RHODES, DANIEL, Ph.D. An Anarchist Psychotherapy: Ecopsychology and a Pedagogy of Life. (2008)
Directed by Glenn M. Hudak. 205 pp.

Drawing from my background in education and psychotherapy, I reflect on how both of these fields are heavily influenced by developmental and behavioral psychology. Today's psychological model is influenced by a western scientific theory that is reductionist and views the natural world and those in it as commodities to be dissected, segmented and studied. I trace the evolution of this western scientific model and reflect on how it has shaped contemporary psychology. Once psychology has adopted this western scientific model as the only model, it demands that both education and psychotherapy view those with whom they work as commodities. This model is hierarchical, patriarchal and linear in its approach, which rejects the individual's needs and desires to be independent and autonomous.

During this process I intimate an alternative scientific model. The scientific model that I postulate is more inclusive and views the natural world and those living in it as organic and interconnected. I draw from an array of philosophical ideas ranging from Eastern philosophies such as Taoism and Buddhism to western philosophical ideas such as anarchism and Marxism. Anarchism and Marxism strongly critique western capitalist endeavors. Both are models of critical theory that challenge the hierarchical aspects of western psychology. I also look at ideas of ecofeminism and its critique of Neoliberalism and globalization, which is promoted by the western scientific model as a way to support the exploitation of Third World countries by transnational corporations and

agribusinesses. Ecofeminism is a strong critic of the patriarchal structure of western science and western psychology. I will then reflect on the ideas of religion and spirituality that are more ecological and "engaging;" or what I call ecospirituality. This ecospirituality places strong emphasis on the ideas of contemplation, dialogue and community building, which provides an alternative to the linear thinking in western psychology and science.

Ultimately psychotherapy and education need to become an intellectual endeavor and educators and psychotherapists need to become "cultural workers." Through this process there will be an embracing of radical democracy, communalism and ecological consciousness. In this dissertation I suggest that western psychology should shift from its developmental and behavioral influences with its reliance on a western reductionist scientific view to what Theodore Roszak calls an ecopsychology. This ecopsychology is inclusive, and therefore views the individual and the natural world as more than a commodity and becomes a pedagogy of life.

AN ANARCHIST PSYCHOTHERAPY:

ECOPSYCHOLOGY AND A

PEDAGOGY OF LIFE

by

Daniel Rhodes

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2008

Approved by

_____
Committee Chair

To

Cecil, Carolyn,
Betty & Laura

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

_____

_____

_____

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to begin by acknowledging my committee chair and advisor, Dr. Glenn Hudak. Dr. Hudak has become a dear friend and mentor and provided a great amount of support for me during this endeavor. I also want to thank Dr. Leila Villaverde, committee member and advisor for my graduate certificate in Women and Gender Studies, for her support in both my graduate certificate and my dissertation. I also could not have done this without the support and assistance of my other committee members, Dr. Bill Hamilton, Dr. Svi Shapiro and Dr. Charles P. Gause, all of whom brought very unique perspective to both my studies and my work on this dissertation. To all of them I give many bows and many thanks.

I also want to thank my very supportive family. My life partner Laura Mrosla who has supported me through all my endeavors (including my periodic stays at Buddhist temples). To my uncle Cecil Allen, I only wish he could be here to share this with me. I want to thank my aunt Carolyn Allen and my mother Betty Rhodes. I also want to acknowledge my brother Randy Williams, who has read this dissertation over numerous times as well as other writings and has given great feedback and suggestions throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Journey

I reflect on the fact that while I now sit down and begin this dissertation I have spent most of my adult life in some form of higher education, either in formal educational institutions or by my own personal quest. There is a lot of irony in this realization considering I was not regarded as a stellar student during my primary and secondary school years. Since I was perceived as a "lost cause" by our public educational system, I was easily passed along in school, mainly sitting in the back of class with a book, usually Kurt Vonnegut or science fiction. This reading became my own form of self education, gravitating towards those stories or ideas that I found fascinating and would transport me away from the oppressive confines of a small southern town. Since there was no standardized testing, like the end of grade tests, I was able to do the bare minimum needed to pass my classes, or be passed along without much difficulty. I was very crafty and subversive during these years and this stealthy gamesmanship helped me avoid getting in trouble or being labeled as a "special needs" child and placed in remedial classrooms. With all of this subversion and avoidance of being inculcated into this institutional educational system I managed to graduate from high school with a 1.86 GPA and a future that seemed wide open, or as wide open as can be for a person that graduated high school with such a low GPA.

Reflecting on this high school experience I am reminded of a passage I read in Henry Giroux's (2001) book Theory and Resistance in Education in which he talks about "resistance theories" (p. 246). Giroux (2001) claims that the most common type of resistance in educational settings are by those who he terms as "showy rebels," individuals who resist the educational systems by being boisterous, defiant, and oppositional (p. 246). Giroux laments the fact that resistance theories ignore those other resistant students who do not exhibit these showy rebel characteristics, these are students I would call "shadow rebels." For them, Giroux (2001) notes:

> Some students go through the daily routines of schooling by minimizing their participation in school practices while simultaneously displaying outward conformity to the ideology of the school. That is, these students opt for modes of resistance that are quietly subversive in the most immediate sense, but potentially politically progressive in the long run. (p. 246).

I, of course, had no clue that I was being "politically progressive" at the time. I was simply trying to survive in what I perceived as an oppressive school system where I didn't "fit in." It was also during this time that I was also a victim of an even more insidious system of social control: The media during the 1980s, something that I will elaborate on a little later.

Part of the reason I was so resistant to the public education that was foisted upon me was because I viewed it as part of a larger overall oppressive system, and that was the small southern town mentality. My aunt and uncle had assumed the role of my parents and settled in this small town after spending a good portion of their adult life traveling and working around the United States. They came to this small community with a certain

cosmopolitan view that was unusual in these small southern areas. They instilled in me a view of the world that was larger than this town and broader than the narrow views of the inhabitants of the community. This broader perspective of course immediately separated me from my peers and as I grew older I was increasingly viewed as strange and a misfit. I felt alienated and disenfranchised from my teachers as well, most of whom shared the narrow and provincial outlook of the community. An example of their parochial and narrow outlook was an experience I had in third grade when my English teacher informed the class we would be using “thee” along with “the” since “thee” was in the Bible and for that reason we will be using it also. This, mind you, was a public school in the 1970s. I also attribute educational styles such as this as laying the foundation of a conflicted view of education and reality that would follow me up to the time I graduated high school.

As I barely progressed academically during my educational years and I increasingly became distant from both peers and teachers, isolating myself through reading and what was becoming a dominant force of the time, movies and the media which included a very sparse version of cable network in relation to today standards. Part of the problem I was having during these young years was that most of the people I knew in this small community were unable to visualize the world beyond the small town and anything outside of this community was regarded with suspicion. My aunt and uncle had lived around the country so they viewed the world as an interesting place and wanted to show me other parts of the country which they did through periodic travel. The books that I read while growing up were also giving me an escape from the oppressiveness of a small town with racist tendencies (the Klan was still active in this community in the

1970s and early 1980s and would periodically march through downtown). Kwame Appiah reflects on this very notion of this small town mentality that would allow groups like the Klan to still march. He focuses on Eric Rudolph, the individual who placed a pipe bomb in a park during the 1996 Atlanta Olympics. As Appiah (2006) notes:

> As news reports suggest, what's especially troubling is the amount of support that Rudolph seems to have enjoyed in places like Murphy, North Carolina, where he was finally apprehended. Many of its residents openly identified with Rudolph; during police manhunt, bumper stickers and T-shirts with the slogan "Rudolph's a Christian and I'm a Christian and he dedicated his life to fighting abortion," a young woman from Murphy, a mother of four, told a *New York Times* reporter. "Those are our values. These are our woods. I don't see what he did as a terrorist act" (p. 142).

So as you can see the addition of movies and the media gave me the visual outlet that allowed escape from the doldrums of this community. The irony of this fact was that during the 1980s movies were dominated by an extreme form of patriotism that was primarily being used to manipulate the population to buy into a perverted form of Reagan democracy and more importantly a contemporary form or imperialism.

Mind you I was skinny, weak and strange. The images I was inundated with during the 1980s were Rambo (Sylvester Stallone), and Schwarzenegger (in movies such as *Commando*, 1985), and other movies such as *Top Gun* (1986). This *was* masculinity and created a phenomenon that Douglas Kellner (1995) called the "Rambo effect" (p. 62). *First Blood*, the first installment of the Rambo movies, came out in 1982, when I was a callow fourteen years old. For any adolescent, this is an age of self-doubt, insecurity and awkwardness but for me I had all these feelings and the addition of being isolated and adrift in this community. I had been greatly influenced by the movie *Gandhi* (1982)

when it came out in 1980 and actually had read some of Gandhi's works while growing up. Gandhi however was a million miles away both in time and place, much less ideologically to the mindset of the small southern town in the early and mid 1980s. Kindness in this small southern town was equated with weakness by both boys and girls with whom I was growing up with (not to mention adults who psychically were not that much more mature). I felt that my actual survival in this community would have to be based on something that was perceived as a lot more masculine, and then enters Rambo. As Kellner (1995) notes, Rambo and these other so called mythic figures are seen as "victims of…the government and society at large" (p. 65). This victimization figured in very well with the disenfranchisement that I was feeling at the time by both the government (i.e. school system) and the society in which I was growing up (i.e. small town).

You can see this victimization in the beginning of the first *Rambo* (1982) movie where Rambo enters a small community which had very similar characteristics to the one in which I was living. Here comes the mythic figure, war hero, outcast, and walking wanderer; almost spiritual in a way, reminiscent of the 17th Century Japanese Zen poet Basho and his travels that he wrote about in Narrow Road to a Far Province (1974),

A mound of summer grass:
Are warriors' heroic deeds
Only dreams that pass?

His poem goes on to reflect, "What a fleeting thing is military glory." (p. 57). Rambo wanders into this small town and is immediately harassed and abused by the local law

enforcement agency. After being arrested and mistreated, he manages to escape and instead of leaving the town decides to fight against the victimizing “oppressive authority and power” (Kellner, 1995, p. 64). So here comes the twisted form of fascist propaganda; Rambo, a product of militarism and structure, now fights against oppressive power structures. The local law enforcement and National Guard are portrayed as bumbling idiots, and it is Rambo’s great discipline, instilled by the military, that allows him to be successful. It is not that Rambo was different than those that were victimizing him, just better trained by the same system.

I, of course, just saw a man entering a small town that was being abused and disenfranchised. Here was a worldly man who viewed the world as greater than himself. This small town viewed him as strange and an outcast; I immediately identified with this in my own life. This character became the modern version of myth. *Star Wars* (1977) played a great role in the realm of myth for youth of my generation, but it was couched in stellar fantasy and therefore unattainable. Rambo was the here and now and contained all the elements of great myth, of the hero’s journey. As Joseph Campbell (1949) notes about the hero’s journey and return he is “frequently unrecognized and disdained. He and/or the world in which he finds himself suffers from a symbolic deficiency” (p. 37).

This movie was followed by a string of similar movies like it. Vietnam vet movies, military hero movies, all with this notion of fighting for a cause, for something just. As Kellner (1995) notes, the irony is that these movies conscripted the ideology of the 1960s, of “individualism as social revolt and non-conformity”, and “about the triumph of the individual over the system” (p. 65). I would argue that Rambo was not as

much personifying the hippie of the 1960s; he was personifying the revolutionary of the late 50s to early 70s. He looked more like Che Guevara than a typical hippie of the 60s and Rambo stumbling into this small community just bolsters this image. The individuals in this small community were very much like the ones in my small town, narrow minded. Rambo was worldly, he was Frantz Fanon and Che Guevara all wrapped up in one:

> Fanon himself, like many of those fighting for Republican Spain or the Taliban, was an international combatant. In many respects, his cosmopolitanism, his tendency to identify with oppression and injustice in its many forms universally rather than locally, his powerfully expressed humanism, his Maoist emphasis on the revolutionary primacy of the peasantry, align Fanon with another famous internationalist revolutionary and committed activist, another déraciné man of routes, who was almost his exact contemporary and who died similarly young: Che Guevara (Young, 2003, pp. 124 – 125.)

The media's support of an actor president with imperialist designs very masterfully crafts this image. It is no coincidence that in the third installment of the Rambo movies, Rambo goes to Soviet occupied Afghanistan and fights with the Mujahideen to help rescue his former colonel (in the real world the Mujahideen eventually split off into Taliban and anti-Taliban factions and many of the Mujahideen become Al Qaeda fighters). Rambo is supposed to be a postcolonial fighter, struggling with freedom fighters in a small third world country, battling for independence against the huge Soviet empire. In reality he is a symbol of American colonialism. In this movie Rambo not only knows how to fight and use weapons, he also has the skills and abilities to engage in complex tasks such as flying Soviet made helicopters, thus synching his skills and intelligence with those real world freedom fighters that were also highly trained and educated (both Fanon and Guevara were trained medical doctors).

Here is the contemporary postcolonial fighter, Rambo. In the fantasy world Rambo was battling alongside freedom fighters in a Third World country. Meanwhile, in the real world, Reagan was illegally supplying weapons to right wing dictators and death squads in Third World Latin American countries, resulting in the death and rape of untold number of people, all while conducting illegal weapons deals with Middle Eastern countries. This support for dictators and right wing death squads actually began long before Reagan, but was greatly escalated and supported by Reagan and his administration. One of the most public assassinations occurring in a Latin American country was the murder of Salvadoran Archbishop Oscar Romero; a Catholic priest who spoke out against the United States supported dictator of his country, reporting to the world the killings of innocent victims by the death squads. Romero had actually pleaded with the American government not to send *any* money or support since it was being used against his people:

> Romero had asked President Carter to stop sending all aid, including humanitarian aid, because, he said, it will be misused to *"repress our people."* Turning a deaf ear to Romero's plea, the U.S. Congress appropriated $5.7 million in military aid to El Salvador just one week after Romero's murder. The precedent was set. By the end of the twelve years of war, the United States was sending an average of $1 million a day to the Salvadoran government (Dennis, et. el., 2000, p. 94).

In addition to the monetary support that the United States provided to dictators and death squads, supporting their terrorist activities in Latin American countries, the United States military also trained them. One of the more insidious military fighting groups from El Salvador was the Atlacatl Immediate Reaction Battalion:

> The Atlacatl Battalion is an elite group organized by U.S. trainers in the early 1980s as a crack counter-terrorism force, and has been frequently implicated in human rights abuses. The most famous was the massacre of over seven hundred civilians in the town of Morazón in 1981,[1] immediately following the battalion's initial training at Ft. Benning, Georgia (Sobrino, et. el. 1990, p. xv).

The training at Fort Benning mentioned in this paragraph was at the infamous School of Americas. This School was developed to help train Latin American leaders and soldiers to fight against communist insurrection, but most of the training involved torture techniques and the training of death squads.

Another relatively well known case of murders in El Salvador (carried out by soldiers educated at the School of Americas and sustained by United States financial support) was the assassination of six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her teen-age daughter in November 1989. The U.S. government was shameless in their denial of their support of these murders and their assistance in helping the Salvadoran government cover it up. This is evidenced by then U.S. Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney noting that "There's no indication at all that the government of El Salvador had any involvement" in these murders and the State Department reporting that "The evidence has not linked the killing to the military" (as cited in Sobrino et al., 1990, p. xix).

Of course, while the U.S. and Salvadoran governments were denying that they had any connections to these brutal murders, they were both colluding to make sure the only potential witness to all of this, a cleaning woman that lived on the campus where the priests were located, would not go public with the information that she had seen

[1] Bill Hamilton, PhD, one of my dissertation committee members, pointed out some inaccuracies in this quote. "Town of Morazón" is actually "Department of *Morazán*." Hamilton also noted that the massacre took place in several hamlets and El Mozote being the largest of six.

Salvadoran soldiers enter the priests residence. Both the FBI and SIU (Salvadoran Special Investigations Unit) assisted in transporting this woman to the United States, where she was interrogated. After being denied legal counsel she became increasingly frightened and eventually changed her story, leading the Attorney General to state that she was "a very unreliable witness" (quoted in Sobrino, et. el., 1990, pp. xix – xx).

So in contrast to these actual events we have Rambo, elevated to the status of "mythical" postcolonial fighter by the media. At the same time that Rambo was playing as hero of the downtrodden in third world countries, the United States government was actually directly connected to the massacre of countless number of people in Latin American countries. But during this era of Reaganism the media were using these movies as propaganda. These movies fed my need to rebel and to not conform to the system, and encouraged a desire to feel important and wanting to do something that was greater than myself. In essence I was being programmed, mentally colonized, and it was working. This source of subversiveness becomes morphed into a perverted form of patriotism, and in essence justified my rejection of my high school education. I did not need an education to become a hero, I did not need an education to die for my country and fight for what I thought was "right."

These movies were also tapping into my insecurities. As mentioned earlier I was this skinny, weakly kid growing up in a town were strength and masculinity were valued. Rejected by girls because of my size and oddness, I felt isolated both mentally and physically. These figures on the movie screen were god like. Rambo was a "mythic warrior…larger-than-life human being" (Kellner, 1995, p. 67). As Kellner (1995) notes

the camera would “focus on his glistening biceps, his sculptured body and powerful physique” and with this it would develop a “homo-erotic fascination with the male warrior” (p. 67). I can attest to this! I was enthralled by these character’s physiques and prowess. Being in my mid-teens, I would fantasize about being like one of these guys, becoming one of them. Having the body shape of an ectomorph this Rambo body shape was unattainable and unrealistic for me, but it was the body shape that was being fed to both young men and women at the time.

This hyper masculine image added to my frustration and yet I was insidiously drawn to it. What complicated the matter was the fact that these figures were also emotionally damaged and unable to love. These movies were dripping with male eroticism, but anything that consisted of actual erotic love was rejected. As Kellner (1995) notes “this renunciation of women and sexuality highlights the theme that the male warrior must go it alone and must thus renounce erotic pleasure” (p. 67). So in this sense I could justify rejecting sexuality and women before they rejected me. This rejection of love was very important for a crypto fascist system that was using the media to brainwash impressionable young men to join the military under Reagan’s expanding empire. For if you love, if you feel love for someone, then you have something to live for. One is not as quick to sacrifice one’s life for a shaky political ideology if they have something to live for.

This propaganda paid off. With the success of Rambo movies and *Top Gun* (1986) there was an increase in military recruitment with a “big jump in applications to military academies [where]…many students mentioned [*Top Gun*] in their applications”

(Kellner, 1995, p. 80) and where posters of Rambo were placed outside of Army recruitment stations (Kellner, 1995, p. 70). It also was very influential in the school systems, in relation to how kids interacted with each other and the system at large. The one extracurricular activity that I engaged in during high school was with the annual staff (yearbook), since my parents were photographers and I knew photography very well.

Figure 1 Author's High School Annual Staff Photo (Author is on the row standing, second from the right)

Being steeped in the "Rambo effect" influenced our annual staff photo. We chose to dress in camouflage and pose in the back of a military truck at the local National Guard armory. This image is a sick statement considering an annual staff generally attracts creative, sensitive and artistic individuals. This Rambo effect also influenced my decision to join the Army and infantry at eighteen. My enlisting created a cognitive

dissonance however, where my sense of individuality and rejection of authoritarianism reinforced by these movies bore no resemblance to the daily life of the infantry. I was lured into this system with the idea that it would make me a "man"; where adventure lurked around every corner and I could leave the oppressive small town mentality and see the world.

Not only did these movies have a great impact on my youth and help steer me into professions such as the military, they have had a dark and frightening legacy even now. In an autobiography titled A Long Way Gone; Memoirs of a Boy Soldier Ishmael Beah (2007) reflects in his days as a child soldier in Sierra Leone. As a way for adult soldiers to indoctrinate the children kidnapped and forced into a life of military service and killing, the adults would play for these children the movies that were such pop culture icons in this country in the 1980s. In the events, which happed only a few years ago, Beah talked about how "We would watch movies at night. War movies, *Rambo: First Blood*, *Rambo II*, *Commando*, and so on. We all wanted to be like Rambo; we couldn't wait to implement his techniques" (p. 121). Beah notes on a disturbing conversation he had with one of his childhood soldier buddies:

> "Sometime I am going to take on a whole village by myself, just like Rambo," Alhaji told me, smiling at the new goal he had set for himself.
> "I'd like to have some bazookas of my own, like the ones in *Commando*.
> That would be beautiful," I said, and we laughed (p. 122).

It is amazing to me, reading this and reflecting on my own experience, how powerful this form of media is and how influential the messages from these movies are. These movies

instill a sense of invincibility. They equate the ability to massacre large numbers of individuals with being courageous and brave.

In high school I studied different militaries and their combat forces. While the Army attracted me because of the potential to enter Ranger or Special Forces school, I was in for a rude awakening. Traveling down to Fort Benning Georgia (as noted earlier this is where the infamous School of Americas is located) I was excited that I would be training where both the Airborne school (parachute training) and Ranger school were located. Upon arrival I was introduced to a system of hierarchy and control. Rambo was valued by the military as a symbol of individual heroism and willingness to die for a "cause" (of course, in fantasyland Rambo never dies). But individual heroism is not the main purpose of the military. The ability to control young soldiers and get them to following orders, conform and not ask questions, this is the main purpose of the military. When I graduated high school I left an environment where if you were not part of the culture you were an outcast, and entered an institutional system of the military where you were ordered to be part of a culture. The sustaining aspect of the military culture is the fact that at one point you may encounter adventure (this was the Army motto when I was in high school, "It's not just a job, it's an adventure"). I struggled in basic training but continued my military career (both active duty and reserves) for five years. I would not trade my experience in the military, even though I do not agree with it. In some strange way it gives me credibility to argue the insidiousness of the military system with individuals that buy into jingoistic patriotism hook, line, and sinker, most of them having never served in the military.

I learned more about personal hygiene, exercise, and athletics in the four months I spent in infantry basic training then I did all during those years I took gym in school (from 6th grade to 10th), which leads me to question what do most gym teachers provide? In the school system I was faced with educated professionals that did not understand the simple concept that one should wear shower shoes into a gym locker room to prevent the spread of athlete's foot, or the importance of wearing the correct shoes for running.

After my brief stint with basic training and active duty in the Army I returned home, still active in the Army reserves. Not yet disillusioned by the military I was planning my future and I knew I needed to utilize the resources that the military had given me (i.e. G.I. Bill). Still steeped in this philosophy of *duty* and *honor* I decided to attend the local community college and work towards a degree in criminal justice, with the intent of becoming a law enforcement officer and possibly a federal agent. The military actually gave me this sense of accomplishment, something that I had not felt in the school system. The military also gave me something else, which I am sure they had not intended, and that is my first introduction to Marxism.

When I entered the Army the US was still deep in the cold war with the Soviet Union so most of our training was in relation to this "evil empire." I wanted to understand this enemy so I researched several aspects of beliefs, which included their political structure. This research eventually introduced me to Marxist theory. Small southern towns are not known for their understanding and support for leftist politics, so there is a hint of irony that going from this small town to the Army gave me an introduction to a political theory that is a lot better known in other democratic western

countries. My parents were products of the 1950s and McCarthyism and were terrified of anything that could be considered subversive. Even though they identified themselves as liberal, they were uncomfortable discussing ideas that were considered to the far left. Marxism stayed in the back of my mind and really did not surface until a couple of years later, when geopolitical events came to the forefront of my understanding.

While attending the local community college I once again interacted with a bureaucratic system layered with rules and regulations. These rules serve a greater purpose and that is perpetuating a system of institutional control for future workers. Having managed to maneuver though high school I was armed with skills and techniques that could help me in the process of obtaining my associates degree regardless of institutional regulations. This experience in community college taught me that I have to take a very active role in my own educational process. Bureaucrats in positions of power in educational systems do not always have the student's best interest at heart and if you are going to rely on them you may never obtain your ultimate goal. Instructors and advisors can be very helpful allies, but in a lot of ways they are in the same boat as the students, attempting to understand and maneuver through a constantly changing system of rules and regulations.

Since I actually graduated high school with little formal educational training I was somewhat at a disadvantage when entering community college. Fortunately I supplemented my secondary school years through my own studies and reading. When I entered community college the school reviewed my high school GPA and required that I take a few remedial classes. I attended a couple of these classes and found them tedious

so I decided to surpass them and work directly on the courses required for my degree. I registered for the regular classes, and since most bureaucratic systems overwhelm themselves with their own rules and regulations nobody followed up with fact that I had not taken the required remedial courses. I passed all my coursework and eventually graduated from community college with my associate's degree without ever taken one remedial class. The one very important idea I learned from my community college encounter is that I have to take a very active part in my educational experience and not rely on the system to do it for me.

A series of events happened towards the end of my community college experience that changed my life dramatically and, to my view, re-connected me back to who I was as a person. While in community college I continued my military service in the Army reserves, transferring into a training or drill instructor unit. While in the reserves I attended leadership schools such the Primary Leadership Development Course (PLDC), the Leadership Academy (this was a school that trained individuals to become drill instructors). All of this was happening to me during the late 1980s and events were transpiring in the world from a geopolitical perspective that would change both my view of the military and politics in general. One of these incidents happened in China and was known as the Tiananmen Square massacre.

In June of 1989 students entered Tiananmen Square in China to protest and demand for freedom and democracy. The Chinese government eventually cracked down on these individuals, killing and wounding several. The United States government was "somewhat" outspoken about this incident, but really did not make any moves to

demonstrate their concerns. While in community college I was starting to learn more about American and World history. I was fascinated by the fact that the United States was not really attempting to show its concern about China slaughtering its own people, especially since we have been so aggressive in sanctions towards another communist country, Cuba, where we have gone as far as implementing an embargo on "food and medicine" (Chomsky, 2003, p. 88).

China has had a long history of Most Favored Nations (MFN) trading status with the United States (or what is known as Normal Trade Relations). I began to question this reality of sanctions and embargos on one communist country, yet MFN trading status with another, especially since I was being feed a steady diet of *honor, duty and country* in these military leadership academies. What I started to see is what Noam Chomsky (2002) pointed out, "U.S. power doesn't care much if the Chinese leaders murder dissidents, what they care about is that the Chinese leaders let them make money" (p. 294). This exploitation of its own citizens for US economic gain is something that Cuba would not allow and so we had to sanction them. I started to realize that the American propaganda (brainwashed for me by the media and movies) was not about freedom and democracy, but money and power; it was a neoimperialistic power

This was greatly complicated for me in 1990, when in August of that year Iraq invaded the neighboring country of Kuwait. No more than a year after the Tiananmen Square incident and suddenly the US starts to become very outspoken about this attack on a sovereign nation. Much controversy came with this invasion, most of which the American public did not understand. Iraq was very much a "US client state" which means

we had a very cozy relationship with Iraq up to this point (Churchill, 2003, p. 202). As Ward Churchill (2003) points out, the U.S. government under the guidance of President Bush "had approved the transfer of $5 million in advanced computers to the Iraq military only the day before" Iraq invaded Kuwait (p. 202).

The United States had known about Iraq's human rights violation and the killing of their own people before its invasion of Kuwait, yet the United States continued to maintain a very close relationship with Saddam Hussein. The United Stated continued supporting Hussein and his government both economically and militarily even with the knowledge of his barbarism. As Noam Chomsky (2003) points out, "Praise and support shifted to denunciation as soon as the monster committed his first authentic crime: disobeying orders by invading Kuwait" the orders that Hussein disobeyed were by the US, which means as Chomsky notes, that the US was more concerned that Hussein was becoming an independent leader instead of somebody we could control (p. 17). To the US the worst crime that Hussein could commit was *not* listening to what we told him to do. The other side of this story (which the American public was not made privy to) was that Iraq considered Kuwait as part of its province. Most of the lines that were drawn in the Middle East were drawn by colonial powers, and Kuwait was "separated from the rest of the country by British fiat during the early 1920's" (Churchill, 2003, p. 202).

My military role during all of these geopolitical conflicts had changed. Personally I had become older and had grown intellectually so I started critically questioning what was happening around the world, and the United States involvement. There was no doubt in my mind, especially reflecting on our policy with China, Cuba, and now Iraq, that the

U. S. was motivated by a lot more than “honor, duty and democracy”; we were motivated by oil and money. As noted my role in the military had also changed; I was no longer a “grunt” (term used to demarcate an infantry solider from other soldiers), but I was a leader and instructor. Reserve training units like the one I was in were being activated to train others and then send them over to the Middle East to fight for oil companies and money (although the U. S. was claiming it was democracy and freedom). The battalion I was in was activating units and training people for the infamous “back door draft,” although my unit had not yet been activated.

This back door draft needs some explanation since most people do not understand it. When a person enlists in the military, they sign an agreement to an eight-year commitment. So an individual can do two years active duty in the Army, finish his or her time and go home, but they are still tethered to the Army for an additional six years, they are just on “inactive status.” This means that at any point within the six years after a soldier’s initial two-year service, he or she can be “called up” and ordered to active duty again. After the cold war the military began following a business model and was “downsizing,” which meant closing down units and releasing people from active duty. When the United States government decided to invade Iraq, they basically reactivated those soldiers that have been released from active duty, some of which did not want to be reactivated. The units and instructors in our battalion that were activated were to do a retraining “crash course” for these soldiers reactivated and send them overseas. I had a great existential crisis with this.

So during the time leading up to this geopolitical event I finished the Leadership Academy in the reserves, completed my associate's degree, and was completing Basic Law Enforcement Training (BLET) or "rookie school." BLET is where I trained and became certified to be a police officer. I was at a pinnacle point in my life; here I was this young man, academically barely graduating high school, now having completed several difficult training programs and an associate's degree. I was still inculcated with this brainwashing by the media and government, living this fantasy of being a soldier and hero. I was now faced with the very great and difficult reality that I may be activated and would have to train individuals to go fight and die for a cause that I believed was false.

I had to face the very real possibility that I may not be able to do what was expected and ordered of me. I made the decision that if activated I would probably not go and train others to die for oil companies and greedy politicians; I was prepared to become a consciousness objector. That subversive part of me, that part of me that rejected authority so many years ago in high school was coming out again, was being reclaimed. I was becoming what I had been so long ago, a kid with anarchist leanings. Fortunately I was not activated and as soon as the ground war was over and the troops started coming back home I went to my Army reserve unit's main office, turned in my equipment, and transferred into the inactive reserves. Having a few more years left to serve on my inactive statue I knew perfectly well that if in the future I was activated I would probably not show up. I gave up my plans to become a law enforcement officer and decided to continue on with my education, transferring to a university to work on my bachelor's degree.

This is where my true journey began. I started to reflect on the person I was before the *Rambo* (1982) and *Top Gun* (1986) movies. Having my first introduction to Marxism while in the Army, I revisited that philosophical theory, believing that the government probably lied to me about a lot of things. Having gone through this great existential crisis (my whole life was based on my training in the military and for law enforcement) I sought out counseling to help me deal with this transition in life. Education during this time also became a form of counseling for me, allowing me the ability to explore philosophy, religion, the world and myself. What all of this did was help me deprogram from the propaganda I had been inundated with and the training I had received. Instead of rejecting all that I had learned during this time, I used it and accepted it, integrating it into my understanding of this system that I had lived in and of myself.

My experiences in both the military and beyond became powerful tools for me in my studies, in who I am and how I view this country and the world. It was also during this time, after the military and while I was working on my bachelor's degree, that I began my studies in Eastern philosophies (Buddhism and Taoism). I had always been fascinated with Eastern traditions, but my only venue for learning about them in a small southern town was through martial arts. Once again I managed to morph this Eastern philosophical interest into my military identity as an adolescent, but I was able to reclaim this from a different standpoint and that was the philosophical and spiritual component. My interest in psychology and psychotherapy was effectuated with my personal counseling experience, especially in relation to how it can be helpful for people to ferret through the minutia that we are all inundated with by both the media and government. To

me psychology was not a system to manipulate and brainwash, but to liberate and free a person. It was becoming an anarchistic endeavor.

After completing college I worked in my chosen field of social work and eventually went to graduate school, obtaining a master in social work and becoming a psychotherapist. All of these experiences shaped me into what I am today, sitting here working on my PhD and writing my dissertation. These experiences also gives the foundation for this dissertation and imbues me with the theories I have and the arguments that I want to postulate through these writings as reflected through the title I have for this dissertation which is *An Anarchist Psychotherapy: Ecopsychology and a Pedagogy of Life*. As the title itself denotes this dissertation is a fusion of multiple ideas; multiple ideas that I have been in contact with throughout my life and that have played a significant role in the shaping of my values and belief system. Some of these ideas seem contradictory at first, if not at the very least unrelated. But for me there are various threads that run through them and these threads are ideas such as justice, freedom, ecology, and spirituality. As Kathleen Kesson (2002) notes on her work on contemplative spirituality and social transformation she will, “Attempt to draw some theoretical links between postmodernism, spirituality and the anarchist project” (p. 64).

This leads to the struggle I have with all of this, and that is congealing these ideas together into a synthesis. One way I have personally managed to bring these ideas together is through an internal dialectics, and synthesis is what dialectics does and I hope that what you will see in the finished product is a dialectics of thoughts, ideas, etc (which will be part of my methodology). I believe I can actually coalesce these ideas into a

working theoretical model that will not only offer a critical model to contemporary society and our practices, but also provide an alternative model to how we approach psychology, psychotherapy and education.

These ideas I work with throughout this dissertation are directly related to my interests and beliefs. This work is related to my interest in leftist politics, especially Marxism and anarchism. These are two ideologies that have been at odds for close to 150 years now, because adherents to these ideologies like to argue their views from a historical standpoint and what I am proposing now is a need to bring these two ideas together into a working model. There are some who have historically brought these differing models together and it needs to continue to happen even now. Contemporary anarchist Murray Bookchin (2004) touches on this in his introduction to the second edition of his book Post-Scarcity Anarchism:

> There was a time, even as recently as the early thirties, when radicals of all kinds formed an ethical community, despite the many ideological differences that divided them. Whether as socialists, anarchists, syndicalists, or populists, they shared their views in free discourse, defended each other's rights, and even aided each other in publishing works that were ordinarily proscribed by the bourgeois press. Anarchists like Emma Goldman could find solace and help form Marxists like John Reed in times of difficulty, and anarchists like Sacco and Vanzetti rallied universal support from the Left, including Communists, despite their explicit criticisms of Soviet Russia (p. xxii).

I personally place myself in an anarchist camp, but with a strong desire to understand and incorporate Marxist ideas and I hope my dissertation will reflect this. As feminist Gayle Rubin (1993) notes, "Marxism is probably the most supple and powerful conceptual system extant for analyzing social inequality" (p. 33). This work is also

related to my interest in religions, especially Buddhism, Taoism and indigenous religious practices (Native American traditions and shamanism). Being a practicing Buddhist for close to 10 years now, Buddhism has been and will continue to greatly influence how I view the world. Related to my Buddhist beliefs I also plan to incorporate Buddhist and Taoist poetry into the dissertation, especially in its relation to the natural environment and ecology and how it has influenced what is known as ecopsychology. As well as being a practicing Buddhist I have also been a practicing psychotherapist for over 10 years and so I have a great interest in incorporating psychology and psychotherapy into my dissertation and looking at how both psychotherapy and education have been heavily influenced by behavioral and developmental psychology. I strongly believe that our form of psychotherapy and education today needs to be influenced by more than just a behavioral psychological model, that it needs a model that is more inclusive to the natural environment, personal freedom and social justice, which is also an ecopsychology.

Methodology

The methodology that I am applying to this dissertation is as multifarious as the dissertation itself, but there is method to my methodology. The theory of autoethnography will be predominant as a methodology throughout this process. Beginning with this chapter I explained the journey that led me to where I am today, I will continue to use this autoethnography as a way to weave the personal with the theoretical. This is closely related to Alan Watts' (1951) notion of theory:

> The proper meaning of "theory" is not idle speculation but *vision*, and it was rightly said that "where there is no vision the people will perish" . . . But vision in this sense does not mean dreams and ideals for the future. It means understanding

> of life as it is, of what we are, and what we are doing. Without such understanding it is simply ridiculous to talk of being practical and getting results (p. 105).

Using some of my personal experiences to critique the political, this autoethnography becomes, as Stacy Homan Jones notes (2005), "a radical democratic politics" (p. 763), it is also, as she continues to note, "A balancing act" (p. 764) and as some of us know this balancing act can be very difficult to achieve sometimes. Some of the theories and ideas that I try to bring together do not always want to "balance" well, but I will attempt to do the best I can with these. I also believe that autoethnography is an advantageous form of methodology to use in this arena since autoethnography is a "blurred genre, it overlaps with, and is indebted to, research and writing practices in anthropology, sociology, psychology, literary criticism, journalism and communication" (Jones, 2005, p. 765).

I feel that autoethnography as a methodology is a very effective tool to use with a dissertation in a cultural studies program, with its roots in the Frankfurt School[1] and a multidisciplinary approach to contemporary issues. I also believe that this is a useful methodology to use for somebody attempting to synthesize ideas such as anarchism, Buddhism, Taoism, Ecopsychology, Ecofeminism and spirituality. All of these are personal issues and a methodology of autoethnography will help me to explore these concepts and to "Invoke the corporeal, sensuous, and political nature of experience rather than collapse [this] text into embodiment or political language play" (Jones, 2005, p. 767).

[1] Martin Jay (1973) notes in his history of the Frankfurt School that, "At the very heart of Critical Theory was an aversion to closed philosophical systems" (p. 41).

This autoethnography is also a "poetics," and I will actually use poetry throughout this dissertation as a way to view and understand some of these issues. Attempting to break away from the idea of scientific positivism that has saturated social sciences research I am hoping to lean more towards what Brady (2005) notes are "Methods of immersion and self-conscious saturation than to those of clinical distancing as forms of learning" (p. 981). This *poetics as methodology* is for whom Brady (2005) calls the "beachcombers of life" (p. 986), looking at bits and pieces laid out on a bigger area, not eschewing that which is eclectic. As Brady (2005) notes about poetry and poetics, "In its most creative form, poetry, surplus meaning is a protest against the constraints of the ordinary rules of inquiry" (p. 998). This may not always read like it, but it is all poetry to me.

Autoethnography is not the only methodology that I will employ for this process. Since I will incorporate different ideas and beliefs into my dissertation (some of which are contradictory) a dialectics of these ideas will be very important. This dialectical approach is flexible with ideas that I am able to incorporate into my dissertation but also flexible with ideas that I am not able to work into my theoretical model. Just because I consider myself an anarchist does not mean I will subscribe to all anarchist theory, and reject certain Marxist ideas. As anarchist Murray Bookchin (1999) notes:

> Anarchists should learn from serious Marxists, as Marxists should learn from serious anarchists, that we desperately need to strike a rational balance between theoretical insight and popular spontaneity, between organization and impulse. Each without the other is a guarantee of failure (p. 297).

For this dialectic process to work in my studies and research, I will have to be very mindful of what I am reading and writing about, which leads to the other part of my methodology which I call *mindfulness deconstruction*. I am using mindfulness from eastern philosophical traditions such as Buddhism and Taoism, and western traditions such Ellen Langer's incorporation of mindfulness in education. As Langer (1993) notes: "Mindfulness is a state of mind that results from drawing novel distinctions, examining information from new perspectives, and being sensitive to context" (p. 44). In other words with this mindfulness an individual has "the capacity to see any situation or environment from several perspectives" (Langer, 1993, p. 44). As researchers we have a tendency to exclude ideas that we do not agree with or that does not mesh with our own personal beliefs or perspective. For a true dialectical process to work, especially as a methodology, I will have to be as open and mindful as I can be.

This mindfulness from an eastern perspective will help me to be "aware" and to be as skillful as I can in how I look at these issues. If my idea of *mindfulness* comes from mainly eastern philosophy with some western traits, the *deconstruction* comes from western philosophy and Derrida. This deconstruction is a "fine-grained reading of the text" (Caputo, 1997, p. 83). But more than reading, it is as it sounds: it is deconstructing it, to pick it apart. But to do this I have to be mindful and aware of what I am deconstructing. It is difficult to deconstruct that which you do not know or understand. As David Loy (2003) notes: "Jacques Derrida speaks of the necessity to lodge oneself within traditional conceptuality in order to destroy it" (p. 26). For this methodology to

work, the deconstruction is essential, and will work very well with the autoethnography, since this dissertation is *un*conventional. As Caputo (1997) notes:

> Deconstruction means to be essentially anti-essential and highly unconventional, not to let its eyes wax over at the thought of either unchanging essence or ageless traditions, but rather to advocate an in-ventionalistic incoming, to stay constantly on the lookout for something unforeseeable, something new. Deconstruction is a way to giving things a new twist; it is bent on giving things a new bent, which is what sets the nerves of both essentialists and conventionalists on edge. (p. 42).

For some reason I love the thought of setting conventionalists on edge. Deconstruction does not go without its critics however; Allan Bloom (1987) feels that deconstruction is the "last, predictable, stage in the suppression of reason and the denial of the possibility of truth in the name of philosophy" (p. 379). Allan Bloom is somewhat of a conventionalist however. David Loy (1988) feels that "the problem with Derrida's radical critique of Western philosophy is that it is not radical enough: his deconstruction is incomplete because it does not deconstruct itself" (p. 249). To which Derrida (1991) would respond that: "the enterprise of deconstruction always in a certain way falls prey to its own work" (p. 41). With so much controversy surrounding a philosophical idea, what better way than to use it as a form of methodology for my dissertation, especially since some of the ideas I will be looking at can take one in many different directions. As Caputo (1997) states: "The trick in deconstruction, if it is a trick, is to keep your head without having a heading" (p. 116).

Chapter Summaries

Chapter Two: A Psychology of Anarchism

Numerous books have been written on the history of anarchism and what the ideas of anarchism are. My intent is to avoid replicating that process in this chapter. What I would prefer to do is reflect on what a psychology of anarchism would look like and to do this I will start with reviewing a psychology of control. Western society is based on hierarchical and patriarchal structures and to create these structures those in power must convince others that it is in the best interest for all to have select individuals in positions of power and control. This psychology of control becomes an epistemology of control. This epistemology of control is where those in power use different means (i.e. media, psychology, education) to develop a form of self monitoring within the population along with technological monitoring. I will use Foucault's exploration of Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon to look at this epistemology of control and how this idea of the Panopticon has been used as a model for prisons, military structures, hospitals, school systems and places of work. I will then look at how this mode of control has actually evolved with technology and science (such as psychopharmacology).

From there I will then look at what a psychology of anarchism could conceivably look like and it is here that I will be drawing from anarchist and Marxist thought. The Frankfurt school was instrumental in the fusion of Marxist thought and psychoanalysis but with anarchism I want to draw from a broader arena and look at other forms of psychology and philosophical thought. What this will do is lay the groundwork for an ethics of psychology and psychotherapy that may differ greatly with the ethics that are

being fed to a contemporary psychotherapeutic profession (I would argue that this contemporary ethics we see today in psychotherapy, given as a “code of ethics” is just another form of Panopticism). This will also launch us into questioning where do concerns like the environment come into play when dealing with psychology and psychotherapy and will lead us into the third chapter on ecopsychology.

Chapter Three: Ecopsychology

This chapter will look at the ideas and theory of ecopsychology. Ecopsychology is a word coined by the philosopher Theodore Roszak (2001) in his book The Voice of the Earth and it fuses the concepts of psychology and ecology. Ecopsychology is an alternative philosophical and scientific endeavor and it views ideas from two main perspectives; first it examines at how the damage and destruction done to the earth is creating suffering in humans and other living creatures. Second it reflects on our disconnection from the natural environment and how, as integral living beings on the planet, this also has created great suffering in humanity. Through this venture I will look at some of the various alternative influences that have shaped and influenced ecopsychology. These alternative influences are ideas such as the Beat and counterculture movements and how Buddhism and Taoism play a great role in ecopsychology and environmental movements that we see today.

In this chapter I will use a lot of poetry from Buddhist and Taoist sages. I will reflect on the fact that ecopsychology pulls greatly from spiritual influences that can be seen as pragmatic. I will also look at the critiques by some on the influence of Buddhism, Taoism and spirituality into the ecology and environmental movement. Some, such as

Murray Bookchin, view the influence of spirituality in ecology movements as mystical and irrational. But what this means is that, unlike traditional western psychology, ecopsychology is willing to draw from many different sources that can be beneficial for ecology movements. Western psychology is heavily influenced by western science. Ecopsychology is willing to use western psychology as a useful tool, but also draws from other influences such as ecofeminism and spirituality. This will lead us into the next two chapters on ecofeminism and ecospirituality.

Chapter Four: Globalization & Ecofeminism

Ecofeminism has long been a strong critic of globalization, free market capitalism and traditional western feminism. In this chapter we will begin by looking at ecofeminism's critique of these issues and how it has rightly criticized the ways globalization and transnational corporations have created havoc upon the ecology in third world countries. Ecofeminism has been instrumental in exposing how global agribusinesses have tethered indigenous farmers to corporations and ways that pharmaceuticals have used impoverished people in third world countries as guinea pigs for medication experiments (making one think of the Tuskegee experiment that the U. S. did from the 1930s-1970s with African Americans in this country) and I will explore these issues also.

Additionally those who identify themselves as ecofeminists have been very critical to what would be considered traditional western feminism. I look at the issues above that ecofeminism has addressed, and examine ecofeminism's critique of traditional western feminism. Ecofeminism has often portrayed western feminism as just another

form of imperialism, sometimes probably rightly so, but I want to go a little deeper and see whether at a theoretical level if this is a valid criticism. Ecofeminism itself has been criticized and part of the criticism directed towards it is in relation to its connection to and advocating of certain religious traditions and spiritual beliefs. I will challenge this notion of ecofeminists connection with spirituality and religion a little (and probably support it some), and this will lead us into the fourth chapter of the dissertation which is on spirituality or what I call ecospirituality.

Chapter Five: Ecospirituality

Much criticism has surrounded the inclusion of spirituality and religion in the ecological and environmental movement, and yet for some it has been an integral part of what the environmental movement is about. I will begin this chapter looking at some specific criticisms of ecofeminism and spirituality and attempt to understand where these criticisms come from and if they are valid. I will then delve deeper into this idea of spirituality and religion and its influence on ecological concerns overall. To me spirituality and religion is more than a belief in a God or higher power, it is about our connections to the natural world and to each other. Spirituality is about engagement. Capitalism, with the advent of industrialization, has created a rift between individuals and the natural world; it has removed us from a spiritual center. What has happened with this form of capitalism, industrialization, and corporate control is that power has been concentrated into the hands of a few individuals and they in turn have used other institutions such as religions to control people, hence Marx's idea that religion "is the *opium* of the people" (Marx, 1974, p. 244).

The irony of spirituality in contemporary society is that ad agencies and corporations have taken advantage of the need for meaning in individual's lives and the fact that our disconnection from the natural world and each other has caused a "spiritual" emptiness. Capitalism exploits this emptiness as a way to encourage people to consume more and to fill that void. We have established a society of consumerism, a consuming civilization where money and things have become our religion. Ecospirituality becomes engagement and a way to build communities that has a foundation of sustainability. It shifts our thinking from a pedagogy of death through ecocide to a pedagogy of life. This will lead into the conclusions and what I call *an anarchist psychotherapy*.

Conclusion

In the conclusion I will take a very critical look at my own profession as a psychotherapist. Contemporary psychotherapy has adopted a very western approach to how it deals with individuals. Contemporary psychotherapy grounds itself in developmental and behavioral psychology which views human nature as very linear and segmented. Therapist claim to be "client-centered," in actuality the client plays a minor role in psychotherapy. Institutions become the main component of what psychotherapy is and the role of psychotherapy is to make sure these institutions run efficiently. Through this process psychotherapy becomes panoptic. I will reflect on this and discuss why this model needs to change why psychotherapy needs to become *an anarchist psychotherapy*.

This is where the inclusion of the ideas that I address in this dissertation become important. Psychotherapist, like educators, need to become public intellectuals and cultural workers. By psychotherapy adopting a western model of science it greatly limits

its approach to working with people, and in essence become anti-intellectual. *An anarchist psychotherapy* will draw from a multitude of ideas such as feminism, ecofeminism, religion and ecospirituality, to name a few. This *anarchist psychotherapy* views the world as more than a commodity that can be dissected and sold off, but as a living organism with which we are all interconnected.

CHAPTER II

A PSYCHOLOGY OF ANARCHISM

> *This is a society which needs to make man fit in a complicated and hierarchically organized system of production with a minimum of friction. It creates the organization man, a man without conscience or conviction, but one who is proud of being a cog, even if it is only a small one, in a big and imposing organization. He is not to ask questions, not to think critically, not to have any passionate interests, for this would impede the smooth functioning of the organization.*
> (Fromm, 1990, p. 140)

Who Is Watching Me?

Growing up I remember that I always had this strange feeling of being watched. When I say being watched I mean that I had this bizarre feeling that somebody was literally observing me at all times. I could never pinpoint who was surveilling me or how they were watching me, but I felt that somebody was observing what I was doing, or in essence, *spying* on me. I am sure that is normal for children to have this sense that they are being watched at one point. Children have a sense that their parents are keeping a watchful eye out for them (as the joke goes by parents “I have eyes in the back of my head”), or that friends are sneaking a peek on them to tease them. But my feelings of being observed went a little bit beyond this. I felt that somebody may have had a small camera hidden away, or some sort of listening device, or that the TV was two-way and that it was a means for somebody to peek in on me.

Knowing that this sounds a little paranoid I have to qualify it with the fact that I was pretty young and the limits of my world were narrow at that age. But reflecting back on these feelings I believe that I could have been perceived as paranoid and delusional by a mental health professional. The reason I sense that these feelings could have been diagnosable was the fact that they would sometimes go beyond the typical *feelings* of being observed to actual *beliefs* or suspecting that I was being watched.

These feelings have slowly abated as I have gotten older, but in some ways they are always there, nagging at me. As I have gotten older I don't think I have totally lost this notion that somebody is watching. I still have this vague impression of being spied on. But I attribute this decrease in intensity of being watched partly to the fact I don't care as much now if somebody is observing me. I feel that if somebody does not have anything better to do with their time than to watch my daily activities then that's more their concern than mine. But I question how much of this decrease is my "growing" out of my paranoid feelings or just adjusting to them, accepting them as a part of who I am. I also reflect on these feelings when I was younger and wonder how much was paranoia and how much was just a response to a modern, technological society.

As children our individual lives are consumed by institutions. The predominant institution for children in our society is of course the school system, and then depending on the child and their family other institutions may become an important aspect of his or her life (i.e. churches, health care settings such as doctor's offices, public health agencies, mental health agencies, etc.). When you reflect on how these institutions are established and the agenda that they have as a part of their mission, you begin to understand why I

had this overwhelming sense that I was being observed at all times. The main purposes of most of these institutions are to *institutionalize people*. To institutionalize people there has to be established a system of domination and control, a structural and hierarchical system that becomes hegemonic. As Peter Kropotkin (1987) puts it, “A whole mechanism of legislation and of policing has to be developed in order to subject some to the domination of others” (p. 10). This statement by Peter Kropotkin personifies what institutions can and in most cases do represent.

From a very early age we become dependent on institutions for our way of life. Institutions are established and are packaged, marketed and sold or legislated to the public under the guise of providing essential services or public safety. The birthing process that mothers go through is a great example of this. As a way to combat death rates among mothers and children during labor, the medical field and hospitals take the lead in the birthing experience. Through this process the mother is, in a lot of ways, removed from child-bearing and professionals are put in place to facilitate this, as ecologist and feminist Marie Mies (1993) notes:

> Apart from total quality control, the new reproductive technologies will mean for most women a loss of confidence in their own bodies and in their child-bearing competence. Already most young women are afraid to have babies without constant monitoring by a doctor. Most children are born in clinics. The new reproductive technologies, advertised as a means to widen women’s choice, will greatly enhance women’s fears. Women will eventually become totally passive, abandoning themselves to medical experts who know everything about them and their child inside them. (Mies & Shiva, 1993, pp. 186-187)

School systems have similar agendas, as Vallance (1974) states that “until the end of the nineteenth century, American educators argued the case for public education precisely in

terms of social control" (pp. 5-6). Vallance (1974) continues to note that for the State, with schools, "homogeneity was explicitly cited as a goal" and that they also were there to "reinforce the legitimacy of established authority" (p. 9). So these institutions become entities with their own set of agendas and ideas that may not be in accordance with how they present themselves to the public.

What happens is that our perceived dependence on institutions becomes a form of symbiosis, where individuals in society and these systems become dependent on each other. Erich Fromm (1969) reflects on that this idea of symbiosis is and what it means:

> in this psychological sense, (symbiosis) means the union of one individual self with another self or any other power outside of the own self in such a way as to make each lose the integrity of its own self and to make them completely dependent on each other (p. 157).

What institutions need to do is convince individuals that they need these institutions more than the institutions need the individuals. This can come in different ways, ranging from psychological coercion to legislative means (as sanctioned by the State), which ultimately develops into a system of power and control and creates an idea of "false consciousness" in individuals where there is a "distorted picture of reality" (Fromm, 1990, p. 15). This distorted sense of reality is that we as individuals cannot function and are not safe unless we have these institutions there to provide us with the safety we need. This becomes a false consciousness that Fromm is alluding to, institutions want to instill a consciousness of dependence, that we are dependent on an institution even if we do not need it. This system of power and control coupled with a false consciousness that individuals need these institutions fundamentally becomes an epistemology.

What we see developing with these institutions is a form of systematic and societal control, an *epistemology of control*,[1] implemented and regulated by those who assume power and eventually the State. When I say State, I think this is a term needs to be clarified a little. In using "State" I am assuming and expanding on the definition that has been argued by historical and political anarchists such as Peter Kropotkin. For Kropotkin "State" represents something very different from a "government" or a form of governance. For Kropotkin (1987), government can be just a form of democratic control; whether this is involves communes or free federations (p. 10). Kropotkin (1987) argues differently about the State:

> However, it seems to me that State and government are two different concepts of a different order. The State idea means something quite different from the idea of government. It not only includes the existence of a power situated above society, but also of a *territorial concentration* as well as the concentration *in the hands of a few of many functions in the life of societies* (p. 10).

The State in our contemporary society becomes more than just a Big Brother government. Naomi Klein (2007) defines it best when she notes that, "A more accurate term for a system that erases the boundaries between Big Government and Big Business is not liberal, conservative or capitalist but corporatist" (p. 15). So this State becomes a corporatist State and it adopts the model of institutions as a way to exert power and control over others. Through this process the State then is able to narrow this power and

[1] Murray Bookchin (2005), in his book The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy uses the term "epistemologies of rule" to discuss ideas of hierarchy. Although I will draw from Bookchin's work throughout this text, I am hoping to look at this epistemology from a slightly different perspective, especially in relation to psychology, education and psychotherapy and how these disciplines have been inundated with a western scientific model that removes the humanity of them and uses them as a system of control.

control into the hands of a few. A perfect example of this would be the school systems where learning is not as much democratic as it is authoritarian. It is through looking at the foundation of these institutions such as schools that I can shed some light on the paranoid feelings that I had as a child and the feeling of somebody spying on me at all times.

Panopticon

Schools manage themselves with a model developed by the philosophical works of Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and his theory of the panopticon. Although you will not see this model listed in any mission statement of a school system or provided in a curriculum, this is the basic structuring of schooling. Bentham is best known for his philosophy of utilitarianism and his belief that "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, *pain* and *pleasure*" (Gottlieb, 2000, p. 294). But few today understand how influential Bentham's thoughts and ideas are to contemporary life, especially in regards to the way that we are educated and managed in our daily lives such as in the workplace. Foucault (1977) helps us understand this model of the panopticon (pan – optic, "all seeing") and how it was originally designed and used for prisons where:

> This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the center and periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure . . . (p. 197)

In this panopticon, each individual (or from a free market concept: client or consumer)[1] is acutely aware that their every move *may* be watched, but they cannot be absolutely sure. The structure of the panopticon is set up so that, with the use of angles, shadows and light, one can only assume that he or she is being watched at all times, thus establishing a sort of internal source or power and control, "Hence the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, 1977, p. 201). Those who are watching the inmates are invisible, "and this invisibility is a guarantee of order" (Foucault, 1977, p. 201).

It is important to understand that with the adopting of Bentham's model of the panopticon western society was entering into the beginnings of industrialization and capitalism, so there needed to be a model of regimenting individuals in different settings and so the panopticon could be a very effective tool. I think Erich Fromm (1990) in his text Beyond the Chains of Illusion best describes this epistemology of control and the value of the panopticon model for this burgeoning western capitalist ideology:

> Modern, industrial society, for instance, could not have attained its ends had it not harnessed the energy of free men for work in an unprecedented degree. Man had to be molded into a person who was eager to spend most of his energy for the purpose of work, who had the qualities of discipline, orderliness and punctuality, to a degree unknown in most other cultures. It would not have sufficed if each

[1] I use the term here "client" or "consumer" because even in this panoptic model, we are still under what Giroux (2001) calls a "hypercapitalist" system (p. xxix). Even in my profession of psychotherapy there has been this push to change the identity of individuals we work with from "client" to "consumer" since they are, in essence, consuming our services. If you can identify individuals as consumers then you create an illusion of somebody actually buying into being observed, or regulated. We generally are willing to consume things so we must want to consume our own imprisonment.

> individual had to make up his mind consciously every day that he wanted to work, to be on time, etc., since any such conscious deliberation would lead to many more exceptions than the smooth functioning of society can afford. Nor would threat and force have sufficed as a motive since the highly differentiated tasks in modern industrial society can, in the long run, only be the work of free men and not of forced labor. The social *necessity* for work, for punctuality, and orderliness had to be transformed into an inner *drive*. This means that society had to produce a social character in which these strivings were inherent. (p. 79)

The panopticon instills in individuals an internal authority that produces this drive of order and regimentation. Instead of the State regimenting people's behaviors by constantly and physically watching subjects, individuals become their own authority. In one of Eric Fromm's (1969) other text, Escape from Freedom he explains this well:

> Anonymous authority is more effective than overt authority, since one never suspects that there is any order which one is expected to follow. In external authority it is clear that there is an order and who gives it; one can fight against the authority, and in this fight personal independence and moral courage can develop. But whereas in internalized authority the command, through an internal one, remains visible, in anonymous authority both command and commander have become invisible (p. 166).

This panoptic model was not used just for prisons however, and the physical structure of the panopticon ultimately became a metaphor for power and control. The panopticon becomes a system of arranging and structuring people and especially a way to attempt to manage mental spaces. As Foucault (1977) notes, replacing children for inmates:

> If they are schoolchildren, there is no copying, no noise, no chatter, no waste of time . . . among schoolchildren, it makes it possible to observe performances (without there being any imitation or copying), to map aptitudes, to assess characters, to draw up rigorous classifications and, in relation to normal

> development, to distinguish ‘laziness and stubbornness’ from ‘incurable imbecility.’ (pp. 201, 203)

This system is created in such a fashion, established by such a huge institutional, hierarchical system, that basically anybody can manage it without any formal training; “Consequently, it does not matter who exercises power. Any individual, taken almost at random, can operate the machine” (Foucault, 1977, p. 202). This idea of “machine” that Foucault refers to denotes how this whole process is mechanistic, where people running the machine are cogs. There is no need for thought in the individual operating the machine; the science of the machine will do this for you.

So this becomes the oppressiveness of an inflexible and rigid scientific model that was being incorporated into the school systems as a way to control and regulate children. For this system to be completely effective it has to make people feel that they are being monitored even outside the walls of the specific institution, in this case the school system. It becomes clear to me why I felt paranoid that somebody was watching me at all times; I was being trained, inculcated, into a system of power and control. Children’s minds were being managed, the panopticon was becoming more than just a structure used to regulate and regiment children in the classroom; it was becoming a way to regulate thought outside of the school.

Panopticon and Social Sciences

As Foucault notes, the model of the panopticon is not just used in school systems. The panopticon can be utilized in almost any setting, “Whenever one is dealing with a multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or a particular form of behaviour must be

imposed, the panoptic schema may be used" (Foucault, 1977, p. 205). In other words, the system used to control prisoners and children is now used to control patients and workers. This panopticon becomes a cross hegemonic form of power and control, adopted by various disciplines (i.e. medical field, psychological field, etc.). With these disciplines there is a crossover to other realms of social control:

> At this point the disciplines crossed the 'technological' threshold. First the hospital, then the school, then, later, the workshop were not simply 'reordered' by the disciplines' they became, thanks to them, apparatuses such that any mechanism of objectification could be used in them as an instrument of subjection, and any growth of power could give rise in them to possible branches of knowledge; it was this link, proper to the technological systems, that made possible within the disciplinary element the formation of clinical medicine, psychiatry, child psychology, educational psychology, the rationalization of labor (Foucault, 1977, p. 224).

Through the adopting of the panoptic model by institutions such as schools, we begin to see that "the child, in fact, is taught primarily not how to survive in society but how to submit to it" (Cooper, 1973, p. 170). Child psychology then adopts the panopticon model (influenced by behavioral and developmental psychology) and some children who are more sensitive and susceptible react to this form of institutional control. Those children that react to this control can become pathologized or criminalized. To be productive members of capitalistic and industrial societies we have to be taught to establish an internal locus of control that becomes panoptic. If somebody cannot watch me at all times to make sure I am acting in accordance with how institutions want me to act, then I need to feel like I am being watched at all times to act in accordance with the way institutions want me to act. This becomes a slippery slope however; I cannot express

that I feel like I am being watched; the fine line is between being watched and accepting it and being watched and becoming paranoid about it. If you become paranoid about being watched you become a threat and a liability.

This is where psychology and education collude. An individual's natural response is to reject being controlled and dominated. This system of domination has to be surreptitious and yet visual enough to make sure people are being controlled. One can respond by rebellion as noted in my first chapter with Henry Giroux's (2001) idea of the "showy rebel" (p. 246). Or one can become paranoid and question why they feel they are being watched at all times. Both become dangerous to the institutions that attempt to control and dominate.

For those who become overtly rebellious the criminal justice system can become involved and the child can be criminalized. For those who become paranoid and question the system, the mental health institutions become involved and a child can be pathologized. For those that exhibit paranoid reactions to the panopticon the American Psychiatric Association (APA) has a disorder in the text of mental health diagnosis, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM IV TR), (APA, 2000). There are a multitude of diagnoses that can be attached to an individual for demonstrating paranoid symptomology, which include Schizophrenia with paranoid delusions and Paranoid Personality Disorder. But the disorder that I want to specifically look at is Delusional Disorder, since this can be the catch all disorder that almost anybody can be diagnosed with and includes paranoid symptoms as part of its diagnosis.

Paranoid and Delusional

Delusional Disorder addresses different issues with an individual that is exhibiting a range of delusions and also focuses on specific paranoid feelings. The DSM becomes a complex tool, breaking Delusional Disorder down into two classes of delusions; bizarre and non bizarre (APA, 2000, p. 324). From there Delusional Disorder is divided into seven subtypes; Erotomanic Type, Grandiose Type, Jealous Type, Persecutory Type, Somatic Type, Mixed Type and Unspecified Type (APA, 2000, pp. 324-325). Growing up I could have easily been diagnosed with Delusional Disorder, nonbizarre type ("nonbizarre delusions involve situations that can conceivably occur in real life . . . e.g. being followed") (APA, 2000, p. 324). And the subtype that I could have been diagnosed with would have been Persecutory Type; this being the subtype that specifically addresses ideas of being "spied on" (APA, 2000, p. 325). The concern about Persecutory Type is at the end of its diagnostic features it notes: "Individuals with persecutory delusions are often resentful and angry and may resort to violence against those they believe are hurting them" (APA, 2000, p. 325). So even if you may not exhibit any violence tendencies, if a mental health professional feels the need to diagnose somebody as having a Delusional Disorder, Persecutory Type, then the apprehension that you *may* be violent can be enough to warrant concern. This would ultimately merge the three panoptic systems that respond to an individual, the school system, the mental health system and the criminal justice system.[1]

[1] This is an evolution of Peter Kropotkin's (1987) idea of systems of control where he notes "Individual psychology, and even more that of societies, are falsified in each of their assertions in justifying the triple alliance of soldier, priest and judge" (p. 55), which today would equate to 'police, religion and

The successful panopticon should not have to include these other systems to respond to individuals however, since the successful panopticon will inculcate individuals into a system of domination without a response to it, but they sometimes may have to. A way for institutions to deal with reliance on other systems is to merge the different panoptic systems together into greater systems with subsystems managing specific tasks. This begins to narrow the means of power down to fewer and fewer individuals, creating bureaucratic structures that become insurmountable. It also establishes a need to incorporate a panoptic system as early as possible in a person's life. To prevent individuals from responding to the panopticon you have to make it seem as if it is a necessary system for survival. Life itself without the panopticon can seem uncertain, and as Eric Fromm (1969) notes "when one has become an individual, one stands alone and faces the world in all its perilous and overpowering aspects" (p. 29). Although when one becomes an individual they may not *be* alone they may feel like they are alone and have this feeling of having to face things alone, and this feeling can make life seem uncertain.

Fromm (1969) continues to note that "in our effort to escape from aloneness and powerlessness, we are ready to get rid of our individual self either by submission to new forms of authority or by a compulsive conforming to accepted patterns" (p. 134). This becomes the foundation of the panopticon, taking advantage of individual's uncertainty and then selling itself as the only thing certain. It is also part of Fromm's (1969) understanding of the symbiosis between ourselves and the panoptic system, "It is always

---

court.' As panoptic systems become more sophisticated with technology and science there becomes a blending of institutions that actually help some people and control others.

the inability to stand the aloneness of one's individual self that leads to the drive to enter into a symbiotic relationship with someone else" (p. 157). So if institutions can make things seem certain then people will feel comfortable and happy and accept their authority, or as Bauman (1995) puts it panopticons will "regiment uncertainty out of existence" (pp. 107-108).

The ultimate purpose of institutions, beginning with schools, is to develop an idea that Noam Chomsky (2002) calls "manufacturing consent" (p. 14), and this manufacturing consent becomes a process of indoctrination. But to most effectively indoctrinate citizens, to make it feel democratic, it has to be a process of indoctrination that seems to be in the best interest of the citizens and an indoctrination that is acceptable; it becomes a "self-imposed totalitarianism" (Chomsky, 2002, p. 65). Through this self-imposed totalitarianism we have in effect a "mass culture (which) socializes people to police themselves against their own freedom" (Freire & Shor, 1987, p. 25). This was the paranoia that I felt growing up, a self-imposed totalitarianism and a policing of my own freedom. For institutions to be successful in establishing this type of self regulation they need to separate humanity from who we are. In other words these systems of control have to adopt a rigid scientific model that eschews the humanness of life and the connection we have towards ourselves and others. Their system of operation becomes scientific and "objective," removing passion or feelings, establishing itself as the "truth."

Incorporating Science

This scientific model becomes a powerful tool to mandate ideas of power and control that are difficult to argue against because of its authority. Also, as science

advances it becomes more technologically savvy in how a panoptic model can be administered. Through these advancements regimenting children become a medical science. The tools made available to institutions whose primary goal is to regulate children's behaviors become easily accessible, sanctioned and promoted by the medical profession. When speaking of pathologizing children, I talked about Delusional Disorder as a way to diagnose somebody who responds to the panopticon with paranoia and questioning. If you can regulate children before they get to that point of questioning the system and rejecting it then you have an easier job of controlling behaviors. The regimentation of the classroom is one way of doing this, since the shape and structure of how the classroom is forces children to sit still and repress feelings of playfulness and activity.

Jonathan Kozol (2005) discusses this very idea of regimentation when he revisits a school which has now adopted a "zero noise" policy since his last visit (p. 66). When Kozol was sitting in one of the fourth grade classrooms, noticing some children whispering, the teacher responds by stating "'zero noise' . . . His arm shot out and up in a diagonal in front of him, his hand straight up, his fingers flat" (p. 56). This gesture elicited the same response from the children in the classroom, as in some strange militaristic salute. The teacher then responds with "Active listening! . . . Heads up! Tractor beams! . . . every eye on me" (p. 56). This childhood conditioning is very systematic and scientific. As the assistant principle reported to Kozol later that day, the school has adopted a "Taylorism" model of controlling classrooms and educating students (p. 56). This Taylorism is based on the writings of Frederick Taylor and is a

form of “primitive utilitarianism.” This is a model used to structure and manage factory workers in the early 1900s (Kozol, 2005, p. 68) and works extremely well with the panoptic model.

When this form of Taylorism and the panopticon is not enough, then medical science steps in and children can be regulated with medications. If a child is resistant to this form of classroom physical structuring then they can be diagnosed (with the help of the DSM again) as having Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), (APA, 2000, p. 85). This also is broken into subtypes, with the attention deficit being one and the hyperactivity being the other (or a child can be diagnosed with a “combined type”) (APA, 2000, p. 87). Generally this diagnosis has been reserved for older children that may be exhibiting problems such as concentrating in the classroom, but it is increasingly being used as a diagnosis for younger children, where “the number of preschoolers taking medications for ADHA has increased 300% from 1990 to 1995” (Leo, 2002, p. 52). As Jonathan Leo (2002) notes in his article, the age of children that are being diagnosed with ADHA and placed on medications such as Ritalin have gone as low as three.

Preschools now become an extension of the panopticon. They are not a place to allow young children to play and explore but to help prepare them for the regimented classroom of primary and secondary schools, to help these very young children to learn to stay “on task” (Leo, 2002, p. 56). And once again institutions work together to convince people that they need them, that these systems are in the public’s best interest and they take advantage of the uncertainty that may plague a parent of a young child:

> A child with ADHA is “at risk” and will continue to fail at school, and if left untreated long enough the child will probably develop a more serious condition. Without some sort of medication, the child is doomed to a life of frustrations, failures, and possibly even incarcerations. Talk therapy might sound good, but . . . withholding medications from these kids is irresponsible and even verges on child abuse. (Leo, 2002, p. 53)

This can be a powerful incentive for a parent to follow the medical advice of a professional working with the authority of a school system. It does not matter that there is *no* correlation between not placing a child on medications and the *possibility* of that child failing in school and eventually being incarcerated, but why would a parent take that chance? Medication itself becomes a sort of panopticon, it becomes a chemical panopticon.

Another strange advancement in science that is now being studied for the use in school systems is the technology of Radio-frequency Identification (RFID). In the UK, RFIDs are being tested as a tracking device for school children (Claburn, 2007). Some children in secondary schools are having RFID chips placed in their uniforms as a way to track where these children are during the day and to make sure they stay where they are supposed to. This technology is also sold as a way to track children in case something happens to them, and as Claburn (2007) notes: “Add the RFID chips to increased video surveillance and fingerprinting of kids, and this is a heavily tracked generation—for safety's sake.” This increases the way to monitor and regulate behaviors, using technology to watch individuals by cameras, track their every move through RFID devices and controlling mental processes through medications. This is where science and humanity makes its final and greatest split; where science becomes completely

mechanistic and further removes life and humanity away from scientific process and removes us from ourselves and the natural world.

Evolving Science

Interestingly the ideas of science and humanity have not always been so divided and separated, nor have they always been at such odds with each other. It is with a contemporary western scientific model that we see a divide between that which is scientific and that which is human (or I would argue that which is natural and alive). By separating these two aspects (scientific and nature *or* scientific and humane), institutions adopt a model which is not alive. As Sartre (1963) notes, "Human science is frozen in the non-human, and human reality seeks to understand itself outside of science" (p. 179). This statement by Sartre makes me think of C. G. Jung in his autobiography (1963) where he comments "I cannot employ the language of science to trace this process of growth in myself, for I cannot experience myself as a scientific problem" (p. 3). This is the struggle that we go through in our contemporary society, especially a society that wishes to reduce everything to quantifiable, measurable, scientific equations that can be studied and controlled. Are we a scientific endeavor, like the school systems want us to be, or are we a human one?

If we trace this history of the scientific model and how it has evolved we begin to understand that when implemented by schools and other institutions they can only view people as scientific endeavors. We can find the roots of our western scientific theoretical model dating back to the 5th century B.C. Greek philosopher Aristotle. Aristotle, being Plato's student, deviated from the teachings of Plato's metaphysics and theory of the

Forms and Aristotle grounded himself in a "scientific model," as an example of this "about a fifth of his extant writings describe the physiology and behaviour of some 540 zoological species, based on his own dissections and observations" (Gottlieb, 2000, p. 221). This does not mean that Aristotle was devoid of an understanding of life beyond the scientific model; it is in Raphael's famous painting *The School of Athens* that depicts Aristotle and Plato engaging in a dialectical conversation, with Plato pointing to the heavens and Aristotle motioning to the earth, "In Aristotle and Plato together, then, we find a certain elegant balance and tension between empirical analysis and spiritual intuition" (Tarnas, 1991, p. 68).

In some ways it is this elegant balance portrayed in Raphael's panting that I think Jung was attempting to convey with his statement that he is not a scientific problem. Jung could not see himself as a scientific problem, but when we look at who Jung was as a person, he was a trained scientist. Jung was a medical doctor and psychiatrist, and was a student of Sigmund Freud (1989) who viewed psychiatry and psychoanalysis as a science, or what he called "the science of unconscious mental processes" (p. 41).

This statement by Jung of not wanting to view his growth as a scientific process probably stems from his break with Freud and his reaction to Freud's derogatory view of unscientific methods applied to psychoanalysis. Freud (1966) notes this in his Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis about "psychological modes;" "You have grown accustomed to regarding them with suspicion, to denying them the attribute of being scientific and to handing them over to laymen, poets, natural philosophers and mystics" (p. 23). Not a very complimentary view. As I stated earlier however, Jung was a

trained scientist, and I for one have a difficult time believing he could not, based on his training and experience, incorporate a scientific method in relation to his growth. This does not mean that science was all he applied to his growth, but I do believe that he managed to strike a balance between his scientific training and understanding and his philosophical one. As Jung (1963) notes later in his autobiography "I am primarily interested in how I can help my patients find their healthy base again. To do that, a great variety of knowledge is needed, I have learned" (p. 349). I would assume that Jung would have applied this method to himself in relation to his own growth and that variety of knowledge would include science.

What I do believe Jung was attempting to communicate is the fact that we have a tendency to apply *only* a scientific model when it comes to not only ourselves but also to that which we study; sometimes the only way that we view something as "valid" is if it is based on a rigid scientific examination that excludes soulfulness. What we have seen with Plato and Aristotle was a balance between the two ideas of science and what I would call humanistic thought,[1] and even though Plato was considered to be the intellectual superior "in many respects it would be Aristotle's philosophical (scientific) temperament that would come to define the dominant orientation of the Western Mind" (Tarnas, 1991, p. 68). We must not forget however that even Plato felt that science was an important part of what is philosophical (contemporary western thought is what removes philosophy

[1] This idea of humanistic thought is what we would today call "philosophy" and is considered the antithesis of science, even though both have historically been connected. Humanistic thought and philosophy here would include religion, poetry, literature, etc, the "humanities," whereas science includes that which is to be reduced to its quantifiable components.

from science). “Plato understood the physical universe to be organized in accordance with the mathematical Ideas of number and geometry” (Tarnas, 1991, p. 10).

Though some would argue that it was Plato and Aristotle that laid the groundwork for the separation of science and philosophy, mind and body, humanity and the natural world[1] (Suzuki & McConnell, 1998, p. 191) it was not until René Descartes that we really have see break of humanity from the natural world and the development of a foundation of the western scientific model that eschews a human element. As Thomas Berry (1999) notes about René Descartes:

> In a very real sense he *de*soulded the Earth with his division of realty between mind and extension. In this perspective the nonhuman world was seen simply as mechanism. It was, however, a mechanism that could be, and even must be, exploited for human benefit. (p. 78)

But what exactly did Descartes say that would lead people to think that he is to blame for the disconnection of people from those around them and the natural world, eventually leading to a soulless endeavor known as science? We are familiar with Descartes’ (1998) famous line *I think therefore I am* or “I am, I exist; that is certain” (p. 25). But this was only part of his work on “meditations.” Before Descartes (1998) could get to the point of acknowledging his existence he had to, for some reason, deny the existence of others, or even demonize them:

[1]Some would argue that this was not even a split, but a religious mandate ordained by God as Buell (2005) notes: “The opening chapters of Genesis, the first book of Hebrew and Christian scripture, have been blamed as the root cause of western technodominationism: God’s mandate to man to take ‘dominion’ over the creatures of the sea and earth and ‘subdue’ them” (p. 2). Of course it does not say destroy them in the process.

> Therefore, I will suppose that, not God who is the source of truth but some evil mind, who is all powerful and cunning, has devoted all their energies to deceiving me. I will imagine that the sky, air, earth, colours, shapes, sounds, and everything else external to me are nothing more than the creatures of dreams by means of which an evil spirit entraps my credulity. I shall imagine myself as if I had no hands, no eyes, no flesh, no blood, no senses at all, but as if my beliefs in all these things were false (p. 22).

And this was Descartes conclusion, "Thus I will assume that everything I see is false" (p. 23).

Based on Descartes' theoretical understanding of who he is, he can be sure that he exists. He cannot necessarily acknowledge that other humans exist but can posit based on his existence that they may exist and have souls. He cannot extend this courtesy to animals however as Avramides (2001) points out Descartes considers non human animals as "*bête*-machines . . . All animal bodies are, by this definition, automatons. What distinguishes human animals from non-human animals is the fact that the former have been endowed by God with minds" (p. 57). This, of course, does not bode well for non-human animals that fall victim to a western scientific model that embraces a Cartesian viewpoint of the world, and was actually used by western colonialism and imperialism to justify the subjection of other humans by viewing them as non-human animals. But what does this strong Cartesian model mean for science and humanity, especially with this embracing of a mind/body dualism? What this Cartesian model eventually does is lead to a system of power and control being implemented in the scientific model, since all things are reduced to quantifiable means and the human element removed from science. It leads to the panopticon.

A Psychology of Anarchism

Figure 2 Photograph Taken at a Local Park

The picture above was taken by me recently during a hike in a local park. It never ceases to amaze me how we not only allow ourselves to be monitored and surveilled, but we almost expect it. Reflecting on what I have discussed so far I can see where there would be this overwhelming sense of hopelessness and despair of the fact that we are increasingly becoming a monitored society and removed from not only the natural world but from our own humanness. Believe it or not, with all the cameras and panoptic systems I actually don't feel as much despair as I do hope. As Erich Fromm (1969) notes, "The authoritarian systems cannot do away with the basic conditions that make for the quest for freedom; neither can they exterminate the quest for freedom that springs from

these conditions" (p. 238). Comments like Fromm's give me hope and hope also comes from my vocation as a psychotherapist and the work I do in education. It is a hope that comes from my values and beliefs and from the people I have met and connected with on a philosophical and personal level. These are fundamentally things that make us human and as much as panoptic systems want to remove our humanness from who we are, I believe ontologically that is impossible. It is impossible however only if we are willing to reconnect science with the human element and reconnect ourselves to the natural world.

This is where the intersection of anarchism, psychology and education come into play. Contemporary education is heavily influenced by psychology, especially behavioral and developmental psychology. This psychological model serves two main purposes, one being the monitoring and studying of behavioral habits of children and the other is to manage and produce citizens that fit a society of producers and consumers. There is no room for existential thought or exploration in contemporary psychology or education, as Vallance (1974) points out, "education continued (and continues) to be justified more as a means of social control than as an instrument of individual betterment" (p. 12). Because of this agenda of social control, education and psychology becomes rigid and reductionist.

This reductionist scientific model that we have been looking at through the system of the panopticon also removes us from the natural world, and as noted with the ideas of Descartes, views the natural world as either nonexistent or dead. Our minds and nature both become areas to be dissected and studied, our minds metaphorically and the natural

world literally. This reductionist scientific model has two characteristics as noted by Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993):

> 1) It reduces the capacity of humans to know nature both by excluding other knowers and other ways of knowing; and 2) by manipulating it as inert and fragmented matter, nature's capacity for creative regeneration and renewal was reduced. Reductionism has a set of distinctive characteristics which demarcates it from all other non-reductionist knowledge systems which it has subjugated and replaced. Primarily, the ontological and epistemological assumptions of reductionism are based on uniformity, perceiving all systems as comprising the same basic constituents, discrete, and atomistic, and assuming all basic processes to be mechanical. The mechanistic metaphors of reductionism have socially reconstituted nature and society. In contrast to the organic metaphors, in which concepts of order and power were based on interdependence and reciprocity, the metaphor of nature as a machine was based on the assumption of divisibility and manipulability (p. 23).

The basic structure of classrooms demonstrates this divisibility of reductionist science, where classrooms are structured in rows and columns and a hierarchal structure is established between the teacher and student, establishing the manipulability postulated by Shiva. This structure creates the symbiosis that Fromm discusses, where the student needs the teacher to learn and the teacher needs the students to maintain this hierarchal position.

The intersection of anarchism, psychology and education is to break this symbiotic dependence. What we start to notice when we begin to reflect on these panoptic systems is that in actuality they need us more than we need them. These institutions spend a good portion of their time attempting to convince us how much we need them. They want to somehow convince us that by monitoring our every move, we are now free. This surveillance somehow becomes freedom and the concern for this, as Marcuse (2007) points out is that "Psychologically . . . the difference between domination

and freedom is becoming smaller" (p. 162). But I still believe that our natural reaction is to reject this artificial form of freedom and embrace a freedom that disconnects us from the panopticon and reconnects us to ourselves and those around us. That is why I think the ideas of anarchism are so important to education and psychology.

Freedom

This freedom becomes, as Fromm (1969) notes, a "freedom from" instead of a "freedom to" (p. 133).[1] As we notice with the structuring of the classroom, with rows and columns, this establishes a dependence on the authority of school (i.e. teachers, administrators, etc.), but disconnects students from themselves and each other. School settings become hypercompetitive and yet establish a sense of uniformity. Grades and class rankings develop the competitiveness required for a hypercapitalist society, but unique individuality is discouraged. There becomes a cognitive dissonance for students; one is to be the best and yet be just like everybody else. This becomes the purpose of schools and other institutions, as noted by Kropotkin (1914):

> The absorption of all social functions by the State necessarily favoured the development of an unbridled, narrow-minded individualism. In proportion as the obligations towards the State grew in numbers the citizens were evidently relieved from their obligations towards each other. (p. 227)

So freedom does not mean just extricating yourself from a panoptic system. Freedom means also reconnecting yourself to others and the natural world. As Bookchin (1995) notes, "*freedom* dialectically interweaves the individual with the collective" (p. 12).

[1] Viktor Frankl also uses the ideas of "freedom from" and "freedom to." Frankl (1983) notes that "human freedom is not a 'freedom from' but a 'freedom to' – a freedom to accept responsibility" (p. 70). In this case I would see this *freedom to* responsibility as taking responsibility of our actions instead of relying on institutions to be responsible for us.

Freedom is not this sense that you can do whatever you want, but that you begin to understand the interconnectedness of all things.

When you speak of the ideas of anarchism in relation to psychology, you are using two ideas that people would normally not connect with each other. Anarchy is still perceived as chaos and destruction and not something that people would want an individual to think of psychologically. In reality anarchy is anything but destruction, it is an embracing of life and an existential quest to understand who we are in relation to others and to the natural world. Anarchy is a rejection of domination and control, of hierarchy and of authority that has the intent of manipulating others. "The word anarchy comes from the Greek word *anarkhia*, which loosely translated means without rule, or to a society without government" (Rhodes, 2007, p. 99). You can see where a concept like anarchy would be a threat to power structures, and this becomes the impetus behind power structuring morphing the definition of anarchy to mean chaos.

If the purpose of the panopticon is to regiment uncertainty out of existence as Bauman has noted, then any idea that encourages people to govern themselves, to have independence and autonomy in relation to community, is dangerous. To combat this, the institutions that govern the panoptic system have to manipulate ideas that would encourage individual's freedom. As Murray Bookchin (2004) notes: "Viewed from a broad historical perspective, anarchism is a libidinal upsurge of the people, a stirring of the social unconscious that reaches back, under many different names, to the earliest struggles of humanity against domination and authority" (p. x).

For me anarchism should draw from different philosophies and ideas, not limiting it to what it can learn from. It should attempt to stay away from dogmatic ideas, although this has not always occurred with anarchists. Murray Bookchin (1995) complains that some individuals defining themselves as anarchist will attempt to merge the ideas of historical anarchists like Kropotkin and Bakunin with individuals like John Stuart Mill. My response to this type of logic is, so! Actually, Kropotkin (2002) himself references John Stuart Mill and the importance in being able to connect anarchism with other philosophers, "in order to realize how closely anarchism is connected with all the intellectual movement of our own times" (p. 299). Bookchin, as I discussed in Chapter I, is a great defender of anarchism drawing from the ideas of Marxism, even though some anarchist are great critics of Marx, yet he wants to complain about anarchism drawing from other philosophers? Anarchism needs to learn and draw from a multitude of theories and ideas. To me referring to Marx and contemporary psychology would be essential in understanding a psychology of anarchism. Of course even the use of Marx in psychology has been controversial; I would imagine this would be the same in combining Marx with contemporary psychology and anarchism.

Groups such as the Frankfurt School attempted to incorporate ideas such as Marx and Freud to analyze society, capitalism and fascism. Not everyone has agreed with the attempted use of incorporating the ideas of Marx in relation to psychology. Keith Brooks (1973) states that Marxism "fails to deal with those spheres of social life that have come to be the domain of psychology" (p. 315), and he continues to note that "there are real gaps in Marxist social thought, perhaps most particularly in regard to psychology" (p.

321). I have a tendency to disagree with these statements by Brooks. Marx was no psychologist, but he was adept at analyzing systems and I believe he was very perceptive on how humans responded to oppressive systems. With institutions adopting panoptic and Taylor models of structuring, they in essence become factories. School systems become factories with children engaging in their work as if they were on a conveyer belt, and this in turn leads to a psychological condition that Marx called *alienation*.

Alienation

Marx made some very profound critiques of capitalist systems. He had a clear understanding how the production of means in western society created an oppressive system that removed humans from themselves and the work that they did. Marx (1990) called this process that removes humans from themselves, this capitalist process that oppresses individuals, *alienation* and is very clear on what it means and does:

> Within the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productivity of labor are put into effect at the cost of the individual worker; that all means for the development of production undergo a dialectical inversion so that they become means of domination and exploitation of the producers; they distort the worker into a fragment of a man, they degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, they destroy the actual content of his labour by turning it into a torment; they alienate [*entfremden*] from him the intellectual potentialities of the labour process in the same proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power; they deform the conditions under which he works, subject him during the labour process to a despotism the more hateful for its meanness; they transform his life-time into working-time, and drag his wife and child beneath the wheels of the juggernaut of capital. (p. 799)

This writing of Marx is taken from his tome Capital Volume 1 written in the mid to late 1800s, and it is interesting to note that already he was picking up on the use of science ("science is incorporated in it as an independent power") as a means of control and

power. We think of science in relation to the panopticon and ideas of power and control as being a very twentieth-century notion, but not only did Marx identify the psychological condition of this system, but the use of science to organize and make it more efficient.

Capital is not the only place that Marx talks about this idea of alienation. In his Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 Karl Marx (1964) once again speaks of alienation and its effects on individuals:

> The *alienation* of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an *external* existence, but it exists *outside him*, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien. (p. 108)

So as Marx notes, individuals not only become alienated from themselves, but from the work they do, their own products become alien and hostile. There is no longer a connection between the individual and his labor, nor the individual and him or herself. Marx (1964) once again notes, "so much does labor's realization appear as loss of realization that the worker loses realization to the point of starving to death" (p. 108). This "starving to death" becomes a metaphor of life, where an individual mentally and emotionally starves to death because of this alienation, there is a loss of soul, or spirit, or humanity. Erich Fromm's (1994) response to Marx's idea of alienation would be that "there is a threat to his spiritual existence resulting from an industrial society in which man becomes increasingly alienated, a mere *homo consumens*, a thing among things, subordinate to the interests of the state and to economic production" (p. 262).

This idea of alienation is a very real and psychological condition that Marx was able to identify in the mid 1800s. Marx's works are greatly extensive and it would take a lifetime to study them all, but as one purses his writings you can see that Marx actually did have an understanding of the psychological condition of oppressive labor and that his ideas are actually very relevant to psychology today.[1] Being a trained psychotherapist, I cannot help but notice the similarities between Marx's idea of alienation and the APA's diagnosis of a condition called Dissociative Disorder, specifically Depersonalization Disorder.

Dissociative Disorder is marked by a dissociating of the individuals from themselves, from themselves and other around them, or from themselves and activities. People dissociate themselves, literally removing themselves mentally from the event or situation. The DSM IV TR notes this in the criteria for Dissociative Disorder where it "is characterized by a persistent or recurrent feeling of being detached from one's mental process or body that is accompanied by intact reality testing" (APA, 2000, p. 519). Some of the diagnostic features of Depersonalization Disorder in the DSM IV TR strike very similar resemblance to Marx's notion of alienation:

> The essential features of Depersonalization Disorder are persistent or recurrent episodes of depersonalization characterized by a feeling of detachment or estrangement from one's self. The individual may feel like an automaton or as if he or she is living in a dream or a movie. There may be a sensation of being an outside observer of one's mental processes, one's body, or a parts of one's body. (p. 530)

[1] Many of Marx's ideas are still relevant today, as Howard Zinn (1999) points out in his comical play about Marx returning to late 20th century Soho, Marx in Soho. In the play Karl Marx picks up a paper and reads "'Giant merger of Chemical Band and Chase Manhattan. Twelve thousand workers will lose jobs . . . Stocks rise.' And they say my ideas are dead!" (p. 9).

We contrast this with the fact that our model of work and schooling are based on a panopticon theory, we can begin to see how one would become alienated from his or her work, or disassociate, leading to depersonalization.

Not only do we become alienated from our work and ourselves, these panoptic systems alienate us from the natural world. Anarchist Murray Bookchin (2004) postulates this in regards to industrialization and capitalism when he notes that "we became alienated from nature" (p. 76). Bookchin (2004) continues to state that "our technology and environment became totally inanimate, totally synthetic – a purely inorganic physical milieu that promoted the deanimazation of man and his thought" (p. 76). Some would argue that the ideas of Marx do not take in account this contemporary anarchist view of our separation from nature. Marxists like Theodor Adorno actually feel that Marx's notion of the environment are anti-ecological and notes this in a correspondence with Martin Jay (1973), where he states that, "If Marx had his way, the entire world would be turned into a 'giant workhouse'" (p. 259).

Marx of course was not an environmentalist, mainly because the environmental concerns that we see today could not have been fathomed in the mid-nineteenth century. But I do believe that if Marx were alive today he would be just as disturbed about the environmental damage that is being caused as any contemporary environmentalist. We actually do see an understanding of nature in Marx's (1994) writings, especially his Economic and Philosophical Manuscript where he notes that "*Man* is directly a *natural being*" (p. 181). Marx (1994) also understood how the capitalist machine disconnects humans from their natural being, "Light, air, and the simplest *animal* cleanliness cease to

be human needs. *Filth*, this corruption and putrefaction which runs in the *sewers* of civilization becomes the *element in which man lives*" (p. 142).

Re-connecting and Ecopsychology

With this idea of an anarchist psychology we are looking at reclaiming our humanity with science, to reestablish the dialectic of nature and science, to rebuild the connection of ourselves with the natural world. We have to look at different forms of science beyond reductionist science to help do this, and as Murray Bookchin (2004) notes, "There is one science, however, that may yet restore and even transcend the liberatory estate of the traditional sciences and philosophies. It passes rather loosely under the name 'ecology'" (p. 20). This is why I think that a psychology of anarchism will ultimately be an ecopsychology. Where traditional western psychology and science have worked so hard to remove humanity from the natural world, and with the panopticon actually removing us from our own human nature, a psychology of anarchism and ecopsychology will *re-connect* us back to ourselves and the natural world. This is where anarchism draws from Marx, with this dialectical model.

Western science creates division and segmentation; it views things in binary terms, what Fromm (1990) calls "Aristotelian logic" (p. 120). Fromm (1990) notes a different approach called "*paradoxical logic*" (p. 120). Paradoxical logic is what Fromm (1990) feels was "predominant in Chinese and Indian thinking, in Heraclitus' philosophy, and then again under the name of dialectics in the thought of Hegel and Marx" (p. 120). Beat poet and philosopher Gary Snyder (1969) would agree with Erich Fromm's postulation of connecting Marx and Hegel's idea of dialectics with Eastern traditions,

"It's an easy step from the dialectic of Marx and Hegel to an interest in the dialectic of early Taoism, the *I Ching*, and the yin-yang theories" (p. 114). We will look at this connection of this dialectic with ecopsychology and Eastern philosophy in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

ECOPSYCHOLOGY

The Beats Man . . . The Beats . . .

In Jack Kerouac's (1958) book The Dharma Bums, Kerouac describes a friend of his named Japhy:

> Being a Northwest boy with idealistic tendencies, he got interested in old fashioned I.W.W. anarchism…I first saw him walking down the street in San Francisco… – I saw Japhy loping along in that curious long stride of the mountainclimber, with a small knapsack on his back filled with books and toothbrushes and whatnot which was his small "goin-to-the-city" knapsack as apart from his big full rucksack complete with sleeping bag, poncho, and cookpots. He wore a little goatee, strangely Oriental-looking with his somewhat slanted green eyes…He was wiry, suntanned, vigorous, open, all howdies and glad talk and even yelling hello to bums on the street and when asked a question answered right off the bat from the top or bottom of his mind I don't know which and always in a sprightly sparkling way. (pp. 9-10)

This was my first contact with Gary Snyder, the infamous Japhy in Kerouac's book. Kerouac frequently wrote about the individuals with whom he cavorted in his fictitious works. While he was considered the bellwether of the Beatniks (or simply the "Beats") it is the writings of Gary Snyder and Alan Watts that I gravitate towards. [1]

The Beats, or beatniks, were an odd bunch of characters, post war poets and writers, drifting around the country and traveling the world. The terms Beat and beatnik

[1] Alan Watts was never really considered a "Beat" but his writings were influential to the Beats. Watts was actually a professor of Religious Studies and was very interested in Eastern philosophies as many of the Beats were. He also saw a likeness between the Beats and the "sages" and "mystics" within many counter-culture movements and Eastern religious traditions. One should reference two books by Watts in regards to these issues, The Culture of Counter-Culture (1998) and Zen and the Beat Way (1997).

are hard to define, much like anarchism. This ambiguity may be why Gary Snyder was influenced by both ideas, this refusal to be pinned down to one ideology or philosophy. Even where the term Beat itself comes from is of much debate, with individuals who studied the Beats like Ann Charters (2001) noting that it was Kerouac and John Clellon Homes sitting around musing their lives when Kerouac stated that they were the "Beat Generation" (p. xv). Others state that Kerouac and his followers stumbled on the word in Time Square from a junkie and they all derived their own meaning from this word, where for some the word meant "exhausted, poor, beatific" while for others it meant "steal or con" (Douglas, 1999, p. 5).

Regardless of the history or meaning of these terms, the Beats themselves represented a counter-culture movement in the United States that personified a reaction to and movement against authority and regimentation. They embraced the notion of playfulness, individuality and personal expression through song, poetry and the written word. Their writings have influenced many disenfranchised youth that were seeking an existential philosophy that did not fall within the normal confines of western tradition and culture. The Beats wanted to embrace intellectualism even while rejecting traditional academics as Kerouac (1958) once again notes in The Dharma Bums:

> Colleges being nothing but grooming schools for the middle-class non-identity which usually finds its perfect expression on the outskirts of the campus in rows of well-to-do houses with lawns and televisions sets in each living room with everybody looking at the same thing and thinking the same thing at the same time (p. 39).

The actor Johnny Depp (1999) sarcastically stated it best with the title of an essay he wrote about the Beats, "*Kerouac, Ginsberg, the Beats and Other Bastards Who Ruined My Lif*e" (p. 410). I reference these individuals and the Beatniks because I believe that the roots of ecopsychology do not lie in contemporary psychological or psychotherapeutic thought, or even in contemporary ecology, but in the writings, poetry and thought of the counter-culture movements such as the Beats, and they in turn were heavily influenced by Eastern philosophy.[1]

When traditional society viewed the counter-culture movements, and especially the Beats of the 1940s and 1950s they perceived them as drug users and wastrels, although in reality they were more like mendicants. The 1950s Beat movement was the prelude to the 1960s hippy counter-culture, a culture that was sometimes rightly maligned for its seemingly gratuitous drug use but also a culture that espoused peace, love and acceptance and included among its adherents many strong proponents of civil rights and anti-war activists. This does not mean that there was not the experimentation with alcohol and drug use among the Beats; even in Kerouac's The Dharma Bums (1958), Gary Snyder's character Japhy chides Kerouac about his alcohol consumption:

> How do you expect to become a good bhikku or even a Bodhisattva Mahasattva always getting drunk like that . . . You're just drinking too much all the time, I don't see how you're even going to gain enlightenment and manage to stay out of the mountains, you'll always be coming down the hill spending your bean money on wine and finally you'll end up lying in the street in the rain, dead drunk . . . (to which Kerouac responded) but I just went on drinking. (pp. 190-191)

[1] It is no coincidence that Theodore Roszak who coined the word "ecopsychology" in his book The Voice of the Earth (2001) also wrote a book in the late 1960s entitled The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition (1995).

Of course, Kerouac eventually died from his alcohol abuse[1] at the age of 47. As Ann Charters (1973) notes in her biography of Kerouac towards the end of his life "Jack sipped continuously at half-quart cans of Falstaff, alternating beer with the whisky" eventually dying of "massive abdominal hemorrhaging" (p. 350). This lifestyle however was not the foundation of the Beats. Experimentation with some drugs and alcohol was a way to break away from the authoritarian life that many perceived to be a part of the traditional western cultures; the Beats however were more interested in learning about spiritual traditions and discovering a different way to live. As Watts (1997) points out "The real, original Dharma Bums of the 1945-46 era—young veterans hitchhiking across the country and stopping every place there was a 'sage' who knew something about Eastern philosophy . . . They weren't interested in jazz or drugs or hot rods I assure you" (p. xi).

The Beat movement, of which Gary Snyder is considered one of the original "inner circle," were heavily influenced by Eastern philosophy (not to mention on Gary Snyder's part Native American spirituality as well). It is in these philosophies, Buddhism, Taoism and Shamanism, that we find the foundation of ecopsychology. It was this fusion of Eastern Philosophy and western activism (specifically Industrial Workers of the World, or simply I.W.W. and anarchism) that Snyder drew heavily from to develop his own personal theoretical approach to ecological concerns. Snyder actually wrote a

[1] Jack Kerouac's (1962) book Big Sur was actually a written document about his struggles with delirium tremens, a physical affliction caused by the withdrawal of alcohol after a long period of consumption.

pamphlet in 1961 titled "Buddhist Anarchism"[1] where he notes that "The mercy of the West has been social revolution; the mercy of the East has been individual insight into the basic self/void. We need both" (1969, p. 92).

This Beat movement was a reaction to a burgeoning technological panopticonic life, a life where after WWII individuals were expected to come back to the states and capitulate to a white, middle class lifestyle. They were expected to never question authority or the government and help keep the corporate and capitalist machine moving forward. Gary Snyder (1995) comments about this time spent with Kerouac and the Beats, and poetry's influence upon his own leanings towards leftist politics:

> We had a sudden feeling that we had finally broken through to a new freedom of expression, had shattered the stranglehold of universities on poets, and gone beyond the tedious and pointless arguments of Bolshevik versus capitalist that were (and still are) draining the imaginative life out of so many intellectuals in the world. What we had discovered, or rediscovered, was that the imagination has a free and spontaneous life of its own, that it can be trusted, that what flows from a spontaneous mind is poetry—and that this is more basic and more revolutionary than any political program based on "civilized abstractions" that end of murdering human beings in the name of historical necessity or Reason or Liberty; Russia and America are both huge witless killers of the heart of man. (pp. 8-9)

What we begin to see in this statement is Snyder's new revolutionary vision. In this revolutionary vision he incorporates ideas such as anarchism, Eastern and western philosophy and poetry (especially Asian poetry) as a reaction against societal authority that helped shaped his own pedagogy of life.

---

[1] This pamphlet can be found in a chapter entitled "Buddhism and the Coming Revolution" of Gary Snyder's (1969) book titled Earth House Hold: Technical Notes & Queries To Fellow Dharma Revolutionaries.

Kerouac was heavily influenced by Snyder's ideas and it is through his novel The Dharma Bums that Kerouac encouraged disenchanted youth to throw off the shackles of society, grab rucksacks and hike around the country, camping out, reading and writing poetry, learning Buddhism, other Eastern and western philosophy and connecting with nature. This wandering mendicant idea encouraged by Kerouac and Snyder has a long and rich tradition in Eastern philosophy, especially among Buddhist and Taoist poets, monks and sages. You can see this with the seventeenth-century Japanese Buddhist poet Matsuo Bashō in his famous knapsack notebook titled Narrow Road to the Interior, where he hiked around Japan writing about his experiences and the poets and sages that influenced him:

> Saigyō in poetry, Sōgi in linked verse, Sesshū in painting, Rikyū in the tea ceremony—the spirit that moves them is one spirit. Achieving artistic excellence, each holds one attribute in common: each remains attuned to nature throughout the four seasons. Whatever is seen by such a heart and mind is a flower, whatever is dreamed in a moon. Only a barbarian mind could fail to see the flower; only an animal mind could fail to dream a moon. The first task for each artist is to overcome the barbarian or animal heart and mind, to become one with nature. (Hamill, 1998, pp. 55-56)

These poets and sages meant so much to Kerouac that he dedicated his book The Dharma Bums to the ancient Chinese poet Han Shan, which translates to Cold Mountain. Han Shan is considered one of China's greatest poets, a recluse who lived around the late eighth early ninth century; he was regarded as an odd character and would write his poetry "on trees and rocks or the walls of the houses and offices in the nearby village" (Watson, 1970, pp. 8-9). The belief is that Han Shan rejected his chance to be a

government official for a life of poverty and poetry and you may see this reflected his following poem:

Here we languish, a bunch of poor scholars,
Battered by extremes of hunger and cold.
Out of work, our only joy is poetry:
Scribble, scribble, we wear out our brains.
Who will read the works of such men?
On that point you can save your sighs.
We could inscribe our poems on biscuits
And the homeless dogs wouldn't deign to nibble.
(Watson, 1970, p. 28)

We see the beginnings of Snyder's growth and development in Kerouac's book The Dharma Bums, where he chronicles Snyder's spiritual evolution as Snyder decides to leave the United States and to travel to Japan to study at a Buddhist monastery. Kerouac greatly respected Snyder's decision to leave and study at a monastery. Although Kerouac did not consider himself an ecologist, he was heavily influenced by the Asian poets that Snyder had introduced to him. Gary Snyder, since his return from Japan, has been a tireless environmentalist incorporating his studies of Buddhist and Taoist poets along with his Native American spirituality studies into his ecological vision. He has published many books of poetry (one winning the Pulitzer Prize for Poetry, Turtle Island) and we see how important poetry is to Snyder (1995):

> We do recognize that poetry can make one remember one's own parents, celebrate friendships, and feel tender toward lovers. Poems give soul to history and helped express the gratitude we might sometimes feel for the work and sacrifices of our predecessors. Poetry strengthens the community and honors the life of the spirit. (p. 92)

So what are these Buddhist and Taoist influences on this idea of ecopsychology? These spiritual traditions and its poetry influenced individuals like Jack Kerouac, Gary Snyder and Allen Ginsberg, but what does this have to do with an elusive idea such as ecopsychology? Before we can delve into what Buddhism, Taoism, Shamanism and philosophy and poetry contributes to ecopsychology we need to first try to understand what ecopsychology is.

Ecopsychology

The philosopher Theodore Roszak (2001) in his book titled The Voice of the Earth: An Exploration of Ecopsychology coined the term "ecopsychology." It is in this book that Roszak (2001) notes, "This is an essay in ecopsychology. Its goal is to bridge our culture's long-standing, historical gulf between the psychological and the ecological, to see the needs of the planet and the person as a continuum" (p. 14). I want to point out that Roszak notes that this "historic gulf" is with "*our* culture." This is something that Snyder picks up on when he studies Eastern philosophy and shamanism. As I discussed in chapter two, traditional western science is what has historically separated us from the natural world and has viewed nature as something to conquer instead of working *with*. Because of this need to conquer not only other cultures, but also animals and the planet itself, we have created numerous and enormous environmental problems today. As Roszak (2001) notes, "These commonplace environmental problems have become the psychopathology of *our* everyday life" (p. 13).

We, of course, turn to science to help us with psychopathology. The development of psychotherapy over the years has been to address the issues of psychological problems

and concerns. But we have a tendency to focus more on the problems than the root of those problems. “We look to the psychiatrists to teach us the meaning of madness, but our dominant schools of psychotherapy are themselves creations of the same scientific and industrial culture that now weighs so brutally on the planet” (Roszak, 2001, p. 19). As I noted in chapter two, the model of the Panopticon extends out to any discipline that can be utilized to measure and control individuals, and this includes psychology and psychotherapy along with education.

The question is what role does psychotherapy play in perpetuating a system of domination and control that may be destroying the planet and in essence ourselves? For Lester Brown, a psychotherapist who wrote the forward to Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind, the answer is that: “Ecopsychology brings together the sensitivity of therapists, the expertise of ecologists, and the ethical energy of environmental activists. Out of this rich mixture may arise a new, more effective, more philosophical grounded form of environmental politics” (Roszak, Gomes & Kanner, 1995, p. xvi). Unfortunately this is not the predominant opinion or idea that is shared by contemporary, traditional psychology and psychotherapy, or even education as R. D. Laing (1973) notes:

> In a society where competition for the basic cultural goods is a pivot of action, people cannot be taught to love one another. It thus becomes necessary for the school to teach children how to hate, and without appearing to do so, for our culture cannot tolerate the idea that babes should hate each other. (p. 120)

The incorporation of the playfulness of the Beats, the idea of poetry and arts and reconnecting to the planet are not ideas that resonate very well with a governmental

power structure that supports a capitalist system where making money is the most important factor in how society (dys)functions. But then again, this has always been the case, at least where strong hierarchal lines are established, as we see with the eighth century Chinese poet Meng Chiao and his poem *Despair*:

Despise poetry, and you'll be named to office.
But love poetry is like clinging to a mountain:

frozen, holding tight, facing death,
days of sorrow followed by sorrow.

The bourgeoisie are jealous of those
who love poetry: they flash teeth like knives.

All the old sages are long since dead,
But bureaucrats still gnaw their bones.

Now I'm frail, dying like a frond.
All my life I sought a noble calm,

a calm I could never achieve.
And the noisy rabble mocked me.
(Hamill, 2000, p. 176).

I cite this poem because even though we will be looking at the Buddhist and Taoist influence upon ecopsychology, especially with the poets, even these Chinese and Japanese sages were looked down upon by governmental officials. They were looked down upon much like the Beats were in the United States, not to mention some communist, anarchist groups and other counter-culture movements that wanted to reclaim the humane nature of our modern existence.

As we see below, Gary Snyder (1995) understood the importance to the poets' ideas and their poetry and writing in relation to humanity, ecology and challenging hierarchical power structures such as panoptic systems:

> What does poetry do then? For at least a century and a half, the socially engaged writers of the developed world have taken their role to be one of resistance and subversion. Poetry can disclose the misuse of language by holders of power, it can attack dangerous archetypes employed to oppress, and it can expose the flimsiness of shabby made-up mythologies. It can savagely ridicule pomp and pretension, and it can offer—in ways both obvious and subtle—more elegant, tastier, lovelier, deeper, more ecstatic, and far more intelligent words and images. (pp. 92-93)

It is this *social engagement* that Snyder references that becomes important in understanding the influence Buddhist and Taoist poetry and philosophy to ecopsychology. I will address this social engagement a little later, but first I want to reflect on the history and influence of Taoism and Buddhism, both poetry and ideas, to counter-culture movements and ecopsychology.

Taoist and Buddhist Influence

Do you want to improve the world?
I don't think it can be done.

The world is sacred.
It can't be improved.
If you tamper with it, you'll ruin it.
If you treat it like an object, you'll lose it.

This particular quote comes from the 29th verse of Lao Tzu's Tao Te Ching, translated by Stephen Mitchell (1992, p. 34). The Tao Te Ching is a Chinese text that was supposedly written around 500 B.C. in a period commonly known as the Axial period

because of the great progress in philosophical thought throughout the world; Socrates, Plato in Greece, Shakyamuni Buddha in India and Taoist and Confucius thought in China. It is believed that a Chinese sage named Lao Tzu (which translates to "Old Master") penned this book; short in nature it only had eighty-one entries.

Much controversy surrounds the actual inception and writing of this text, with some historians stating that there was not an actual person named Lao Tzu, but that this author was an amalgamation of individuals working together and over the years they have merged into the myth of one great sage known as Lao Tzu. As Witter Bynner (1994) notes in his introduction to The Way of Life according to Lao Tzu, both Eastern and Western scholars "believed that long-lived Laotzu was a myth and that the sayings attributed to him were a compilation of the sayings of a number of men" (pp. 13-14). Of course there are others who believe that Lao Tzu was an actual living individual who possessed otherworldly sagacity. The Tao Te Ching is the human attempt to communicate the essence of the Tao (or Way) which is the "all-embracing ultimate principle, which existed before Heaven and Earth" (Fischer-Schreiber, 1996, p. 175). The Tao is that which flows through all things.

Regardless of who wrote the Tao Te Ching, the point of the quote at the beginning of this section is to convey a message, a message that has been known (or should be known) by people for thousands of years and that message is respect for the natural world. What Lao Tzu was able to recognize, and what environmentalists have been pointing out for years now, is that our attempts to control the world, to dissect it and treat it like a commodity, is destroying it and ourselves ("*If you treat it like an object, you'll*

lose it"). This sense of interconnectedness was realized even before Lao Tzu, but through the writing of the Tao Te Ching both Taoist and Buddhist sages were heavily influenced by its message. Buddhist and Taoist poetry is imbued with a sense of naturalism and ecology, partially because Taoism has its roots in shamanistic religions and the connections to the natural world. These poets and sages were able to recognize though their own sensory perception that we are all interconnected and the damage that is done to one is damage done to others. These Taoist and Buddhist sages perceived that the "wilderness is nothing less than a dynamic cosmology in which humans participate in the most fundamental way" (Hinton, 2002, p. xiii).

Our view of individuals that lived during the time of Lao Tzu can be somewhat denigrating. We, in this modern age,[1] have a tendency to look at our historical ancestors with a sense of contempt owing to their supposed lack of knowledge of the "world." We imagine ourselves "enlightened" by massive scientific breakthroughs, discoveries and technology that allow us to traverse great distances in a short time, convincing ourselves that we somehow understand the world in a vastly superior fashion than those who lived long before us. This is a common view among those who have little to no understanding of the natural world, our relation to it and how our actions affect others. But it does not have to be limited to the average individual, environmentalists such as Murray Bookchin (1999) state that other environmentalists idealize preliterate and historic societies, noting

[1] I use "modern" instead of the more ubiquitous "postmodern" because of Patrick Slattery's definition of postmodern being, among others, as "post-anthropocentric . . . post-patriarchal . . . post-scientific…earth first," etc., and looking at our contemporary environment, we are just not there yet (Slattery, 1995, p. 19).

that they romanticize individuals that lived in historic times[1] as "noble savages" and accuse these environmentalists of supporting "primitivism" (p. 186). However, Kwame Appiah (2006) makes a good point in relation to our historical progenitors:

> Our ancestors have been human for a very long time. If a normal baby girl born forty thousand years ago were kidnapped by a time traveler and raised in a normal family in New York, she would be ready for college in eighteen years. (p. xi)

Spiritual and Mystical Component

Bookchin (1999) spares no punches when it comes to criticizing the Tao Te Ching where he claims that "the book itself is inherently mystical, antihumanistic and irrational—and therefore incompatible with social ecology" (p. 220). But Theodore Roszak (2001) would counter this by stating, "A renewed appreciation of the primitive and the traditional may be one or our most useful resources in dealing with our environmental emergency" (p. 226).

When you take the time to sit down and read some of the poetry that was produced by these Buddhist and Taoist poets and monks who were influenced by the Tao Te Ching (something that does not often happen in our fast paced, productivity oriented society), you get a sense that these individuals were not so ignorant and irrational after all. Here we see a poem by the Chinese poet Wang Chih-huan (688-742):

> The white sun is hidden in the mountains.
> The Yellow River empties into the sea
> Climb up one floor:

[1] By "historic" I mean in an era where capitalism and industrialization has not yet taken over; a time when individuals were more reliant on the natural world for daily activities (i.e. farming, foraging, hunting, etc.).

you'll see a hundred miles more.
(as cited in Hamill, 2000, p. 68)

I particularly like how this poem so eloquently expresses the vastness of the natural landscape, and this during a time when there were no skyscrapers or airplanes, just the ability to view the natural world using the natural world as a starting point. From there to our interconnectedness with the natural world we look at the Chinese poet Han-shan Te-ch'ing (1546 – 1622):

A hundred thousand worlds are flowers in the sky
a single mind and body is moonlight on the water
once the cunning ends and information stops
at that moment there is no place for thought.
(Red Pine, 1998, p. 121)

Interestingly, Han-shan Te-ch'ing was a Buddhist monk who studied Buddhist teachings for several years on a spot called Wutai's Han-shan Peak, and because of this he incorporated the name of the peak into his own name, thus solidifying his connection to the natural world and environment in relation to his studies (Red Pine, 1998, p. 115).

But some ecologists view this poetry and beliefs (Buddhism and Taoism) as "mystical" and as Bookchin notes this form of mysticism is religious, and religion and mysticism are both "irrational." Bookchin, who considers himself a social anarchist, has ideas that are steeped in a neo-Marxist theory and he is quick to point out the Marxist (1992) adage that religion is "the *opium* of the people" (p. 244). Individuals such as Bookchin that follow this Marxist tradition fail to acknowledge that this statement of Marx is just the last sentence of a profound paragraph where Marx (1992) notes:

> *Religious* suffering is at one and the same time the *expression* of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world and the soul of the soulless condition. (p. 244)

Marx is employing humanistic language to respond to religion and social concerns ("*heart of a heartless world . . . soul of the soulless condition*") and this humanistic language is not that much different than the mystical language of the Buddhist and Taoist sages and poets. In actuality, Fromm (1994) notes that "Marx's atheism is the most advanced form of rational mysticism, closer to Meister Eckhart or to Zen Buddhism than are most of those fighters for God and religion who accuse him of 'godlessness'" (p. 64). What we see in Bookchin's comments about the "mysticism" of these beliefs is his attempt to apply a Western, neo-Marxist thought to a sixth-century B.C. text. My question would be why could we not draw from both of these sources?

Ironically, Bookchin (1999) himself defends ancient philosophers that he particularly likes from critics that attempt to judge them by contemporary standards:

> What would life be, for any educated person, without a knowledge of Plato and Aristotle, always bearing in mind the times in which they lived? . . . We have to see how ideas developed over the course of history. I am not going to stop reading Aristotle, who was a genius, indeed truly one of the most monumental thinkers of Western history as a whole because he accepted slavery. (p. 136)

We have seen in my second chapter what this almost blind adherence to Aristotle has done for western science. Bookchin, being an anarchist, also is a big critic of hierarchical structures, including heterosexist ones where men attempt to rule over women. Ecologist Carolyn Merchant (1989) quickly points out Aristotle's view of women: "Socially, Aristotle found the basis for male rule over the household in the analogy that, as the soul

ruled the body, so reason and deliberation, characteristic of men, should rule the appetites supposedly predominant in women" (p. 13). So barring Aristotle's scientific, heterosexist and slave owning views Bookchin would consider him one of the "most monumental thinkers" but reject Lao Tzu because he was a "mystic?" Interesting.

This idea of mysticism should be qualified though, especially in relation to Taoist and Buddhist thought, because one person's mysticism is another person's superstition. Some argue that Taoist thought is passive and removes one from society ("*The Tao never does anything, yet through it all things are done,*" Mitchell, 1992, p. 37). That the mystical aspect of the Tao is to place yourself in the hands of a "greater being" to do things and all one has to do is have faith in the Tao. But as Bynner (1994) points out the Tao "was not, as has been widely assumed, vacant inaction or passive contemplation. It was creative quietism" (p. 11). It is because of this "quietism" that people criticize Taoism as a passive belief system, and I am afraid that it is this "creative" aspect that people view as mystical. To Bynner (1994), "Laotzu's quietism is nothing but the fundamental sense commonly inherent in mankind, a common-sense so profound in its simplicity that it has come to be called mysticism" (p. 16).

One unfortunate side effect of contemporary scientific society is that when we attempt to see the sacredness in others (others as the natural world and all those living in it); this becomes labeled as religion, spiritual, mystical and superstitious. One of the reasons that this is viewed as mystical is because to actually see and understand the sacredness in others requires that we actually have to take time to slow down, be observant, listen to others (this includes the natural world) and to be mindful of those

around us.[1] To some in the Western world this approach to life becomes passive and mystical. Once again quoting Bynner (1994):

> Mysticism or not, (Taoism) seems to me the straightest, most logical explanation as yet advanced for the continuance of life, the most logical use yet advised for enjoying it. While most of us, as we use life, try to open the universe to ourselves, Laotzu opens himself to the universe" (pp. 16 – 17).

This opening of oneself to the universe helps facilitate an understanding of our inexorable connection to the living planet. This contrasts heavily with the Western scientific and Cartesian model, which separates us from the rest of the planet; "human beings are things that think (the *only* things, and that is *all* they are), and the rest of the world is made up of things that can be measured" (Suzuki, 1998, p. 192).

This idea of Taoist thought as opposed to Cartesian thought ("Thus I will assume that everything I see is false," Descartes, 1998, p. 23), sets up a psychology of inclusion as opposed to disconnection. The reflection by Taoist and Buddhist sages (even those that isolate themselves in a hermitage) of the interconnectedness of all things helps them to understand that even alone, they are not alone. Descartes lived in a city and could literally look outside his window, see many people, and manage to view himself as a separate individual convinced that the only thing he can be sure of is that he alone exists. The Buddhist and Taoist sages could live away from other people, but know they were never alone and by reflecting on the process of the natural world could develop a psychology of inclusion. We best see this in the poetry of the Japanese Zen monk Ryokan (1758-1831):

[1] In a system that promotes hyper individualism through conformity, anything that promotes a sense of being mindful of others becomes a threat to that system.

The flower invites the butterfly with no-mind:
The butterfly visits the flower with no-mind.
The flower opens, the butterfly comes;
The butterfly comes, the flower opens.
I don't know others,
Others don't know me.
By not-knowing we follow nature's course.
(Stevens, 1993, p. 21)

This reflection on the simple act of pollination of the butterfly and the flower demonstrates a profound understanding on the process of the natural world. One could view the butterfly and the flower as being passive and the act of a Buddhist monk watching this as silly and childish, much like the Taoist poet Ch'eng Hao (1032-1085) when he notes:

The clouds are thin the wind is light the sun is nearly overhead
Past the flowers and through the willows down along the stream
People don't see the joy in my heart
They think I'm wasting time or acting like a child.
(Red Pine, 2003, p. 181)

But what we have in this Taoist and Buddhist mindset is not an irrational or illogical religion, but a mystical experience that views the sacred in all things, even those that cannot be seen (i.e. such as the others that Ryokan is speaking of). This is a psychological understanding of the world that is sacred as opposed to a view of the world that is a commodity, to be dissected and used, sectioned off and sold.

These poets were following the natural flow of the world with their *mindful* observations. Some individuals, like Bookchin, feel very uncomfortable with the language that both the Tao Te Ching uses and the language that the poets use to describe

the world and their place in it. We can see this in the three previous poems (by Han-shan Te-ch'ing, Ryokan and Ch'eng Hao) when they use language like "*there is not place for thought*" and "*by not knowing we follow natures course*" and "*acting like a child*." Bookchin (1999) sees this language and rhetoric as "anti-intellectual" (p. 230), and perhaps he disavows Taoism because his philosophy is based on "action" and involves a system where a process is supposedly taking place. But as Alan Watts (2006) points out "The Philosophy of Tao sees man as a part of nature rather than dominating it" (p. 116) and I would think that this would resonate to some degree with Bookchin, especially in his hierarchy where humans are dominating the planet. Watts' (2006) reflections are very similar to the poets' writings,

> All the interrelationships of nature, whether they appear to be friendly relationship, as between bees and flowers, or conflicting relationships, as between birds and worms, are actually forms of cooperation. This is called 'mutual arising.' When you understand this as the basis of all existence and are able to act 'without forcing,' your life is spontaneous, a life which is so of itself, natural, not forced and not unduly self-conscious. (pp. 117-118)

This language that Watts uses, "mutual arising" and "cooperation" sounds very similar to the language that the anarchist Peter Kropotkin used in his work Mutual Aid. Bookchin often references Kropotkin, especially in relation to his ecological writings, since Kropotkin is considered a pioneer in the social ecology movement (Morris, 2004). As Kropotkin (1914) notes, "With many large divisions of the animal kingdom mutual aid is the rule" (p. 10). Kropotkin (1914) believed that historically humans have survived, not by competition, but by voluntary cooperation and "mutual support" (p. 18). Bookchin

(2005) himself cites Kropotkin and his book on Mutual Aid, "Following very much in the tradition of Peter Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* . . . social ecology *also* emphasizes that the survival of living beings greatly depends on their ability to be supportive of one another" (p. 30). In all of Bookchin's works that I have read, I have never seen him accuse Kropotkin of mysticism. Kropotkin's view of cooperation and mutual aid actually sounds very pragmatic. So maybe what Lao Tzu and these Taoist and Buddhist poets gave us were not superstitious or mystical beliefs, but what Gary Snyder (1995) calls a "mix of elegant pragmaticism and shamanistic vision" (p. 93).

Connection ☯ Balance

So this mystical idea of the Tao, that which connects us, when viewed at its simplest level, actually becomes very pragmatic and a psychology of inclusion and simplicity. We see this form of pragmatic thought in contemporary philosophers today such as Kwame Appiah. Appiah (2005) uses the term "Rooted Cosmopolitanism" to describe how one lives in one area, is a part and identifies with a specific region of the planet, but knows that he or she is a "citizen of the world" (p. 213). As Appiah (2005) notes, "Everyone knows you cannot have face-to-face relations with six billion people. But you cannot have face-to-face relations with ten million people or a million or a hundred people" but this should not stop an individual from understanding the idea that you should "be someone who thinks that the world is, so to speak, our shared hometown" (pp. 216-217). Ryokan understood this fundamental notion by seeing a butterfly and flower interact, yet Ryokan, Buddhists and Taoists will be accused of being superstitious and mystical, I wonder if some would accuse Appiah of such superstition?

Another pragmatic view of this idea of connection with others is from Richard Rorty. Where Appiah uses the idea of Rooted Cosmopolitanism, Rorty just uses the simple notion of "us." He views this from the standpoint of how we treat those that are close to us, family, friends, etc, that which we define are a part of "us." As Rorty (1989) notes we need to continue:

> reminding ourselves to keep trying to expand our sense of 'us' as far as we can . . . the inclusion among 'us' of the family in the next cave, then of the tribe across the river, then of the tribal confederation beyond the mountains. . . . This is a process which we should try to keep going. (p. 196)

What the Taoist would say is that we should be even more pragmatic than what Rorty is suggesting, and see the planet itself as an extension of us (or better yet, we as an extension of the planet). When we begin to view others as us, the hope from Rorty is that we begin to show understanding and compassion. This would be the same if we view us as an extension of others. The exploitation of others has come from the standpoint that we view these "others" not as a part of us, but beneath us, that somehow we are inherently better than others. The same holds true for our exploitation of the planet. This comes from the idea of hierarchy and Bookchin (2005) would note that our need to dominate the planet comes from "the increasing domination of human by human" (p. 109).

When one starts to dominate others or even attempt to dominate the planet, there is a loss of equity, evenness, or what a Taoist would call "balance." This idea of balance is a fundamental tenet in the study and understanding of Taoism and the image that has been used to convey this has actually been appropriated by Western consumerism. The

image of balance in Taoism is the *yin* and *yang*. A very common image now, the *yin* and *yang* are symbolized by a circle with the colors of black and white almost running together, but still demarcated from each other (☯). In each side of the circle is a dot with the opposite color; this is to represent the inclusion of shared elements of the opposite in all things.

> *Yin* and *yang* translated literally mean shade and light. Originally used to describe the absence and presence of sunlight on mountain slopes, it was adopted by the *I-Ching* (Book of Changes) to refer to female and male and other pairs of complementary opposites. Thus, *yin* became associated with stillness, tranquility, softness, flexibility, female, and receptivity; and *yang* became associated with movement, activity, hardness, strength, male, and initiative. (Wong, 1997, p. 126)

The point is that one should maintain a balance in all aspects of his or her life; this does not mean excluding aspects of the other but inclusion (i.e. one cannot have stillness without elements of activity, something we would see in both Vipassana meditation and quantum physics (Capra, 1999, p. 203). This idea of domination of other people or animals or even the planet throws one out of balance and when it is done on a large scale, the more out of balance things become. Something that Taoists knew 2500 years ago and something we are just discovering now with the planet.

So Taoism gives us a psychology of inclusion, simplicity and balance. These Taoist and Buddhist sages and poets were psychologists, espousing a systematic psychological theory of living which includes these very ideas of inclusion, simplicity and balance. Their ideas were rooted in the natural world, in ecology, which would lead Theodore Roszak (2001) to note that:

> Once upon a time, all psychologies were 'ecopsychologies.' Those who sought to heal the soul took it for granted that human nature is densely embedded in the world we share with animal, vegetable, mineral, and all the unseen powers of the cosmos. Just as all medicine was in times past understood to be 'holistic'—a healing of body, mind and soul—and did not need to be identified as such, so all psychotherapy was once spontaneously understood to be cosmically connected. (p. 14)

We can see what Roszak is speaking of in the poetry of the Taoists and Buddhists that were greatly influenced by the Tao Te Ching. Roszak (2001) points out the difference between the Taoist view of life and the Cartesian discussed earlier:

> It is peculiarly the psychiatry of modern Western society that has split the 'inner' life from the 'outer' world – as if what was inside of us was not alone inside the universe, something real, consequential, and inseparable from our study of the natural world. (p. 14)

So this fusion of Taoist thought, with its reverence for nature and others, its inclusion, its approach to life through the idea of simplicity and its focus on maintaining balance coupled with a psychology of living gives us what Theodore Roszak calls "ecopsychology."

Murray Bookchin (2005) notes that when egalitarian societies began to break down and class structures developed, these societies started to have what he calls "epistemologies of rule," which led to hierarchies, and perpetuated humanity's desire to dominate and control the planet (p. 159). It was during this period of transition that we began to lose a sacred balance that was once felt on the planet. From there, as things moved out of balance, our emotions, or psyche, moved from that of love (eros, for others,

for the planet) to death and destruction (Thanatos or death instinct). Sigmund Freud (1960) notes this transition:

> In obsessional neurosis it has become possible, through a regression to the pregential organization, for the love-impulses to transform themselves into impulses of aggression against the object. Here again the instinct of destruction has been set free and it seeks to destroy the object, or at least it appears to have that intention. (p. 55)

We have seen this destruction instinct with war, but we are also now seeing it in our lifestyle. Though the lifestyle that we engage in will eventually destroy the planet and eventually destroy us we continue to perpetuate this destructive lifestyle, becoming Thanatos, and this death instinct becomes a form of eco-fascism and eventually ecocide.

This Taoist influence in psychology becomes an ecopsychology and reflects on the fact that the suffering that is being experienced by people in the world is in direct relation to the suffering that the planet is experiencing because of our overt exploitation of it. This idea of ecopsychology becomes a force of social change, but not in the way that is conventionally perceived. Ecopsychology is not a new form of psychotherapeutic technique that one becomes trained in, studied, certified and licensed. Ecopsychology is a reclaiming of that which was lost, and that is our inherent connection to the planet. As Alan Watts (2006) notes:

> Man is something in nature, just as everything else is, including mountains and streams, trees, flowers, and birds. He is not commissioned by some sort of supernatural being to farm or dominate nature. The Taoists see nature as a self-regulating, self-governing, and indeed, democratic organism—a totality. It all goes together, and this totality is the Tao. (p. 116)

So this idea of the Tao is not, as Bookchin would say, a mystical, supernatural being or force, but the totality of us all. It is this understanding that is fundamental in an ecopsychology; a psychology of who we are.

Wu Wei

We are inundated with information on a daily basis about the destruction that is being caused on the planet. We are deluged by stories of the polar ice caps melting, stronger and more violent storms, foods and water that are potentially unhealthy and possibly having chemicals in them, and this overwhelms us to the point of "non-action." This is what Thomas Merton (1998a) calls the "non-ecology, the destructive unbalance of nature, poisoned and unsettled by bombs, by fallout, by exploitation" (p. 240). But the problem is that we don't know what to do or if doing anything will actually create positive change. This helplessness can also cause us to feel disconnected from the natural world (*alienated*) and hence powerless to influence anything. Individuals like Bookchin confuse this non-action that we are experiencing today (I would argue that this non-action is fear, much like a deer caught in headlights) with the Taoist notion of *wu wei* which has been mistranslated into "non-action," when a better translation would be "not forcing." As Alan Watts (2006) notes "Wu wei means always acting in accord with the pattern of things as they are" (p. 116). Bookchin argues that Taoism is telling us to not act, I would argue that Taoism is telling us that we better act soon!

Ecopsycholog's role in this action would necessitate a fundamental shift in thinking of psychology not from a Cartesian model, but rather from a Taoist perspective. When I say Taoist that is just a term that I use, it can be Taoist; it can be scientific or

religious, or spiritual, or even humanistic. Regardless of the label, it is essentially a rejection of a scientific model that separates humanity from itself and the natural world. It is a psychology that does not remove us from the natural world but reconnects us to the planet. It becomes a psychology and pedagogy. These two ideas (psychology and pedagogy) become inexorably fundamental and I think Andy Fisher (2002) notes it best:

> Although environmental educators need not be ecopsychologists, ecopsychologists do need to be involved in environmental education. Indeed, my hope is that the work of the ecopsychologists will become sufficiently influential that they can help us remove the handcuffs from those teachers who do wish to more concretely engage their students with the natural world, but whose lesson-plans, dictated from above, keep it otherwise. (p. 186)

We need a paradigmatic shift in our consciousness and understanding of the planet and our relationship to it, and this has to start at a very early age. The panoptic system removes us from the natural world from an early age. We have to disconnect ourselves from this panopticon and re-connect us to ourselves, to others and the natural world.

This paradigmatic shift means that we have to understand that what we do in our daily lives is fundamentally important, no matter how small or insignificant it may seem. One of Bookchin's (1999) arguments of the idea of *wu wei* is that "*Wu-wei* is, among other things, a rejection of the very assertiveness and militancy that any revolutionary movement direly needs" (p. 234).[1] He critiques the reference of Tao as the "Way" and

[1] This comment by Bookchin also demonstrates his lack of knowledge of Taoist history and philosophy. The Chinese text of military operations, The Art of War, is steeped in Taoist philosophy. Thomas Cleary (2000) notes in his translator's preface that "In my opinion, the importance of understanding the Taoist element of *The Art of War* can hardly be exaggerated" (p. 3). And in the first part of Cleary's introduction to his translation of The Art of War he discusses the history and importance of Taoism to this text. This does not mean that Taoism is a militaristic philosophy however and its principles have been applied to both military strategy as well as peace movements.

the belief that one should learn to "flow" as opposed to struggling and fighting. Bookchin (1999) believes that this idea of "flowing like water" (referenced in Taoist writings) and going with the grain "essentially means accepting the existing social and political order" (p. 235). I could imagine thousands, or even hundreds of thousands of individuals, literally "flowing" like water in protest to what the government and corporations are doing to the planet. Taoism is not about rejecting suffering, for there is an understanding that suffering is an integral part of life, it is about applying the appropriate amount of force needed. These protestors should be able to engage in *wu wei*, becoming one, not forcing. This means they should not have to throw stones through windows of storefronts, or to pick up arms or destroy people's personal property to stand up for or against an issue, such as the environment. What they should be expressing is the need to have a societal shift in the way the planet is treated and to point out that what governments and corporations are doing is actually going "against the grain."

These principles of Taoism with psychology (ecopsychology), the idea of *wu wei* and the need for individuals to make changes in their own lives to help alleviate the destructive pattern inflicted on the planet culminates into what I call a social or spiritual engagement. We saw Gary Snyder (1995) talking about this idea of social engagement earlier in the chapter, especially in relation to poets and writers, "the socially engaged writers of the developed world have taken their role to be one of resistance and subversion" (p. 92). This engagement lets us know that there are things that we can do individually or in smaller groups to help create change, we do not just have to be part of a mass movement to create change.

I would like to use a Taoist example again to demonstrate the simplicity of this engagement. In Taoism there is the notion that the Taoist sages lived off of dew and leaves, but I believe that this is a metaphor for living and eating simply. In the Taoist story of Fan (sixteenth-century China) it states that he went into the forest to meditate, with him he took only "a few sacks of rice and one or two jars of oil, to which slender recourses he added the bounty of the forest—silver tree-fungus, bamboo shoots and all sorts of delicious, nourishing plants" (Blofeld, 1978, p. 77). Now that does not mean we need to give up on our life in civilization and move into the forest to eat off of twigs and roots. But we can use this as a lesson on how we can incorporate the ides of simplicity in our lives to help bring about great change.

Even if we embark on social engagement in our personal lives that does not mean that we remove ourselves from those around us. We still have an understanding of the global environment and how our lifestyle affects others on the planet. This is where the issues of ecofeminism become fundamental to an understanding of ecopsychology and this engaged spirituality (what I would call ecospirituality). In my view ecofeminism bridges the theories of ecopsychology and ecospirituality and I want to focus on ecofeminism in the next chapter as it relates to the last chapter on ecospirituality.

CHAPTER IV

GLOBALIZATION and ECOFEMINISM

Globalization

> *The Nobel Foundation and the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences are recalling the following Nobel Prizes, as we have recently determined that they were not merited and should never have been awarded. We regret any inconvenience and suffering that giving out these prizes may have caused by giving flawed economic theories and ideas propounded by the individuals in question unwarranted credibility and influence on public policy.*
>
> *Milton Friedman, University of Chicago, 1976*
> *Original reasons for award: "Macroeconomics: For his achievements in the fields of consumption analysis, monetary history and theory and for his demonstration of the complexity of stabilization policy."*
>
> *Reason for recall: Friedman was the 20th century's most prominent supporter of laissez-faire capitalism. Whatever the empirical evidence, he fervently believed that unregulated markets would lead to socially desirable outcomes. His naïve belief in the invisible hand and his bias against government spending made him argue that government's role should be largely limited to that of policeman, judge and jailer. Friedman was a monetarist obsessed with controlling inflation who disregarded the social harm caused when monetary policy led to high unemployment levels. The application of his laissez-faire ideology has led to great harm around the world (Green, 2008).*

This, of course, is not an actual news release or statement by the Nobel Foundation. It is a spoof in a journal titled Adbusters (Vol. 16, Number 2, 2008), and its attempt with this parody is to illuminate the pervasive Freidman style economic policy that has been foisted upon the rest of the world through a neoimperialistic ideology promoted by western countries and especially the United States. Milton Freidman was a professor of economics at the University of Chicago during the height of the Cold War

and churned out a group of fervent adherents to his ideas known as the Chicago Boys. These Chicago Boys, groomed and trained under Friedman eventually went out into the world and garnered high powered positions in universities, governmental agencies (both in the United States and abroad), political organizations and in cabinets and in institutions such as the World Bank, World Trade Organization (WTO) and International Monetary Fund (IMF).

This neoimperialistic ideology promoted by privileged western countries has become globalization. The terms neoimperialism; globalization; laissez-faire capitalism all have been euphemistically lumped under the term “free trade” since this denotes a certain amount of egalitarianism, freedom and willingness among all parties involved to engage in its so called benefits. What we see is that this idea of free trade is anything but free and it is definitely not fair. It actually comes at a very high price, not only to those in this country, but especially those in economically depressed countries, commonly known as Third World countries (denoted because of its position in relation to capitalist and communist countries). For the most part, those that have benefited from globalization’s ideas and actions, however, are privileged westerners and a handful of individuals in other countries willing to support its ideas.

In the last chapter we briefly looked at the pragmatic philosophies of Richard Rorty and Kwame Appiah, especially with ideas of rooted cosmopolitanism and the extended concept of “us” to others. My attempt was to connect their contemporary ideas with Eastern philosophical thought that views all things in the world as interconnected. Rorty and Appiah’s ideas are progressive and idealistic in their thinking, but

unfortunately these ideas have not implemented on a global scale. The United States has in reality taken the lead in a form of neocolonialism and other privileged western countries have followed suit. This neocolonialism has transpired most effectively with the use of the bank note rather than the gun.

When I say bank note, this does not mean that we as a nation have not used military force to implement our economic values. When we have used force this force it has usually fallen under the guise of advancing free market democracy and as Barber (1995) notes, “Democracies prefer markets but markets do not prefer democracies” (p. 243). We see this use of our military force today in Iraq, where we are selling this war to the world as a way to fight terrorism and install democracy but in actuality it is a military campaign for unfettered access to natural resources. Naomi Klein has been able to document that in places like Iraq we have actually squashed any form of independent democratic movement that may spring up. The United States representative in Iraq, Paul Bremer, became increasingly frustrated with what he considered to be unauthorized and independent elections that were being held by Iraqi people after the fall of Hussein. “At the end of June, only his second month in Iraq, Bremer sent word that all local elections must stop immediately” and we used the United States military to make sure this happened (Klein, 2007, p. 363). The United States did not want any independent and indigenous political groups to take power, as this may go against our economic needs, regardless of how many American politicians held up blue fingers in some euphemistic solidarity with the Iraqi people.

Our best method to ensure globalization has been through our financial support to militaries and individuals that share our fanatical view towards an economic policy that only benefits few individuals, usually at the expense of local populations. By surreptitiously (and sometimes not so surreptitiously) backing groups that support our economic views, we can distance ourselves when certain situations turn disastrous from a human rights standpoint. As Klein (2007) notes:

> But what of the contemporary crusade to liberate world markets? The coups, wars and slaughter to install and maintain pro-corporate regimes have never been treated as capitalist crimes but have instead been written off as the excesses of overzealous dictators, as hot fronts on the Cold War, and now of the War on Terror. (p. 20)

I touched on the outcomes of these free market economic policies in chapter one when I discussed El Salvador and the murder of Archbishop Romero and the six Jesuit priests by soldiers trained at the infamous School of Americas at Fort Benning, Georgia.

Another famous example of our ideology executed in another country is in Chile where the Unites States government helped install the military dictator Pinochet with a coup staged on "little" September 11th 1973 (Harvey, 2003, p. 8). Before Pinochet, Chile was a democracy, but "democracy had been inhospitable to the Chicago Boys in Chile; dictatorship would prove an easier fit" (Klein, 2007, p. 63). Economists in Chile working with Pinochet were deeply steeped in Freidman's views of capitalist ideology and because of their connection with Freidman while he was at the University of Chicago this became known as the "Pinochet-Chicago alliance" (Klein, 2007, p. 79). Pinochet, with the encouragement of his economists, implemented the corporatist state which literally

privatized all public services, deregulated the economy and "dismantled . . . popular organizations such as the community health centers in poorer neighbourhoods" (Harvey, 2005, p. 8). This generated immense popular resistance and Pinochet used the military under his control to instill political terror as a way to control Chile's citizens, becoming one of Latin Americas greatest dictators. In one of Naomi Klein's (2007) book she quotes Eduardo Galeano, who states, "The theories of Milton Freidman gave him the Nobel Prize; they gave Chile General Pinochet" (p. 73).

It is with the fall of communism that those who adhere to western capitalism have seen it as triumphal and the only politically viable system. Because of the changes with the fall of the Soviet Union we are starting to see the same economic policies that the United States supported in Latin American countries being implemented in other "developing" countries such as Russia, Poland and now Iraq. What we have now is the conquest of capitalism over socialism. Capitalism becomes a largely unopposed political and economic system where those responsible for its advancement do not want to be held responsible for their actions. The irony of globalization is that the principles and ideas of socialism that are believed to be dead "can still be found lurking in the boardrooms of failing and bad-risk investment companies like those that misjudged the peso that yearn to spread their losses across the backs of long-suffering tax payers" (Barber, 1995, p. 28). This becomes the ultimate externality,[1] where corporatists failings become the burden of

[1] Externality is a term used to represent a situation where a corporation will utilize tax payer's money to pay for services or problems for which corporations do not want to take responsibility. Roads can be considered an externality, where tax payers will pay for roads leading to a business or corporation. Tax breaks for corporations can be an externality and clean up, i.e. a corporation has a chemical spill but the tax payers have to pay for it.

tax-payers, except it is not only at the expense of tax-payers, but of the impoverished in third world countries.

We may on occasion employ our own military to help implement these economic policies but in actuality is expedient for us to use the local military and police of economically depressed countries to help execute fiscal policies that are beneficial to western corporations. The military and police in Third World regions help create a certain amount of fear in the populace and as Klein (2007) notes “fear and disorder are the catalysts for each new leap forward” (p. 9), this so called leap forward meaning an economic leap for western countries.

Along with instilling this fear and disorder, these local militaries and police help maintain an enormous amount of control over the local population when economic policies are established that may not be in the best interest of citizens. This includes the privatization of most public services. While local populations may have control over their own public systems such as education, health care, public works, etc. the goal of globalization is to privatize these systems and sell them off to the highest bidder. These historically public systems should be controlled and regulated by local populations, now they become the domain of corporations that generally are not located in the region. These corporations have no personal stake in these new commodities beyond making a profit.

Under normal conditions citizens would not willingly give up control over their own resources. For this to effectively work it has to happen under some disaster situation (i.e. coup, war, natural disaster, etc.). The disaster can be natural or it can be created, such

as the overthrow of a government. While the population is attempting to recover from this disaster, external entities come in to "help" and as a condition of this assistance demand that these laissez-faire capitalist ideas be implemented. Milton Friedman (2002) notes in the 1982 preface to his famous book Capitalism and Freedom:

> Only a crisis—actual or perceived—produces real change. When that crisis occurs, the actions that are taken depend on the ideas that are lying around. That, I believe, is our basic function: to develop alternatives to existing policies, to keep them alive and available until the politically impossible becomes politically inevitable. (p. xiv)

Some of the external entities that come in to help are generally what are called Nongovernmental Organizations (NGO's) that provides aid and assistance in times of disaster. But there are also external entities that come in to specifically provide financial support to help rebuild the infrastructure of a country dealing with a disaster. These are organizations such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (INF). Over the years individuals that are in positions of leadership in these organizations have been inculcated with the economic policies of Milton Freidman and his belief in exploiting disasters to implement laissez-faire capitalist ideology.

These economists and corporate leaders with the support of neoliberal western governments' and international organizations such as the World Bank attempt to deregulate struggling governments and implement Friedman's vision of laissez-faire capitalism, in most cases regardless of the cost to life and political stability. Once again euphemistic language is used to justify these means, by stating that they come under the guise of "development" and "improvement." Since these economic policies are usually

established in countries that are struggling politically and economically, “these developments have meant that democracy has had an increasingly hard time inside nation-states afflicted with radical market ideology” (Barber, 1995, p. 245)

The irony is that organizations such as the World Bank and IMF were both established after World War II to prevent what happened in Germany after the World War I from happening again. In that situation, dire economic conditions lead to the rise of Hitler and Fascism (Stiglitz, 2002, p. 11). The World Bank and IMF were to act as “global shock absorbers” and help prevent economically depressed and desperate countries from spiraling out of control (Klein, 2007, p. 162). However, over the years these institutions have been colonized by Freidman’s apprentices, the Chicago Boys. Their main concern has not been assisting countries in rebuilding their economies in a democratic fashion as much as deregulating services and creating an exploitable free market.

The natural reaction is to blame Milton Friedman specifically for the problems that we are experiencing with globalization. It is true that his ideas are widely adopted and disseminated throughout the globe through either military or economic means. Though many blame him, there are numerous groups that champion and venerate his ideas and consider them the only ones feasible for implementing economic policies. There develops with this willingness a whole institution that becomes in part what Hannah Arendt (1992) calls the “banality of evil” (p. 252). This idea of banality of evil is in response to one of Nazi Germany’s high functionaries Adolf Eichmann. Eichmann stated at his trial that he “did his *duty* . . . he not only obeyed *orders*, he also obeyed the

law" (Arendt, 1992, p. 135). This "it s just business" philosophy also becomes the defense of corporate bureaucrats and technocrats when their economic policies create great hardship on local populations in countries where these economic policies are adopted.

These individuals become "economic technocrats" because they manipulate economic policies as a way in increase profits for western corporations, usually at the expense of other countries and the environment (Klein, 2007, p. 10). These economic technocrats are what Ward Churchill (2003) calls "little Eichmanns" in an essay that garnered so much trouble for him and eventually led to him being dismissed from his tenured university job. In his essay in response to the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center, Churchill (2003) called some of the individuals working for financial institutions in the World Trade Center "little Eichmanns'—that is, as a cadre of faceless bureaucrats and technical experts who had willingly (and profitably) harnessed themselves to the task making America's genocidal world order hum with maximal efficiency" (p. 19). This statement by Churchill by no means excuses or justifies the atrocities that happened on 9/11 with the terrorists attacks. But the willingness by corporations to attempt to avoid or ignore the damage that their economic policies cause is not an excuse to say that 9/11 was an unprovoked terrorist attack either.

Along with the economic disaster that happens in relation to globalization and neoimperialism, there are also psychological and ecological disasters. The economic technocrats that have worked tirelessly to spread free market ideology have historically been privileged white males or privileged males in other parts of the world that have

colluded with western globalization in adopting these economic policies. These western institutions are hierarchical and patriarchal structures and the expectation is that their economic means are to be adopted without question. Through this process, "Cultural imperialism became an important weapon in the struggle to assert overall hegemony" (Harvey, 2003, p. 56). Because of these ecological and psychological concerns in relation to globalization it becomes vitally important to look at and critique globalization from an ecofeminist perspective.

Ecofeminism and Globalization

Ecofeminist and activist Vandana Shiva (2005) notes in her book Earth Democracy that, "Corporate globalization has unleashed a war against farmers, against women, against other species, and against other cultures" (p. 110). This is a very broad and damning statement of globalization, but as we have seen it is not made without merit. Shiva has spent her life as an activist and feminist. Originally from India, she is trained in traditional western science as a physicist but has actually spent most of her life working as a "seed activist," advocating for small rural farmers, especially in Third World regions of countries like India.[1] This seed activism is a direct response to globalization and new forms of corporations that have developed with this unfettered capitalism and free trade called agribusinesses. What agribusinesses have done is genetically modify seeds that rural farmers in Third World regions use so that they yield only one crop per season.

[1] From here on out I will use the term "Third World regions" as well as Third World countries because with the advent of globalization some countries that have been considered Third World are now becoming a dominant force on the world economic market. That, however, has not translated into these countries totally emerging from Third World status. Like with other forms of capitalism and hierarchy, strong social class is established (made more problematic with the caste system already in place in India) so India is becoming a strong economic power but still has deplorable Third World conditions, much like we have in the United States.

These agribusinesses are a relatively new phenomenon and not only demonstrate to what extent global corporations will go to make money, but is also another example of the scientific process replacing natural, human processes. As Ruether (2005) notes the rationale behind agribusinesses to genetically modify seeds are so they "yield more and bigger grains per plant" (p. 106). The problems with these genetically modified seeds is that "large quantities of chemical pesticides and water are added to them" to enable them to grow into viable plants (Ruether, 2005, p. 106). Because of the large abundance of water being added to these plants, this takes away water resources from local communities. With the use of greater amounts of pesticides, there comes the contamination of both the dwindling water resources and the soil used to grow other plants.

These are not the only problems with these genetically modified seeds. As Ruether (2005) continues to note, "These seeds are sterile. So farmers are unable to set aside some of the seeds for the next planting, but become dependent on the seed company for purchase of next year's seeds" (p. 106). As a result of genetically modifying the seeds to yield only one crop the farmers become tethered to the agribusinesses, relying on them to provide more seeds for each growing season. This is why Shiva has called herself a "seed activist." Where farmers were once able to harvest and trade seeds for farming, they are now dependent on the agribusinesses to provide them with seeds to survive at a very substantial profit for these agribusinesses. What the host country does is enforce a policy where farmers must purchase seeds from agribusinesses, in essence making it illegal for farmers to harvest and trade seeds with other farmers, creating a "dictatorship

of debt" (Klein, 2007, p. 161). The governments of these host countries receive kickbacks for developing and enforcing laws that keep farmers connected to agribusinesses. Western countries, through globalization, work with countries that have historically been considered Third World; in return creating profit for governmental officials in these Third World countries while state officials enforce laws basically developed for the agribusinesses. We have gone from standard colonialism and neocolonialism to a new and improved "eco-colonialism" (Mies & Shiva, 1993, p. 68).

Those in privileged western countries do not perceive war as a part of free market economic policies but, as Shiva notes, this is in essence a war against women, children, and the environment. This "war" becomes a standard externality, where western countries now pay Third World governments to fight their battles. Whereas historically western colonizers would send their own soldiers to fight the local population, now oppressive measures are being outsourced to local Third World militaries and police forces. Western countries may be sending soldiers to fight in countries like Iraq, but they are exporting war with the help of multinational organizations through political maneuvering to fight wars in Third World regions such as India. As Mies and Shiva (1993) note, "The main victims in these wars are not only women and children, but also nature" (p. 124).

Third World countries have had to historically fight empires for their independence and those in western countries like to think that they are no longer an "empire." But globalization has become the new and improved form of imperialism.

> The poverty of the Third World has resulted from centuries of the drain of resources from the sustenance economy. Globalization has accelerated and expanded the methods used to deplete the sustenance economy—the privatization

> of water, the patenting of seeds and biodiversity, and the corporatization of agriculture. This deliberate starving of the sustenance economy is at the root of the violence of globalization. (Shiva, 2005, p. 18)

This form of eco-colonization has resulted in not only the subjugation of the impoverished in Third World regions to these agribusinesses and multinational corporations, it also has the insidiousness of destroying the planet in the process, all in the name of free trade and profit.

This free trade and profit of globalization becomes what Giroux (2001) calls "hypercapitalism" (p. xxix). Ecofeminist Maria Mies discusses how she has been versed in Marxist theory, but just converting to a socialist ideology would not magically change globalization. As Erich Fromm (1990) has pointed out between contemporary socialist societies and contemporary capitalists societies, "In fact, the rivalry between the two systems seems to center around the question of which can produce a higher level of consumption, rather than a better life" (p. 165). So even though Mies grounds herself in Marxist theory, not only does ecofeminism need to give strong critiques to both capitalism and globalization, but also traditional socialist thought. As Thomas Berry (1999) notes,

> Tensions between capitalism and socialism, between liberalism and conservatism, are disputes over minor differences in comparison with the issues now before us. Both capitalist and socialist regimes are committed to ever-increasing commercial-industrial exploitation of the resources of the planet. (p. 110)

Reflecting on this "war," Mies and Shiva asseverate that what happens with this type of war as with any type of war is that women and children are disproportionately

affected by the destruction of the natural environment. What ecofeminism contributes to this critique is that it brings a philosophy that grounds itself in praxis and exposes the destructive nature of this system. As Warren (2000) points out:

> Ecofeminist philosophy is about institutional structures of power and privilege, not about praise or blame for what individuals (e.g. individual men, women, white people, upper-class people) do or do not do. It does not assume that all and only males are 'the problem,' or that all and only females are 'the solution.' (p. 65)

But even though Warren states that ecofeminism is not about blame, ecofeminists do have some strong critiques, and globalization is not the only thing they critique. Some ecofeminists also argue that what they consider to be traditional feminism is based on a western model that in actuality supports the very system of globalization that ecofeminism is attempting to fight. Plus, they argue, whereas traditional western feminism has focused on power structures in relation to gender and sexuality, "Ecofeminists bring attention to the historical fact that under patriarchal rule the repressing and exploiting of women has gone hand-in-hand with the repressing and exploiting of the natural world" (Fisher, 2002, p. 19). In other words ecofeminism, which itself has roots in feminist theory, states it goes beyond just looking at power structure and hierarchy in the human relationships, and extends its understanding to the natural world, our place in it, and how "the very notion of the domination of nature by man stems from the very real domination of human by human" (Bookchin, 2005, p. 65).

Ecofeminism and Feminism

So do these critiques from ecofeminism mean that traditional western feminism does not have sensitivity to ecological concerns and the concerns of individuals in Third

World regions? Some ecofeminists argue that in western feminism their focus and their needs may sometimes trump the needs of Third World regions. Ecofeminists would argue that western feminism in some ways actually benefits from this oppression just as much as the western world does. Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993) both note this by stating that, "Some women, however, particularly urban, middle-class women, find it difficult to perceive commonality both between their own liberation and the liberation of nature, and between themselves and 'different' women in the world" (p. 5).

What ecofeminism postulates is that western feminism focuses most of its resources on obtaining what historically privileged white men have benefited from in the western world or they want to catch up to these privileged white men. As both Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993) note:

> for affluent societies' middle-class women this catching-up policy presupposes that they will get a share of the White Man's loot . . . From the early women's movement up to the present, a large section of women have accepted the strategy of catching-up with men as the main path to emancipation. (p. 65)

The so called white man's loot is that which has been obtained historically by imperialism, and now neoimperialism through globalization. Mies and Shiva are connecting feminism with privileged western white women and are also stating that they are benefiting from globalization. Colonialism and globalization both have a unifying philosophy and that is obtaining more and more resources and this comes at a heavy price for both Third World regions and nature itself, as Mies and Shiva (1993) point out:

> Without turning foreign people and their lands into colonies for the White Man, the capitalist economy could not have evolved. Without violently destroying the

> symbiosis between man and woman, without calling woman mere animal nature, the new man could not have risen as master and lord over nature and woman. (p. 47)

Is this critique of western feminism a little too harsh? The fight and struggle that western feminists have had to endure is a direct result of the overt patriarchal system in the western world that has justified the subjugation of women and minorities for centuries. But since western feminism has had its roots in white middle class structure those who do not fit this criterion have felt "frustrated by racial exclusion in the women's movement" (Friedman, 2002, p. 91).

Black feminist and educator bell hooks (2003) has noted this exclusion of others races by traditional feminism, "during my undergraduate years at Stanford University I met groups of liberal well-meaning white folks who were in theory anti-racist, but the vast majority of them had little or no actual everyday contact with black people" (p. 58). Of course my question to bell hooks is how many Asian people, or Latino people does she have everyday contact with, or even African people? The point of feminism is that it should be concerned with more than just race and class. There has to be an understanding of the multidimensional issues that we now confront with globalization, and part of the problem with some western feminist theory is that it "ignores the working of the capitalist world system and its power to transform life into saleable commodities and cash" (Mies & Shiva, 1993, p. 12). Even hooks (2003) herself invokes the writings of Judith Simmer-Brown noting that "in pluralism, we commit to engage with the other person or the other community. Pluralism is a commitment to communicate with and relate to the larger world—with a very differing neighbor, or a distant community" (p. 47).

hooks makes a valid point however, and that is if western feminism becomes so rooted in white, middle class power structure there will be no room for an understanding of issues that are brought about in Third World regions. Regardless of whether one is a white middle class executive male, or white middle class executive female that considers herself to be a feminist with the intent of breaking the glass ceiling, our personal lifestyles affect those in other countries.[1] Western feminism cannot revolve around issues of reproductive rights and the ability of primarily white middle class women to obtain status in a corporation that supports globalization. As Mies and Shiva (1993) note:

> When feminists in the West demand reproductive self-determination for all women, without at the same time attacking the exploitative economic world order from which they themselves profit, then this demand is on the same level as was Ronald Reagan's demand for human rights at the time when the US was supporting military dictatorships in the "Third World." (p. 220)

Feminist in first world countries need to be mindful of what they demand and how that affects the rest of the world, as Maria Mies (1993) notes with reproductive rights:

> Thus in this case, as in many others, Third World women were used as guinea-pigs by multinational drug industries. It is cheaper, faster and politically more convenient to use a crash programme against fertility to discover long-term effects of a contraceptive than it is to run clinical tests on samples of women in the West. In this sense, a number of Third World countries have been turned into human laboratories for transitional drug industries. (p. 192)

What Mies is attempting to communicate is that there becomes this ethnocentrism when some western feminists claim to speak for the rights of all women, regardless of

[1] The irony is, that in today's western pluralistic society you could easily exchange white middle class executive male or female with Asian executive, or Latino executive, and there will still be this issue of class and support of western globalization.

race, class and ethnicity. Japanese poet Ikuko Atsumi (1977) relates to this when she discusses the poetry of Ishigaki Rin who, in Japan:

> is probably the leading woman poet of social protest. Unmarried, she supported her sick father and stepmother as an office worker in a Tōkyō bank for forty years, a situation she met with merciless realism. Few poets have written so well of the monotony of poorly-paid women office laborers. Unlike many much younger women to whom "women's lib" is just the latest U.S. fad, she is aware that the subjugation of women is far more a social question than a sexual one . . . Perhaps because her problems are real rather than psychological, she writes with considerable dry humor. (pp. 155-156)

We see this dry humor in one of her poems translated by Atsumi titled *Shellfish*:

I awake at midnight.
The little shellfish I bought last evening
Are alive with their mouths slightly open.

I will eat them all when day breaks

I laugh a hag's laugh.
Afterwards there is nothing left of the night,
Except to sleep with my mouth slightly open.
(Rin, as cited in Atsumi, 1977, p. 96)

This poem encapsulates the monotony of a life of oppression, but with great irony and humor.

What concerns me in ecofeminists critique of western feminism is that there is this generalizing idea of what western feminism is, just because it is western. What ecofeminism essentially is doing is not critiquing feminism in general, but critiquing what Rey Chow (1991) would call "bourgeois liberal feminism" (p. 82), or Anne McClintock (1995) would call "bourgeois imperialist feminism" (p. 384). But do these

labels of bourgeois, liberal, and imperialist really go with feminism? Granted that western feminism has struggled with its identity and relation to race, class and gender, but western feminism has also grown in those struggles. As McClintock (1995) notes, "Denouncing all feminisms as imperialist, however, erases from memory the long histories of women's resistance to local and imperialist patriarchies" (p. 384). I think that ecofeminists critiques of western feminism is not as much a critique of western feminism, especially it being "liberal and bourgeois" as it is a critique of some privileged western women being liberal, bourgeois and imperialistic. Just because a women in the western world considers herself to be progressive and liberal, does not mean that she is grounded in feminist *theory*.

I actually have a personal example of this in my own work. Working as a therapist at a nonprofit organization I had a supervisor who viewed herself as progressive, liberal, and I would say she would consider herself to hold certain feminist views. She was well educated and would have had some contact with feminist theory. We would have staff meetings every couple of weeks where she would do a check in to see how everybody has been doing. During one of these staff meetings I started discussing my experiences at the Vietnamese Buddhist temple that I had been attending. The temple was preparing for an upcoming festival and I had been working with the temple members to help arrange for this event. During one of these "check in" sessions at work I shared with my coworkers and supervisor my observations of the strong division of labor among the Vietnamese culture. Women of this temple would be inside cooking, sewing flags, etc. The men of the temple were outside building a structure that would provide shelter for individuals

during the upcoming ceremony. My supervisor began to vilify me about “supporting” this system. She noted that she could not understand how I could support such, what she considered, “sexist values.” I responded by noting that this was a division of labor that this culture had established and that the labor of each individual was important and valued. I also attempted to point out the fact that it was ethnocentric to think that it was my responsibility to come into this temple where I was a guest and attempt to impose my western views on them and attempt to change their culture. She was still very adamant that she could not understand how I would support this system.

Two weeks later we had another staff meeting and conducted our usual check in. One of my female coworkers was noting that she had spent the past weekend helping her husband paint the house. My supervisor actually spoke up and stated that she would not do something like this since that was “men’s” work. I quickly pointed out the discrepancy in her comments to me two weeks ago and the statement she just made. She chose to ignore me and continue the meeting. In essence my supervisor felt that her traditional western values were superior to others. She wanted to argue from her class perspective that this other culture was sexist, and yet she still wanted to hold onto traditional stereotyped gender roles (not to mention heterosexist) where the man has responsibility over certain domains in the relationship and yet she can pick and choose what she wants to do. This becomes a luxury in western society, especially for someone in the middle or upper classes. This is why it is important to point out that there is a difference between western feminism and a western liberal and bourgeois perspective. When privileged western women want to adopt feminist values, it is to them the value of adopting

privileged western men's lifestyle. These are not as much feminists as reformists, and as bell hooks (2000) notes, "Reformist white women with class privilege were well aware that the power and freedom they wanted was the freedom they perceived men of their class enjoying" (p. 38).

Just because western women have benefited from western feminism's fights and struggles, does not mean that they are grounded in feminist theory, or that they are willing to adopt feminist's values. This becomes the paradox of western feminism, where "White women are both colonized and colonizers" (McClintock, 1995, p. 379). By the works and struggles of western feminism to help gain equality for women in the western world, women in the western world now hold positions of power and influence and have adopted the same economic and political values that have greatly benefited western men for centuries. This is not the failing of feminism as much as the fact that "Privileged women wanted equality with men of their class" (hooks, 2000, p. 40). This is not as much grounding in feminism as it is in class identity. A privileged western woman can consider herself liberal and then espouse ethnocentric sexist values towards other cultures since she assumes she is progressive and liberal. So when ecofeminism is critiquing western feminism, they in essence should be critiquing western imperialism masked under progressive feminist values.

This is where the idea of theory and practice becomes very important. A western feminist *should* understand the issues of race, class, gender, culture, etc, not to mention environmental issues and how western lifestyle is so destructive to the rest of the planet. In essence feminism is ecofeminist and ecofeminism is feminist. Both should have an

understanding that it is the historical patriarchal system of western culture and science that has lead to the domination and exploitation of other cultures and the natural environment. They both also need to be careful not to perpetuate and support that system, whether they identify themselves as feminist or ecofeminist.

My supervisor's comments were not only distinguishing stereotyped gender roles, but reinforcing the male's gender role in western society. Men in western society are expected to be strong and virile; they are expected to adopt the stereotyped gender roles. McMaughey (2008) calls this the "Caveman mystique," and it "is that sense of one's manhood as inherently productive, protective, aggressive, and heterosexual" (p. 23). McMaughey (2008) continues to note that "the caveman ethos offers them a reassuring identity as virile warriors, manly men" (p. 23). Because of this reinforced male identity it is easy for feminists and ecofeminists to blame men for their roles in war and the destruction of the natural environment but excludes themselves in these issues. This is why it is important to look at the issues of feminism, ecofeminism and male patriarchy also.

Ecofeminism and Male Patriarchy

What ecofeminism and feminism both have to be careful with is to not fall into the trap of over connecting women with nature and laying the blame of the world's suffering at the feet of men. Part of this concern is essentializing that women are inherently less violent or destructive; given the fact that women do not "create" as many wars and that they are victims of wars. Men, just as women, are victims of war, and women, just as men can be purveyors of war. All one has to do is look into history to see

this and I would like to use an example from 5th century B.C. Herodotus, in his book The Histories (1996), about the Persian wars, notes how the wife of Darius encourages him to go to war with the Greeks:

> My lord, with the immense resources at your command, the fact that you are making no further conquests to increase the power of Persia, must mean that you lack ambition. Surely a young man like you, who is master of great wealth, should be seen engaged in some active enterprise, to show the Persians that they have a man to rule them . . . what I want you to do is invade Greece. I have heard people talk of the women there, and I should like to have Spartan girls, and girls from Argos and Attica and Corinth, to wait upon me. (p. 206)

In actuality there has been a number of feminists that have noted this potential among women to not only accept the institution of male patriarchy, but to encourage and expect it. The early twentieth-century radical feminist and anarchist Emma Goldman (1970) notes this when she was presenting to a feminist group:

> Always on the side of the underdog, I resented my sex's placing every evil at the door of the male. I pointed out that if he were really the great sinner as he was being painted by the ladies, women shared the responsibility with him. The mother is the first influence in his life, the first to cultivate his conceit and self-importance. Sisters and wives follow in the mother's footsteps . . . from the very birth of her male child until he reaches a ripe age, the mother leaves nothing undone to keep him tied to her. Yet she hates to see him weak and she craves the manly man. She idolizes in him the very traits that help to enslave her—his strength, his egotism, and his exaggerated vanity. The inconsistencies of my sex keep the poor male dangling between the idol and the brute, the darling and the beast, the helpless child and the conqueror of worlds. (p. 557)

Even ecofeminists Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993) warn about connecting ecological destruction and war to just men:

> It would, however, be wrong to see women as only the victims in these new wars about fatherlands; there are many examples of women's support for patriotic wars. The First World War was supported by patriotic women's organizations, in Germany and elsewhere; Hitler's national socialism as well as the Second World War were also supported by women, some of whom were enthusiastic admires of Hitler's system. In Yugoslavia, too, as elsewhere, we also find women who support these civil wars and even volunteer to fight against the 'enemy'. In the erstwhile USSR, one of the movements for a new, independent nation-state – Tatarstan – is even led by a woman, Fauzia Bairamova. Even more surprisingly Fauzia Bairamova is a Muslim woman who fights for a Muslim fatherland. It would be naïve, therefore, to conclude that all women, because they pay the price for the fatherlands, together with Mother Earth, would reject these suicidal and fratricidal wars. (p. 130)

As I noted in the first chapter, I struggled with this idea of masculinity that was presented to me by society. It is what has created this "Rambo effect" in our society and encouraged men to join military forces and adopt patriarchal values as the norm. It did not start with Rambo; it has its roots in contemporary western society with the idea of John Wayne and G. I. Joe. All of these are mythical warrior figures that ostensibly personify what a man is and how he should act and have been carried down by the Caveman mystique that McCaughey mentions. This image is only becoming more pervasive in our society in what has been termed as "reverse anorexia" (Egan, 2002). This is where boys want to "glisten with six-pack abs and granite pecs like the hulks on Wrestlemania" (Egan, 2002). As Timothy Egan (2002) notes in a *New York Times* articles boys as young as 10 years old are now using steroids to help increase their muscles and bulk up. The images in the media and society of this hyper masculine physique have now become so pervasive and the expectation that boys are to be men at younger ages so powerful that boys will go to great extremes to fit that image.

This makes me think of Anzaldúa (1999) comments where she notes:

> I've encountered a few scattered and isolated gentle straight men, the beginnings of a new breed, but they are confused, and entangled with sexist behaviors that they have not been able to eradicate. We need a new masculinity and the new man needs a movement. (p. 106)

Is it any wonder that men are confused and entangled with their sexist behavior? How are men to eradicate their sexist behaviors when they are inundated with it on a continuous basis? These sexist behaviors are reinforced by women, which in turn reinforced to them by the media and society also. This new "men's movement" that Anzaldúa is calling for would receive a lot of resistance, not only by men but also by women. For any men's movement to be effective there has to be a fundamental shift in the way societies think, especially privileged western countries where individuals have financially benefited from this patriarchal structure. This is where both ecofeminism and western feminism need to reflect on their views and its role in hierarchical structures, especially in relation to human's domination over the natural world. As Buell (2005) notes, "Ecofeminism is itself a multiverse, but inquiry starts from the premise of a correlation between the history of institutionalized patriarchy and human domination of the nonhuman" (p. 19).

Ecofeminism and Western Environmentalism

This patriarchal system that has lead to the domination of western imperial powers over Third World regions in the world through globalization has created havoc on the environment and the natural world.

> At a time when a quarter of the world's population is threatened with starvation due to the erosion of soil fertility, water, and genetic diversity, chasing the mirage of unending growth becomes a major source of genocide. Killing people through

> the destruction of nature is an invisible form of violence which threatens justice, peace, and survival. (Shiva, 2005, p. 52)

Not only does ecofeminism critique this western lifestyle, but it has also been a strong critic of traditional western environmental movements that would critique Third World countries for their lifestyles as being destructive to the planet, all the while ignoring that these modern lifestyles (such as farming techniques) have been heavily influenced by western science. Deep ecology is one of these western environmental movements that has taken a Social Darwinian approach to the destruction of Third World regions. Murray Bookchin (1999) reflects on this in an interview of David Foreman by Bill Devall (both deep ecologists), Foreman "had declared that hungry Ethiopian children should not be given any food relief and that nature should 'be permitted to take its course'" (p. 223). The irony in that statement is that if nature had been originally permitted to "take its course" children in Ethiopia would probably not be starving to begin with.[1] Comments like this would make deep ecologists and other environmentalists no better than the standard technocrat that works for a multinational corporation that exploits Third World regions. Vandana Shiva notes that "Third World populations need to be controlled to ensure natural resources for the growth of US corporations" (Shiva, 2005, p. 58), a thought that deep ecologists need to ponder before making comments like the one above.

McFague (1993) notes that the bottom line for western countries and our consuming lifestyles is that:

---

[1] In defense to deep ecology, not all deep ecologists believe in this course of action and although some ecofeminists would actually identify themselves as deep ecologists, Buell (2005) notes that "ecofeminists are apt to situate themselves closer to social ecology than to deep ecology" (p. 111). But the deep ecology movement itself has had to change its views on how environmental problems in Third World regions have been of a direct result of western intervention.

> there is no free lunch: for city dwellers to have heat and air conditioning, cars, computers, microwaves, planes, and so forth, other parts of the planet have to be sacrificed. The law means that the higher the life-style supported from various energy sources, the greater the damage done to the environment. Thus, a typical first-world baby, will, over its lifetime, drain five times more energy from the environment than a third-world baby will. The implications for both population and life-style are immediately evident from this seemingly esoteric Second Law of thermodynamics. (p. 58)

These are issues that most people in western countries do not want to think about. They do not want to think about how our lifestyle is not only creating havoc on the planet, but that by our lifestyle we are supporting an eco-colonialist policy that subjugates others and depletes their resources. There becomes this enormous resistance and this creates a difficult problem when attempting to educate people on globalization, for as Bookchin (1999) notes:

> No ordinary person wants to hear that they are responsible for the problems of the world because they have too many children, or consume too much, or own a car or a computer. Such reproaches understandably alienate people who might otherwise be eager for major social changes. (p. 343)

My argument is, however, that the ordinary person no longer has the luxury to live in denial of what our lifestyle is doing to the planet. Ecofeminism deepens out understanding of not only our lifestyle, but how this lifestyle is supported by (or we support) globalization.

We have looked at a multitude of issues in relation to ecofeminism, feminism and globalization. The one issue that I have not touched on yet and is what I mentioned briefly in the last chapter is not only ecofeminism but also spirituality. In the next chapter I will be looking specifically at spirituality and ecology, or what I call ecospirituality.

Ecofeminism has had a connection with these issues of spirituality and part of this is in relation to reclaiming spirituality and religion from predominantly male, patriarchal power structure that has diminished women's role in religion and spirituality. Before I delve into the issues of spirituality and ecology I want to briefly look at these specific issues of ecofeminism and spirituality and the critiques that ecofeminism has received because of this connection.

Critiques of Ecofeminism and Spirituality

Noting the critiques that ecofeminism has of western feminism, there are those that critique ecofeminism itself. Social ecologist and anarchist Murray Bookchin notes "Ecofeminism, too, has been transformed from an appreciation of women's historical role in bearing and rearing children into a veneration of women as 'closer to nature' than men" (Bookchin, 2005, p. 17). Bookchin (2005) is concerned because of what he considers to be the "mystical" element that has been added to the ecofeminist ideology:

> Added to this imagery is a belief in an "Earth Goddess" whose worship is expected to transform patriarchal views of women into a theistic "eternal feminine." In short, I began to see a growing array of mystical, romantic, and often downright silly ecologies emerge that now threaten the very integrity of a rational ecology movement. (p. 17)

Bookchin is concerned that there has been this strong connection between ecofeminism and new age religions developing around ecological issues and he feels that this detracts from ecofeminist work. Bookchin however is going to critique anything that attempts to have a connection to religion or spirituality and as noted in the second chapter grounds himself in *western* philosophy and tradition and is a great admirer of Aristotle.

Vandana Shiva however has been very outspoken about western science and how it perpetuates the hegemony of western imperialism. Bookchin in essence is stating that western thought and science is rational and superior to other forms of thought and beliefs (not to mention other forms of science that are not western). Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993) counter this:

> The ecological relevance of this emphasis on 'spirituality' lies in the rediscovery of the sacredness of life, according to which life on earth can be preserved only if people again begin to perceive all life forms as sacred and respect them as such. This quality is not located in an other-worldly deity, in a transcendence, but in everyday life, in our work, the things that surround us, in our immanence. And from time to time there should be celebrations of this sacredness in rituals, in dance and song. (pp. 17-18)

It is through the inclusion of spirituality by ecofeminists that we begin to see a re-connection to the natural world that western science has worked so hard to sever. It was this connection, this ability to see the sacred in the natural world that gave people purpose and strength. In essence, this spirituality itself was ecofeminist. An example of this would be from the Chinese Taoist priestess and poet of the 19th century Yü Hsüan-chi in her poem *Living In The Summer Mountain*:

I have moved to this home of Immortals.
Wild shrubs bloom everywhere.
In the front garden, trees
Spread their branches for clothes racks.
I sit on a mat and float wine cups
In the cool spring.
Beyond the window railing
A hidden path leads away
Into the dense bamboo grove.
In a gauze dress
I read among my disordered

Piles of books.
I take a leisurely ride
In the painted boat,
And chant poems to the moon.
I drift at ease, for I know
The soft wind will blow me home.
(Hsüan-chi, 1972, p. 18).

This is a view of nature that has a strong connection to humanity, is sacred and denotes a religion that is a lot more sustainable then the religion of science in the west. Shiva (1993) defends this notion of spirituality that some would include with ecofeminism and notes that there is this almost fanatical devotion to western progress that views the natural world as a commodity:

> Dams, mines, energy plants, military bases – these are the temples of the new religion called 'development', a religion that provides the rational for the modernizing state, its bureaucracies and technocracies. What is sacrificed at the altar of this religion is nature's life and people's faith. The sacraments of development are made of the ruins and desecration of other sacreds, especially sacred soils. They are based on the dismantling of society and community, on the uprooting of people and cultures. (p. 98)

Western society's religion and spirituality has become the need and desire to consume more, to fill the emptiness that has been created by our removal from the natural world, from the connections with others and with us. Spirituality and religion for ecofeminism is not as much becoming mystical and superstitious as it is becoming engaged. We become engaged in ourselves, in the natural world and with each other and we can eventually move from this idea of globalization, to Appiah's idea of "rooted cosmopolitanism" to eventually what Gary Snyder (1995) calls "planetary and ecological cosmopolitanism" (p. vii).

I would like to end with a poem by the 18th Century Vietnamese female poet Hồ Xuân Hương (whose name means “spring essence”). In some of her poetry she would assail male authority, but I particularly like this poem because to me it synthesize this idea of spirituality in regards to the sacredness of the natural world and the idea that we really should not view the natural world as a commodity that can be bought and sold. The title of the poem is *Heaven Market*:

Praise to the Creator, so clever, so teasing,
In bringing forth this field called Heaven Market

where breezes riffle mornings, and sunlight floods the days,
where evening clouds gently drift, where moonlight always plays.

Throughout the four seasons, we find flowers and fruits
in this open-air market bound by hills.

Buyers and sellers of fame and glory
can’t cut a deal in Heaven Market.
(Hồ Xuân Hương, 2000, p. 109)

CHAPTER V

ECOSPIRITUALITY

Irrational Mysticism?

In the previous chapter we briefly looked at Murray Bookchin's critique of ecofeminism, especially in relation to religion and spirituality. Bookchin has always been a strong critic of the inclusion of spirituality in the movements of ecology and anarchism. As noted in chapter four, Bookchin (2005) believes that the inclusion of religion and spirituality to both ecofeminism and ecology movements is irrational and borders on clinging to the mystical. Bookchin's (1999) vast writings are replete with criticisms of spiritual movements in ecology:

> As for the ecology movement, about which I've written at length elsewhere: certain Green tendencies drenched in mysticism were turning it from a serious radical social movement that could be part of a New Left, into a cult of romantic nature-worship. Not only were these tendencies mystical, but they tended to blame human beings as such for the ecological crisis, and they saw their own role as a defense of "the Earth" against human beings. So greatly did they identify themselves with "the Earth" that they become harshly antihumanistic. In effect, they pined after a natural world that had not been altered by human beings, as if human beings were not part of the natural world itself and as if many of their activities were not endowments of natural evolution. (pp. 117-118)

Bookchin (1999) viewed alternative or counterculture movements to be a reaction to and rejection of capitalist systems that exploit the natural world, but with spirituality becoming part of these movements his concern was that, "The counterculture was drifting more and more toward mysticism: particularly Taoism and Buddhism" (p. 99).

Bookchin's (1999) almost fanatical rejection of the connection of spiritual movements to ecological movements has even ended friendships, as he notes with fellow ecologist Gary Snyder, "who broke off all relations with me after my criticism" (p. 223). I believe this splitting by Snyder and others towards Bookchin was not as much in relation to his "criticisms" as the fact that Bookchin was denigrating those who chose to adopt a spiritual path against Bookchin's "better advice." Not known for tact, Bookchin's (1994) critiques actually border more on insults where he notes, "a widespread cultural decay has followed the degeneration of the 1960s New Left into postmodernism and of its counterculture into New Age spiritualism" (p. 55).

Bookchin does not limit his critiques to just Eastern religions (what he misinterprets as New Age spiritualism that is "mystical"), but to other religious traditions as well. Bookchin (1999) notes that "*All* religions by definition rest on faith rather than reason – that is, they appeal to the least critical faculties of their disciples and commonly reduce them to acquiescence to the ruling class" (p. 222). Bookchin, in a lot of ways, is just following an age old conflict between Marxism, anarchism and religion and a whole chapter could be spent reflecting on this dispute, but this is something that I am not going to do here. I do, however, want to look at other criticisms of religion to the ecological movements. After this I will look at the benefits of including spirituality with ecological movements and actually reflect on how this can be productive and helpful as opposed to tethering us to the capitalist system as Bookchin wants to claim.

Fascist Ecology

Meera Nanda, in an article where she looks at issues concerning ecospirituality, makes some remarkable analogies. In an almost apologetic preface to later comments Nanda (2004/5) makes in her article, she notes:

> All neo-pagans are not fascists. Indeed, neo-paganism can stand by itself as a genuine religion, with no necessary connections with fascists, racist politics. And I have no evidence that the neo-pagan groups that Hindutva [Hindu way of life] is trying to bring into its own fold have any overt connections with Nazi or neo-Nazi groups (p. 20).

And yet, right after this comment, Nanda (2004/5) notes, "Nevertheless . . .":

> There is a long history of Nazi and neo-Nazi involvement with the occult and paganism. Most people don't realize that Nazism was a revolt against the universalistic, rationalist, and secular elements of the Enlightenment tradition, which the Nazis ascribed to the influence of the Jews. Indeed, the contemporary, feminist, deep-ecologist and post-colonial revolt against Enlightenment ideals shares many features with the Nazi critique of universal civilization. (p. 20)

So where Bookchin critiques the inclusion of "New Age" spirituality in the ecology movement because it can foster mysticism and irrationality, Nanda feels the need to take this one step further and postulate that the inclusion of spirituality and religion, especially Eastern traditions and paganism, is establishing a link with Nazism and neo-Nazism. Even though Nanda (2004/5) briefly states she has "no evidence" of this connection between ecospirituality and neo-Nazism she still claims that, what she calls "religious environmentalists" (p. 20), "Run the risk of aiding and comforting the religious right and the ultra-nationalistic politics" (p. 19). In other words, asserting there is a connection, and devotes a good portion of her article arguing this point.

This is actually not the first time I have heard this type of rhetoric. There has been great disputation at to whether Hitler was a vegetarian. Because of this belief, those who oppose vegetarianism and oppose groups that support or advocate vegetarianism will use this claim of Hitler to bolster their arguments (Vegetarians are Evil, 2006). But just because two, in this case ecospirituality and neo-Nazism, diametrically opposed groups share some of the same philosophical belief system does not mean that they are somehow connected and sympathetic with each other. Nanda is actually attempting to use a western philosophical model to argue her point and to make it seem that religious environmentalistism or ecospirituality connection to neo-Nazism is *a priori*.

Nanda and the Principle of Deduction for Justification

Nanda is attempting to use a western philosophical model called the *principle of deduction for justification* (PDJ) to rationalize her claim in the connection between ecospirituality and neo-Nazism. Kwame Appiah (2003) notes how this *principle of deduction for justification* is supposed to work:

> PDJ: If you take any two sentences, A and B, then, if you are justified in believing both A and B, and if from A and B together, C follows logically, then, if you believe C, you are justified in believing C. (p. 50)

The important part of the PDJ is that C has to follow A and B *logically*. Nanda's argument has no logic to it. What Nanda (2004/5) is attempting to do is say that (a) Nazism and neo-Nazism had and has a connection to the occult and paganism (p. 20); (b) religious environmentalism and ecospirituality has a connection to paganism (pp. 19-21); so therefore, (c) since both ecospirituality and neo-Nazism (along with Nazism) have a

connection with paganism, then they both have a connection with each other. Appiah (2003) notes that PDJ can work, if the justification for it is an "indefeasible justification," in other words if the justification (c) can be seen as valid (p. 50). For it to be valid, it has to be logical. Nanda's justification is not logical, it is presupposition. Just because neo-Nazis and the historical Nazi party had an obsession with naturalism and pagan rites, this does not mean they share a common sense of ecological concern with modern religious environmentalists, that they are "kindred spirits."

Nazis, Science and Fanaticism

Hitler and the Nazi party's connection to naturalism and paganism had nothing to do with their concern for ecology.[1] In actuality they started a fanatical war that was egregiously destructive to the natural environment and human life. Their connections to naturalism had more to do with the advancement of the Aryan race than any concern over the ecology and natural environment. It was because of this naturalism that the Nazi government actually made incredible advancements in their understanding of health related issues as Richard Evans (2005) notes in his historical document of the Third Reich:

> In trying to improve the health and fecundity of the racially acceptable part of the German population, the Nazis gave strong support to preventive medicine and research into major killers. It was a Nazi epidemiologist who first established the link between smoking and lung cancer, establishing a government agency to combat tobacco consumption in June 1939. Party and government agencies

[1] This issue is too broad and controversial to address here, much less in Nanda's article. For those interested in the subject of Nazism and the occult should see Peter Levenda's Book Unholy Alliance: A History of Nazi Involvement with the Occult. In this book Levanda (2007) notes "Proving the existence of a hitherto unknown German religious tradition that predated Christianity and which was more in tune with the German *Volk* would go a long way toward propping up Himmler's other theories and give substance to the twin policies of Aryan racial superiority and German claim to the land" (p. 214).

> actively pursued bans on carcinogenic substances like asbestos and dangerous pesticides and food colouring agents. Already in 1938 the air force had banned smoking on its premises, to be followed by other workplace smoking bans imposed by the post office and offices of the Nazi Party itself, in April 1939. Books, pamphlets and posters warned of the dangers of smoking, and pointed out repeatedly that Hitler himself never put a pipe, cigar or cigarette to his lips. Nor did he imbibe alcohol, and the Nazis were equally active in combating excessive consumption of beer, wines and spirits. The fact that tobacco manufacturers, brewers, distillers and wine merchants were more than likely to be members of the Party and give it substantial financial support cut little ice here: the overriding imperative was to improve the health of the Aryan race. (p. 319)

Based on Nanda's argument, we could use her PDJ to say that any attempt in our contemporary society to not only warn, but protect the community of the health hazards of smoking, pesticides, food colorings, asbestos, etc. is in essence a connection to Nazism and neo-Nazism, since they were some of the first to discover the health concerns related to all of these. As Evans points out, this was not as much of a concern for public safety and health as it was for advancing the Aryan race specifically. Nanda's attempt to connect ecospirituality to neo-Nazism is just as absurd as attempting to connect school programs that endeavor to teach the dangers of cigarette smoking to school children to neo-Nazism.

But Nanda uses surreptitious language to show this connection, noting that ecospirituality may not want the connection to neo-Nazi groups, but that they somehow are too ignorant to understand how these neo-Nazi groups can be attracted to these movements. Nanda (200/5) notes this when she states that, "Wicca, or even deep ecologists who have no right-wing sympathies, tend to attract neo-Nazi groups who are into the occult" (p. 21). So these deep ecologists may not agree with neo-Nazis, but they somehow *attract* them? Her whole argument rests on this attraction of both groups to

paganism and the occult. What Nanda fails to understand is that Hitler and the Nazis did not use paganism and the occult because they were drawn to the spirituality of it; they used it precisely because of the cult like status that it could foster in the population.[1] Hitler was a great admirer of that which was fanatical and willing to go to any extremes to advance its cause. In Hitler's Mien Kampf (My Struggle) Hitler (1971) discusses the connection between fanaticism and Christianity:

> The greatness of every mighty organization embodying an idea in this world lies in the religious fanaticism and intolerance with which, fanatically convinced of its own right, it intolerantly imposes its will against all others. If an idea in itself is sound and, thus armed, takes up a struggle on this earth, it is unconquerable and every persecution will only add to its inner strength.
>
> The greatness of Christianity did not lie in attempted negotiations for comprise with any similar philosophical opinions in the ancient world, but in its inexorable fanaticism in preaching and fighting for its own doctrine. (p. 351)

Although Nanda (2004/5) is not saying that it is the cult like fanaticism that attracts these neo-Nazis to ecospiritual movements, she does allude to the cult like status of leaders in ecology and ecospiritual movements when she notes, "The cult-like status of Vandana Shiva in the anti-globalization and environmental movements" (p. 20). Once again she is attempting to use language to establish a pattern of behavior that will lead one to connect neo-Nazis to ecospirituality and ecology movements. In another part of Nanda's (2004/5) article she states, "Some groups, like Earth First! or Vandana Shiva's Research Foundation in India, are *more aggressive* in the commitment to defend the earth" (p. 19, emphasis added). What exactly Nanda (2004/5) means by *more aggressive*

[1] One should once again reference Levenda (2007) where he notes, "The Nazis were not simply a political party . . . they were a *cult*, and as such had every trapping of the typical cult, from a spiritual Master to a brotherhood of identically clad disciples . . ." (p. 155).

is left to the interpretation of the reader, although she points out that, "Others are more inward-looking, more drawn to life-style rituals than political activism" (p. 19). I would also question this disconnection of "life-style rituals" from political activism. If one decides to ride a bike instead of driving, is this not both a life-style ritual and possibly the statement of a political activist? I would think that some in the bicycle activist movement Critical Mass would argue this point.[1]

Centrism vs. Radicalism

These are important distinctions to note however, since what Nanda is attempting to do is take what is called a centrist approach, which means she can position herself as being more moderate and centrally located philosophically and then in essence *she* places ecospirituality on the radical fringes. By positioning herself in a centrist position politically, Nanda can critique both groups and by doing this connect both groups (ecospiritualists and neo-Nazis) with little justification. Nanda is not the only one that does this, as Josh points out in an article written in Earth First! (the journal of the environmental group Earth First! that Nanda states is aggressive). Josh makes some disturbing observations where he notes that groups like the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) have lumped several, in many cases diametrically opposed, groups together just because some of these groups position *themselves* on the radical fringes of society. As Josh (2007) notes, "The Southern Poverty Law Center concluded that the 1999 World Trade Organization protests signaled a

[1] See Chris Carlsson's (2002) book Critical Mass: Bicycling's Defiant Celebration by AK Press.

coming alliance between right-wing and left-wing opponents of globalization, including neo-Nazis, the Nation of Islam and Earth First!" (p. 12).

Historically organizations such as the SPLC and the ADL have been powerful advocacy groups and have done incredible work in the advancement of civil rights. But what Josh notes is that these groups (SPLC, ADL) have taken a more centrist position and in response to this they justify lumping what they would consider extremist groups together even though these groups may have vastly different philosophical foundations. Josh (2007) notes this with the ADL:

> The ADL adopted centrist/extremist theory, a neoconservative social model that clumps together *all* dissidents from the political right and left—regardless of their diverse and often conflicting agendas—and dismisses them as psychologically unstable people deserving of marginalization and imprisonment. (p. 12)

What is even more alarming is some of the practices that groups like SPLC and ADL have engaged in, especially in regards to their research conducted on these differing groups (Earth First! and neo-Nazis). As Josh (2007) continues to note in his article:

> Additionally, there is evidence to suggest that both the ADL and the SPLC have a history of conducting covert investigations using surveillance and infiltration tactics that law enforcement is generally barred from employing without a warrant. The organizations then provide this information to the police and FBI, effectively circumventing constitutional rights of privacy and assembly. The result is that these private watchdog groups are increasingly complicit in classically fascist systems of government surveillance and control. Apparently, the ADL and the SPLC oppose fascism when it is promoted by private individuals but condone it when practiced by the state, which is precisely when it is most dangerous. (p. 14)

The evidence that Josh (2007) is talking about is when, in 1993, a police investigation of ADL itself revealed that ADL had compiled vast amounts of information on "Thousands of Arab-Americans, anti-war, anti-apartheid, civil rights, environmental, labor and social justice groups" (p. 12). Among these groups that ADL compiled information on that Josh (2007) reports in his article were, "ACT UP, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Indian Movement, Food Not Bombs, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Greenpeace and the Simon Wiesenthal Center" (p. 12).

What is disturbing is the morphing of some of these groups, which historically have been strong advocacy groups themselves, into what is now considered an "extremist" group. Food Not Bombs is a great example of this. Food Not Bombs is a group that actually adheres to non-violence and has a mission of not only advocating for the reduction of nuclear weapons, but of feeding the poor and hungry. Food Not Bombs is a group not well known by the mainstream, so when organizations like the ADL start considering them an "extremist" group, the information that the mainstream digests is greatly distorted (see Food Not Bombs webpage: http://www.foodnotbombs.net).

Ecoterrorism

In essence, what happens when individual like Nanda attempts to connect ecospirituality with neo-Nazis and groups like SPLC and ADL start lumping right wing fascist groups with environmentalists the information that is disseminated to the public is that ecology movements are dangerous and destructive. Because of the history of terrorist activity among Neo-Nazis and other fascists groups the connecting of ecology

movements to them, without any real correlation, manipulates information and persuades some citizens to view environmentalist groups as being terrorists. What merges is a new form of terrorism that western countries, especially the United States, feel they need to protect themselves from, which is ecoterrorism. The term ecoterrorism then becomes prevalent and is used to incite fear in the public (see FBI's webpage on ecoterrorism: http://www.fbi.gov/congress/congress02/jarboe021202.htm).

The word "ecoterrorism" itself is an oxymoron. The term ecoterrorism is an attempt to merge the word ecology with the acts of terrorism, hence the term ecological terrorism. The actions of terrorists are used to induce fear and the greatest fear is through destruction. The justification for defining radical ecology groups as being terrorists is because they *have used* aggressive means to make their point, as Day (2005) notes with these radical ecology groups engaging in such activities as "Halting urban sprawl by burning down luxury housing developments under construction, and spray-painting anti-war slogans on petrol-hungry SUVs (Sport Utility Vehicles)" (p. 26). What I find interesting is that when a corporation engages in overtly destructive activities towards the environment (sometimes sanctioned by the government); they are not defined as terrorists. And yet their activities are the essence of what terrorism is, as Shiva (2005) points out:

> At a time when a quarter of the world's population is threatened with starvation due to the erosion of soil fertility, water, and genetic diversity, chasing the mirage of unending growth becomes a major source of genocide. Killing people through the destruction of nature is an invisible form of violence which threatens justice, peace, and survival. (p. 52)

Ecoterrorism should not be defined as radical ecology groups engaging in destructive (and in some cases misguided) activities in protection of the environment, but defined as overt destruction done to the environment. Milton Friedman's style of laissez-faire capitalism and globalization become ecoterrorist because of the damage done to the environment *and* to human life, as Chellis Glendinning (1994) notes, "pumping toxic materials like dioxin and mercury into a river is violence" (p. 7). Instead what we see is that systematic destruction of the natural world somehow becomes "progress" and groups that attempt to defend the natural world become ecoterrorists.

What eventually happens is the information that gets filtered to the mainstream public is that environmental groups are somehow connected to ecoterrorism. An example of this came up in a conversation I had with my brother-in-law where he was attempting to connect the activity of "tree spiking" to Greenpeace. Tree spiking is where some radical environmentalists will hammer spikes into trees to discourage loggers from cutting them down. The spikes will cause damage to chain saws and could possible harm or kill a logger. This is not an activity that has ever been connected to Greenpeace nor have they ever advocated for it. This is an activity that the more radical Earth Liberation Front (ELF) has engaged in. But since Greenpeace is a well known environmental group that engages in civil disobedience the reaction from some individuals that are unaware of Greenpeace's activities is to connect them with radical groups like ELF and their activities. Articles like Nanda's help foster this misunderstanding and even take it a step further since she wants to insinuates that ecospirituality itself, which is more of a belief

system than a specific environmentalist activity, is connected to neo-Nazis and in essence terrorist activities.

Secularism vs. Spirituality

What is the motivation behind connecting environmental groups and ecospirituality with neo-Nazi groups and terrorists? For corporations it allows them to portray *all* activist groups as terrorists and hence diminishes their credibility and negates these groups' real criticisms of corporate environmental abuse. Corporations can portray themselves as victims of environmental groups and depict environmental groups as having an agenda that is wider than ecological concerns, that environmental groups have the intent of causing great destruction to the western (or American) way of life. This also allows corporations to "greenwash," in other words through portraying environmental groups as dangerous and radical, corporations can present themselves to the public as being legitimately concerned about the environment, and in essence spend more money advertising their ecological programs than they actually spend doing something about ecological concerns (Beers & Capellaro, 1991, p. 38).

But for individuals like Bookchin and Nanda this portraying of spirituality as being irrational and dangerous is more of a philosophical and theoretical issue. For Nanda attempting to make ecospirituality connected to neo-Nazism is a way to make ecospirituality seem unstable, dangerous and eventually fanatical. This is not based on Nanda's (2004/5) real concern about ecology movements or ecospirituality somehow being connected to neo-Nazism, this is based on her bias towards secularism and against religion, and you can see this in the last paragraph of her article:

> This secular motivation for environmental action is an untapped resource for *secular environmentalism* and, more generally, *secular activism* in other social movements such as the anti-globalization movement. Rather than drape the cloak of sacredness on nature, environmentalism in India can become a source of secularism and class-based collective action. (p. 22)

Nanda is in essence attempting to create a further divide between a secular model of environmentalism and a religious model of environmentalism. Much like Bookchin's attempt to make the inclusion of religion and spirituality in social movements seem mystical and irrational, Nanda wants to make ecospirituality appear teetering on fanaticism and being dangerously neo-Nazi. I understand that there are different philosophical values in both traditions, but through this exclusionary process secularism becomes just as rigid and inflexible when it comes to understanding and working with religious movements as religious movements can be. What is even more disturbing is not only does Nanda (2004/5) attack religious environmentalism and ecospirituality, she is also attacking other social movements and theories, "Indeed, the contemporary, feminist, deep-ecologist and post-colonial revolt against Enlightenment ideals shares many features with the Nazi critique of universal civilization" (p. 20). Some within these groups that Nanda mentions may have no connection to religious movements, but they do share a common goal of fighting against Neoliberalism and globalization, especially with its reliance on western science to advance its cause. Nanda is once again attempting to connect groups that she does not agree with to neo-Nazism just because these groups are attempting to fight against western imperialism.

What Nanda demonstrates is an adherence to a western model of scientific thought; where the attempt is to make those not adhering to this model seem irrational

and anti-humanistic. The argument is that sense *they* are "secular" they are scientific and therefore rational. If one does not buy into the "rational" secular model then *they* must be irrational. What we have seen with history though is that neither science nor religion is always rational (Spanish Inquisition, dropping of the atomic bomb, etc.).[1] But this argument, with euphemistic language such as "rational" becomes not only egocentric, but also ethnocentric based on the fact that it is a model grounded in *western* scientific thought. It is a way to denigrate activism that includes a religious or spiritual base (it is either too "non action," like Bookchin's criticism of Taoism, or too "aggressive" based on Nanda's comments of Shiva and Earth First!). It is also a way, based on Nanda's statements, to denigrate theories and philosophies that may want to include a scientific thought that is not specifically a secular western scientific model.

What needs to happen is religious and secular movements need to put theoretical differences aside (or at least learn to argue them constructively) and begin to work together for economic, social and ecological justice. What will happen if they do not do this is that secularism will continue to connect all religious groups to fanatical religious groups and neo-Nazi movements. In addition secularism will continue to see itself as the only rational choice and in essence support the western Neoliberalism and globalization ideas that are rooted in free market capitalism and its need to exploit the rest of the world. Also religions will continue to separate themselves from scientific thought and consider all science, especially western science, as intrusive and invasive and having the intent of destroying identity and culture.

---

[1] Jung (2005) makes a great comment in relation to this, "For ages man has dreamed of flying, and all we have got for it is saturation bombing!" (p. 123).

Barring Nanda's and Bookchin's view of religion and spirituality I think we need to take a closer look at how the inclusion of spirituality to ecological movements manifests itself. We have done this briefly in the last chapter on ecofeminism, but what I would like to do here is to take a broader look at spirituality and religion in environmentalism and what evolves into ecospirituality. To do this we need to first look at what motivates people to become attracted to and seek out spirituality and religious movements.

Fast Food Spirituality

The word spirituality is a greatly loaded term and comes with enormous connotations. Spirituality becomes a catch all phrase for those who do not necessarily want to define themselves in religious terms or who reject some traditional religious structures of hierarchy and patriarchy. It also becomes a term for those who do not want to be pinned down to one specific religious tradition or who want to be more inclusive in religious beliefs. The down side of the term spirituality is that it morphs into a phrase that reflects a growing trend of religious chic or religious dabbling, what has now become New Age spirituality. It becomes what Dorothee Soelle (2001) calls "fast food" spirituality (p. 50). This fast food spirituality comes from our fast food nation, this sense of mindlessly consuming, not taking the time to see what is inside of what we consume; we just consume. We have been programmed and trained to expect quick results and to view everything as a commodity to devour so our spirituality just becomes an extension of this lifestyle. As Soelle (2001) notes about those that engage in fast food spirituality,

"Many of them change gurus, groups, and rituals often—first precious stones, then deep breathing!" (p. 50).

Of course the first reaction is to blame individuals who engage in this fast food approach to religion and spirituality as being shallow, and I am sure it is true that a portion of them are engaging in a superficial bourgeois attempt to seem genuinely interested in diversity of thought. But I think that it is a lot deeper than this; in a lot of cases it is an authentic attempt to fill a void that has been created because of our contemporary lifestyle and an effort to discover our humanity. This emptiness comes from the lifestyle where we are made into producing and consuming beings, where the point of our lives is to consume goods. This idea of alienation that Marx expostulated on from a philosophical viewpoint is carried forward by the Trappist monk Thomas Merton (1998b) from a religious perspective, "The term alienation is used of a human being who is systematically kept, or who allows himself to be kept, in a social situation in which *he exists purely and simply for somebody else*" (p. 72). Merton (1998) continues to note:

> His reason for existing and for acting is not for himself, but in someone else's profit. That is to say that what he does is vastly more profitable and pleasant for someone else, and he gets little or nothing out of it himself. His life lacks meaning. As far as he personally is concerned, there is no reason for him to exist at all. Life is not worth living. (pp. 72-73)

I know that this seems to be somewhat of a bleak outlook on what alienation is but I think it has some validity. As we reflect on the concept of alienation, and with my earlier inclusion of Dissociative Disorder in Chapter II, we see there does become this emptiness in people's daily lives. Corporations want us to identify with that which we

consume, to make that somehow seem spiritual. As Marcuse (1964) notes this is what begins to happen, “People recognize themselves in their commodities; they find their soul in their automobile, hi-fi set, split-level home, kitchen equipment” (p. 9). But this can only go so far, when the sum total of our existence is reduced to what we can produce and consume, we eventually start to feel that life should have more meaning than this.

This is where spirituality and religion come in, for a lot of people it is what gives them meaning. This is why people search for a mystical experience, why they are seeking for something to fill the void. You can only consume so much before you begin to figure out that this is not filling that void, so people turn to other means to fill it. People want something that will bring meaning and purpose in their lives, and as Dorothee Soelle (2001) notes, “Without mysticism, the image of the human being deteriorates into that of a consuming and producing machine” (p. 44).

This brings us back to the panoptic model I discussed in chapter two, where we become programmed as children to become machines. Machines in a corporate capitalistic society; whereas children we are programmed to operate like an apparatus. Somehow through this process we are expected to be highly individualistic and show little concern for others and concomitantly expected to adopt uniformity. Glendinning (1994) phrases it well:

> School has us sitting in stiff rows memorizing information categorized into rigid departments purported to be unrelated to one another. We are disciplined to abide by rules that squelch all spontaneity, require us to control our emotional and biological needs, and quantify our worth with tests and grades. When we become adults, acts as simple and “normal” as standing in line, obeying traffic signals, paying taxes, and registering for the draft all constitute ways we are required to participate in this grand machine. (p. 107)

As adults, this leads us to a point of removing our psyche from ourselves, where we don't live our lives as if they were whole. We go through life "doing" our job, "consuming" goods, hoping that they will bring meaning to our lives, as Soelle (2001) notes:

> This situation where we are not quiet what we do, where we kiss, drink, work, laugh, or meditate only with part of ourselves, is the most normal of situations. We are not wholly present in what we experience; we are still watching ourselves, and we do not attain the self-forgetfulness of being one. We do not play as a child can play; rather, we observe ourselves. Our doing—for example, earning a living—is often smaller than we are. It does not express our riches, strengths, and our longings. Instead, it gets us stuck in a kind of lifeless self-satisfaction that resembles a lobster's armor. We cannot be what we do in the office, the household, the factory; we have become so estranged from ourselves that this being one can at best be postponed to the weekend or vacations. (p. 25)

This was what the Beats and counter-culture were railing against. They referred back to the poets and monks of Taoism and Buddhism because it was what they were reacting to in a lot of ways also. These Buddhist and Taoist poets and monks were the Beats' progenitors, and they knew that the mystical experience was more than just an irrational religious experience; it was an embracing of life, an engaging with it. This is why Snyder (1995) considered them to be *pragmatic* shamans, since this mystical experience was not irrational nor evolved from superstitious beliefs (p. 93). For those who break through this simple understanding that religion and spirituality are more than just attempting to fill the void, or to believe in some higher celestial power, they transcend into a level of seeing that spirituality is an engagement. Whereas contemporary societal practices removes us from ourselves, others, the natural world, this form of spirituality re-connects us and we become engaged in life.

The epiphany of the mystical experience comes when our engagement in this search for something meaningful goes beyond the fast food spirituality. The bouncing around from one spiritual endeavor to another is because of the lack of contemplation, or meditation on what the spiritual experience is. The bourgeois New Age spirituality is when we view religion and spiritual movements as just another thing for us to consume. Purchasing the accoutrements of exotic religions as a way to seem mysterious does not engage one in spirituality or endeavor a spiritual experience. The mystical experience happens when through this process of engaging it re-connects us to ourselves, to others and to the natural world. This does not have to be "religious" as Soelle (2001) notes, "Mystical sensibility has theistic, atheistic, and pantheistic forms" (pp. 21-22). But is has often been defined as religious because it manifests itself mystically, because it is so alien to how we have been programmed to live. That mystical manifestation is when we reject the Thanatos that the panopticon instills in us and embrace the Eros. Caputo (2001) best describes this:

> Religion is for lovers, for men and women of passion, for real people with a passion for something other than taking profits, people who believe in something, who hope like mad in something, who love something with a love that surpasses understanding. (p. 2)

Caputo (2001) believes that this transcends both religion and secularism as he continues to note, "A lot of supposedly secular people love something madly, while a lot of supposedly religious people love nothing more than getting their own way and bending others to their own will" (pp. 2-3).

Bookchin's critique is that this religion and spirituality is a rejection of rationality, an acquiescence to authority and "fostering passivity" (1999, p. 222). In actuality this is the opposite of what Bookchin is saying. What happens when a person has a "mystical" experience, or a humanistic one, or however you want to define it, is it becomes an engaged endeavor. I touched on this in the third chapter when Snyder (1995) talks about "socially engaged writers," because the mystical experience manifests itself with these engaged writers through the poetry and stories they write, it becomes their social activism (p. 92). This social or spiritual engagement for me comes in the form of engaged Buddhism, but can extend to any spiritual or humanistic tradition where it becomes an engaged spirituality.

Engaged Buddhism

As I just noted, this form of engaged spirituality for me manifests itself through my personal Buddhist practice as engaged Buddhism. The term engaged Buddhism was coined by the Vietnamese Buddhist Monk Thich Nhat Hanh in relation to the work that he and other Buddhists were doing during the Vietnam War (Kraft, 1996, pp. 64-65). It is an "engagement" in life as opposed to a rejection of worldly affairs. Historically monastic traditions have been perceived as a way to separate oneself from the world or to isolate one from worldly concerns. Since Buddhism has a strong monastic tradition, monks and nuns have been viewed as more concerned with their own spiritual development then being of assistance to others. As Kraft (1996) notes, "Buddhism has been seen as passive, otherworldly, or escapist" (p. 65). The Vietnam War however forced monks and nuns of

the Buddhist tradition to become more engaged in worldly affairs and help those that were harmed during the conflict.

Vietnam has had a long history of conflict and struggle and before the Vietnam War the Vietnamese had dealt with colonial powers and occupation by Japan and France. Through this process the country was divided ideologically which resulted in a civil war that culminated in the involvement of the United States. During this time in history the United States and the Soviet Union were huge imperialistic powers and their ideological struggles were often played out in smaller Third World countries. The United States responded to the Soviet Union's involvement with the rest of the world by means of a foreign policy known as "containment." This theory of "containment" was basically to prevent communism from spreading throughout the world, but in a lot of ways it established the United States own imperialistic boundaries (Harvey, 2003, p. 40). Through this foreign policy of containment Vietnam became a protracted war for the United States lasting over ten years[1] which resulted in numerous deaths on both the United States and Vietnam.[2] The ideas of engaged Buddhism were forged in the battlefield that was Vietnam. It was not only a reaction to globalization and neoimperialism, but hatred and violence; it was a reaction to and a struggle against the war and the violence that ensued. Engaged Buddhism consisted of activities such as

[1] The length of the war is of debate, Howard Zinn (2003) notes that "From 1964 to 1972, the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the history of the world made a maximum military effort" (p. 469). Our time spent in Vietnam was a lot longer however.

[2] Noam Chomsky discusses the issue of deaths in relation to the Vietnam War. Chomsky (2002) notes that when questioned on how many Vietnamese perished as a result of the Vietnam War, the average American would speculate around "100,000. The official figure is about two million. The actually figure is probably three to four million" (p. 36).

feeding the poor, caring for children whose parents were killed because of the hostilities and advocating for peace.

Engaged Spirituality

Engaged Buddhism is just a one piece of socially conscious and socially active religious movements that becomes engaged spirituality. Engaged spirituality is more than just an activist endeavor, it requires a strong reflection on oneself, especially in relation to the world and those in it. Engaged spirituality becomes what King (2001) considers a combination of "Contemplation and action" (p. vii). This idea of contemplation is what becomes so essential in any form of engaged spirituality. For Thich Nhat Hanh, engaged Buddhism is not engaged unless it has a meditative process with it that creates some kind of personal awareness and growth. Thich "Nhat Hanh's social activism is grounded in personal transformation. Mere activism, in his view, lacks the inner resources necessary to be an effective force for good" (King, 2001, p. 105).

Contemplation/meditation is fundamental in this engaged spirituality, because we become connected to ourselves and others. Through contemplation we also become *dis*connected from the panopticon, which is the mechanism that contorts us into creatures of producing and consuming. As Thomas Merton (1961) notes about this contemplation, "Without a certain element of solitude there can be no compassion because when a man is lost in the wheels of a social machine he is no longer aware of human needs as a matter of personal responsibility" (p. 53). This solitude that Merton refers to is this process of contemplation/meditation and it helps us develop the sensitivity to understand those

around us. It is also a rejection of the panoptic model with its need to alienate us from ourselves and our work.

The notion I discussed in chapter four of neoliberal technocrats statement of "it's just my job" is essential in the functioning of the panopticon, and in essence for globalization to work. This is why we need to be "alienated" from our work. If we begin to understand how our work and lifestyle affects the rest of the world we begin to see that we need to change it. If we are removed from each other, if we are alienated from each other, our work and ourselves, we do not have to have empathy for harm done to others because of our actions. When we begin to contemplate or meditate on what we do, the work we do, how we live our lives, we start to understand the interconnectedness of all things. This has the potential to create an understanding of ourselves and the possibility of creating change in the world. As King (2001) notes about Engaged spirituality:

> [It] Combines traditional meditative practice with social action directed at the eradications of the most deeply rooted, intractable problems of contemporary life. It is, moreover, a spirituality particularly well-suited to this age of globalization, a period in history when genuine dialogue among the world's leading religions may be crucial for human survival. (pp. 1-2)

Engaged Pedagogy

So what distinguishes engaged spirituality is this process of contemplation and action, or in other words this process of contemplation and action becomes *praxis*. This idea of contemplation and action in engaged spirituality manifests itself very similarly to Freire's (1993) idea of praxis where he notes that it is "reflecting and action upon the world in order to transform it" (p. 51). For Freire this "reflection" is intellectual, praxis is

a combination of one's intellectual endeavor and action. This intellectualism can be a form of contemplation and we do not need to separate the two. Intellectualism and contemplation can be complimentary to each other and supportive of each other. I discuss that engaged Buddhism is my engaged spirituality, but my educational pursuit is also my engaged spirituality. My ability to sit, to meditate, to read and study, all become contemplative. My Buddhist practice allows me to engage others and so does my educational practice, or what bell hooks (1994) calls "engaged pedagogy" (p. 15). For hooks, as for me, this engaged pedagogy becomes this fusion of the engaged Buddhism of Thich Nhat Hanh and education. hooks (1994) carries forward with Freire's ideas of praxis where she notes, "Whereas Freire was primarily concerned with the mind, Thich Nhat Hanh offered a way of thinking about pedagogy which emphasized wholeness, a union of mind, body, and spirit" (p. 14).

For contemplation and action to become a force of social change however, it needs a third element, and that is dialogue. What my engaged Buddhism and pedagogy has allowed me the opportunity to do is to engage others in dialogue. As King (2001) notes, "Engaged spirituality as a paradigm for religious encounter consists of three basic element: contemplative practice, social action, and interreligious dialogue" (p. 35). For me this "interreligious" dialogue needs be inter-philosophical, it needs to include not only religion, but scientific and humanistic ideas, and the praxis of engaged spirituality becomes dialectic and what Freire (1987) calls "dialogical" (p. 100). We often view dialogue as a conversation between two people, but in engaged spirituality it becomes more than this. As King (2001) notes this dialogue becomes multidimensional:

> We sometimes think of dialogue simply as communication between two persons, as the word "dialogue" would seem to imply. But . . . true dialogue has a triadic structure. It requires a third shared point of reference, something that two parties have in common that they can discourse about or act on together. This 'common third' is what creates community. (p. 37)

So as I noted, this "interreligious dialogue" will have to be inclusive and allow for other religious traditions, but philosophical ones also, which includes science. What has to happen in this process is just as religions have to critique their past practices that have been detrimental, science will have to do the same and work towards change and growth. This is what has partly attracted me to Buddhism, the possibility of it building bridges between religions, philosophies and science. Jean-François Revel (1998), in his book, paraphrases the Dalai Lama about Buddhism in this process,

> Poor Buddhism! Rejected by religions as an atheistic philosophy, a science of the mind; and by philosophers as a religion—there's nowhere that Buddhism has citizen's rights. But perhaps that's an advantage that could allow Buddhism to build bridges between religions and philosophies. (Revel & Ricard, 1998, p. 20)

Engaged Communities

So we have this triad of engaged spirituality manifested with contemplation, action and dialogue, and as King notes this dialogue is what creates community. Thich Nhat Hanh (1998) makes a great comment about community when he states that "The Buddha of the twenty-first century—Maitreya, the Buddha of Love—may well be a community rather than an individual" (p. 155). This is a stark contrast to the hyper individualism of the panoptic world. For me engaged Buddhism created a community with Vietnamese Buddhists. I developed rich relationships that expanded my

understanding of the world and allowed me unique opportunities that I would not have generally had. By developing these relationships with the Vietnamese community I was afforded the opportunity to travel to California and stay at a Vietnamese Buddhist temple for a month one summer, with the future possibility of eventually traveling to Vietnam and staying with a Buddhist community there. Through my engaged spirituality I entered into a dialogue with others, and in the process not only did I learn from others but educated others about me and my culture.

My pursuit of a Ph.D. became an engaged pedagogy and again in this process I entered into dialogue with amazing people, where I learned and grew in the process. This also becomes a community for me and along with bringing my own experiences into this community I also learned from others' experiences. My studies in Buddhism and education merged together and became synthesized into my engaged spirituality. It is through the experiences and my studies that I began to see the interreligious community building by individuals like Thich Nhat Hanh (Buddhist monk) and Thomas Merton (Trappist monk), where upon meeting Thomas Merton (2006) called Thich Nhat Hanh his "brother" and notes that he has more in common with him than "many Americans" (pp. 111-112). I also saw this interreligious dialogue with Thich Nhat Hang and Daniel Berrigan (Jesuit Priest) whereupon during one of their conversations Berrigan points out, "Our real shrines are nuclear installations and the Pentagon and the war research laboratories. This is where we worship, allowing ourselves to hear the obscene command that we kill and be killed" (Berrigan & Thich Nhat Hanh, 2001, p. 10).

It is through my experiences of community, and seeing these interreligious community building activities that I develop the hope that I was discussing in chapter three. The hope that is a response to the panoptic world and the fact that we are becoming increasingly surveilled. We are becoming increasingly surveilled because these dialogical communities are dangerous to the panoptic model, Neoliberalism and globalization. These communities are a reaction to this; they become what Hardt and Negri (2000) call "counter-globalization" (p. 207). These counter-globalization communities are communities where dialogue is not sanctioned by the state. Thich Nhat Hanh (2001) discusses this with Berrigan in relation to Thich Nhat Hanh's School of Social Service in Vietnam, "Which is doing the work of reconstruction, has no license to operate; the government doesn't want to grant one" (p. 43). Berrigan (2001) responds to this with the communities that he works with, "People always are conscious of that – that they operate illegally, without approval . . . this is true everywhere. When good people are trying to do good work today, they are in this kind of trouble" (p. 43).

My communities, education, and engaged Buddhism, also have this air of subversion, but we have been able to establish what Freire (1987) calls "deviance credits" (p. 67). This is where a community can operate under the illusion of "respectability" because it may fall in the realm of acceptable and credentialed institutions, but in actuality it is a community of engagement that is working towards this counter-globalization and against the panopticon. With these deviance credits we become "self-destructive." To save ourselves, others and the planet we in positions of privilege have to destroy that privilege, or as Day (2005) notes, "as persons of relative privilege, we can

work to *demolish* our privilege without asking the state to do it for us" (p. 188). What we begin to recognize in these communities is that the *actual community* is bigger than our privilege in the west. It becomes a community that is working for something bigger than the community itself, as King (2001) points out:

> This community may be no larger than the family or it may encompass a whole nation or ethnic group, but what holds it together, what makes it more than a mere collection of individuals, is something beyond itself—a cause or an ideal, a shared purpose or reason for being. (p. 37)

Ecospirituality

What King (2001) notes is our "shared purpose or reason for being" is now becoming our reason for surviving. What is now becoming our shared hope and purpose is the environment. We have seen throughout this work how a panoptic model in conjunction with globalization has led to the exploitation of other people on the planet. In addition it is responsible for the exploitation and damage to the natural world itself for the *religion* of western consumerism. Both science and religion have perpetuated this exploitation and destruction. If there is actually a perfect fusion of science and religion it is in *de*humanizing others for the justification of subjugating and exploiting them, and in viewing the planet as a commodity. Freire (1993) notes, "In dialectical thought, world and action are intimately interdependent" (p. 53). To me this "world" that Freire is talking about is literally the natural world that *we all* live on, it is our community. It is as Shiva (2005) notes, "the community of all beings supported by the earth" (p. 1).

Regardless of doctrinal differences between science and religion, we all cohabit on this planet and the destruction is the one thing that we all seem to be able to agree on,

based solely on our actions. As Gary Snyder (1995) notes: “If humans are to remain on earth, they must transform the five-millennia-long urbanizing civilization tradition into a new ecologically sensitive harmony-oriented wild-minded scientific-spiritual culture” (p. 41). This, to me, becomes ecospirituality. Ecospirituality is this dialogue we enter; it is ecohumanistic, ecosecular, ecoscientific. Secularism and spirituality do not have to be mutually exclusive. This ecospiritual dialogue not only is among others, and groups, and beliefs, but with the planet itself. We need to start listening to what the planet is telling us and to begin speaking back to it based, not on words, but by actions. When this happens, ecospirituality stops being ecospirituality and just becomes spiritual.

Working towards Synthesis

D. T. Suzuki (2002) notes, “The religious consciousness is awakened when we encounter a network of great contradictions running through our human life” (p. 123). One of these contradiction occurs when we realize that the way we are living our lives is destroying the natural environment, and in essence us with it. It is when we realize that with globalization we may live an affluent and comfortable life in the west, yet it causes great suffering among others. This engagement with its fusion of contemplation, action and interreligious dialogue is what awakens our religious consciousness. It becomes the mystical experience that Bookchin feels is so detrimental to the ecology movement.

I’m afraid part of the problem Bookchin has with this *experience* is not the experience itself, but with the language of religion used to express it. There comes this conceit that just because *I* may consider it a religious or mystical experience, I think that *you* should consider it a religious experience also. What happens however is because of

semantics a wedge is driven between individuals and groups that really do need to work together, such as Bookchin and Snyder. Both Bookchin and Snyder have worked tirelessly on environmental issues, both have been greatly influential to me in my studies and beliefs, and yet they consider themselves diametrically opposed. The irony is that they both speak of being versed in Marxism and speak of dialectics, and yet they cannot dialogue.

I think Bookchin actually makes a valid point in relation to the dangers of New Age Spiritualism. This is what Shiva (1993) would call "luxury spiritualism" and notes "as long as it fails to integrate this search for wholeness into a critique of the existing exploitative world system and a search for a better society it can easily be co-opted and neutralized" (Mies & Shiva, 1993, p. 19). Bookchin's fear is that social movements will be neutralized by this New Age, or luxury Spiritualism. But we have seen that religious traditions that ground themselves in contemplation and social action actually become powerful agents for social change. Religious movements that also are willing to engage in interreligious dialogue are able to work together for social, ecological and economic justice as opposed to just competing for adherents. This idea of an *experience* comes from this process of engagement. This experience can be mystical or secular, but fundamentally it is an experience that recognizes the importance of change that has to happen in the world.

This also relates to the second part of Snyder's (1995) comments about Taoist and Buddhist poets and monks being pragmatic *shamans*. The shamanistic aspect is that they have had this mystical experience. As Joseph Campbell (1988) notes, "The difference

between a priest and a shaman is that the priest is a functionary and the shaman is someone who had had an experience" (p. 73). It is not the social position of a cleric that denies the ability of having an experience (i.e. a priest as opposed to a monk or shaman) but the motivation behind the individual to have an experience. Campbell also notes this based on a conversation where a friend told him about an interreligious meeting. Campbell's friend notes that "Catholic monks had no problems understanding the Buddhism monks, but that it was the clergy of the two religions who were unable to understand each other" (Campbell, 1988, p. 73). When religious leaders are placed in positions of just being functionaries and do not engage in the process of having a "mystical" experience, they in essence are there to support the hierarchical and patriarchal system that leads to globalization. They are supporting the ruling class that led Bookchin to have a problem with religious traditions.

But this engaged spirituality is, in a lot of ways, a reclaiming of the religious experience away from patriarchal systems that use the hierarchal structures to dominate and control. As Campbell notes, the "priest" is a functionary, whereas religious experience is personal and does not necessarily need an intermediary to experience that which is sacred. This of course does not mean that religious leaders do not have a very important role, and just because they are religious "leaders" does not mean that they are patriarchal and oppressive. But by the inclusion of spirituality into the ecological movement we are tapping into individual's personal understanding that we are interconnected not only to others on the planet but to the natural world itself. Where Bookchin and Nanda would claims that this is "anti-humanistic" I would argue that it is

very humanistic, and not just humanistic but ecological. We no longer have the luxury to equate ecospirituality, feminism, deep-ecology, post-colonialism with neo-Nazi movements, just as we no longer have the luxury for those that consider themselves spiritual to expect others to adopt their rhetoric and language of religion. As I noted, this interreligious dialogue of engaged spirituality has to become inter-philosophical and incorporate the language of science and religion, or we are no longer going to have the community that we all share.

As Campbell (1987) notes, “In the final analysis, the religious experience is psychological” (p. 262). To me this psychological experience is an ecopsychology and a pedagogy of life. How does all of this congeal into an anarchist psychotherapy? This is what I will look at in my conclusions.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Intellectual Contemplation

Through the process of writing this dissertation I have gone through a dizzying array of ideas, from the Beat movement, Taoist philosophy to globalization. I understand that this is quite a broad range of ideas but I think it is very important to cover them and feel that overall this has been an intellectual (and contemplative) endeavor on my part. These are two things that I personally feel society lacks, intellectualism and contemplation. I reflected on the ideas of contemplation in the last chapter so I want to look at intellectualism here in the conclusions. Intellectualism is actually an activity that our society denigrates. When I say intellectual, I am referring to a very specific type of intellectual, what Foucault (1994) calls an "organic intellectual" (p. 316).[1] For Foucault (1994) this is an "Intellectual in the political sense not the sociological sense of the word, in other words, the person who uses his knowledge, his competence, and his relation to truth in the field of political struggles" (p. 314). For me this is also a person who continues to grow "intellectually," beyond the scope of schooling.

In the undergraduate class I teach I question my students on what an intellectual is and I get sardonic responses of an intellectual that is "detached," "stuffy," "uppity," etc. These students have been given an image of an intellectual they feel they cannot relate to.

[1] Organic Intellectual is an idea postulated by Antonio Gramsci, see also Gramsci's (2000) article *Intellectuals and Education* in The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935.

Because of this image they have become anti-intellectual and this anti-intellectualism pervades our culture and it is just as rampant in my profession as a psychotherapist as it is in education. I feel that this idea of being an intellectual and drawing from a broad array of ideas is an important activity to reclaim and it is just as important whether you are a psychotherapist or an educator. As Jungian analyst Alexander McCurdy (1982) notes an analytical oriented psychotherapist needs to pull from "symbolic material from mythology, religion, alchemy, and literature" (p. 51). In other words, they need to be intellectuals. As an intellectual I chose to pull from what McCurdy listed *and* from feminism, anarchism and geopolitical theory, among other ideas.

I think I have always had this intellectual drive, but never really had the outlet or the mentoring to foster it until I got older. The anti-intellectualism that I grew up with in a small town was almost pathological. Because of this I also rejected my intellectual curiosity and slowly learned how to protect myself emotionally. As Alan Watts (1951) notes that for some men growing up: "Almost more common is the sensitive boy who learns in school to encrust himself for a life in the shell of the 'tough-guy'" (p. 31). This was the Rambo effect for me that I discussed in the first chapter. This also relates to the image that is expected of men that I addressed in chapter four on ecofeminism. Because of this anti-intellectualism and male image I adopted I rejected the institution of education and embraced another institution; the *institution* was all I knew, so I embraced the institution of the military. I was a product of the panopticon and so I had become institutionalized. Even though I was rejecting the institution of the school I still was unable to stand alone; I had to embrace another institution. Fromm (1994) speaks of this

well when he notes, “The average person runs for shelter; he tries to escape from freedom and he seeks for security in the lap of the big state and the big corporation” (p. vi). I had to get away from my schooling and from the town I grew up in, but the fear of becoming a whole and independent individual was far too ominous for me to face, so I entered the military.

I slowly began to regain my intellectual drive after the military when I started going to college. I had a great appreciation of school when I got to the university level, and I think part of this is because I was never supposed to be there. As a person that graduated high school with a 1.86 GPA I was not supposed to be at a university. In college I interacted with very bright individuals who had no interest in being intellectual and school to them was just a means to an end. They, too, were anti-intellectual. I remember as an undergraduate student in social work my classmates were complaining because we had to take an introduction to anthropology course. They could not understand why they had to take such a class. This same anti-intellectual disdain held true for many subjects—philosophy, history, biology, etc. But we social work undergraduates were required to take an introduction to anthropology and the students complained. My argument to them was that we needed to take more anthropology courses, especially cultural anthropology, considering that as social workers we would be working with other cultures. But they also had this resistance to any kind of intellectualism.[1] My classmates wanted to take the very basic and general courses, nothing too rigorous, to get out of school and get a job. They wanted something that pays decently and not be too

[1] Jung (1964) jokingly alludes to this, “I had always been impressed by the fact that there are a surprising number of individuals who never use their minds if they can avoid it” (p. 48).

intellectually challenging. I think they actually took for granted the privilege they had of being able to attend a university. I was really not supposed to be there, so I was going to take advantage of it. It was expected of them to be there so they just wanted to do what they could to finish and get out.

Over the years, after completing my master's degree and becoming a psychotherapist, one of the concerns I have is that my profession is degenerating into a voc-tech discipline. When you reflect back on the works of Fraud and Jung, they were intellectuals who attempted to combine the rigors of science with humanistic observations. Both brilliant men and they were interested in the soul and psyche of humans. Freud has been relegated to English departments and the humanities as a way to analyze texts and theories. Jung has been relegated to religion departments and New Age pop psychology. Their vast writings and intellectual pursuits are seen as outmoded and outdated in our contemporary, technocratic society. Psychotherapy and the mental health profession have embraced the western scientific model. My discipline of social work wants to view itself as a "social science" and reject anything that is closely related to the humanities. Unfortunately, this includes rejecting the idea of being intellectual. This is how academic psychotherapy programs are structured now; social work, counseling, psychology, all are rigid and inflexible. You are only allowed to take a certain class, at a certain time and you are strongly discouraged from taking classes in other departments (there are some exceptions if you are doing a dual degree which are preapproved and prearranged). I think there is an inherent fear by respective administrators that if you take

classes in other programs you may somehow become polluted and the power structure loses the ability to control what you learn.

This rigidity is also a way to inculcate individuals into a specific ideology. Since a lot of academic programs are fighting for validity they want to embrace a western scientific model and hence euphemistically call themselves “social scientists.” There is much quibbling between academic disciplines, with the “hard” sciences—biology, chemistry, etc., denigrating sociology, psychology, anthropology, cultural studies, etc., as “soft” and thereby lesser disciplines and imply they operate with far less scientific rigor. So to create a sense of respectability these historically humanities oriented disciplines now call themselves “social sciences.” Mathematics has been chosen the language of the social sciences, manifested through statistics, and thus people become numbers. Now even human behavior can be quantified and measured. Instead of asking a person how they feel, connecting with a person on a human level, we now ask “On a scale from one to ten, where does your depression fall? One being the most depressed you can feel and ten being the least.” The social sciences then become just as rigid and inflexible as the hard sciences can be. Hard sciences want to claim to be “objective,” but as ecofeminism has helped us recognize, in reality it is patriarchal and white western male centered. The problem is you cannot base your foundation on white male objectivity without thinking like a white western male. Historically, this is what has given the western world justification for imperialism, and now neoimperialism and globalization. Is this the model we want to adopt as psychotherapists?

This “objective” science with the stereotypical image of the psychologist, studying lab rats as they run through the maze, then becomes the “behavioral sciences.” There is this connection between psychologists studying lab rats as part of their social scientific study in academic programs while simultaneously engaging in psychological testing and psychotherapy. In society we become the lab rats running through the maze. Observed, studied, and measured. Is psychology and psychotherapy there to help us evolve, grow, learn, and engage in an existential understanding, or is it there to evaluate us and keep us more productive for the machine of capitalism and globalization? Psychotherapists like to claim that they do not have a political agenda when they sit in the office with a client, but in essence they do. The panoptic, behavioral and social scientific model currently taught to psychotherapists manifests itself in a technocratic jargon that promotes, sometimes unwittingly, a political agenda. It is the political agenda of globalization and Neoliberalism.

We start to see the same euphemistic language in psychotherapy that we are seeing in education. Jonathan Kozol (2005) talked about it in his book The Shame of the Nation where he revisits some schools he has written on. One of these schools Kozol revisited was replete with technocratic language used to measure and evaluate each student and their every activity. Kozol (2005) mentions this technocratic language, where he notes, “four levels of success,” and “systematic, complete, efficient,” and “Approximately 50 separate categories of proficiency” (p. 67). This is just an example of words and ideas used to study and evaluate children. Like the lab rats in a maze, the children sit in the classroom trying to figure out what the teacher wants them to know,

trying to extricate themselves from the maze. Kozol (2005) notes that when he sat down with the assistant principle he informed Kozol that the school adopted a “form of classroom management” known as Taylorism (as I mentioned in chapter two) and how this had a “Model of industrial efficiency” (p. 67). Kozol (2005) makes a disturbing note in his work, reflecting on visiting schools in Cuba, “What I saw in Cuban schools was certainly indoctrinational in its intent but could not rival Mr. Endicott’s approach in its totalitarian effectiveness” (p. 68). In chapter two we reflected on Kozol and this idea of science and social science, which is now becoming behavioral sciences. What concerns me is seeing this rigidity in psychotherapy programs and increasingly seeing it incorporated into my profession as a mental health worker and psychotherapist.

Client Centered and Productive

The indoctrination in the mental health profession begins with euphemistic language, psychotherapists claim to become “client centered.” Every agency I have worked at as a mental health professional and psychotherapist uses this term “client centered” as its mission. The irony is that these agencies are client centered *only* if the client is willing to engage in this *short-term, solution-focused, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy*. This is a form of therapy that is short in duration (i.e. limited number of sessions that is usually non-negotiable). This therapy draws heavily from behavioral scientific oriented psychology and it has been closely studied using statistical measurements to identify the optimal outcome (i.e. the quickest way to get the most done in the shortest amount of time with a person). Instead of being able pull from a variety of psychotherapeutic techniques, therapists are only to use one very narrow and

circumscribed psychotherapeutic model. What has happened is psychotherapists now have become heavily monitored to make sure that they are engaging in the only approved form of psychotherapy. This monitoring is conducted by varies groups, either with insurance companies, or Medicaid, or accrediting bodies and agencies using the activity of the "audit" to review the intervention that has been conducted by a psychotherapist. This audit is to make sure psychotherapists are doing preapproved work; that the psychotherapist is capitulating to a specific form of psychotherapy. If it is discovered that the psychotherapist is not engaging in the prescribed intervention then the psychotherapist can be reprimanded and money paid back to insurance companies or Medicaid.

Not only is the psychotherapist supposed to follow this narrow model of psychotherapy, he or she should do it efficiently. When I entered this profession the buzzword was "productivity standards." This, of course, is just what it sounds like. As a psychotherapist I have worked at agencies where there were productively standards, as a psychotherapist I had to see a certain number of clients each day, I had to meet productivity, or I would lose my job. This is another reason why in chapter two I was critical of Brooks' (1973) comment of "The failure of Marxism to deal with those spheres of social life that have come to be the domain of psychology" (p. 315). When clients are reduced to the capitalist equivalent of a "widget" and the psychotherapist has been reduced to the laborer, Marxist ideas become very significant in the domain of psychology. As Marx (1933) notes, "The worker perishes if capital does not keep him busy" (p. 32). This is, in essence, what is happening. The psychotherapist becomes a

functionary, an extension of a machine. Instead of this being an actual physical machine it becomes the social, capitalistic machine. Psychotherapists are to churn out the client widgets. This of course if very different from what Marx had studied in the mid 19th century, but is applicable for today as Fromm (1994) notes "Marx did not foresee the extent to which alienation was to become the fate of the vast majority of people, especially of the ever increasing segment of the population which manipulate symbols and men, rather than machines" (pp. 56-57). This is why intellectualism becomes an imperative in many of these socially oriented professions; it is important so that one has the ability to understand how something as simple as the psychotherapy intervention has the potential to support this alienation, when in essence it should be struggling against it.

Panoptic Psychotherapy

So when does the panopticon invade psychotherapy and when does psychotherapy become a tool to support the panopticon? Clients come to a psychotherapist with usually with a great existential crisis in their lives, but to uncover what is really disturbing the client usually takes time and requires "depth," (hence the depth therapies: analysis, gestalt, existential therapy, etc.). *Short-term, solution-focused, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy* is not concerned with depth; it is only concerned with "patching" the client up and sending him or her back out into the grind, back into the world of producing and consuming. As Chellis Glendinning (1994) notes, "Much of psychotherapeutics has focused on facilitating our adjustment to society as it is" (p. 175). This is as much of a political agenda as telling a client to start a labor union or to vote for a specific political

candidate. But we think that somehow we negate the politics of it by calling it "client-centered."

The irony is as psychotherapists we don't even question the language we use that has become so technocratic. It's easy to transfer the language we picked up in our secondary schools into the university setting, then into the work setting. This is why programs like social work, counseling and psychology have become so rigid in their curriculum. You do not want to pollute the voc-tech field of these disciplines with humanistic language or ideas or something as frivolous as intellectualism. For a psychotherapist to be "culturally sensitive" does not mean that he or she will actually take the time to learn a culture as much as help somebody acculturate. Once again, taking the time to learn about a person's culture takes too long and requires too much depth, just speak a little slower (but not too slow as to use up the standard fifty minute session) and make sure to refer the client to an English as a Second Language class (ESL).

Dependence vs. Progress

I have been instructed in my profession as a psychotherapist that my very first session with a client should be in preparation for our last session. In its short sightedness, my profession is always working towards termination. I think this "termination" is psychotherapy's example of its adoption of western science and its view of objects as dead. A psychotherapist needs to work towards termination because he or she does not want to work with a client too long for they may foster "dependence" in the client. To make an actual human connection with your client may foster a dependence of your client onto you. A psychotherapist must have strict boundaries, be "empathetic" but don't

connect too much with your clients. It is the conceit of my profession. I have heard therapist debate the ethics of (*hypothetically mind you*) developing a friendship with a client if they were to run into them ten years in the future (these are the issues that will be brought up in ethics workshops I attend). Some in my profession feel that this would be unethical since it could undermine the work that we as therapists do with clients. Of course maybe, *just maybe*, the client that we worked with got what he or she needed and is actually emotionally healthy enough to have a friendship with a therapist they had seen only a couple of times ten years ago. We as psychotherapists elevate ourselves into a position of self-importance to think that we can somehow undermine a therapeutic intervention in some hypothetical situation set ten years in the future.

Jungian analyst Joseph Wheelwright makes a joke about this issue of how much influence a psychotherapist has on a client. Wheelwright quips about the fact that when he finished training as a Jungian analyst he began working at the Berkeley Student Health Center. At this Health Center psychotherapists were only allowed to see students in short term session and Wheelwright (1982) notes that once he finished therapy with a student the student metaphorically "dumped [the therapist] in the [ash]can, saying 'Thanks very much, but I don't need you any more'" (p. 113). I think this kind of debate where we presume that client's could not emotionally handle a friendship with a therapist ten years in the future just perpetuates the notion that if a person is in psychotherapy to begin with, then they must be emotionally unstable. So then *we can* treat clients like widgets with a productivity standard, we are supposed to be empathetic yet treat them with short term

therapy, but don't be surprised if they are too emotionally unstable after therapy to develop any kind of acquaintanceship with a psychotherapist.

But we return to the euphemistic language that becomes prevalent in the contemporary psychotherapy lexicon. The simple act of documenting a therapy session becomes imbued with technocratic language. Psychotherapists document therapy sessions on a "progress" note, denoting that there is some kind of progress, some movement forward in therapy. A therapist would never call it a "regress" note, for that would demonstrate that the therapist has failed in some way. For a client to be getting better, he or she has to be progressing forward, constantly marching in step with society towards a undefined goal, as long as it consists of producing and consuming (as I mentioned in chapter two, we like to use the word consumer as opposed to client, since they are consuming our services). So even though existentially some kind of regression may be healthy and essential for a client, in contemporary psychotherapy it is seen as a failure. A psychotherapist must document on a progress note and document some kind of progress, some movement forward, it *has* to be linear. This progression we begin to see in psychotherapy greatly models the developmental psychology, as postulated by Piaget, that we see in education.

In this developmental model of education a student begins at one point and climbs incrementally upward towards a given goal. These developmental models are "A collection of linear and/or hierarchical sequences and taxonomies that are generally presented in terms of staircases, pyramids and other vertical progressions" (Davis, Sumara, & Luce-Kapler, 2000, p. 128). This linear notion of education and development

also reinforces hierarchical structures. If contemporary psychotherapy can adopt this developmental and behavioral model, it just reinforces that which is taught to us in school, and in essence psychotherapy has to follow this linear model. So this progress note has to show "progress" and it has to correspond with a "treatment plan." A treatment plan is a plan formulated in the very beginning that will demonstrate what specific treatment will be used and what outcomes are expected. This is part of the beginning of therapy with clients, assessment and treatment planning; it is called "strength-based practice."

Strength-Based Practice and Outcome Measures

Referring to this type of linear and progress oriented psychotherapy intervention as strength-based gives it validity since it is *strength*-based as opposed to being weak. This "strength" bolsters the *short-term, solution-focused, cognitive-behavioral, client-centered psychotherapy* treatment. The psychotherapist and the client know exactly what needs to be done in the very first session and the work that they do will be based on the treatment plan. The psychotherapist and the client should not deviate from this treatment plan since this is not part of the treatment. *Short-term, solution-focused, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy* does not like surprises and is not interested in what your childhood was like; but it is to be empathetic. This is where the panopticon of my profession comes in. Psychotherapist historically have been notoriously independent thinkers, so to make sure they are keeping in line with the prescribed psychotherapeutic treatment modality there has to be checks and balances put in place. Audits can work, but they are limiting in their effectiveness since it is reactionary as opposed to proactive and

preventative. This form of self audit needs to begin in the training programs of graduate school, so it can become self-governing. It then becomes reinforced in the workplace with what is called “outcome measures.” These are put in place to measure the outcome of treatment with a psychotherapist and client.

Outcome measures are also in place to make sure the psychotherapist is doing what he or she is supposed to be doing. These outcome measures are to make sure that a psychotherapist’s progress notes correspond with the treatment plan, that psychotherapy treatment is progressing and that a psychotherapist and client are working towards termination. The outcome measures are to justify the work that a psychotherapist is doing with his or her client and it is replete with euphemistic language to make it seem like the treatment is beneficial. It is “accountability;” psychotherapist are being held accountable, not for the actual work that the psychotherapist is doing with the client, but that the treatment itself is following the client-centered, *short-term, solution-focused, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy* model. It is called “best practices,” since this denotes that this is the best practice that we as psychotherapists can and should engage in, anything else would be worst practices. It is called “quality assurance,” this is not as much assuring the quality of the psychotherapeutic technique and relationship as it is assuring that the psychotherapist is following the practice that is expected and required.

This all comes back to the outcome measures which are denoted in the treatment plan and signified with quantifiable measurements such as the Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) which is taken from the DSM (APA, 2000, p. 34). The GAF is a scoring system that psychotherapist give clients based on their presumed level of

functioning. It is scored on a scale from 1 to 100, 1 being the absolute lowest and 100 being the absolute highest. Outcome measures should measure an improvement in the client's GAF, so if you start seeing a client and assign him or her a GAF score of 70, within a few weeks the client should be demonstrating a score of 75 or better. If the client is not demonstrating some improvement in psychotherapy then something is not working in the therapy session and the psychotherapist is not engaging in best practices. All of this has become the de-skilling of psychotherapy. No longer is a psychotherapist able to be flexible and unique, the psychotherapeutic intervention is clear and it has to be correct since it is client-centered and the best practice. Giroux (2001, p. 69) talks about de-skilling with educators, but we now start to see this de-skilling becoming prevalent in other professions and psychotherapy is one of them.

CQI and CMIS

For psychotherapist all of this falls under "continued quality improvement" or CQI. This is where committees meet (called Quality Management Committees) to review client's charts and make sure that all systems are in place and that client's are demonstrating, based on treatment plans, progress notes and GAF scores, improvement in psychotherapy. This is also to make sure that psychotherapists are having a continual, revolving door of clients, not seeing any client too long, and to make sure psychotherapist's "case load" is up to standard and meeting productivity standards. With advancements in technology this CQI becomes even more panoptic. In my current position as a clinical supervisor I work at an agency that has what is called Client Management Information System (CMIS) computer program. All clients' information is

now kept on a CMIS computer system that we as psychotherapists can access from our office, from our home, from somebody else's offices. Since I am a supervisor I can now access those I supervise client's records at any time to make sure they are keeping up to standards. I can make sure their notes are up to date and treatment plans with their clients are up to date. To access this information I have an icon on the CMIS webpage, and that icon is a simple eyeball "👁", which denotes that I can "eye" my supervisees at any time. Historically a supervisor would schedule an appointment with a psychotherapist that they supervise, sit down with them personally one-on-one and review charts manually. During this process a supervisor and supervisee can ask questions of each other, which in turn generates a conversation, and this engagement actually turns into its own form of psychotherapy and mentoring called the supervision session. Now I can just "see" what my "subordinates" are doing whenever I want to, and they don't even have to know. They can only assume that I am watching them at any given moment. Psychotherapy and supervision has become part of the panopticon.

This is why psychotherapy programs not only discourages intellectual development, it embraces students ideas of not wanting to be intellectual, much like my classmates who did not understand the need to take an anthropology class. As an undergraduate social work major I also obtained minors in anthropology and classical studies. In my PhD program I decided to obtain a graduate certificate in women and gender studies. I did not want my educational pursuits to be limited. This is also one of the reasons I considered this PhD program over a traditional social work, counseling or psychology PhD. None of these disciplines would allow me the flexibility and

opportunities to study what I have and write what I have in this program. Through this flexibility I am able to bring more into my therapy session. As Jung (1982) notes “The analyst must go on learning endlessly, and never forget that each new case brings new problems to light and thus gives rise to the unconscious assumptions that have never before been constellated” (p. 116). This statement by Jung speaks volumes in relation to limits of contemporary psychotherapy today and the attitude of those studying in this field.

This anti-intellectualism and embracing of a technocratic model in contemporary counseling departments also plays very much into our fears (as mentioned by Fromm earlier). The rigidity of the counseling program gives us reassurance, there is no ambiguity; counseling students know exactly what they need to take and when they need to take it. This feeds into what Fredrick Perls (1969) states is our “Hankering for security, for not taking risks, our fear to be authentic, our fear to stand on our own feet, especially on our own intelligence” (p. 29). In the voc-tech graduate program in counseling and social work students do not need to have fear, it is all planned out for them. This also addresses the fear of making a meaningful connection with somebody, like a client. It is scary to delve into our own psyche, much less the psyche of a stranger. There is a strong fear of the unknown, “what will I find? Where will we go?” Graduate schools inculcating students into *short-term, solution-focused, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy* do not have to worry about this, since the therapy session is already planned out from the beginning. Once a student finishes his or her education and is working as a professional psychotherapist all they need to do is follow this prescribed

psychotherapy model. If a psychotherapist follows this model, he or she will not have to have fear or worry about making too strong of a connection with a client, the whole course of the treatment is planned out in the beginning with the treatment plan. Since the first session of psychotherapy is in preparation for the last a psychotherapist can have the client out of his or her office before they get into anything too difficult.

Cultural Workers

As Giroux (2006) notes, "Teachers and other cultural workers need to redefine their roles as engaged and transformative intellectuals" (p. 32). To me social workers and psychotherapists are cultural workers and need to be public intellectuals. They need to have an understanding of a broad range of ideas, and be able to reflect on them critically. The fact is that *any* engaged intellectual (educator, social worker, psychotherapist, etc.) needs to continue learning and growing intellectually, to challenge systems and question authority. Jung's comment above about each new client brings new problems also speaks to the psychotherapeutic setting and the fact that each client that we see is a unique individual and no "one size fits all" psychotherapy technique is going to work on all clients. If we are truly are "client-centered" then where does the client come in? If a psychotherapist is a cultural worker, if they are intellectual and are able to draw from a broad range of ideas, then they can actually work with the client as if therapy were client centered. This is why I discussed ideas such as ecofeminism in this dissertation. As Mies and Shiva (1993) note, "An ecofeminist perspective propounds the need for a new cosmology and a new anthropology which recognizes that life in nature (which includes human beings) is maintained by means of co-operation, and mutual care and love" (p. 6).

Imagine what a psychotherapy session would be like if it included the ideas of ecofeminism and its inclusion of "co-operation, and mutual care and love?"

My experience has been that most clients come to psychotherapy and they do not know what the hell they want, just that something is wrong in their life. This is why there is a system that discourages analytic or depth oriented psychotherapy, because it takes an intellectually oriented psychotherapist to journey with a client to figure out what is wrong and what needs to be worked on, and to not fear doing this. With *short-term, solution-focus, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy* the psychotherapist does not have to engage in the messy process of discovering who the client is or helping the client discover him or herself. "You have a problem? What specifically is the problem? Okay, let's work on that." The quicker you can fix the problem the quicker you can get the client back into the world of producing and consuming.

But as I mentioned earlier the training for psychotherapy is now rigid and inflexible, it has become a voc-tech form of schooling. The schools for individuals to become psychotherapists are mainly training grounds now. You do not have to have been in psychotherapy as a student, you do not have to engage in any form of existential thought or quest. The philosophy of most of these counseling academic programs is "Take this course at this time to receive this degree and then get a job working in this profession, here is your code of ethics…be client-centered." After this pedagogical process a psychotherapist also has to follow a developmental model of progression, completing his or her degree and then obtaining a clinical license, their credentials. This clinical licensing process is presented to the profession as a way to protect the community

and clinical licensing boards cloak themselves in the language of “ethics.” This clinical license is supposed to demonstrate to the public that you are ethical. It mainly becomes a tool for monetary reimbursement, since most insurance companies and Medicaid will not reimburse a person unless they have a clinical license. In other words a psychotherapist becomes the sum total of his or her clinical license, since this will generate income for an agency where one works. Slater (1976) states it well:

> Requirements for credentials are designed not to create excellence but merely to limit membership and keep prices up. In the fields that I know best – university teaching and psychotherapy—the kind of training that leads to proper credentials is often actually detrimental—at best irrelevant. There are equal numbers of excellent therapist, for example, among the credentialed and uncredentialed, and equal number of dangerous incompetents. (p. 131)

The clinical licensing board becomes another institution of checks and balances that keeps psychotherapists accountable to a panoptic system. For a psychotherapist to obtain a job, he or she has to have a clinical license or be working on obtaining a clinical license. The clinical license is the only thing that allows a psychotherapist to get reimbursement from insurance, Medicaid, etc. For a psychotherapist to be “valuable” he or she has to generate income and to do this a therapist needs a clinical license. For a therapist to truly be able to survive, this is the only route he or she can take; become licensed and marketable to an agency. Being an intellectual or critical, or democratic does not factor into the equation.

Psychotherapeutic Regime of Truth

I understand that not every client coming to psychotherapy wants or needs longer term, depth or analytical psychotherapy. Nor does every client that comes to

psychotherapy want to become an intellectual. Concomitantly treatment plans are not inherently “bad”; they can actually be very effective and useful tools. This is the same with the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders; it can be used as a tool to correctly and appropriately diagnose someone with a mental health issue that needs to be addressed. But the DSM can also be used as a tool to place a label on somebody and justify the suspension of a person’s civil rights. The problem is that when these become the *only* acceptable tools and treatment modality there becomes a problem. And when these tools and modality becomes sanctioned and endorsed by institutions with strong ties to the state capitalist apparatus then there develops a hidden agenda where psychotherapy becomes similar to what Vallance (1974) viewed education to be and that is “Creating a specifically national and uniform culture” (p. 10).

So, as I just noted, not everyone wants long-term therapy (and not everyone wants or needs psychotherapy at all). Some people may just have a problem that they want to work on and a shorter term psychotherapy model will work just as well if not better than longer term. I am not speaking of completely rejecting the use of western scientific ideas in psychotherapy (social sciences, developmental and behavioral psychology), but these should not be the *only* ideas that we use on contemporary psychotherapy. But, if a therapist pushes these issues with a client and expects a client to engage in some form of libratory, long term, and depth oriented psychotherapy, then the psychotherapist is just engaging in the same practices that *short-term, solution-focus, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy* is engaging in. In either case psychotherapy becomes what Foucault calls a regime of truth, where the psychotherapist has an agenda. This issue with having an

agenda becomes a problem for both the educator and the psychotherapist. With the narrowing of psychotherapy practice to a *short-term, solution-focus, cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy*, the power structure has assured that psychotherapy along with education keeps the wheels of the global, neocolonialism capitalist machine rolling. The psychotherapist has to fight this without pushing his or her agenda onto the client. As Foucault (2003) notes:

> The essential political problem for the intellectual is not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology, but that of ascertaining the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth. The problem is not changing people's consciousnesses—or what's in their heads—but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. (p. 317)

Towards an Anarchist Psychotherapy

This is why I call it an *anarchist psychotherapy*. This does not mean there is an adopting of specific techniques and styles, or specific therapeutic intervention, or even an anarchist political agenda. It is about critical thinking and intellectual questioning. It is about psychotherapy not being solely based on the social sciences and behavioral psychology; it is based on ecopsychology and its rejection of the western scientific model being the *only* model to be used. With contemporary psychotherapy adopting behavioral sciences and the social sciences, there is an adoption of western science and a supposition that this is the only applicable method. Western science, as I have noted throughout this work, views the natural world as dead and something that is dissectible. People are reduced to objects and psychology and eventually psychotherapy becomes a tool to manipulate those objects, to make them conform to society. Ecopsychology views the

natural world as living, we are not segmented objects removed from each other, but all living organisms interconnected. Whereas western science would exclude other forms of science (feminist, spiritual, etc.), ecopsychology would be more inclusive, even drawing from western science.

Jung Singer (1994) makes an interesting statement about analytical psychology:

> Analytical psychology does not seek to achieve a race of happy, productive sheep. People are troubled in a troubled world; they do not cry "'Peace,' when there is not peace." Nor does this psychological view suggest that individuals submit to any external authority which is given the power to determine what kind of activity or behavior is acceptable and what is not. Analytical psychology casts its lot with the champions of individual freedom and offers another source of guidance than that of the political or psychological despot, however "benevolent" that person may be. (p. 302)

This means that just as a psychotherapist should not try to "convince" his or her clients that they are deluded and are dominated by the panopticon; neither should a psychotherapist just "patch" a client up and propels him or her back into that machine. Each individual has to develop their own unique individuality. But I, as a psychotherapist, should not be a functionary of a state capitalist system that attempts to keep the machine rolling with maximum efficiency; that this somehow becomes just "my job." This is why psychotherapy needs to have an understanding of both Marx and anarchism, as Day (2005) notes, "Marx's critique of capitalist exploitation is, I believe, a deep and rich well from which we must continue to draw. Anarchist theory is equally valuable for its insistence that state domination is as great a problem as capitalist exploitation" (p. 9).

The corporatist, capitalist state wants to utilize psychotherapy as an institution and as an extension of education, and that is to have individuals "adjust" to the system as it is. As Frederic Perls (1969) notes, "We *adjust*, and in most kinds of therapy you find that adjustment to society is the high goal. If you don't adjust, you are either a criminal, or psychopath, or loony, or beatnik or something like that" (pp. 29-30). We are expected to adjust to the institution of domination and control. We are expected to adjust to society as it is and its push for ever increasing progress at the expense of others and the natural world, through Neoliberalism and globalization. This becomes the *institution of psychotherapy* where, "big business and big government combining their formidable powers to regulate and control the citizenry" (Klein, 2007, p. 307). This is why we need a psychotherapy that is anarchist, because of this need to reject overt authority that tells us that we have to capitulate to a political and economic ideology that is harming those that live on this planet and destroying the planet in the process.

Institutions

I want to reflect on the idea of the institution. Throughout this work I have been critical of the idea of institutions; noting how we are institutionalized from our very inception with the birthing process, all the way through school and into adult life. Institutionalized in work and surveilled throughout the day, we have become institutionalized beings. Day (2005) notes this well:

> The societies of control put all of us in an extremely ambivalent position. Since they make it increasingly difficult to do anything without the appropriate password, card, clearance, number, it is also difficult to 'do anything wrong'—that's the point of societies of control, not to react to what we do, but *to make it impossible* for us to do anything that is not optimized for state control and

> beneficial for capitalists exploitation. At the same time, however, *everything* we do becomes a problem, or at least a potential problem, due to the intensity, ubiquity and fallibility of the systems deployed to keep us in line. No human being can live up to the standards of perfection they demand, so we are perpetually failing to make payments on time, filling out forms incorrectly, taking our medication in the wrong dose, and so on. We are always already enveloped in error, always already deviant, problematic and therefore deserving of the very imprisonment that has put us in to this situation in the first place. Taken to its ultimate end, the society of control becomes *The Matrix*, a perfect virtual world of total envelopment and control of utterly docile bodies. (p. 136)

I know I have felt this sense of being unable to keep up with what society and institutions expect from me on a regular basis. With this being said, I note with more than a hint of irony that I have spent most of my life in institutions and have willingly embraced them. My time in school is in an institution, even with this Ph.D. program. I have dedicated my adult working life in the support of institutions, especially government ones like mental health centers. But I believe that institutions themselves are not inherently evil or controlling. What is happening is that institutions are based on a western scientific model, which is hierarchical, patriarchal, and linear. Behavioral and developmental psychology is also being used to help institutions run at maximum efficiency. As noted in chapter two, institutions have become panopticons.

Institutions do not have to be based on this model. They can be more inclusive and less dominating. This is where the *anarchist psychotherapy* must begin and it reflects Foucault's (2003) comment earlier where he notes, "The problem is not changing people's consciousnesses—or what's in their heads—but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth" (p. 317). These institutions can no longer be organized and controlled by a corporatist system; they need to be ecologically oriented

and worker administered. As Noam Chomsky (2005) notes, “I think there should be worker self-management, but I think that the funding should be socialized” (p. 214). This is where institutions become communal and supported by the workers *and* the community, institutions become radically democratic. This does not mean that institutions lose their ability to organize and function, there still has to be a form of structure, as Bookchin (1999) notes, “Allow me to say that when it comes to political discussion, which has to sort out positions and ideas, this lack of structure is lethal, because it renders a sequential flow of ideas impossible” (p. 104). But this alternative institutional structure is not authoritarian like the structure of contemporary western institutions, it is co-operative and communitarian.

Institutions do not rely on the physical structure to control and dominate, it relies on the internal mental component of those in the institutions to control and dominate themselves, in the name of the institutions. As Fromm (1969) notes:

> Authority does not have to be a person or institution which says: you have to do this, or you have not allowed to do that. While this kind of authority may be called external authority, authority can appear as internal authority, under the name of duty, conscience, or superego. (p. 165)

This self imposed authority appears in the technocratic language that we use in our professions and in education, it becomes the internal institution, the internal authority and the internal panopticon. When we adopt the developmental and behavioral model of psychology and education, with its linear model and hierarchical structure, we just accept that this is the only way to live and function. I still think that we can work within these institutions and still be engaged, pubic intellectuals. What we have to do is reject the

internalized authority of the institution and replace it with a radical idea of democracy. As Kathleen Kesson (2002) notes:

> I share with many other scholars and activists a commitment to the increase of radical democracy in our social world (Trend 1996), a viewpoint which (among other things) calls for the redistribution of power away from bureaucracies, the state, and large corporations into the hands of citizens and decentralized citizen groups. I view contemporary anarchist thought, having incorporated discourses such as radical ecology, feminist theory, spirituality, and postcolonial theories into its infrastructure, as possibly the most compatible basis for social organization within a postmodern philosophical framework. I am inclined toward an organicist, ecological anarchism, a contemporary form of anarchism characterized by voluntarism, communitarianism, and antiauthoritarianism (Clark 1984). (p. 64)

This is what *an anarchist psychotherapy* is. It draws from an alternative of western psychology which is based on western science and its viewing of the world as not living, dissectible and a commodity to an ecopsychology that views the world as living and all on it as interconnected.

Final Note

This dissertation is formulated so that these chapters can either stand alone or be woven together. At the point of writing this dissertation the story being told from scientist about the natural environment looks pretty bleak. We have had a political system that has supported corporation's rights over individual's rights and the importance of the natural world. Our almost suicidal need to consume more and more natural resources, at the expense of the rest of the world, has led to ecofascism and if continued unchecked will eventually lead to ecocide. Instead of reflecting on these ideas of ecofascism and ecocide, we as a society have developed such concepts as "ecoterrorist" to impose extreme prison

sentences on those groups that attempt to stand up to corporations that are destroying the environment.

Traditional education has been to educate individuals on being obedient servants to power structures (i.e. corporations, governments), and to be good consumers. The role of psychotherapy has become to “patch” an individual up and send them back out into the daily grind and to continue to be good consumers. Existential questioning is not something that insurance companies will permit in the psychotherapeutic setting. The ethics of this dissertation is that this needs to change at a very fundamental level, now with environmental issues this needs to change more so than ever. Our pedagogical and psychological approach needs to take a radical diversion from where it stands today and directly challenge the power structure, and this is where to me *an anarchist psychotherapy* comes into play, and how it becomes a pedagogy of life.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., Text Revision).Washington, DC: APA Publications.

Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands: La Frontera.* San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Appiah, K. A. (2003). *Thinking it through: An introduction to contemporary philosophy.* New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The Ethics of Identity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers.* New York: W. W. Norton Press.

Arendt, H. (1992). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. New York: Penguin Books.

Atsumi, I., & Rexroth, K. (Trans.). (1977). *Women poets of Japan.* New York: New Directions Books.

Avramides, A. (2001). *Other minds.* New York: Routledge.

Barber, B. R. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld: Terrorism's challenge to democracy.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Basho. (1974). *A Haiku journey: Basho's narrow road to a far province* (D. Britton, Trans.). Tokyo, Japan: Kodansha International.

Bauman, Z. (1995). *Life in fragments: Essays in postmodern morality.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Books.

Beah, I. (2007). *A long way gone: Memories of a boy soldier.* New York: Sarah Crichton Books.

Beers, D., & Capellaro, C. (1991). Greenwash! *Mother Jones, 16*(2), 38-43.

Berrigan, D., & Thich Nhat Hanh. (2001). *The raft is not the shore: Conversations toward a Buddhist-Christian awareness.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Berry, T. (1999). *The great work: Our way into the future.* New York: Bell Tower Books.

Blofeld, J. (1978). *Taoism: The road to immortality.* Boston, MA: Shambala Publishing.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind.* New York: Simon & Schuster Publishing.

Bookchin, M. (1995). *Social anarchism or lifestyle anarchism: An unbridgeable chasm.* San Francisco, CA: AK Press.

Bookchin, M. (1999). *Anarchism, Marxism, and the future of the left: Interviews and essays, 1993-1998*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Bookchin, M. (2004). *Post-scarcity anarchism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Bookchin, M. (2005). *The ecology of freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Brady, I. (2005). Poetics for a planet: Discourse on some problems of being-in-place. In N. K. Denzin & Y. K. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Brooks, K. (1973). Freudianism is not a basis for a Marxist Psychology. In P. Brown (Ed.), *Radical psychology* (pp. 315-374).

Buell, L. (2005). *The future of environmental criticism: Environmental crisis and literary imagination*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Bynner, W. (1994). *The way of life according to Lao Tzu*. New York: Penguin Publishing.

Campbell, J. (1949). *The hero with a thousand faces*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Campbell, J. (1987). *Primitive mythology: The masks of God*. New York: Penguin Books.

Campbell, J. (1988). *The power of myth*. New York: Random House.

Capra, F. (1999). *The Tao of physics: An exploration of the parallels between modern physics and Eastern mysticism*. Boston, MA: Shambala Publishing.

Caputo, J. D. (1997). *Deconstruction in a nutshell: A conversation with Jacques Derrida*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Caputo, J. D. (2001). *Thinking in action: On religion*. New York: Routledge Publishing.

Carlsson, C. (Ed.) (2002). *Critical mass: Bicycling's defiant celebration*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Charters, A. (1973). *Kerouac: A biography*. New York: St. Martin Griffin Publishing.

Charters, A. (2001). *Beat down to your soul*. New York: Penguin Books.

Chomsky, N. (2002). *Media control: The spectacular achievements of propaganda* (2nd Ed.). New York: Seven Stories Press.

Chomsky, N. (2002). *Understanding power: The indispensable Chomsky*. (R. Mitchell, & J. Schoeffel, Eds.). New York: The New York Press.

Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance*. New York: Henry Holt Books.

Chomsky, N. (2005). *Chomsky on anarchism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Chow, R. (1991). Violence in the other country: China as crisis, spectacle, and woman. In C. Mohanty, A. Russo, & L. Torres (Eds.), *Third world women and the politics of feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Churchill, W. (2003). *On the justice of roosting chickens: Reflections on the consequences of U. S. imperial arrogance and criminality*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Claburn, T. (2007, October 25). U. K. kids get RFID chips in school uniforms. *Information Week*. [Online]. Available: http://www.informationweek.com /news/mobility/RFID/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=202601660

Cleary, T. (Trans.). (2000). *The art of war: Complete texts and commentaries*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.

Copper, D. (1973). Being born into a family. In. P. Brown (Ed.), *Radical psychology*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Day, R. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2000). *Engaging minds: Learning and teaching in a complex world.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Dennis, M., Golden, R., & Wright, S. (2000). *Oscar Romero: Reflections on his life and writings*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Depp, J. (1999). Kerouac, Ginsberg, the Beats and other bastards who ruined my life. In H. George-Warren (Ed.), *The Rolling Stone book of the Beats*. New York: Rolling Stone Press.

Derrida, J. (1991). *A Derrida reader: Between the blinds* (P. Kamuf, Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Descartes, R. (1998). *Meditations and other metaphysical writings* (D. Clarke, Trans.). New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Douglas, A. (1999). The city where the Beats were moved to howl. In H. George-Warren (Ed.), *The Rolling Stone book of the Beats*. New York: Rolling Stone Press.

Egan, T. (2002). Body-conscious boys adopt athletes' taste for steroids. *New York Times*. [Online]. Available: http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E00E3DF1239F931A15752C1A9649C8B63.

Evens, R. J. (2005). *The Third Reich in power*. New York: Penguin Books.

Fisher, A. (2002). *Radical ecopsychology: Psychology in the service of life.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Fischer-Schreiber, I (1996). *The Shambhala dictionary of Taoism*. Boston, MA: Shambala Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1994). *The essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984* (P. Rabinow & N. Rose, Eds.). New York, NY: The New Press.

Frankl, V. E. (1983). *The doctor and the soul: From psychotherapy to logotherapy*. New York: Vintage Books.

Freire, P., & Shor, I. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*. Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey Press.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum Press.

Freud, S. (1966). *Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis* (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Freud, S. (1960). *The ego and the id*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Freud, S. (1989). *The Freud reader* (P. Gay, Ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Friedman, M. (2002). *Capitalism and freedom: Fortieth anniversary edition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Fromm, E. (1969). *Escape from freedom*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Fromm, E. (1990). *Beyond the chains of illusion: My encounter with Marx and Freud*. New York: Continuum Publishing.

Fromm, E. (1994). *Marx's concept of man.* New York: Continuum Publishing.

Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the oppressed*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Books.

Giroux, H. (2006). Educational vision. In H. S. Shapiro, K. Latham, & S. Ross (Eds.), *The institution of education*. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Gottlieb, A. (2000). *The dream of reason: A history of philosophy from the Greeks to the Renaissance*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Glendinning, C. (1994). *My name is Chellis & I'm in recovery from Western Civilization*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.

Goldman, E. (1970). *Living my life, Vol. 2.* New York: Dover Publishing.

Gramsci, A. (2000). *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*. (D. Forgacs, Ed.). New York: New York University Press.

Green, T. (2008). The Nobel Foundation. *Adbusters, 16*(2).

Hamill, S (1998). *Narrow road to the interior: And other writings of Matsuo Bashō.* Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.

Hamill, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Crossing the Yellow River: Three hundred poems from the Chinese*. Rochester, NY: BOA Editions Limited.

Hardt, M., Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. New York: Oxford Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism.* New York: Oxford Press.

Herodotus. (1996). *The histories*. (A. Sélincourt, d. Trans.). London, England: Penguin Books.

Hinton, D. (2002). *Mountain home: The wilderness poetry of ancient China*. New York: Counterpoint Press.

Hitler, A. (1971). *Mein Kampf*. (R. Manheim, Trans.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York: Routledge Press.

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge Publishing.

Hsüan-chi, Y. (1972). Living In the Summer Mountains (K. Rexroth & L. Chung, Trans.). *Women poets of China*. New York: New Directions Books.

Hương, H. X. (2000). Heaven market (J. Balaban, Trans.). *Spring essence: The poetry of Hồ Xuân Hương*. Port Townsend, WA: Copper Canyon Press.

Jay, M. (1973). *The dialectical imagination: A history of The Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jones, S. H. (2005). Autoethnography: Making the personal political. In N. K. Denzin & Y. K. Lincoln (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Josh, ?. (2007). Extreme confusion: Why do civil rights watchdog groups care about the earth liberation front? *Earth First!, 27*(5), 12-14.

Jung, C. (1963). *Memories, dream, reflections* (A. Jaffé, Ed., R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Jung, C. (1964). Approaching the unconscious. In C. Jung (Ed.), *Man and his symbols*. New York: Dell Publishing.

Jung, C. (1982). *The practice of psychotherapy: Essays on the psychology of the transference and other subjects*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C. (2005). *The earth has a soul: The nature writings of C. G. Jung*. (M. Sabini, Ed.). Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.

Kellner, D. (1995). *Cultural studies, identity and politics between the modern and the postmodern media culture*. New York: Routledge Publishing.

Kerouac, J. (1958). *The Dharma Bums*. New York: Penguin Books.

Kesson, K. (2002). Contemplative spirituality, currere, and social transformation: Finding our "way." In T. Oldenski & D. Carlson (Eds.). *Educational yearning: The journey of the spirit and democratic education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

King, R. H. (2001). *Thomas Merton and Thich Nhat Hanh: Engaged Spirituality in an age of globalization*. New York: Continuum Publishing.

Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise and fall of disaster capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Kraft, K. (1996). Engaged Buddhism (A. Kotler, Ed.). *Engaged Buddhist reader*. Berkeley, CA: Parallax Press.

Kropotkin, P. (1914). *Mutual aid: A factor of evolution*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent Publishers.

Kropotkin, P. (1987). *The state: Its historic role*. London, England: Freedom Press.

Kropotkin, P. (2002). *Anarchism: A collection of revolutionary writings*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Laing, R. D. (1973). The mystification of experience. In P. Brown (Ed.), *Radical psychology*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Langer, E. (1993). A mindful education. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(1), 43-50.

Leo, J. (2002). American Preschoolers on Ritalin. *Society, January/February.* 52-60.

Levenda, P. (2007). *Unholy alliance: A history of Nazi involvement with the occult*. New York: Continuum Publishing.

Loy, D. R. (1988). *Nonduality: A study in comparative philosophy*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.

Loy, D. R. (2003). *The great awakening: a Buddhist social theory*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One dimensional man*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Marcuse, H. (2007). *The essential Marcuse: Selected writings of philosopher and social critic Herbert Marcuse* (A. Feenberg & W. Leiss, Eds.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Marx, K. (1933). *Wage-labour and capital: Value, price and profit*. New York: International Publishers Company.

Marx, K. (1964). *The economic & philosophic manuscripts of 1844* (J. Struik, Ed. & M. Milligan, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Marx, K. (1992). *Early writings* (R. Livingstone, Trans.). New York: Penguin Publishing.

Marx, K. (1990). *Capital, Volume 1* (E. Mandel, Trans.). New York: Penguin Classics Publishing.

Marx, K. (1994). The economic & philosophic manuscripts of 1844. In E. Fromm *Marx's concept of man*. New York: Continuum Publishing.

McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial leather: Race, gender, and sexuality in the colonial contest*. New York: Routledge Publishing.

McCurdy, A. (1982). Establishing and maintaining the analytical structure (M. Stein, Ed.). *Jungian analysis*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

McFague, S. (1993). *The body of God: An ecological theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

McMaughey, M. (2008). *The caveman mystique: Pop-Darwinism and the debates over sex, violence, and science*. New York: Routledge Publishing.

Merchant, C. (1989). *The death of nature: Women, ecology and the scientific revolution*. San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins Publishers.

Merton, T. (1961). *New seeds of contemplation*. New York: New Directions Books.

Merton, T. (1998a). *Dancing in the waters of life, seeking peace in the hermitage: The journals of Thomas Merton, Volume Five, 1963-1965*. San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins Publishing.

Merton, T. (1998b). *Contemplation in a world of action*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Merton, T. (2006). *Passion for peace: Reflections on war and nonviolence*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Mies, M., & Shiva, V. (1993). *Ecofeminism*. New York: Fernwood Publications.

Mitchell, S. (Trans.). (1992). *A new English version: Tao Te Ching*. New York: Harper Collins Publishing.

Morris, B. (2004). *Kropotkin: The politics of community*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.

Nanda, M. (2004/5). Eco-spirituality, neo-paganism and the Hindu right: The dangers of religious environmentalism. *Women & Environments, Fall/Winter*, 19-22.

Perls, F. S. (1969). *Gestalt therapy verbatim*. Moab, UT: Real People Press.

Red Pine. (Ed. & Trans.). (1998). *The clouds should know me by now: Buddhist poet monks of China*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publishing.

Red Pine (Ed. & Trans.). (2003). *Poems of the masters: China's classic anthology of T'ang and Sung dynasty verse*. Port Townsend, WA: Copper Canyon Press.

Revel, J., & Ricard, M. (1998). *The monk and the philosopher: A father and son discuss the meaning of life*. New York: Random House.

Rhodes, D. (2007). Emma Goldman. In Kincheloe & Raymond (Eds.), *The Praeger handbook of education and psychology, Vol. 1*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Roszak, T., Gomes, M. E., & Kanner, A. D. (1995). *Ecopsychology: Restoring the earth healing the mind*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.

Roszak, T. (2001). *Voice of the earth: An exploration of ecopsychology*. Grand Rapids, MA: Phanes Press.

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, G. (1993). Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality (H. Abelove, M. A. Barale, & D. Halperin, Eds.). *The lesbian and gay studies reader*. New York: Routledge Publishing.

Ruether, R. R. (2005). *Integrating ecofeminism, globalization and world religions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing.

Sartre, J. P. (1963). *Search for a method*. New York: Vintage Books.

Shiva, V., & Mies, M. (1993). *Ecofeminism*. New York: Fernwood Publications.

Shiva, V. (2005). *Earth democracy: Justice, sustainability, and peace*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Singer, J. (1994). *Boundaries of the soul: The practice of Jung's psychology*. New York: Anchor Books.

Slater, P. (1976). *The pursuit of loneliness*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Slattery, P. (1995). *Curriculum development in the postmodern world*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Smith, C. M. (1997). *Jung and Shamanism in dialogue: Retrieving the soul/retrieving the sacred*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Smith, L. (Ed. & Trans.). (1998). *Chinese Zen poems: What hold has this mountain?* Huron, OH: Bottom Dog Press.

Snyder, G. (1969). *Earth house hold: Technical notes & queries to fellow Dharma revolutionaries*. New York: New Directions Publishing.

Snyder, G. (1995). *A place in space: Ethics, aesthetics, and watersheds*. New York: Counterpoint Press.

Sobrino, J., Ellacuría, I. (1990). *Companions of Jesus: The Jesuit Martyrs of El Salvador*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Soelle, D. (2001). *The silent cry: Mysticism and resistance*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Stevens, J. (Ed. & Trans.). (1993). *Dewdrops on a lotus leaf: Zen poems of Ryokan.* Boston, MA: Shambala Publishing.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Sun Tzu. (1988). *The art of war: Complete texts and commentaries* (T. Cleary, Trans.). Boston, MA: Shambala Publications.

Suzuki, D., & McConnell, A. (1998). *The sacred balance: Rediscovering our place in nature*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Suzuki, D. T. (2002). *Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist*. New York: Routledge Publishing.

Tarnas, R. (1991). *The passion of the Western mind: Understanding the ideas that have shaped our world view*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Thich Nhat Hanh. (1998). *The heart of the Buddha's teaching: Transforming suffering into peace, joy, & liberation*. Berkeley, CA: Parallax Press.

Thich Nhat Hanh, & Berrigan, D. (2001). *The raft is not the shore: Conversations toward a Buddhist-Christian awareness*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Vallance, E. (1974). Hiding the hidden curriculum: An interpretation of the language of justification in nineteenth century educational reform. *Curriculum Theory Network, 4*(1), 5-21.

Warren, K. J. (2000). *Ecofeminist philosophy: A Western perspective on what it is and why it matters*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing.

Watson, B. (Ed. & Trans.). (1970). *Cold mountain: 100 poems by the T'ang poet Han Shan*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Watts, A. W. (1951). *The Wisdom of Insecurity: A Message for an Age of Anxiety*. New York: Vintage Books.

Watts, A. (1997). *Zen and the Beat way*. Boston, MA: Tuttle Publishing.

Watts, A. (1998). *The culture of counter-culture*. Boston, MA: Tuttle Publishing.

Watts, A. (2006). *Eastern wisdom, modern life: Collected talks 1960-1969*. Novato, CA: New World Library.

Wheelwright, J. B. (1982). Termination (M. Stein, Ed.). *Jungian analysis*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publishing.

Wong, E. (1997). *The Shambhala guide to Taoism*. Boston, MA: Shambala Publishing.

Young, R. (2003). *Postcolonialism: A very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zinn, H. (1999). *Marx in Soho*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Zinn, H. (2003). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.