in the restoration of Tarboo Creek in the Puget Sound Basin of western Washington, Tarboo Creek is their place "to engage in work that can help heal a damaged landscape—a place for [them] to give back and, by so doing, increase in wisdom, happiness, and understanding" (187). The restoration of Tarboo Creek is directly related to the concept of an ecological self in which humans and nonhumans are interconnected, and the health of one being depends on the health of another. This process of elimination leads to the formation of a greater Self. The healing of Tarboo Creek means "saving salmon and trees" (187), which also means saving ecosystems, bringing life once again. The people who participate in the restoration of Tarboo Creek act on behalf of their ecological selves which they believe, as Snyder writes in "Ripples on the Surface," "—Nature not a book, but a *performance*" (*No Nature* 381). They take action in the healing process of an ecosystem, whereas monkeywrenchers try to prevent the destruction of an ecosystem. Boyle, in his formation of Ty's character, brings together a radical environmentalist who acts in the prevention of an ecological disaster as a monkeywrencher, as well as a character who starts restoring the ecosystem in which he lives.

In conclusion, as Naess argues, when there is no definite biological place to call home, humans feel at home wherever they are. Since the idea of home has evolved into "Home," the ecosphere or the planet, one's concept of community is expanded to include both living and nonliving beings. This sense of feeling connects one's identity with the identity of other entities and, as a result, one's being rests on the existence of others. Since the boundary between one's self and the others is erased, this leads to an extended Self which encompasses all. Moreover, this ecocentric view lends itself to a loving and caring lifestyle with a feeling of responsibility towards all the fellow members of the land. Abbey in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Chadwick in *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and Boyle in *A Friend of the Earth* create radical environmentalist characters who are prepared to act through their ecological selves to

defend a natural world which is a part of their enlarged Self, and Home. These monkeywrencher characters' drive for action is the motto "live and let live" which originates from the feeling of "I am the land, the land is me." They do so for their well-being, for the health of the planet, and for a livable future because they know that eco-defense is becoming one with the forest, the mountain, the desert, collectively, the Earth, one's greater Self.

WORKS CITED

Abbey, Edward. *Abbey's Road*. E.P. Dutton, 1979.

---. "Arizona: How Big is Big Enough." *One Life at a Time, Please*. Henry Holt and Company, 1988, pp. 20-4.

---. "A San Francisco Journal." *One Life at a Time, Please*. Henry Holt and Company, 1988, pp. 51-84.

---. "A Walk in the Desert Hills." *Beyond the Wall*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984, pp. 1-50.

---. "A Writer's Credo." *One Life at a Time, Please*. Henry Holt and Company, 1988, pp. 161-78.

---. *Beyond the Wall*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.

---. *Black Sun*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2014.

---. *Confessions of a Barbarian: Selections from the Journals of Edward Abbey, 1951-1989*. Little, Brown and Company, 1994.

---. *Çölde Tek Başına: Yabanıl Doğada Bir Mevsim* [*Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness*]. Translated by Ufuk Özdağ and Demet Sökezoğlu Çakır, BilgeSu Yayıncılık, 2018.

---. *Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness*. Ballantine Books, 1971.

---. "Down the River." *Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness*. Ballantine Books, 1971, pp. 188-245.

---. "Eco-Defense." *One Life at a Time, Please*. Henry Holt and Company, 1988, pp. 29-32.

---. *One Life at a Time, Please*. Henry Holt and Company, 1988.

---. "Shadows from the Big Woods." *The Journey Home: Some Words in Defense of the American West*. E. P. Dutton, 1977, pp. 223-6.

---. *The Journey Home: Some Words in Defense of the American West*. E. P. Dutton, 1977.

---. *The Monkey Wrench Gang*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2000.

---. "Water." *Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness*. Ballantine Books, 1971, pp. 141-60.

Ackerman, Diane. *The Human Age: The World Shaped by Us*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2014.

Angus, Ian, and Simon Butler. *Too Many People?: Population, Immigration, and the Environmental Crisis*. Haymarket Books, 2011.

Baier, K.. "The Meaning of Life: Christianity versus Science." *Philosophy for a New Generation*, edited by A. K. Bierman and James A. Gould, Macmillan, 1973, pp. 596-610.

Bergesen, Albert. "Eco-Alienation." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1995, pp. 110-26.

Berman, M. *The Re-enchantment of the World*. Bantam Books, 1984.

Berry, Thomas. "The Viable Human." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 8-18.

Birnbaum, Robert. "Author Interview: T.C. Boyle." *Identity Theory*, 2003, www.identitytheory.com/tc-boyle/. Accessed 19 Feb. 2019.

Bishop, Jr. James. *Epitaph for a Desert Anarchist: The Life and Legacy of Edward Abbey*. A Touchstone Book, 1995.

Boyle, T.C. *A Friend of the Earth*. Penguin Books, 2001.

Branch, Michael. "One Man's Terrorist: Reclaiming Edward Abbey for the Post-9/11 Era." *Abbey in America: A Philosopher's Legacy in a New Century*, edited by John A. Murray, U of New Mexico P, 2015, pp. 35-42.

Bredeson, Carmen. *Mount St. Helens Volcano: Violent Eruption*. Enslow Publishers, 2002.

Byron, George Gordon. *The Poetical Works of Lord Byron*. London, 1890.

Calahan, James M. *Edward Abbey: A Life*. The U of Arizona P, 2001.

Callicott, J. Baird. *In Defense of the Land Ethic: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*. State U of New York P, 1989.

Capra, Fritjof, and Pier Luigi Luisi. *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision*. Cambridge UP, 2015.

Carson, Rachel. "A Fable for Tomorrow." *Silent Spring*. Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1970, pp. 13-15.

---. *Silent Spring*. Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1970, pp. 13-15.

Cassuto, David N. "Waging Water: Hydrology vs. Mythology in *The Monkey Wrench Gang*." *ISLE*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1994, pp. 13-36.

Chadwick, Paul, and Moebius Charles Vess. *Concrete Celebrates Earth Day 1990*. Dark Horse Comics, 2008.

Chadwick, Paul. *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*. Dark Horse Books, 2006.

---. "Publishing History." *paulchadwick.net*. www.paulchadwick.net/a_path_strewn.html. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

---. "Think Like a Mountain." *paulchadwick.net*. www.paulchadwick.net/think_like_a_mountain.html. Accessed 18 Sept. 2015.

Commoner, Barry. *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man, and Technology*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.

"Community." *The Concise Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by George Ritzer, J. Michael Ryan, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, p. 74.

Cronon, William. *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. Hill and Wang, 1990.

Crutzen, Paul J. "Geology of Mankind." *Nature: International Journal of Science*, vol. 415, no. 6867, p. 23. *nature.com*, doi: 10.1038/415023a. Accessed 7 Jan. 2016.

Deffenbaugh, Daniel G. "Toward Thinking Like a Mountain: The Evolution of an Ecological Conscience." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 78, no. 2, 1995, pp. 239-61.

Demarco, Donald. *The Anesthetic Society*. Christendom Pr., 1982.

Descartes, René. "Animals are Machines." *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence*, edited by S. J. Armstrong and R. G. Botzler, McGraw-Hill, 1993, pp. 281-85.

Devall, Bill. "Deep Ecology and Radical Environmentalism." *American Environmentalism: The U.S. Environmental Movement, 1970-1990*, edited by Riley E. Dunlap and Angela G. Mertig, Taylor & Francis, 1992, pp. 51-61.

---. *Simple in Means, Rich in Ends: Practising Deep Ecology*. Gibbs Smith, 1988.

---. "The Deep Ecology Movement." *Natural Resources Journal*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1980, pp. 299-322.

---. "The Ecological Self." *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue, North Atlantic Books, 1995, pp. 101-23.

Devall, Bill, and George Sessions. *Deep Ecology: Living As If Nature Mattered*. Gibbs M. Smith, Inc., 1985.

Diehm, Christian. "Arne Naess, Val Plumwood, and Deep Ecological Subjectivity: A Contribution to the 'Deep Ecology-Ecofeminism Debate.'" *Ethics and the Environment*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2002, pp. 24-38.

Drake, Brian Allen. *Loving Nature, Fearing the State: Environmentalism and Antigovernment Politics Before Reagan*. U of Washington P, 2013.

Drengson, Alan. “In Praise of Ecosophy.” *Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1990, pp. 101-03.

---. “Shifting Paradigms: From Technocrat to Planetary Person.” *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue, North Atlantic Books, 1995, pp. 74-100.

Ehrenfeld, David. *The Arrogance of Humanism*. Oxford UP, 1981.

Ehrlich, Paul R. *The Population Bomb*. Ballantine Books, Inc., 1971.

Fixico, Donald L. “The Struggle for Our Homes: Indian and White Values and Tribal Lands.” *Defending Mother Earth: Native American Perspectives on Environmental Justice*, edited by Jace Weaver, Orbis Books, 1997, pp. 29-46.

Forbes, Jack D. *Columbus and Other Cannibals: The Wético Disease of Exploitation, Imperialism, and Terrorism*. Seven Stories Press, 2008.

Foreman, Dave. *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*. Harmony Books, 1991.

Foreman, Dave, and Bill Haywood, editors. *Ecodefense: A Fieldguide to Monkeywrenching*. A Ned Ludd Book. 1987.

Fox, Warwick. “Deep Ecology: A New Philosophy of Our Time.” *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy*, edited by Nina Witozszek and Andrew Brennan, Rowman and Littlefield, 1999, pp. 153-65.

---. *Toward a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism*. A Resurgence Book, 1995.

Freeman, Scott. *Saving Tarboo Creek: One Family’s Quest to Heal the Land*. Timber Press, 2018.

Freya, Matthews. “Conservation and Self-realization: A Deep Ecology Perspective.” *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue, North Atlantic Books, 1995, pp. 124-35.

Friedman, Thomas L. *Hot, Flat, and Crowded: Why We Need a Green Revolution—and How It Can Renew America*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.

Fromm, Erich. "Selfishness, Self-Love, and Self-interest." The *Self: Explorations in Personal Growth*, edited by Clark E. Mustakes, Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1956, pp. 58-69.

Gessner, David. *All the Wild That Remains: Edward Abbey, Wallace Stegner and the American West*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2015.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Politics of Climate Change*. Blackwell Publishers, 1991.

Gleason, Paul. *Understanding T.C. Boyle*. The U of South Carolina P, 2009.

Glück, Louise. *Poems 1962-2012*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012.

Gottlieb, Alan. "Unedited Transcrip of Interview with Coraghessan Boyle." *tcboyle.net*. www.tcboyle.net/gottlieb.html. Accessed 18 Sept. 2015.

Hobbs, Frank, and Nicole Stoops. *Demographic Trends in the 20th Century: Census 2000 Special Reports*. BiblioGov, 2012.

Hogan, Linda. *Walk Gently Upon the Earth*. Lulu.com, 2009.

Jeffers, Robinson. *The Selected Poetry of Robinson Jeffers*. Stanford UP, 2002.

Jensen, Derrick, and Aric McBay. *What We Leave Behind*. Seven Stories Press, 2009.

Jensen, Derrick. *Endgame: Resistance Volume I*. Seven Stories Press, 2006.

---. *Endgame: Resistance Volume II*. Seven Stories Press, 2006.

---. Foreword. *Diary of an Eco-Outlaw*, by Diane Wilson, Chelsea Green Publishing, 2011, pp. ix-xi.

---. Preface. *Deep Green Resistance: Strategy to Save the Planet*, by Aric McBay, Lierre Keith, Jensen, Seven Stories Publishing, 2011, pp. 11-17.

Jones, Steven E. *Against Technology: From the Luddites to Neo-Luddism*. Routledge, 2006.

Knott, John R. *Imagining Wild America*. The U of Michigan P. 2002.

Langlais, Richard. "Living in the World: Mountain Humility, Great Humility." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 195-203.

Lasch, Christopher. *The Minimal Self: Psychic Survival in Troubled Times*. Picador Publishing, 1984.

Leiss, William. *The Domination of Nature*. George Braziller, Inc., 1972.

Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. Oxford UP, 1968.

---. *Bir Kum Yöresi Almanağı* [*A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*]. Translated by Ufuk Özdağ, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013.

---. "The Land Ethic." *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. Oxford UP, 1968, pp. 201-26.

---. "Thinking like a Mountain." *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. Oxford UP, 1968, pp. 129-33.

---. "Wilderness as a Form of Land Use." *The River of the Mother of God: And Other Essays*, edited by Susan L. Flader and J. Baird Callicott, The U of Wisconsin P, 1991, pp. 134-42.

Lindholt, Paul. *Explorations in Ecocriticism: Advocacy, Bioregionalism, and Visual Design*. Lexington Books, 2015.

---. "Rage against the Machine: Edward Abbey and Neo-Luddite Thought." *Coyote in the Maze: Tracking Edward Abbey in a World of Words*, edited by Peter Quigley, The U of Utah P, 1998, pp. 106-18.

List, Peter C. *Radical Environmentalism: Philosophy and Tactics*. Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1993.

Loeffler, Jack. *Adventures with Ed: A Portrait of Abbey*. U of New Mexico P, 2003.

---. *Headed Upstream: Interviews with Iconoclasts*. Harbinger House, 1989.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Harvard UP, 1961.

"Making a Difference through Appeals and Lawsuits." *Save America's Forests Fund: Citizen Action Guide*. www.saveamericasforests.org/pages/forestsavingfpt.htm. Accessed 18 Jan. 2019.

Manes, Christopher. *Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization*. Little Brown and Company, 1990.

---. "Nature and Silence." *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, The U of Georgia P, 1996, pp. 15-29.

Marsh, George P. *Man and Nature or, Physical Geography as Modified by Human Action*. 1864. *Google Books*. books.google.com/. Accessed 25 Apr. 2016.

Marszalek, John F. *Dictionary of American History*, edited by Stanley I. Kutler, 3rd ed., vol. 7, Charles Scribner's Sons, 2003, pp. 345-46.

Mason, Jim. *An Unnatural Order: The Roots of Our Destruction of Nature*. Lantern Books, 2005.

Matthews, Freya. "Conservation and Self-Realization: A Deep Ecology Perspective." *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue, North Atlantic Books, 1995, pp. 124-35.

Mayer, Sylvia. "American Environmentalism and Encounters with the Abject: T. Coraghessan Boyle's *A Friend of the Earth*." *The Abject of Desire: The Aestheticization of the Unaesthetic in Contemporary Literature and Culture*, edited by Konstanze Kutzbach and Monika Mueller, Rodopi, 2007, pp. 221-34.

McBay, Aric, et al. *Deep Green Resistance: Strategy to Save the Planet*. Seven Stories Press, 2011.

McGrath, Ann, and Mary Ann Jebb. *Long History, Deep Time: Deepening Histories of Place*. ANU Press, 2015.

McHarg, Ian L. "Values, Process, and Form." *The Ecological Conscience: Values for Survival*, edited by Robert Disch, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970, pp. 21-36.

McKibben, Bill. *The End of Nature*. Random House, 2006.

McLaughlin, Andrew. "For a Radical Ecocentrism." *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue, North Atlantic Books, 1995, pp. 257-80.

---. *Regarding Nature: Industrialism and Deep Ecology*. State U of New York P, 1993.

McLuhan, T.C. *Touch the Earth: A Self-Portrait of Indian Existence*. Alden Press Limited, 1996.

Meadows, Donella. "Systems Paradigm." *Co-Evolution Quarterly*, no. 34, 1982, p. 101.

Meeker, Joseph W. "Toward a New Natural Philosophy." *Ecological Consciousness: Essays from the Earthday X Colloquium*, edited by Robert C. Schultz and J. Donald Hughes, UP of America, 1981, pp. 251-64.

Mehnert, Antonia. *Climate Change Fictions: Representations of Global Warming in American Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Meine, Curt. "Building 'The Land Ethic.'" *Companion to A Sand County Almanac*, edited by Baird Callicott, The U of Wisconsin P, 1987, pp. 172-85.

Merchant, Carolyn. *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World*. Routledge, 1992.

---. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*. Harper San Francisco, 1989.

Momaday, N. Scott. *Conversations with N. Scott Momaday*, edited by Matthias Schubnell, UP of Mississipi, 1997.

---. *In the Presence of the Sun: Stories and Poems, 1961-1991*. St. Martin's Press, 1992.

---. *The Names: A Memoir*. The U of Arizona P. 1976.

Muir, John. "Cedar Keys." *sierraclub.org*. https://vault.sierraclub.org/john_muir_exhibit/writings/a_thousand_mile_walk_to_the_gulf/chapter_6.aspx. Accessed 25 June 2019.

---. "The Calypso Borealis." *sierraclub.org*. https://vault.sierraclub.org/john_muir_exhibit/writings/calypso_borealis_by_muir.aspx. Accessed 12 Mar. 2019.

---. "The Forests of the Yosemite Park." *Nature Writings*. The Library of America, 1997, pp. 767-89.

---. *The Mountains of California*. The Modern Library of New York, 2001.

Mumford, Lewis. *Technics and Human Development*. Mariner Books, 1971.

---. *The City in History*. Mariner Books, 1968.

---. *The Pentagon of Power*. Columbia UP, 1970.

Murray, Thomas E. *The American Midwest: An Interpretive Encyclopedia*, edited by Andrew R. L. Cayton, Richard Sisson, Chris Zacher, Indiana UP, 2007, pp. 303-04.

Naess, Arne. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Translated and edited by David Rothenberg, Cambridge UP, 1989.

---. "Ecosophy and Gestalt Ontology." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 240-45.

---. "Equality, Sameness, and Rights." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 222-24.

---. "Identification as a Source of Deep Ecological Attitudes." *Radical Environmentalism: Philosophy and Tactics*, edited by Peter C. List, Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1993, pp. 24-37.

---. *Life's Philosophy: Reason and Feeling in a Deeper World*. The U. of Georgia P., 2002.

---. "Metaphysics of the Treeline." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 246-48.

---. "Self-realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 225-39.

---. "The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 64-84.

---. "The Deep Ecology 'Eight Points' Revisited." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 213-21.

---. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary." *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue. North Atlantic Books, 1995, pp. 3-12.

Naess, Arne, and George Sessions. "Platform Principles of the Deep Ecology Movement." *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology*, edited by Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue, North Atlantic Books, 1995, pp. 49-53.

Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. Yale UP, 1982.

National Intelligence Council, U.S. *Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World*. Cosimo Reports, 2010.

Norton, B. G. *Sustainability: A Philosophy of Adaptive Ecosystem Management*. U of Chicago P. 2005.

Oelschlaeger, Max. *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology*. Yale UP, 1991.

O'Riordan, T. *Environmentalism*. Pion Limited, 1976.

Özdağ, Ufuk. *Edebiyat ve Toprak Etiği: Amerikan Doğa Yazınında Leopold'cu Düşünce* [*Literature and Land Ethic: Leopoldian Thought in American Nature Writing*]. Ürün Yayınları, 2005.

---. "Türkçe Baskı İçin Sunuş: Edward Abbey'den Bir Başyapıt" [Introduction for the Turkish Edition: A Masterpiece by Edward Abbey]. *Çölde Tek Başına: Yabanıl Doğada Bir Mevsim*. Translated by Ufuk Özdağ and Demet Sökezoğlu Çakır [*Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness*]. BilgeSu Yayıncılık, 2018, pp. 13-23.

Paehlke, Robert C. *Environmentalism and the Future of Progressive Politics*. Yale UP. 1989.

Pearce, Fred. *The Coming Population Crash: And Our Planet's Surprising Future*. Beacon Press, 2010.

Philippon, Daniel J. "Edward Abbey's Remarks at the Cracking of Glen Canyon Dam." *ISLE*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2004, pp. 161-66.

Pilkington, Tom. "Edward Abbey: Western Philosopher, or How to be a 'Happy Hopi Hippie.'" *Western American Literature*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1974, pp. 17-31.

Pirages, Dennis, and Paul Ehrlich. *Ark II; Social Response to Environmental Imperatives*. Viking Press, 1974.

Plumwood, Val. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. Routledge. 1993.

---. "Nature, Self, and Gender: Feminism, Environmental Philosophy, and the Critique of Rationalism." *Hypatia*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1991, pp. 3-27.

Ponting, Clive. *A New Green History of the World: The Environment and the Collapse of Great Civilizations*. Vintage, 2007.

Public Policy Institute of California. *California 2025: Planning for a Better Future*, 26 May 2019, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_113BKR.pdf.

Quigley, Peter. *Coyote in the Maze: Tracking Edward Abbey in a World of Words*. The U of Utah P, 1998.

Roland, Ann. *Reader of the Purple Sage: Essays on Western Writers and Environmental Literature*. U of Nevada P, 2003.

---. *The New West of Edward Abbey*. U of Nevada P, 2000.

Rolston III, Holmes. *A New Environmental Ethics: The Next Millenium for Life on Earth*. Routledge, 2012.

Roselle, Mike, and Josh Mahan. *Tree Spiker: From Earth First! to Lowbagging: My Struggles in Radical Environmental Action*. St. Martin's Press, 2009.

Rothenberg, David. Introduction. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, by Arne Naess, Translated and edited by Rothenberg, Cambridge UP, 1989.

---. "Who is the Lone Ranger? Edward Abbey as Philosopher." *Coyote in the Maze: Tracking Edward Abbey in a World of Words*, edited by Peter Quigley, The U of Utah P, 1998, pp. 74-87.

Scarce, Rik. *Eco-Warriors: Understanding the Radical Environmental Movement*. Left Coast Press Inc., 2006.

Seed, John. "Anthropocentrism." *Deep Ecology: Living As If Nature Mattered*, edited by Bill Devall and George Sessions, Peregrine Smith Books, 1985, pp. 243-46.

---. Introduction. *Thinking Like a Mountain: Towards a Council of All Beings*, edited by Seed, Joanna Macy, Pat Fleming and Arne Naess, New Catalyst Books, 2007, pp. 5-17.

---. "Invocation: We Ask for the Presence of the Spirit of Gaia." *Thinking Like a Mountain: Towards a Council of All Beings*, edited by Seed, Joanna Macy, Pat Fleming and Arne Naess, New Catalyst Books, 2007, pp. 2-4.

Sessions, George. "Ecocentrism and the Anthropocentric Detour." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New*

Environmentalism, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala Publications, Inc., 1995, pp. 156-83.

---. Introduction. *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 97-103.

Shelton, Richard. *Selected Poems, 1969-1981*. U of Pittsburgh P, 1982.

Shepard, Paul. *Coming Home to the Pleistocene*. Island Press, 1998.

---. "Ecology and Man—A Viewpoint." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 131-40.

---. *The Tender Carnivore and the Sacred Game*. The U of Georgia P, 1998.

Shevory, Thomas C. "Monkeywrenching: Practice in Search of a Theory." *Environmental Crime and Criminality: Theoretical and Practical Issues*, edited by Sally M. Edwards, Terry D. Edwards and Charles B. Fields. Garland Publishing, Inc., 1996, pp. 184-204.

Snyder, Gary. "Four Changes." *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, edited by George Sessions, Shambhala, 1995, pp. 141-50.

---. *No Nature: New and Selected Poems*. Pantheon Books, 1992.

---. *The Practice of the Wild: Essays by Gary Snyder*. North Point Press, 1990.

---. *Turtle Island*. New Directions Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Speece, Darren Frederick. *Defending Giants: The Redwood Wars and the Transformation of American Environmental Politics*. U of Washington P, 2017.

Sumner, David Thomas. "The Limits of Violence: People and Property in Edward Abbey's 'Monkeywrenching' Novels." *Ecozon@*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2013, pp. 166-181, http://ecozona.eu/article/viewFile/535/576. Accessed 21 Jun. 2017.

Thomis, Malcolm I. *The Luddites: Machine-Breaking in Regency England*. Archon Books, 1970.

Thoreau, Henry David. *Civil Disobedience and Other Essays*. Dover Publications, Inc., 1993.

---. *Nature's Panorama: Thoreau on the Seasons*, edited by Roland A. Bosco, U of Massachusetts P, 2005.

---. "Walking." *The Portable Thoreau*, edited by Carl Bode, The Viking Press, 1970.

Thorpe, Grace. "Our Homes are not Dumps: Creating Nuclear-Free Zones." *Defending Mother Earth: Native American Perspectives on Environmental Justice*, edited by Jace Weaver, Orbis Books, 1997, pp. 47-58.

Tobias, Michael. *World War III: Population and the Biosphere at the End of the Millennium*. Bear & Company Publishing, 1994.

Trexler, Adam. *Anthropocene Fictions: The Novel in a Time of Climate Change.* U of Virginia P, 2015.

Ulin, David L. "The Science of Sex: T.C. Boyle on His *Inner Circle*, Alfred Kinsey and the Fine Line between Fact and Fiction." *tcboyle.com*. 3 Sep. 2004, www.tcboyle.com/author/laweekly.html. Accessed 5 June 2007.

United Nations. *World Population to 2300*. United Nations Publications, 2004.

van Wyck, Peter C. *Primitives in the Wilderness: Deep Ecology and the Missing Human Subject*. State U of New York P, 1997.

Vaughan, Frances. *The Inward Arc*. Shambhala, 1986.

Vince, Gaia. *Adventures in the Anthropocene: A Journey to the Heart of the Planet We Made*. Vintage, 2014.

Wachtel, Paul. *The Poverty of Affluence*. The Free Press, 1983.

Wade, John. "Radical Environmentalism: Is There Any Other Kind?" *Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth*, edited by Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II, AK Press, 2006, pp. 280-83.

Weaver, Jace, editor. *Defending Mother Earth: Native American Perspectives on Environmental Justice*. Orbis Books, 1996.

Wenz, Peter. *Environmental Ethics Today*. Oxford UP, 2001.

Wild, Peter. *The Opal Desert: Explorations of Fantasy and Reality in the American Southwest*. U of Texas P, 1999.

Wilson, Diane. *Diary of an Eco-Outlaw: An Unreasonable Woman Breaks the Law for Mother Earth*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2011.

Wilson, Edward O. *The Diversity of Life*. The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1992.

Winner, Langdon. *Autonomous Technology*. MIT Press, 1977.

Wohlleben, Peter. *The Hidden Life of Trees: What They Feel, How They Communicate*. Harper Collins Publishers, 2016.

Wood, David, *The Step Back: Ethics and Politics After Deconstruction*. SUNY P., 2005.

Woodhouse, Keith Makoto. *The Ecocentrists: A History of Radical Environmentalism*. Columbia UP, 2018.

Worster, Donald. *Nature's Economy: The Roots of Ecology*. Sierra Club Books, 1977.

Wright Christopher, and Daniel Nyberg. *Climate Change, Capitalism, and Corporations: Processes of Creative Self-Destruction*. Cambridge UP, 2016.

APPENDIX 1. ORIGINALITY REPORT

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
MASTER'S THESIS ORIGINALITY REPORT

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
AMERICAN CULTURE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

Date: 12/07/2019

Thesis Title: American Radical Environmental Fiction: Deep Ecology and Eco-Defense in Edward Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Paul Chadwick's *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and T.C. Boyle's *A Friend of the Earth*

According to the originality report obtained by myself/my thesis advisor by using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software and by applying the filtering options checked below on 12/07/2019 for the total of 134 pages including the a) Title Page, b) Introduction, c) Main Chapters, and d) Conclusion sections of my thesis entitled as above, the similarity index of my thesis is 7 %.

Filtering options applied:

1. Approval and Decleration sections excluded
2. Bibliography/Works Cited excluded
3. Quotes excluded
4. Match size up to 5 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

12/07/2019
Date and Signature

Name Surname: Mustafa Eray Eren
Student No: N11128254
Department: American Culture and Literature
Program: American Culture and Literature

ADVISOR APPROVAL

APPROVED.

Prof. Dr. Ufuk Özdağ

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORİJİNALLİK RAPORU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
AMERİKAN KÜLTÜRÜ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 12/07/2019

Tez Başlığı: Amerikan Radikal Çevreci Kurgusal Yazını: Edward Abbey'nin *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Paul Chadwick'in *Concrete: Think like a Mountain* ve T.C. Boyle'ın *A Friend of the Earth* İsimli Eserlerinde Derin Ekoloji ve Eko-Savunma

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 134 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 12/07/2019 tarihinde şahsım/tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda işaretlenmiş filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 7 'dir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:
1- Kabul/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç
2- Kaynakça hariç
3- Alıntılar hariç
4- 5 kelimeden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

12/07/2019
Tarih ve İmza

Adı Soyadı: Mustafa Eray Eren
Öğrenci No: N11128254
Anabilim Dalı: Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı
Programı: Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı

DANIŞMAN ONAYI

UYGUNDUR.

Prof. Dr. Ufuk Özdağ

APPENDIX 2. ETHICS BOARD WAIVER FORM

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ETHICS COMMISSION FORM FOR THESIS

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
AMERICAN CULTURE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

Date: 12/07/2019

Thesis Title: American Radical Environmental Fiction: Deep Ecology and Eco-Defense in Edward Abbey's *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Paul Chadwick's *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, and T.C. Boyle's *A Friend of the Earth*

My thesis work related to the title above:

1. Does not perform experimentation on animals or people.
2. Does not necessitate the use of biological material (blood, urine, biological fluids and samples, etc.).
3. Does not involve any interference of the body's integrity.
4. Is not based on observational and descriptive research (survey, interview, measures/scales, data scanning, system-model development).

I declare, I have carefully read Hacettepe University's Ethics Regulations and the Commission's Guidelines, and in order to proceed with my thesis according to these regulations I do not have to get permission from the Ethics Board/Commission for anything; in any infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility and I declare that all the information I have provided is true.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Date and Signature (12/07/2019)

Name Surname:	Mustafa Eray Eren
Student No:	N11128254
Department:	American Culture and Literature
Program:	American Culture and Literature
Status:	☒ MA ☐ Ph.D. ☐ Combined MA/ Ph.D.

ADVISER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL

Prof. Dr. Ufuk Özdağ

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ETİK KOMİSYON MUAFİYETİ FORMU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
AMERİKAN KÜLTÜRÜ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 12/07/2019

Tez Başlığı: Amerikan Radikal Çevreci Kurgusal Yazını: Edward Abbey'nin *The Monkey Wrench Gang*, Paul Chadwick'in *Concrete: Think like a Mountain*, T.C. Boyle'ın *A Friend of the Earth* İsimli Eserlerinde Derin Ekoloji ve Eko-Savunma

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmam:

1. İnsan ve hayvan üzerinde deney niteliği taşımamaktadır,
2. Biyolojik materyal (kan, idrar vb. biyolojik sıvılar ve numuneler) kullanılmasını gerektirmemektedir.
3. Beden bütünlüğüne müdahale içermemektedir.
4. Gözlemsel ve betimsel araştırma (anket, mülakat, ölçek/skala çalışmaları, dosya taramaları, veri kaynakları taraması, sistem-model geliştirme çalışmaları) niteliğinde değildir.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Etik Kurullar ve Komisyonlarının Yönergelerini inceledim ve bunlara göre tez çalışmamın yürütülebilmesi için herhangi bir Etik Kurul/Komisyon'dan izin alınmasına gerek olmadığını; aksi durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Tarih ve İmza (12/07/2019)

Adı Soyadı:	Mustafa Eray Eren
Öğrenci No:	N11128254
Anabilim Dalı:	Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı
Programı:	Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı
Statüsü:	☒ Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐ Bütünleşik Doktora

DANIŞMAN GÖRÜŞÜ VE ONAYI

Prof. Dr. Ufuk Özdağ

Detaylı Bilgi: http://www.sosyalbilimler.hacettepe.edu.tr
Telefon: 0-312-2976860 **Faks:** 0-3122992147 **E-posta:** sosyalbilimler@hacettepe.edu.tr