UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EXTINGUISHING THE GREEN FIRE: THE RISE OF OPPOSITION TO ENVIRONMENTALISM, 1948-2010

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

KATRINA LACHER
Norman, Oklahoma
2011

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/319284

EXTINGUISHING THE GREEN FIRE: THE RISE OF OPPOSITION TO ENVIRONMENTALISM, 1948-2010

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

_____
Dr. Sterling Evans, Chair

_____
Dr. Donald J. Pisani, Co-Chair

_____
Dr. Robert Griswold

_____
Dr. Warren Metcalf

_____
Dr. Katherine Pandora

© Copyright by KATRINA LACHER 2011
All Rights Reserved.

For Danny

Acknowledgements

Long-distance runners and graduate students often appear as lone and solitary figures – running along the shoulder of a deserted road or hunched over a stack of books in an equally desolate library. However, just as a skilled and dedicated cadre of coaches is often behind every successful marathoner, this dissertation would not be possible without a support team of "coaches," "trainers," "nutritionists," and the like. I remain in awe of the selfless effort and numerous acts of kindness of many friends, relatives, colleagues, and mentors.

The University of Oklahoma was an ideal environment to learn how to be a scholar. In particular, I wish to thank Cliff Hudson for the generous opportunities afforded by the Hudson Family Fellowship. Research grants from the University of Oklahoma Graduate College, the University Foundation, and the Department of History allowed me to travel to archives from coast to coast, literally, Maine to California. I offer my sincere thanks to the tireless efforts of the departmental support staff of Kelly Guinn, Rhonda George, and Barbara Million who helped to decode university procedures and expedited reimbursement.

I extend my deep appreciation and admiration to the archivists at the Edmund S. Muskie Archives and Special Collections, the Linda Lear Center for Special Collections at Connecticut College, the Marist Environmental History Collections, the Western History Collection at the Denver Public Library, the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and the American Heritage Center at the University of Wyoming. The librarians at the above archives gave generously of their time and expertise. I look forward to visiting them again in the future. In addition, I

am grateful for the hospitality of Alex and Tom Fogarty, Christopher and Kelli Hammond, and Jeremy Larance and Paula Makris who opened their homes and made research travel quite enjoyable and enlivening.

Throughout my academic journey, a stellar team of intellectual "coaches" offered the perfect mix of encouragement, reassurance, and rigor. I wish to thank Professor Woody Register at Sewanee who reignited my passion for twentieth-century United States history. While a master's student at Boston College, Professors Crystal Feimster, Kevin Kenny, James O'Toole, and David Quigley sagely shepherded me as I explored topics and learned how to be a historian. I thank them all for encouraging me to pursue a doctoral degree. In Norman, I was lucky to work with and learn from leading scholars and rising stars in the fields of environmental history and history of the American West. My fellow graduate students offered well-timed debate on baseball, beer, and local politics. I would like to thank my seminar professors who helped make me a better writer particularly, Professors Ben Alpers, Jim Cane-Carrasco, Ben Keppel, and Joshua Piker. Through my research assistantship with Professor David Chappell, I had the opportunity to observe a passionate and scrupulous scholar at work. I remain appreciative of his continued interest in my projects. My doctoral committee shared my enthusiasm in my topic from the start and I am grateful to Professors Rob Griswold, Warren Metcalf, and Katherine Pandora for their time and meticulous attention to my work. I am deeply indebted to my advisors, Professors Donald J. Pisani and Sterling Evans, who motivated, emboldened, and sharpened my thinking and writing. Their commitment to and investment in their graduate students is exemplary.

Instrumental in helping my father earn his PhD in biochemistry several moons ago, my mother, Anne Marie Nelson, was invaluable throughout my graduate career. Though she did not have to format protein-chain formulas on a Smith-Corona this time around, her enthusiasm and encouragement are nevertheless evident on every single page.

I reserve my final thanks to my husband, Danny, and our children, Finn and Luna. To my kiddos, whose curiosity, affection, and downright silliness are a blessing and an inspiration, I am forever grateful. I dedicate this work to my husband, whose patience and support are unmatched. This dissertation would not be possible without his love, friendship, and good humor.

Table of Contents

Introduction:
Anti-Environmentalism and the Postwar United States / 1

Chapter 1:
Postwar Ecology Writers, 1948-1968 / 13

Chapter 2:
Critics of Earth Day, 1970 / 55

Chapter 3:
Environmentalism in a Time of Recession, 1973-1983 / 92

Chapter 4:
The Rise of Conservatism and the
Institutionalization of Environmental Opposition, 1980-1988 / 131

Chapter 5:
Turn of the Century Violence, Real and Imagined, 1989-2010 / 177

Conclusion:
The "Paranoid Style" of Environmental Opposition / 224

Bibliography / 246

Abstract

This dissertation identifies the origins and characteristics of late-twentieth century opposition to environmentalism in the United States. I argue that a diverse set of critics cultivated a loose network of ideas, tactics, and arguments in order to challenge specific environmental measures as well as environmentalism more broadly. Though debates over environmental initiatives were about clean air, habitat protection, and wilderness designations, they were also fundamentally about competing visions of America's political and economic future. Politicians, industry representatives, business boosters, public intellectuals, and average citizens used critiques of environmentalism to promote an image of the United States as affluent, dominant, and orderly. Often capitalizing on the prevailing cultural and economic climate, anti-environmentalists reflected contemporary fears and desires. In short, throughout the second half of the twentieth and into the twenty-first century, environmental politics became a vehicle for debating the course of U.S. politics, culture, and economy.

INTRODUCTION – Anti-Environmentalism and the Postwar United States

In a spring 2011 direct-mail letter, Dr. E. Calvin Beisner, founder of the Cornwall Alliance, a non-profit, educational organization "for the stewardship of creation," wrote to warn fellow Christians that environmentalism was "so deceptive and all-encompassing, that it is one of the most cunning tools ever created by those seeking to subvert our Christian values, indoctrinate our youth, trash our economy, and destroy your liberty." Worried that "America's sovereignty is at grave risk," Beisner recommended tactics for identifying and resisting the dangers of environmentalism. How did Beisner come to hold these views? Was he alone in fearing the rise of a tyrannical "global Green government?"[1]

As concerned citizens encouraged environmental legislation, activism, and awareness throughout the United States in the second half of the twentieth century, a coterie of critics expressed apprehension and fear of environmentalism. Challenging both the leaders and the grassroots participants of the environmental movement, opponents such as Beisner, argued that the popular new ecological consciousness not only threatened U.S. economic prosperity, but also the broader "American way of life." Variously portraying environmentalists as elitists, pagans, anti-humanists, technophobes, and socialists, critics questioned the motives and "American-ness" of environmental activists and writers. By the end of the twentieth century, commentators also increasingly depicted direct-action environmentalists and their supporters as "ecoterrorists."

[1] Dr. E. Calvin Beisner, June 15, 2011, Cornwall Alliance For the Stewardship of Creation, Burke, VA, in author's possession.

This dissertation endeavors to identify the origins and characteristics of late-twentieth century opposition to environmentalism in the United States. I argue that a diverse set of critics cultivated a loose network of ideas, tactics, and arguments that they deployed to challenge specific environmental measures as well as environmentalism more broadly. Drawing on an enduring and flexible ideological arsenal, opponents questioned writers from Rachel Carson to Bill McKibben, challenged the legitimacy of groups as varied as the Sierra Club and Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, and protested proposed legislation from the Wilderness Act to the Kyoto Protocol. As varied and multi-issued as the nebulous environmental movement itself, the corresponding *anti*-environmental movement offered competing visions and goals for the United States in the late-twentieth and early-twenty-first centuries.

As I examine how and why critics opposed environmentalists, environmental legislation, and the environmental movement in general, I analyze how individuals and organizations expressed their fears of environmental thought, activism, and legislation. Ultimately, I conclude that as critics developed, popularized, and institutionalized opposition to environmentalism, they encouraged and legitimized an American tradition of paranoia. In the 1950s, historian Richard Hofstadter famously identified a strain of paranoia that coursed through United States history from the rise of anti-Masonic episodes to fears of Catholics to the Red Scares of the twentieth century. Late-twentieth and early twenty-first century critics of environmentalism offered another case study to examine Hofstadter's thesis of the propensity of conspiratorial fears and panics in the United States.

As such, my study explores the intersection of environmental, intellectual, and political history. In tracing the rise of an anti-environmental ideology and accompanying rhetoric, I investigate how the public ideological debate over environmentalism not only influenced the environmental movement and environmental legislation, but also broader political developments as well. Throughout the last quarter of the twentieth century, local and national public figures recognized environmental issues as vehicles for advancing or stalling political agendas. Arguments about environmental initiatives were and are fundamentally contests over competing visions of America's political and economic future. As they castigated environmentalists and their proposals, anti-environmentalists reflected contemporary fears and desires. Often capitalizing on the prevailing cultural and economic climate, critics used environmentalism to promote an image of the United States as affluent, dominant, and orderly. Thus, in mapping the roots and evolution of environmental opposition, my dissertation aims to contribute to a greater understanding of the history of the late-twentieth century United States.

Over the past few decades, historians and other scholars rigorously analyzed the rise of the modern environmental movement. From historical treatments of Rachel Carson's writings to surveys of environmental legislation to monographs on particular environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club and Greenpeace, researchers sought to identify the origins of the modern environmental movement and speculated on the political and cultural significance of environmentalism.[2] Though many

[2] See for example: Linda Lear, *Rachel Carson: Witness for Nature* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1997); Mark Hamilton Lytle, *The Gentle Subversive: Rachel Carson, Silent Spring, and the Rise of the Environmental Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Samuel P. Hays,

scholarly works cursorily addressed the challenges and forces allied against environmental reform, few treated environmental opposition as a distinct historical phenomenon. In short, there have not been many historical analyses of anti-environmentalism.

Despite the dearth of historical treatment, within the past several years, practitioners in other fields began to engage the topic. Jacqueline Vaughn Switzer, a political scientist, offered a survey of environmental opposition in *Green Backlash: The History and Politics of Environmental Opposition in the U.S.* (1997). Examining the "Wise Use" movement in the context of a longer history of anti-federalism, Switzer evaluated environmental opposition as a political process.[3] Journalist David Helvarg also focused primarily on the late-twentieth-century "Wise Use" movement. Embedded with dozens of interviews and first-hand accounts, Helvarg's *War Against the Greens: The "Wise Use" Movement, the New Right, and the Browning of America* (1994) charted the campaign of violence and intimidation against environmental activists. Though significant contributions that cataloged the key events and participants of environmental opposition, neither Switzer's nor Helvarg's books addressed the historical significance of anti-environmental rhetoric.[4]

Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Richard N.L. Andrews, *Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves: A History of American Environmental Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Michael P. Cohen, *The History of the Sierra Club, 1892-1970* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988); Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2005); Peter Heller, *The Whale Warriors: The Battle at the Bottom of the World to Save the Planet's Largest Mammals* (New York: Free Press, 2007); Rex Weyler, *Greenpeace: How a Group of Ecologists, Journalists, and Visionaries Changed the World* (Emmaus, PA: Rodale Books, 2004).

[3] Jacqueline Vaughn Switzer, *Green Backlash: The History and Politics of Environmental Opposition in the U.S.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997).

[4] David Helvarg, *The War Against the Greens: The "Wise-Use" Movement, the New Right, and the Browning of America* (Boulder, CO: Johnson Books, 2004).

Numerous other works engaged a particular case study in the history of environmental opposition. For example, Mark Harvey's *A Symbol of Wilderness: Echo Park and the American Conservation Movement* (1994) offered insight into the debates surrounding the proposed Echo Park Dam.[5] Likewise, J. Sanford Rikoon and Theresa Goedeke's *Anti-Environmentalism and Citizen Opposition to the Ozark Man and the Biosphere Reserve* (2000) analyzed 1990s debates over conservation projects in Missouri's Ozark Mountains. Though not addressing the history of environmental opposition in particular, books such as these offered examples of the types of arguments posited against environmentalists.[6]

Several studies analyzed environmental opposition as a global phenomenon. Citing large, multi-national corporations as hostile to environmental legislation and activism, books such as Sharon Beder's *Global Spin: The Corporate Assault on Environmentalism* (1997) and Andrew Rowell's *Green Backlash: Global Subversion of the Environmental Movement* (1996) argued that well-orchestrated and well-funded campaigns challenged environmental initiatives in the latter decades of the twentieth century and threatened to thwart activists into the twenty-first century. Though sharing a similar title with Switzer's work, Rowell's *Green Backlash* offered a more transnational approach to the study of anti-environmentalism. As he compared resistance to environmentalism in the Americas, Africa, Australia, South Asia, and the Pacific Islands, Rowell identified common trends in anti-environmental rhetoric and action around the globe. An environmental consultant and activist, Rowell remained

[5] Mark Harvey, *A Symbol of Wilderness: Echo Park and the American Conservation Movement* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994).
[6] J. Sanford Rikoon and Theresa L. Goedeke, *Anti-Environmentalism and Citizen Opposition to the Ozark Man and the Biosphere Reserve* (Lewiston, UK: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000).

primarily interested in contemporary environmental issues and politics, and generally eschewed discussion of the historical roots of anti-environmental thought.[7]

Other concerned twenty-first-century environmental activists and supporters of the animal rights movement also contributed studies to the scholarship of environmental opposition. As numerous states strengthened their domestic terrorism and "eco-terrorism" laws in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, animal rights groups worried that stricter legislation and enforcement threatened their campaigns as well as their civil liberties. Attorney and law professor Dara Lovitz's *Muzzling a Movement: The Effects of Anti-Terrorism Law, Money and Politics on Animal Activism* (2010) analyzed the adoption of "eco-terror" laws and argued that rigorous enforcement of the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act and other provisions violated the U.S. Constitution. In *Green is the New Red* (2011), Will Potter, an independent journalist and activist, offered "an insider's account of a social movement under siege." Like Lovitz, Potter argued that the FBI and other law enforcement officials targeted animal rights activists in an attempt to criminalize and silence protest of industries that profit from animal enterprises such as pharmaceutical testing facilities, fur-raising operations, and factory farms.[8]

Drawing heavily upon the above works, "Extinguishing the Green Fire: The Rise of Opposition to Environmentalism, 1948-2010" offers a historical analysis of who opposed the environmental movement and why. Most notably, in contrast to

---

[7] Sharon Beder, *Global Spin: The Corporate Assault on Environmentalism* (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2002); Andrew Rowell, *Green Backlash: Global Subversion of the Environment Movement* (London: Routledge, 1996).

[8] Dara Lovitz, *Muzzling a Movement: The Effects of Anti-Terrorism Law, Money & Politics on Animal Activism* (New York: Lantern Books, 2010); Will Potter, *Green is the New Red: An Insider's Account of a Social Movement Under Siege* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2011).

previous studies, it examines how critics defined their objections to environmental legislation and activism. Focusing on the rhetoric critics deployed against environmentalists, my study presents an intellectual history of anti-environmental thought. As I trace the evolution of allegations leveled at environmentalists and their agenda, I examine which arguments changed over time and which endured across the decades.

Employing chronological organization, my dissertation traces both the changes and the enduring traits of anti-environmental sentiment in the United States from 1948 to 2010. Though writers, politicians, various "experts," and other citizens expressed disagreement with earlier conservation and preservation efforts in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, I begin my study in the mid-century postwar era. During World War II, chemists, physicists, and biologists engineered new inventions and pioneered novel processes as part of the mobilization for war. Developing atomic weapons, an array of synthetic chemicals, and countless other new technologies, mid-century scientists tested and redefined the relationship between humans and the rest of the natural world. Following the war, Americans embraced a culture of consumption and welcomed the variety and abundance of goods offered in supermarkets, department stores, automobile showrooms, and advertised on television. In addition to the multitude of innovative products, postwar habits of consumption and abundance encouraged a significant surge in population, suburban sprawl, as well as a proliferation of highways.

Though most Americans applauded the unprecedented demographic, economic, and infrastructural growth, a few voices questioned the postwar fascination

with technological prowess and expansion. Calling for a reappraisal of individual and national consumption habits, writers such as Fairfield Osborn, William Vogt, and others cast doubt on the long-term viability of unchecked economic and demographic growth and the accompanying resource use. In an era celebrating growth and abundance, conservationists warned of future scarcity and hard times. How would the public and reviewers react to such counter-cultural pronouncements? How would critics describe Osborn, Vogt, and others who dared question postwar affluence and optimism? Not just a question of resource use, the debate between postwar conservationists and their critics engaged broader arguments over America's future identity. Thus, I begin my study in the postwar era as conservationists and their critics commenced a discourse about the nature of U.S. affluence.

Rather than a strict decade-by-decade approach, the chapters instead follow a general chronological order while examining key themes in the development of anti-environmentalism. Chapter One introduces the various arguments leveled at environmentalists. Analyzing reactions to postwar environmental writers such as Fairfield Osborn, William Vogt, and Rachel Carson, the chapter examines how critics lambasted books such as *Our Plundered Planet*, *Road to Survival*, and *Silent Spring* in order to promote and protect a vision of America as an affluent nation of consumers. Fearful that the popular works questioned ideals of abundance and scientific superiority, politicians, business executives, and housewives aimed to censure the consensus-shattering writers. As opponents employed Cold War terminology against Osborn, Carson, and others, they drew upon the prevalent anti-communist language of the era. Casting doubt on the character and patriotism of conservationist writers,

opponents established a vocabulary to denigrate those who challenged the righteousness of American growth and affluence.

Chapter Two analyzes critiques of the inaugural Earth Day in 1970. Rising concomitantly with the 1960s rights revolution as well as the escalating war in Southeast Asia, the environmental movement faced new challenges in the 1960s and early 1970s. The tumultuous domestic and international atmosphere encouraged many civic, business, and reform leaders to question the motives and origins of an "environmental teach-in." Defenders of law and order and the status quo worried that Earth Day signified continued student rebellion and potential communist infiltration. Critics hailing from the other end of the political spectrum argued that the event squandered an unprecedented moment of promise and opportunity for significant and lasting change. An increasingly diverse roster of critics charged that environmental leaders prioritized plants and animals over their fellow humans struggling in the ghettos of Detroit or the jungles of Vietnam. African-American activists, members of the New Left, and other reform groups joined political conservatives and resource industry executives to question the wisdom and timing of Earth Day. Once again, the debate over environmentalism and the arguments directed toward environmentalists centered on competing visions for America's political and social future.

Chapter Three, covering the period from 1973 to 1983, examines how politicians and industry leaders used anti-environmental rhetoric to explain causes of and solutions to the recession. As Americans struggled with a weakening economy and the onset of stagflation, opponents heightened their critiques of environmentalists' alleged no-growth agendas. Anti-environmentalists, worried that the robust postwar

standard of living was stalling, sought to publicly discredit environmental proposals. Arguing that environmental legislation and changes in consumption habits would further impair the nation's economic health, critics contended that environmentalists threatened U.S. prosperity and the American way of life.

Chapter Four, roughly paralleling the administrations of Ronald Reagan in the 1980s, traces the twined rise of American conservatism and institutionalization of environmental opposition. In particular, this chapter shows how politicians and industry leaders fused conservative ideology with anti-environmental rhetoric for mutual benefit. Seeking redress of the previous decade's economic woes and environmental regulation, Reagan and his conservative allies merged anti-environmental and conservative ideology. With the appointment of figures such as James Watt as Secretary of the Interior and Anne Gorsuch as head of the Environmental Protection Agency, Reagan stimulated an institutionalization of anti-environmentalism. In addition, though the defense budget ballooned to unprecedented levels, Reagan professed fealty to fiscal conservatism and pledged to shrink the size of environmental agencies and influence of environmental regulations. Fostering a surge in environmental organization membership, Reagan's appointments and pronouncements inaugurated renewed debate between environmentalists and their ideological opponents. Such discussions were not merely about environmental programs and funding, but rather, a vehicle for tangling with broader issues of economic policy and political theory.

Chapter Five follows the evolution of anti-environmental rhetoric from 1990 into the new millennium and examines the popularization of the term "ecoterrorism."

Throughout the period, the heated discourse between environmentalists and their detractors continued to reflect and refract broader national and international issues. Though many national leaders and average citizens hoped for a period of peace following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, new, seemingly unpredictable forms of violence characterized the era. New international commitments abroad and riots, raids, and rampages at home offered a chilling manifestation of President George H.W. Bush's "new world order." Furthermore, the September 11, 2001, Al Qaeda attacks not only initiated a reappraisal of U.S. security, but also forced a reevaluation of environmental activism and a redefinition of terrorism. As critics compared animal rights activists with the 9/11 suicide bombers, the debate between environmentalists and their opponents once again engaged issues of patriotism. In the press, on cable programs, and in congressional debates, environmentalists and their critics vied to dictate how green the new world order would be.

In short, throughout the second half of the twentieth and into the twenty-first century, environmental politics became a vehicle for debating visions for America's political and economic future and for contesting what it meant to be a "good" American. Though superficially about how clean our water should be or which species of fish should be protected, discussions about environmental initiatives were also fundamentally about defining American values and priorities. Over the course of six decades, both environmentalists and their opponents employed fear, exaggeration, and partisan politics to advance their agendas.

Even though anti-environmentalists did not succeed in thwarting all or much environmental legislation and even though environmentalism remained immensely popular, anti-environmentalists are significant because they influenced a broader political discourse. In portraying environmentalists as an un-American "other," critics of environmentalism replicated and perpetuated a political culture of fear and polarization. Politicians, pundits, and other spokesmen deployed a malleable and Manichean anti-environmental rhetoric to advance their agendas and garner votes. Ultimately, environmentalism proved an effective political tool.

In conclusion, my original research interest centered on the late-twentieth century spike in the use of the term "ecoterrorism." As I began my preliminary inquiries into the topic, I realized that the tendency to portray environmentalists as criminal, dangerous, or subversive was not a new phenomenon. Though a direct line cannot and should not be drawn from Rachel Carson to Earth First!, there exist enduring similarities in how opponents portrayed environmentalists and the environmental movement across the decades. In depicting environmentalists as alarmists, elitists, racists, pagans, and socialists or in describing them as anti-American, anti-industry, anti-humanity, and anti-growth, the environmental opposition offered a unique lens by which to investigate late-twentieth century fears. Through the course of "Extinguishing the Green Fire: The Rise of Opposition to Environmentalism, 1948-2010" I analyze why environmentalism provoked such fears and how those concerns influenced late-twentieth century politics and culture in the United States.

CHAPTER 1 – Postwar Ecology Writers, 1948-1968

Following a tumultuous era of depression and multi-front warfare, many Americans welcomed the promise of peace and prosperity in the years after World War II. As servicemen returned home and the nation refitted its economy for peace, visions of ever increasing abundance muted memories of pre-war scarcity, bank and crop failures, and successive seasons of want. With an air of confidence and optimism, politicians, businessmen, and average citizens celebrated and encouraged postwar consumption and an atmosphere of affluence.

Spurred by a booming population and assisted by federal legislation such as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (GI Bill), veterans and their growing families moved to new suburban housing developments such as those pioneered by William Levitt on Long Island.[1] As blossoming highway networks connected Levittowns to shopping centers, postwar Americans helped build what historian Lizabeth Cohen termed a "landscape of mass consumption."[2] Retrofitted U.S. factories employed an array of wartime technological developments to produce new goods. Filling their homes, yards, and garages with a variety and abundance of products, many Americans enjoyed the rising standard of living and cultivated a culture of consumption.

While many citizens extolled postwar growth in population, housing, highways, and economic productivity, a few voices questioned the long-term viability of such development. Writers such as William Vogt, Fairfield Osborn, Rachel Carson,

---

[1] Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
[2] Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003), 6.

and Paul Ehrlich challenged unchecked growth and overreliance on technology and synthetic chemicals. Calling for a reevaluation of accepted agricultural, business, and lifestyle practices, these writers warned that the contemporary disregard for ecological processes threatened the future of numerous plant and animal species, as well as, potentially, the human species.

This chapter will examine the concerned writings of Vogt, Osborn, and others and analyze the reception of these works in a postwar culture of optimism and abundance. Despite their grim forebodings, many readers applauded the conservation-themed treatises. Engagingly written and positively reviewed in popular newspapers and magazines, books such as Vogt's *The Road to Survival* and Carson's *Silent Spring* enjoyed extensive readership and best-seller status. Believing that conservation was compatible with a healthy economy, reviewers and other commentators encouraged redress of the issues Vogt, Carson, and others raised.

Though the books were widely heralded, a small yet influential group of critics lambasted these works and their authors. I will show that opponents of environmental writers denigrated the authors as alarmist, elitist, and anti-modern in an effort to protect a postwar faith in technology, prosperity, and growth. Contending that conservationists employed overly emotional arguments and inaccurate scientific methodology, critics portrayed these writers as irresponsible, self-interested activists. In addition, conservationists and preservationists also faced charges of racism, biocentrism, pessimism, and crass commercialism. Claiming that "nature lovers" sought to limit economic, demographic, and technological expansion, critics also branded environmental writers as anti-growth neo-Malthusians and anti-development

neo-Luddites. Ultimately, in combining many of these critiques, opponents depicted environmentalists as potentially dangerous and un-American.

In short, the anti-environmental rhetoric of chemical company representatives, politicians, and public intellectuals represented an effort to maintain the popularity and political support of an ethic of consumption and affluence. Arguing that environmental writers threatened the atmosphere of political consensus and economic growth, critics sought to discredit the authors and their gloomy projections. The constructed culture of affluence was not just about celebrating a higher standard of living, but also about masking significant domestic problems as well as troubling international anxieties. With Cold War anxieties accumulating and social and racial unrest simmering just beneath the surface, opponents aimed to silence the challengers of postwar optimism. In effect, criticism of postwar ecology writers reflected deeper concerns about America's political and economic future. Ultimately, as midcentury anti-environmentalists will show, arguments over conservation and resource use were contests over American values and priorities.

While some works such as Aldo Leopold's *A Sand County Almanac* (1949) escaped ideological criticism, many other nature writers attracted disapproval. In book reviews, editorials, congressional testimonies, and television appearances, critics of conservationists launched numerous arguments to challenge the rising popularity of ecological awareness. Though not opposing a clean, healthy environment in general, many commentators opposed the tactics, style, and methods of conservationists as well as the potential economic and social repercussions of environmental writings. Vying

to protect their vision for America's economic and political future, a cadre of concerned citizens cultivated an anti-environmental rhetoric.

Though varying in style, scope, and subject, midcentury environmental writings shared a common tone and message. While it is a bit anachronistic to term them "environmental," works such as *Road to Survival*, *Silent Spring*, and others all emphasized the interconnectedness of natural processes and the complex relationship between humans and the world around them. Suggesting a reevaluation of postwar consumption habits, Fairfield Osborn, William Vogt, Rachel Carson, and Paul Ehrlich offered an alternative and sometimes controversial vision for America's future.

Published in 1948, Fairfield Osborn's *Our Plundered Planet* analyzed the long and short-term implications of postwar lifestyle and agricultural practices. A Princeton University graduate with training in biology and international business, Osborn analyzed the impact of human activity on resources in Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Americas. With Part I focusing on "The Planet" and Part II analyzing "The Plunderer," the book emphasized the potential dire consequences of the continued exploitative relationship between humans and their environments. Comparing misuse of resources with the destruction of World War II, the president of the New York Zoological Society utilized the recent era of global devastation to call for a new attitude toward resources. He argued:

> We human beings were rushing forward unthinkingly through days of incredible accomplishment, of glory and of tragedy, our eyes seeking the stars – or fixed too often upon each other in hatred and conflict – and that we had forgotten the earth, forgotten it in the sense that we were failing to regard it as the source of our life.[3]

[3] Fairfield Osborn, *Our Plundered Planet* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1949), 194.

As he linked human well-being to the health of the earth, Osborn encouraged readers to reconsider their postwar lifestyles and aspirations. Focusing on the imbalance of the relationship between humans and nature, he offered a broad, readable introduction to global ecology. Just as his father, Henry Fairfield Osborn, aimed to popularize science in general and paleontology in particular as president of the American Museum of Natural History, Osborn strove to popularize philosophical questions about man's relationship with the natural world. Imploring citizens, scientists, and national leaders to learn from the failures of past civilizations, Osborn stressed the importance of history to future planning. As he analyzed the demographic statistics and agricultural conditions of the earth's main regions, he detailed the grave repercussions of overpopulation and called for greater financial commitment to conservation work.

Not merely a catalog of abuses, Osborn also suggested alternative approaches to balancing resources, technology, and population growth. Specifically, *Our Plundered Planet* warned readers to avoid overreliance on technological solutions and scientific innovation. In contrast to the prevailing postwar view that science, technology, and American ingenuity could solve any and all of the earth's problems, Osborn argued that humans must change contemporary lifestyle and agricultural practices. Rather than believing "that the marvels of modern technology can solve any of the riddles of life," Osborn argued simply that humans must better comprehend the processes of nature.[4] He concluded, "Man must recognize the necessity of cooperating with nature. He must temper his demands and use and conserve the

[4] Osborn, *Our Plundered Planet*, 199.

natural living resources of this earth in a manner that alone can provide for the continuation of his civilization . . .The time for defiance is at an end."[5] One of the earliest and most unequivocal indictments of postwar land and resource use, *Our Plundered Planet* questioned the prevalent faith in unrestrained economic, technological, and demographic growth. As he advocated for abandoning an attitude of dominance and "defiance," Osborn not only questioned midcentury resource use, but also broader cultural values.

Appearing virtually contemporaneously with Osborn's *Our Plundered Planet*, William Vogt's *Road to Survival* also called for reappraisal of humans' relationship with the environment and reassessment of modern agricultural methods. An ornithologist and ecologist, Vogt traveled throughout South America studying bird populations such as Peru's guano-producing seabirds.[6] As associate director of the Division of Science and Education in the Office of the Coordinator in Inter-American Affairs and as chief of the Conservation Section of the Pan American Union, Vogt expanded his ecological interests from bird populations to human communities. Analyzing past and contemporary trends in land use, poverty, and human population growth in Latin America, Vogt worried about contemporary and future resource scarcity.[7]

Like Osborn, Vogt adopted a region-by-region approach as he catalogued the association between misuse of resources and global politics. Arguing that

---

[5] Osborn, *Our Plundered Planet*, 201.
[6] Maureen A. McCormick, "Of Birds, Guano, and Man: William Vogt's *Road to Survival*," PhD diss., University of Oklahoma, 2005.
[7] Pierre Desrochers and Christine Hoffbauer, "The Post War Intellectual Roots of *The Population Bomb*: Fairfield Osborn's *Our Plundered Planet* and William Vogt's *Road to Survival* in Retrospect," *Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development* 1 (2009): 37-61.

overpopulation served as "one of the most powerful causes of war," Vogt advocated withholding aid to foreign countries until they embraced some form of birth control.[8] He stated unequivocally, "Until they adopt a rational population policy, these nations [such as India, China, El Salvador, and Haiti], it seems to me, have no right to expect aid from the rest of the world." Unabashedly proposing that the United States not "subsidize the unchecked spawning" of Asian, Latin American, and other populations, Vogt demanded a profound change in U.S. economic and foreign policies.[9] As the National Director of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America from 1951 to 1962, Vogt encouraged dialogue about population growth and contraception both in the United States and abroad. Similarly, his 1962 *Saturday Evening Post* article, "Are Too Many Babies Being Born?," examined the correlation between unchecked population growth and community problems such as inadequate classroom space, juvenile delinquency, fouled air and water, disappearing recreation areas, and rising taxes. Throughout his writings and speeches, Vogt urged Americans to reconsider their right to have children and encouraged voluntary conception control "so that compulsion may never become necessary."[10]

Like Osborn, Vogt pointed to the fall of past civilizations, such as the Babylonian Empire, to remind readers that erosive farming and grazing practices could annihilate seemingly prosperous and indefatigable societies. As he connected the demise of Babylon, Assyria, and Carthage to human use and misuse of the land, Vogt asserted that modern procedures dangerously mimicked the ill-fated cultures of the past. Challenging domestic agricultural policies, Vogt criticized American

[8] William Vogt, *Road to Survival* (New York: William Sloane Associates, Inc., 1948), 239.
[9] Vogt, *Road to Survival*, 77.
[10] William Vogt, "Are Too Many Babies Being Born?," *Saturday Evening Post* (January 6, 1962): 11.

farming methods and the U.S. government's subsidization of practices that encouraged erosion. As government programs encouraged short-sighted, maximum-yield husbandry, Vogt worried that the quest for ever greater returns would eventually undermine the earth and its inhabitants. He argued, in short, that the American standard of living "was bought by permanent destruction of . . . topsoil." Throughout *Road to Survival*, Vogt analyzed the attendant costs of a culture of abundance and ultimately questioned the popular faith in progress.[11]

Though widely read, Osborn and Vogt's works did not achieve the blockbuster status of a landmark book that followed shortly thereafter. A highly accessible account of the potentially lethal effects of DDT, Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* enjoyed an even broader readership. Born in western Pennsylvania in 1907, Carson earned a bachelor's degree in science from the Pennsylvania College for Women and by the spring of 1932, a master's degree in zoology from Johns Hopkins University. One of the first women to work as a staff biologist for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Carson authored and edited many of the agency's publications and radio scripts. Fusing her passion for writing with her USFWS field experience, Carson authored books such as *Under the Sea-wind* (1941), *The Edge of the Sea* (1955), and the National Book Award-winning *The Sea Around Us* (1951). Drawing on her work at the Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory in Massachusetts, she shared her knowledge of and passion for sea life with a generation of casual but curious armchair biologists.

Diagnosed with breast cancer, Carson's future research and writing was in doubt. After a radical mastectomy in April 1960 and a brief hiatus from publishing,

[11] Vogt, *Road to Survival*, 67.

Carson returned to writing with a new topic and renewed focus. In response to a growing concern over liberal application of chlorinated hydrocarbons on crops throughout the United States, Carson began gathering data on the chemical's impact on insects, wildlife, and humans. In the summer of 1962, *The New Yorker* published three installments of Carson's findings and Houghton Mifflin released a complete *Silent Spring* in December.[12]

Citing U.S. Department of Agriculture reports, wildlife management data, and numerous scientific journals, Carson argued that postwar overreliance on synthetic chemicals such as dicholoro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) jeopardized future generations of plants, animals, and people. As she castigated the chemical industry and the pronouncements of applied entomologists, Carson encouraged her readers to question the goals and methods of modern agriculture.[13] Throughout *Silent Spring*, Carson explicated the interconnectedness of ecological processes and argued that pesticides such as DDT not only threatened to silence spring birds, but also portended rising cancer incidence among humans. In the shadow of nuclear war, she frighteningly asserted that misapplication of "biocides" posed a similar peril to humankind.

Using captivating prose and jettisoning footnotes, Carson aimed her book at general readers rather than fellow biologists or industry specialists. For example, in summarizing the effect of chemical exposure on humans, Carson wrote:

> Like the constant dripping of water that in turn wears away the hardest stone, this birth-to-death contact with dangerous chemicals may in the end prove disastrous. Each of these recurrent exposures, no matter how slight,

[12] Linda Lear, *Rachel Carson: Witness for Nature* (New York: Henry Holt, 1997).
[13] Donald Worster, *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 349.

> contributes to the progressive buildup of chemicals in our bodies and so to cumulative poisoning. Probably no person is immune to contact with this spreading contamination . . .[14]

In portraying a mythic, but plausible "fable for tomorrow" in accessible language, Carson encouraged housewives, summer vacationers, school teachers, and other readers to question the nation's overreliance on synthetic chemicals.

Like Osborn and Vogt a few years prior, Carson challenged the postwar faith in science, technology, and unlimited production of goods, food, and people. With her characteristic simple, but effective literary style, Carson warned, "The road we have long been traveling is deceptively easy, a smooth superhighway on which we progress with great speed, but at its end lies disaster." Like her predecessors, Carson offered suggestions and road maps for alternate paths. In addition to detailing case studies of successful biological control of pests, she also encouraged Americans to reassess the sagacity of their commitment to an insect-free world. In her typical unadorned style, she informed her readers, "The choice, after all, is ours to make."[15]

In an era of consensus and confidence, an unlikely iconoclast implored the nation's leaders, farmers, scientists, commercial advertisers, and chemical producers to reevaluate their practices and reform their arrogance toward nature. Boldly, yet carefully, Carson argued that humans must acknowledge the interdependence of all life forms and change their domineering attitude toward nature. Thus, though often remembered as merely an indictment of DDT, *Silent Spring* was more importantly a critique of the postwar faith in science, mentality of dominance, and culture of abundance.

---

[14] Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962), 174.
[15] Carson, *Silent Spring*, 277.

Other contemporary works echoed Carson's concerns. Published the same year as *Silent Spring*, Murray Bookchin released *Our Synthetic Environment*. Writing under the pseudonym, "Lewis Herber," Bookchin denounced the use of pesticides and other chemicals in agriculture. Born in New York City in 1921 to immigrant parents who were active in the Russian Revolution, Bookchin was a libertarian socialist who ultimately founded the philosophy of social ecology. Calling for a restructuring of the relationships among humans as well as between humans and nature, social ecology offered an alternative vision to the urban, industrial direction of postwar society.

Though more radical and less subtle than Carson (hence the use of a pseudonym), Murray Bookchin delivered a strikingly similar message and set of warnings. Questioning the ethic of abundance and obsession with control, he called for a reevaluation of postwar values and practices. Just as Carson castigated the aura of arrogance that dominated mid-twentieth century human interaction with the natural world, Bookchin condemned an ethic of dominance that pervaded relations among men and between humans and their environment.

As he examined the interconnectedness between synthetic chemicals, ecology, and cancer, Bookchin feared for the health of the planet as well as for human health. Through his analysis of data in professional journals as well as his personal observations of life in modern, urban America, Bookchin identified numerous short and long-term consequences of scientific arrogance and overreliance on synthetic chemicals. Explaining ecological problems in terms of expressions of power, he argued that the oppression of social classes mirrored human abuse of the environment. In addition to highlighting the role of environmental factors in disease and illness,

Bookchin also criticized an economic system that encouraged constructing food factories for maximum profit. Though acknowledging that science and technology could be used for positive purposes, he castigated Western culture's reliance on food additives, insecticides, fertilizers, and nuclear technology. Calling for a restoration of balance between society and nature, *Our Synthetic Environment* argued for a return to moderate-sized farms "dimensioned on a human scale" and a reassessment of "modern urban life."[16]

Other scholars echoed Bookchin's concerns. Building on the ideological precedents of earlier ecology writers, especially Fairfield Osborn and William Vogt, biologist Paul Ehrlich continued the indictment of unquestioned growth. Just as *Silent Spring* was ostensibly about DDT, Ehrlich's work primarily focused on population growth; however, like Carson's book, *The Population Bomb* also offered a broader commentary about modern culture and values. In collaboration with his wife, Anne, Ehrlich argued that continued increases in population would inevitably lead to famine and starvation. A Stanford University professor of entomology and zoology, Ehrlich turned his attention from insect and butterfly populations to human populations after an eye-opening visit to the congested thoroughfares of Delhi, India. He recalled the trip:

> The streets seemed alive with people. People eating, people washing, people sleeping. People visiting, arguing, and screaming. People thrusting their hands through the taxi window, begging. People defecating and urinating. People clinging to buses. People herding animals. People, people, people, people. As we moved slowly through the mob, hand horn squawking, the dust, noise, heat, and cooking fires gave the scene a hellish aspect.[17]

[16] Lewis Herber, *Our Synthetic Environment* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 215, 237.
[17] Paul Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, (Cutchogue, NY: Buccaneer Books, 1968), xi

In his 1968 publication, Ehrlich not only vividly described the sights, smells, and sounds of crowded India, but he also predicted that the United States and the rest of the world would soon replicate the scenes of Delhi. Linking teeming streets with hungry bellies, Ehrlich warned of future, widespread famine. He solemnly predicted, "In the 1970s and 1980s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death."[18] Claiming that U.S. habits and policies not only helped create such conditions, but also actively inhibited solutions, Ehrlich boldly exposed America's culpability in endemic poverty. In addition to citing the "ecologically incompetent use of synthetic pesticides," Ehrlich castigated U.S. leaders' shortsighted tendency to "increase our domestic food production in an attempt to feed the starving."[19] After enumerating the causes and reasoning behind "The Problem," Ehrlich argued that Americans must change their consumption and reproduction habits. He simply yet dramatically advised, "Obviously our first step must be immediately to establish and advertise drastic policies designed to bring our own population size under control."[20]

Published in the tumultuous year of 1968, when assassinations and riots at home and escalation of war abroad shook Americans' sense of confidence, optimism, and control, Ehrlich's prognosis and suggested solutions further rocked an already tenuous myth of postwar serenity. Bluntly telling readers and audiences, "Americans must . . . change their way of living . . . we can no longer afford merely to treat the symptoms of the cancer of population growth; the cancer itself must be cut out," Ehrlich called for a reappraisal of American affluence and heedless reproduction practices. He candidly warned, "We, of course, cannot remain affluent and isolated."

[18] Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, xi.
[19] Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, 33, 129.
[20] Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, 130.

With startling simplicity and confidence, *The Population Bomb* raised suspicions about contemporary values and priorities.[21]

Though the tone, tactics, and focus of each work varied greatly, all of these midcentury environmental writings questioned the pervasive faith in science, technology, and economic and demographic growth. Encouraging readers to examine the effects of the popular postwar culture of affluence, books such as *Our Plundered Planet*, *Silent Spring*, and *The Population Bomb*, offered an alternate vision for America's future. As they exposed the interconnectedness of natural processes, these early environmental treatises emphasized that all life forms may be at risk. Though superficially about specific issues such as DDT contamination or population rates, all of these works also cast doubt on cherished values of postwar America. As such, though some reviewers applauded the books, many others rigorously condemned the works and their authors.

Midcentury environmental writers enjoyed wide readership and numerous glowing and sympathetic reviews. In fact, even prior to her groundbreaking publication, *Silent Spring*, Rachel Carson was able to retire from her position with the Fish and Wildlife Service and devote her career to full-time writing in 1951. Noting both the style and content of books such as *Our Plundered Planet*, *Road to Survival*, and *Silent Spring*, many readers praised the qualifications and embraced the messages of the authors.

For example, many reviewers applauded *Our Plundered Planet* as well as Fairfield Osborn's ongoing work with the Conservation Foundation, a precursor to the

[21] Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, xii, 129.

World Wildlife Fund. Favorable commentary appeared in nationally prominent periodicals such as the *New York Times* as well as in numerous regional newspapers. In addition to highlighting Osborn's engaging writing style, reviews and articles also echoed his call for increased attention to soil fertility and conservation programs.[22] One editorial remarked, "We are not yet on the brink of ruin, but we need more crusaders like Mr. Osborn to remind us that we are wastrels, that we must pay a heavy price for our prodigality and that there is still time to redeem the sins of our forefathers."[23] Emphasizing that Osborn "is no Cassandra preaching doom," the editorial embraced his suggestions for resource conservation as well as his openness to dialogue with groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In addition, national figures such as Eleanor Roosevelt, Aldous Huxley, and Robert Maynard Hutchins, praised *Our Plundered Planet* for both its style and its message.[24]

Similar to the reception of *Our Plundered Planet*, William Vogt's *Road to Survival* attracted enthusiastic support. Many reviews emphasized the author's educational background and professional experience as well as his writing style. For example, a *New York Times* article summed, "It is eloquent, sometimes grim, but always vivid. It combines literary excellence with sound scholarship." Though acknowledging Vogt's alarming message, the review argued for the book's importance and relevance, "Read *Road to Survival*. It will shock you, and it may infuriate you.

[22] *Waukesha (WI) Daily Freeman*, June 11, 1948; *Dixon (IL) Evening Telegraph*, August 26, 1949; *Olean (NY) Times Herald*, August 27, 1949.
[23] *New York Times*, "Renewable Resources," May 8, 1949.
[24] Osborn, *Our Plundered Planet*, dust jacket.

But it is a preview of things to come as seen by a courageous, honest, competent scientist."[25]

In addition to complimentary reviews in periodicals, Vogt also received numerous letters from readers applauding his work. English entomologist and longtime resident of Rhodesia, Robert Herbert Carcasson, read the book while hospitalized with malaria and requested permission to translate and distribute the book to friends and local leaders.[26] A specialist in butterflies who later directed Nairobi's Natural History Museum, Carcasson witnessed many of the issues detailed in *Road to Survival*. Vogt received congratulatory messages and letters of support from other scholars and researchers. Durward L. Allen of Purdue University's Agricultural Experiment Station praised, "It's a magnificent job and just what I expected from you at this time. May it get the attention it deserves! You can bet that my students hear much about the population problem, and the new book will get plenty of that kind of use." Allen, an ecologist and wildlife management expert who was beginning his study of wolves on Lake Superior's Isle Royale, used the book in his classes and chuckled about Catholic students' summary rejection of population control proposals.[27] In his correspondence with Vogt, he noted with levity, "You can argue about the laws of man but damn well not about the laws of God!"[28] Professor Allen welcomed the opportunity to debate Vogt's important, but controversial message. He,

[25] Robert C. Cook, "Two Billion People Versus Time," *New York Times*, August 8, 1948.
[26] Letter from R.H. Carcasson to William Vogt, William Vogt Papers, Denver Public Library, Western History Collection [hereafter cited as DPL], CONS76, Box 1, Folder FF13.
[27] Durward L. Allen, *Wolves of Minong: Their Vital Role in a Wild Community* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979).
[28] Letter from Durward L. Allen to William Vogt, William Vogt Papers, DPL, CONS76, Box 1, Folder FF1.

like many readers, praised Vogt's lucidity of style, sound scholarship, and uncompromising thesis.

Early reviews of Rachel Carson's bestseller foreshadowed similar reception. Admiring *Silent Spring*'s style, tone, and conclusions, many reviewers encouraged their readers to pick up the book at once. The *Oakland Tribune*'s reviewer claimed, "In prose that is at once highly informative and beautifully lucid, Miss Carson reveals the many facets of an increasingly serious and deeply disturbing situation . . . [she] is no irresponsible alarmist, nor does she ever suggest that there is cause for despair."[29] A *New York Times* review also remarked on the readability of *Silent Spring* and the scrupulousness of its author. In addition to profiling Carson's background, the review made note of the "55 pages of references." The *Times* review also remarked on the popularity of *Silent Spring*, "Hundreds of letters—99 percent of them favorable—poured into *The New Yorker*. Newspapers throughout the country published editorial content. Two Senators and three Representatives read selections into the Congressional Record. Houghton Mifflin ordered 100,000 copies of the book printed."[30]

Though not as widely read as Carson's landmark work, Bookchin's exposé of chemical carcinogens attracted praise as well. Like early reception of *Silent Spring*, *Our Synthetic Environment* enjoyed some positive reviews. For example, the *Pittsburgh Courier*, one of the nation's leading African-American newspapers, glowing commended the book as "a revelation" and sympathized with Bookchin's

[29] *The Oakland Tribune*, September 23, 1962.
[30] *The New York Times*, September 23, 1962.

gloomy conclusions, stating, "It's a wonder we get on as well as we do."[31] Similarly, a *San Mateo Times* review commiserated, "This is a serious treatise, with much supporting data to show that modern man is being eroded mentally and physically by the products of his own cleverness."[32] Not reviewed as extensively as *Silent Spring*, many capsule reviews briefly summarized the book as "alarming," but "well documented."[33]

Similar to the positive reception of Bookchin's work, many newspapers and magazines applauded Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb*. Many early reviews praised or respectfully synopsized *The Population Bomb*. Most listed Ehrlich's professional background, summarized his thesis, and briefly commented on the "chilling statistics" he presented.[34] Prior to outlining Ehrlich's argument, *The Valley News* of Van Nuys, California, for example, noted, "Dr. Ehrlich is professor of biology and director of graduate study for the Dept. of Biological Sciences, Stanford University. His specialty is population biology . . . [He] has written more than 70 scientific papers and several books on this and related subjects. He recently returned from 15 months of travel and scientific research."[35] Numerous other articles stressed Ehrlich's qualifications and experience. In addition to cataloging Ehrlich's previous work, these reviews also presented detailed descriptions and lengthy, contextualized excerpts from *The Population Bomb*.

In short, many reviews of midcentury environmental exposés praised the clear and engaging writing styles and highlighted the scientific qualifications of the authors.

---

[31] *Pittsburgh Courier*, "The Poisons In and Around Us," July 21, 1962.
[32] *San Mateo (CA) Times*, "Times Books," June 28, 1962.
[33] *Muscatine (IA) Journal*, July 12, 1962.
[34] *The Sheboygan (WI) Press*, June 23, 1969.
[35] *The Valley News* (Van Nuys, CA), September 29, 1968.

Pleasantly surprised that professionally-trained scientists could write so effectively, the reviewers enthusiastically encouraged their subscribers to read these new books. From small town presses to national publications, dozens of periodicals reviewed *The Population Bomb*, *Silent Spring*, and lesser-known environmental treatises. In addition to reviewing the aesthetic and stylistic qualities of the works, columnists also commented on the primacy of the books' messages. Concerned about the long-term implications of commercial agriculture, misapplication of pesticides, overpopulation, and synthetic chemicals, commentators echoed the calls for legislative redress and lifestyle changes. Often vigorously promoting the authors' proposed solutions, reviewers suggested that Americans and other citizens of the world needed to read books such as *Road to Survival* and *The Population Bomb*.

Despite the warm and supportive tone of some reviewers, many other commentators rigorously condemned the books and their authors. Fearful that popular writers such as Fairfield Osborn, Rachel Carson, and Paul Ehrlich promoted messages that challenged the postwar aura of optimism, confidence, and American supremacy, several politicians, businessmen, and average citizens aimed to discredit the authors and their conclusions. As ecology writers cast doubt on the midcentury infatuation with technology, growth, and unbridled abundance, their critics sought to protect the primacy of affluence in American culture. Thus, though they superficially challenged Osborn's erosion observations and Carson's DDT data, opponents were ultimately criticizing the writers' defamation of postwar economic and cultural values.

Though the surrender of Germany and Japan in 1945 suggested an era of unparalleled peace, the years following World War II ushered in a new epoch of fear

and uncertainty. Simmering tensions both at home and abroad challenged the vision of a blithe and untroubled postwar world. In short, the veneer of optimism and abundance concealed significant anxieties and unrest in midcentury America. Critics of postwar ecology writers aimed to promote and protect an aura of optimism, affluence, and consensus in a changing world.

While the August 1945 detonation of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki suggested an air of finality, in fact, the events heralded something new and seemingly unending: a nuclear arms race. In September 1949, the Soviet Union tested their own atomic bomb, announcing the end of American atomic supremacy and the beginning of a scientific and economic competition for greater weaponry. Both public pronouncements and classified reports such as the National Security Council's NSC-68 ensured a protracted contest for nuclear mastery. As such, the atomic age stimulated an era of fear and precariousness that pervaded American diplomacy, politics, and popular culture.

Relatedly, panic surrounding the expansion of communism also shattered post-World War II visions for diplomatic and military peace. The October 1949 "loss" of China to Mao Zedong's Communists and the ongoing rise of the Soviet Union as a global contender not only inspired the formation of the policy of containment, but also incited a paralyzing fear of a "red menace" among many Americans. Led by Wisconsin senator Joseph McCarthy in the early 1950s, anticommunists encouraged a sense of unease and a pervading fear of infiltration.

Other issues at home were also disrupting aspirations of postwar optimism and consensus. Civil rights activism picked up apace following the landmark *Brown v.*

Board of Education decision in 1954. With the new ubiquity of television, news coverage of events such as the Montgomery bus boycotts, lunch counter sit-ins, and Freedom Rides, shattered the fragile veneer of domestic peace and prosperity. Relatedly, the coalescence of groups such as Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers hinted at simmering unrest among other minority groups and exposed the fact that American prosperity did not reach many residents. Economic and sociological studies such as Michael Harrington's *The Other America* (1962) revealed the pervasiveness of endemic poverty in a superficially affluent United States. Citing the presence of fifty million impoverished citizens in the nation, Harrington aimed to raise the curtain on an "invisible" economic underworld.[36] Additionally, the rise of dissent among affluent white students and growing unease of middle and upper class women also challenged the myth of postwar calm and consensus. The formation of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in 1960 and the eventual founding of Berkeley's Free Speech Movement in 1964 and the National Organization of Women (NOW) in 1966 cast further and indelible doubt on the promise of domestic harmony.

It was in this environment of fear and uncertainty that commentators criticized environmental writers. Hoping to protect the postwar mood of optimism and confidence, critics viewed ecologists' emotional warnings about even more unseen threats as irresponsible and dangerous. In an age of Cold War with the lurking perils of nuclear holocaust, many of the nation's economic and political leaders desired to minimize the growing fears. Viewing ecology writers as a visible, manageable, and controllable threat, politicians, scientists, and public intellectuals directed their ire

[36] Michael Harrington, *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), 21.

toward *Our Plundered Planet*, *Silent Spring*, and the like. In short, in an attempt to reassert order and hegemony, critics castigated these works and others as recklessly alarmist.

Arguing that environmental writers exaggerated their claims, opponents sought to discredit the authors and their findings. Though not disparaging the idea of conservation as a whole, critics argued that the writers used emotional language to erroneously inflate the severity of ecological issues such as erosion, resource consumption, and overpopulation. For example, though lauding Osborn's *Our Plundered Planet* as "a well-written, informative, and stimulating exposition of the elements of ecology," philosopher Sidney Hook charged Osborn with exaggeration, misinterpretation of facts, and faulty methodology. Emphasizing that Osborn's reductionism ignored other pressing global issues, Hook argued, "As if all other problems are reducible to it [conserving soil], or as if all other problems depend for their solution upon restoring the fertility to the soil, the exaggeration smacks of the fantasies of the cultist."[37] In linking Osborn's conclusions with "fantasy" and "cults," Hook equated ecological ideas with mysterious and potentially dangerous fringe movements.

A former organizer of the American Workers Party, Hook had recently renounced his Marxist ties and worked rigorously to criticize communism in the United States and abroad.[38] Worried that Osborn's conservation plea threatened to overshadow critical postwar issues such as the containment of communism, the "international control of atomic energy," and general "social and economic

[37] Sidney Hook, "Mother Earth – and How We Rob Her," *New York Times*, March 28, 1948.
[38] James Davison Hunter, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America* (New York: Basic Books, 1991), 121.

reorganization," Hook dismissed *Our Plundered Planet* as "an oversimplified physicalistic interpretation of culture and history."[39]

Furthermore, in the midst of postwar enthusiasm for progress and growth, many scientists and public figures believed that technological advances and American ingenuity could tackle any problem, including the twined conundrum of decreasing soil fertility and increasing birth rates. At a 1949 MIT conference, "The Social Implications of Scientific Progress—An Appraisal at Mid Century," several scientists panned Osborn's assessment of diminishing global resources. Vannevar Bush, presidential science advisor and director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during World War II, acknowledged the rise in population, but argued that science possessed the tools to allow a parallel increase in the standard of living. Countering Osborn's Malthusian pessimism with "dry Yankee humor" and optimism, Bush enumerated how scientific discoveries such as controlled photosynthesis and improved fertilizers continually contributed to increases in food production, summing, "The technical part is easy." *Time* magazine's coverage of the forum tilted toward Bush's optimism as it depicted Osborn's presentation as "his familiar Malthusian bogy" and applauded scientists who "tore into Osborn's gloomy theories."[40]

Likewise, numerous reviewers castigated William Vogt's pessimistic and alarmist tone. One *New York Times* review of *Road to Survival* summed with a jocular air, "He [Vogt] is out to scare the living daylights out of everyone who wastes water (back to the Saturday night bath, Mr. Vogt?), land, or any other natural

[39] Hook, *New York Times*, March 28, 1948.
[40] "Where Is Man? A Mid-Century Appraisal," *Time*, vol. 53, no. 15, April 11, 1949, 27-30.

resource."[41] Over a decade later, Vogt's work continued to attract charges of alarmism. In response to his article, "Are Too Many Babies Being Born?," numerous readers wrote letters to Vogt and his publisher. Mrs. Gayle Dever of Seattle, Washington, wrote, "[Y]our statement that pure air is available to a shrinking proportion of Americans sent me gasping to my atlas to reassure myself that there were still a few million acres in our country where one could flee to snatch some breaths of good, clean air." Though acknowledging that "granted, there is a smog problem in some of our congested metropolitan areas," Mrs. Dever maintained that Vogt grossly misrepresented and exaggerated the population and pollution situation of the United States. After recommending that Vogt step away from the "panic button," she urged him and other "writers with your views" to "take several weeks and in that time see a portion of our huge unpopulated areas throughout our country."[42] Similarly, Mrs. R.W. Brown also addressed Vogt's alleged alarmism stating, "Worrying about an overpopulated earth is like getting anxious over the sun's burning out in about 1,000,000,000 years."[43] In an effort to protect the era's aura of optimism and progress, many readers admonished writers such as Osborn and Vogt for broaching cataclysmic topics and irresponsibly alarming an unsuspecting public.

Though Osborn and Vogt encountered repeated charges of alarmism, none matched the allegations leveled at Rachel Carson. Portraying Carson as overdramatic, emotional, and prone to exaggeration and paranoia, critics sought to label *Silent Spring* as an alarmist propaganda tract. Building on traditional notions of women as

[41] Charles Poore, "Books of the Times," *New York Times*, August 5, 1948.
[42] Letter from Mrs. Gayle Dever to William Vogt, William Vogt Papers, DPL, CONS76, Box 1, Folder FF22.
[43] Letter from Mrs. R.W. Brown to William Vogt, William Vogt Papers, DPL, CONS76, Box 1, Folder FF10.

hysterical, opinion pieces such as the *Arizona Star*'s "*Silent Spring* Makes Protest Too Hysterical," linked her alleged alarmism to her sex and marital status.[44] Scholarly and trade journals cast similar aspersions on the author. In the *Archives of Internal Medicine*, Dr. William Bean summed, "*Silent Spring*, which I read word for word with some trauma, kept reminding me of trying to win an argument with a woman. It cannot be done." A prolific and decorated writer in the field of internal medicine and nutrition and eventual editor of over a dozen scientific journals, Bean represented the traditional, male-dominated medical academy. Though Bean's editorial highlighted many thought-provoking features of *Silent Spring*, the review ultimately concluded that the book's point-of-view was inseparable from the author's sex. In the penultimate paragraph of his review, he deemed, "As science it is so much hogwash."[45]

Viewing Carson's emotionalism and alleged alarmism as inherently feminine, critics such as Dr. Bean feared that widespread acceptance of *Silent Spring*'s findings threatened the traditional scientific academy and, ultimately, male concepts of authority. Though Carson did not intend to pen a feminist tract, *Silent Spring* appeared during an era in which a revived women's movement began to question accepted gender roles and notions of dominance. Appearing virtually contemporaneously with Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, Carson's work and conclusions challenged postwar notions of gender, expertise, and power.[46] In short,

---

[44] *Arizona Star*, "*Silent Spring* Makes Protest Too Hysterical," October 14, 1962.
[45] William B. Bean, editorial, "The Noise of Silent Spring," *Archives of Internal Medicine* 112, no. 3 (September 1963): 311.
[46] Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, rev. ed. (1964; New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001).

both positive and critical reviews made special note of Carson's sex, often speculating on how her role as a woman influenced her writing.

Other medical professionals and science writers echoed Bean's concerns. In both scholarly journals and popular periodicals, critics emphasized Carson's alarmist tendencies and tactics. Scientists such as I.L. Baldwin, Harvey L. Sweetman, and Frederick J. Stare led the chorus of critiques. Writing in *Science*, Baldwin argued:

> It [*Silent Spring*] is not, however, a judicial review or balancing of the gains and losses; rather it is the prosecuting attorney's impassioned plea for action against the use of these new materials which have received such widespread acceptance, acceptance accorded because of the obvious benefits that their use has conferred.[47]

Wanting to celebrate the wartime and postwar gains of scientific and technological innovation, figures such as Baldwin represented an effort to reassert the power of human ingenuity and American supremacy. Chairman of the National Academy of Science-National Research Council's Pesticide Review Committee, Baldwin aimed to portray Carson's conclusions as anathema to accepted and traditional consensus science.

Similarly, in an *Agricultural Chemicals* review of *Silent Spring*, Harvey L. Sweetman, author of *The Biological Control of Insects* (1936), echoed Baldwin's fears and assessment of Carson. Pointing to an array of "bias, misinformation, [and] half-truths," Sweetman concluded, "The intent appears to be to scare or frighten, rather than to inform. Judged on that basis, it is successful. Miss Carson appears to have used all the tricks at her command to 'alarm' (attract attention). She has

[47] I.L. Baldwin, "Chemicals and Pests," *Science* 137 (September 28, 1962): 1042-1043.

overexaggerated, which tends to reduce her contentions to absurdity."[48] Once again, in castigating Carson's "tricks" and overexaggerations, Sweetman subtly alluded to Carson's sex.

Researchers and medical professionals persistently attacked Carson's alleged affront to scientific objectivity. Dr. Frederick J. Stare, chair of the Department of Nutrition at Harvard's School of Public Health, intoned, "Dispassionate scientific evidence and passionate propaganda are two buckets of water that simply can't be carried on one person's shoulders." Likewise, Dr. John Beel, head of Colorado State College's Department of Chemistry, simply stated, "Miss Carson's book contains no scientific proof of the validity of any of her general statements."[49] Popular national periodicals often echoed the sentiments of scientists. A *Wall Street Journal* front-page article, "Pesticides and Nature's Advocate," presented a generally objective summary of Carson's work, but eventually summed, "And who can be trusted to tell us whether Miss Carson is a prophet or merely a crank? . . . The book, after all, is built up of a tissue of recorded facts as well as speculative deductions from extrapolated statistical curves."[50] Portraying *Silent Spring* as unfair, inaccurate, and misleading, critics claimed Carson knowingly misapplied scientific evidence to undermine the pesticide industry. As chemical industry representatives, nutritionists, and food science scholars, many of these critics desired to see a continuation of America's leadership position in food production. Not just responding to a pervasive mood of fear and alarm, scientists were also reacting to threats to science's postwar status and authority.

---

[48] Harvey L. Sweetman, "Bias, Misinformation, Half-Truths Reduce Usefulness Of 'Silent Spring,'" *Agricultural Chemicals* 18, no. 2 (February 1963).
[49] *Greeley (CO) Daily Tribune*, "Scientific Views Defend Pesticides," May 30, 1963.
[50] *Wall Street Journal*, "Pesticides and Nature's Advocate," September 26, 1962.

Shaken by the recent publication of Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, the scientific community struggled with continued challenges to its authority and conventions.[51]

Using a more popular venue, *The Saturday Evening Post*, journalist Edwin Diamond worried that "her arguments were more emotional than accurate" and that Carson "stirs the latent demons of paranoia that many men and women must fight down all through their lives."[52] Appearing at the end of a tumultuous year of civil rights unrest and at the end of the month of assassinations of South Vietnamese president Ngo Dinh Diem and U.S. president John F. Kennedy, Diamond's review reflected the uncertainty of the times. Several years earlier, Diamond, a senior editor at *Newsweek* and a frequent contributor to many other popular periodicals, agreed to collaborate with Carson on a book project. Due to personality conflicts, Carson's other commissions, and disagreement over the division of labor, the deal disintegrated, to Diamond's disappointment. Thus, bitterness over being professionally jilted and the loss of a potentially lucrative contract in which the journalist would have split royalties with Carson may have fueled Diamond's particularly stinging review of *Silent Spring*.[53] Regardless, Diamond, like critical readers of Vogt, feared that Carson's alarming message was dangerous in an era of increasing anxieties. Once again, attempting to preserve the aura of postwar confidence, critics aimed to extinguish potential alarms as they arose. Articles in other popular periodicals such as the *Reader's Digest* and local newspapers also urged caution as they discounted

[51] Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).
[52] Edwin Diamond, "The Myth of the 'Pesticide Menace,'" *Saturday Evening Post* 236 (November 28, 1963): 16.
[53] Lear, *Witness for Nature*, 323.

Carson's "unproven fears."[54] Scientists and journalists alike admonished Carson for recklessly planting new phobias in an already anxiety-ridden era.

Citing her use of language, choice of chapter titles, and employment of fictitious future communities, these reviewers often suggested Carson had ulterior motives in scaring America's housewives. For example, one reader, Paul W. Bohne, wrote a letter to the editor of *The Rural New Yorker* and speculated on Carson's "real" intentions. Reprinted in several small-town newspapers, Bohne hypothesized:

> You [Rachel Carson] would have us believe that *Silent Spring*, superlative in its use of negative adjectives, was inspired solely by a desire to focus attention on a "problem" with which you had long been concerned—and about which you had evidently done nothing. Premature publication of your bitter words in a sophisticated magazine, selection in advance of your book by a book promotion club and widespread newspaper publicity preceding the appearance of *Silent Spring* all may well imply that the real "problem" was not a chemical one. Perhaps it was to sell books.[55]

Likewise, one industrial toxicologist described *Silent Spring* as "crass commercialism."[56] Arguing that Carson abused the integrity of science to sell books, critics attempted to counter the popularity of *Silent Spring* and cast doubt on her conclusions.

Linking Carson's alleged intent to alarm, misuse of scientific methods, and lack of professional standards, many critics compared *Silent Spring* to science fiction. In a *Chicago Sunday Sun-Times* opinion piece, co-founder of the American Horticultural Society and developer of gardening chemicals, R. Milton Carleton, compared the book to "horror TV plays and similar self-torture." After cataloguing Carson's "technical errors," Carleton reassured readers that Carson "is conjuring up

---

[54] John Strohm and Cliff Ganschow, "The Great Pesticide Controversy," *Reader's Digest* (October 1963): 123-128.
[55] Paul W. Bohne, letter to the editor, *Bennington (VT) Banner*, June 4, 1963.
[56] John M. Lee, "'Silent Spring' Is Now Noisy Summer," *New York Times*, July 22, 1962.

ogres which do not exist."[57] Similarly, a *World Review of Pest Control* feature article compared *Silent Spring* to the then-popular television show, *The Twilight Zone*.[58] In likening *Silent Spring* to fictitious books, comics, and TV programs, critics aimed to dismiss Carson's work as another form of pulp entertainment.

In an effort to undermine the alarmist conclusions of Carson and other ecology writers, commentators often sought to denigrate the authors' professional qualifications and personal ethics. In an era which celebrated expertise, scientific veracity, and objective truth, critics chided ecology writers for their lack of deference to the scientific academy. For example, though Ehrlich was a degreed biologist, critics argued that his area of expertise focused on insects and butterflies, not humans. Stressing the implausibility of Ehrlich's population claims, many commentators resurrected centuries' old critiques of Thomas Malthus. In answering their own question, "are we being suckered by the doomsayers," several articles offered their own set of demographic statistics that appeared much less gloomy than Ehrlich's numbers. One such editorial claimed:

> But now it begins to appear that the baby proliferation of the 40s and 50s was a momentary phenomenon, an eddy, so to speak, which deflected our attention from the main current. Last year the U.S. population increased by a mere one per cent, and our birth-rate was lower than it had ever been before.[59]

In promoting alternate figures and analysis, Ehrlich's critics not only sought to tar the scientist as overly emotional and alarmist, but they also sought to undermine his professional reputation.

---

[57] R. Milton Carleton, "'Silent Spring' Merely Science Fiction Instead of Fact," *Chicago Sunday Sun-Times*, September 23, 1962.
[58] George C. Decker, "Pros and Cons of Pests, Pest Control and Pesticides," *World Review of Pest Control* (Spring 1962): 6-18.
[59] *Coshocton (OH) Tribune*, October 10, 1969.

In addition to charges of unqualified alarmism, commentators also leveled other allegations to discredit the seemingly dangerous popularity of postwar environmental writers. For example, some critics aimed to expose alleged hypocrisy. Arguing that authors such as Vogt, Carson, and Ehrlich unscrupulously enjoyed all the comforts of American affluence while castigating others for doing the same, opponents often detailed the writers' transgressions. For example, seasoned book reviewer, Charles Poore, opened his *New York Times* review of *Road to Survival* with a meticulous catalog of Vogt's hypocritical lifestyle:

> He smokes a pipe made of metal as well as wood, thus helping to use up the world's precariously limited supply of ore and timber. The tobacco in it passed through all sorts of hands that might have been planting corn and beans. His needless coat lapels waste precious wool. In fact, he probably leaves the parsley sprig on his blue-plate dinners untasted. What's more, he has just appropriated a pulpwood forest or two and a fairish pond of ink to put out another book about our plundered planet, an uncommonly readable sermon on conspicuous waste called *Road to Survival*.[60]

Referencing the year's other major conservation bestseller, Poore hinted at the faddishness of ecological concerns and also cast doubt on Vogt's conservation credentials. As they linked ecology writers' hypocrisy to their affluent academic positions in American society, critics also warned of their inherent elitism.

In more serious allegations, some reviewers argued that ecology writers harbored racist viewpoints. Earl Parker Hanson, a University of Delaware geographer, leveled numerous charges against Vogt in "Mankind Need Not Starve." Appearing in *The Nation* over a year after the publication of *Road to Survival*, the article not only echoed Poore's concerns of alarmism, but also introduced several new indictments against the conservationist. In addition to calling Vogt a "Jeremiah" who spread a

[60] Charles Poore, "Books of the Times," *New York Times*, August 5, 1948.

"cult of fear," Hanson also depicted Vogt as a condescending elitist and xenophobic racist. He argued:

> It is the Chinese, the Hindus, the Africans, the Latin Americans, the spawning millions of backward countries, who must now have fewer children and conserve their dwindling resources—so that *we* may maintain our standard of living. Thus the book's main argument, though Vogt himself may be unaware of its implications, comes dangerously close to being another agonized cry about the rising tide of color, this time dressed up in scientific verbiage . . .Vogt nowhere indicates the slightest intention of asking the Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Indians, or Africans what they may think about the matter.[61]

A scholar of "modern Puerto Rico," Hanson alleged that Vogt and other conservationists perpetuated bigoted and jingoistic colonial paradigms.[62] Thus, as in the charges of hypocrisy, critics aimed to challenge the ethics, morals, and values of ecology writers.

As many Americans celebrated the nation's technological innovation and attendant soaring GDP, critics portrayed ecology writers as dampening the spirit of growth and progress. Claiming that authors such as Osborn, Vogt, Carson and others harbored anti-modern inclinations, opponents sought to vilify the writers as anathema to American visions of progress. For example, Hanson portrayed Vogt as fundamentally opposed to growth and industry. The article proclaimed, "Indeed, he [Vogt] shows so astonishing a tendency to resent all progress—medical, technological, and industrial—that the thoughtful reader can only assume that he laments Adam and Eve's departure from the Garden of Eden."[63] Arguing that ecologists desired a return "to a dark age of plague and epidemic," chemical company representatives, scientists,

---

[61] Earl Parker Hanson, "Mankind Need Not Starve," *The Nation*, November 12, 1949, 464-467.
[62] Earl Parker Hanson, *Transformation: The Story of Modern Puerto Rico* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1955).
[63] Hanson, "Mankind Need Not Starve."

and their allies depicted Rachel Carson and other writers as resistant to technology.[64] For example, pesticide industry spokesman Robert H. White-Stevens castigated Carson in an *Agricultural Chemicals* article:

> Surely she cannot be so naïve as to contemplate turning our clocks back to the years when man was indeed immersed in Nature's balance and barely holding his own. Indeed, in many areas of the world, including some colonies in America, he failed to withstand the competition and ignominiously expired.[65]

In a *CBS Reports* interview, White-Stevens reiterated his concerns to a wider audience, "If man were to faithfully follow the teachings of Miss Carson, we would return to the Dark Ages, and the insects and diseases and vermin would once again inherit the earth." Arguing that without agricultural chemicals such as DDT, "hordes of insects" would threaten human existence, White-Stevens emphasized the danger of Carson's popular message. Through numerous television appearances and speeches throughout the United States, the American Cyanamid spokesman aimed to uncover Carson's "gross distortions of the actual facts."[66]

Claiming that devotion to an anti-progress and "balance of nature" agenda augured pestilence and doom, critics depicted Carson and her work as dangerous to Americans' health and standard of living. For example, the National Pest Control Association warned its members that, "thoughtless acceptance of her arguments can do our public and our customers harm."[67] Likewise, a Pfizer newsletter concluded its reaction to *Silent Spring*, "pesticides are an indispensable part of our lives, accounting

---

[64] Edwin Diamond, "The Myth of the 'Pesticide Menace,'" *Saturday Evening Post* 236 (November 28, 1963): 17.
[65] Robert H. White-Stevens, "Communications Create Understanding," *Agricultural Chemicals* 17 (October 1962): 34.
[66] Eric Sevareid and Jay L. McMullen, "The Silent Spring of Rachel Carson," *CBS Reports*, CBS, April 3, 1963.
[67] National Pest Control Association, "Service Letter No. 1069: Silent Spring," October 1962, Lear/Carson Collection, Linda Lear Center for Special Collections & Archives, Connecticut College, New London, Connecticut [hereafter cited as L/C], Box 18B, Folder 202.

in large measure for the abundance Americans enjoy – an abundance which contrasts sharply with the privation and famine experienced by other nations of the world less advanced in agricultural sciences."[68] Arguing that *Silent Spring*'s case for increased regulation of pesticides would inevitably result in decreased use of agricultural chemicals and, thus, increased pest infestations and decreased food yields for American farmers, commentators crafted an image of Carson as a dangerous and subversive challenger of the American way of life.

Critical reviews of *Our Synthetic Environment* often applied similar arguments of anti-modernism to those employed against *Silent Spring*. For example, the *New York Times* science reporter, John Osmundsen, worried that the author harbored anti-progress inclinations. After enumerating "Herber's" suggestions for a healthier, more balanced environment, Osmundsen summed:

> Nice sentiments, only impossible. No one is going to stop the world so that some who would like to get off will be able to or, as with Mr. Herber, spin us backward in time. Man is here, we hope, to stay, and his very presence and the requirements for maintaining it mean that the natural environment will undergo changes, in most ways for the better, though in some ways to man's detriment. Mistakes will be made that cannot be corrected but only deplored in retrospect, for man is human after all.[69]

During an era that celebrated forward-looking progress and growth, critics lambasted environmental writers as advocating going "backward in time" to "dark ages," "colonial times," or the "antediluvian" epoch. With not-so-subtle reference to Rachel Carson, Osmundsen suspected that "although [Bookchin] seems anxious to be fair and accurate, to avoid the hysterics and histrionics of some other writers on this subject, one nevertheless gets the impression that he is at heart one of the 'back to nature'

[68] "The Role of Pesticides in Modern Agriculture," *Pfizer Scene*, November 1962, L/C, Box 18B, Folder 186.
[69] John Osmundsen, "Man Against Nature," *New York Times*, May 19, 1963.

boys." Conceding that *Our Synthetic Environment* "[was] neither the best book of this sort that one could hope for, nor as bad as many that have been written," Osmundsen ultimately concluded that the book "does sound the alarm."[70] In characterizing Bookchin's work as not only alarmist, but also anti-technology, Osmundsen's review echoed complaints leveled at Carson's *Silent Spring*.

Many commentators also worried that ecology writers advocated a quirky and potentially dangerous biocentrism. As many Americans celebrated the tremendous advances of midcentury science and the attendant ability of humans to alter the natural environment, scientists, businessmen, and others proudly heralded man's domination of the earth. Writers such as Vogt, Carson, Ehrlich, and others questioned the sagacity of the ethic of dominance and anthropocentrism. Critics pounced on the writers' biocentric inclinations. For example, award-winning European historian, Garrett Mattingly, not only questioned Vogt's preachy-tone, elitism, and scientific accuracy, but also worried about *Road to Survival*'s biocentric stance. Mattingly pondered rhetorically, "If I were an editor though, I should wonder about the advisability of asking the reader to break his heart over the extinction of the wolverine and acquiesce in the death of a hundred million Chinamen in the same chapter."[71]

Similarly, critics also portrayed Rachel Carson as a biocentric "nature cultist." Comparing her to "faddists" of the past, a *Chemical Week* editorial, "Nature is For the Birds," argued:

> The organic farmers, antivivisectionists, and those opposed to fluoridation, chemical pesticides, blood transfusions, etc. *ad infinitum*, are a motley lot. They range from superstition-ridden illiterates to educated scientists, from

[70] Osmundsen, "Man Against Nature."
[71] Letter from Garrett Mattingly to Benny Hibbs, William Vogt Papers, DPL, CONS76, Box 1, Folder FF8.

> cultists to relatively reasonable men and women. Despite their diversity, they are bound together by belief in one extravagant fallacy: that 'Nature' is good, and that anything contrary to 'Nature' is bad…. In this fallacy Nature is seen as a state of primitive innocence—limpid pools of pure water, clear skies, abundant nuts and fruits waiting to be plucked. Overlooked are the unfriendly aspects of Nature—hurricanes, earthquakes, droughts, plagues, fleas, ticks, lice, and mites.[72]

Likewise, in a *Chemical & Engineering News* article, "Silence! Miss Carson," William J. Darby, head of Vanderbilt University's Department of Biochemistry, criticized Carson and categorized her followers as "organic gardeners, the antifluoride leaguers, the worshippers of 'natural foods' and those who cling to the philosophy of a vital principle, and other pseudo-scientists and faddists."[73] Other scientists and pesticide industry representatives echoed Darby's sentiment. P. Rothberg, president of the Montrose Chemical Corporation, a leading manufacturer of DDT, stated accusingly, "Miss Carson wrote not 'as a scientist but rather as a fanatic defender of the cult of the balance of nature.'"[74]

In addition to serious and rigorous denunciations of Carson, chemical companies and their advocates also employed proactive tactics and humorous responses to *Silent Spring*. Rather than constantly attacking Carson and her work, some trade organizations published pamphlets emphasizing the positive benefits of pesticides. For example, in August 1962, the National Agricultural Chemicals Association (NACA) distributed "Fact and Fancy: A Reference Checklist for Evaluating Information About Pesticides." Identifying themselves as the "responsible authority," the NACA suggested techniques for subtly challenging the popularity of

[72] "Nature is For the Birds," *Chemical Week*, July 28, 1962.
[73] William J. Darby, "Silence! Miss Carson," *Chemical & Engineering News* (November 5, 1962): 5-6.
[74] John M. Lee, "'Silent Spring' Is Now Noisy Summer," *New York Times*, July 22, 1962.

Silent Spring.[75] Similarly, Robert H. White-Stevens, the chemical industry representative best known for his appearance criticizing Carson on *CBS Reports*, also offered suggestions to the readers of *Agricultural Chemicals*. He encouraged his colleagues to "make [the benefits of scientific agriculture] clear in schools, in service clubs, in church meetings, and in the hundreds of other groups to which our people attach themselves."[76] In addition to informational publications, the Monsanto Chemical Company also circulated a parody of *Silent Spring*. Mimicking Carson's opening chapter, "A Fable for Tomorrow," in which Carson depicted a future world "silent, deserted by all living things," Monsanto macabrely warned about "The Desolate Year" in which, "bugs were everywhere . . . [even], inside man."[77] Hoping to tarnish Carson's findings, chemical companies and their trade organizations utilized a variety of tactics to invalidate her popularity.

Though the type and intensity of criticism varied, the underlying motive in discrediting Carson was not only to counter her calls for greater regulation of the chemical industry, but also to defuse her questioning of postwar abundance. Like other midcentury ecology writers, Carson challenged the postwar myth of optimism, affluence, and limitless progress. Portraying preservationists as alarmist, unprofessional, cultish, dangerous, and anti-progress, critics sought to disparage environmental writers as potentially un-American.



[75] National Agricultural Chemicals Association, "Fact and Fancy: A Reference Checklist for Evaluating Information About Pesticides," August 1962. L/C, Box 18A, Folder 78.
[76] White-Stevens, *Agricultural Chemicals*, 34.
[77] "The Desolate Year," *Monsanto Magazine*, October 1962.

In conclusion, in an effort to protect postwar ideals of abundance and affluence, scientists, commentators, and industry representatives vigorously attacked environmental writers. However, it is essential to note that not all midcentury Americans condemned environmental writers and their conclusions. Many citizens embraced preservationist and conservationist writing and legislation. For example, Linnie Marsh Wolfe won the 1946 Pulitzer Prize in Biography for *Son of the Wilderness: The Life of John Muir*.[78] An iconic preservationist who passionately opposed early twentieth century visions of progress such as Hetch Hetchy Dam, Muir's life and work enjoyed a midcentury renaissance. Nearly two decades later, in the midst of the controversy surrounding Carson's *Silent Spring*, the U.S. Postal Service even issued a commemorative stamp honoring the nation's foremost advocate of wilderness. At a dedication ceremony in Martinez, California, postmaster general John A. Gronouski echoed Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall's concern for the environment as he intoned, "I hope that in its way, the John Muir commemorative postage stamp will remind Americans of the 'quiet crisis;' that it will enlist their support of programs now underway; that it will remind them of the important task that lies ahead."[79] In the following year, *Time* magazine lionized Muir as "the real father of conservation."[80] Both the *Time* article and Gronouski's remarks reflected an appreciation of preservationist thinkers of the past, but also an acknowledgment of modern problems.

---

[78] Linnie Marsh Wolfe, *Son of the Wilderness: The Life of John Muir* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1945).
[79] *Society of Philatelic Americans*, vol. 27, no. 1 (September 1964): 3; John Muir Stamp Dedication Ceremony Program, April 29, 1964, http://www.sierraclub.org/john_muir_exhibit/stamps/dedication_program_1964.aspx , (accessed September 14, 2011).
[80] "The Land: The Flight from Folly," *Time*, vol. 86, no. 12, September 17, 1965.

In addition to honoring past preservation writers, many citizens and politicians embraced the conclusions of contemporary environmental authors and took action to address pollution, population growth, and other concerns. Though significantly weakened through the legislative process, the House and Senate overwhelmingly supported the Wilderness Act of 1964.[81] In fact, the Wilderness Act signified the belief, held by many Americans, that the nation could preserve natural areas *and* be a modern, growing, and technological country. Authorizing mining, the building dams, and power plants amongst nine million acres of protected land, the act exemplified how environmentalism and progress could coexist. A flurry of other preservation and multi-use legislation in the mid to late sixties signified the nation's willingness to embrace reform.[82] Likewise, in an effort begun years before, Congress banned DDT in the United States through passage of the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act in 1972. Though the act threatened timber and agricultural industries with potential loss of profit, most Americans thought the nation could afford the financial hiccup and applauded the measure. [83] In short, in the midst of a booming economy, many of the nation's lawmakers and voters embraced an emergent environmental ethic.

Despite the widespread support of midcentury conservationist and preservationist reform, many businessmen, columnists, and scientists rigorously criticized postwar environmental writers. A small, but vocal and influential minority,

---

[81] Kirkpatrick Sale, *The Green Revolution: The American Environmental Movement*, 1962-1992 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 15.
[82] Samuel P. Hays, *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 53. In addition, popularity of books such Roderick Frazier Nash's *Wilderness and the American Mind*, originally published in 1967, further exemplified the interest in and support of wilderness ideas and preservation.
[83] Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation, *Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act*, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., March 1971.

opponents of midcentury authors were significant in three regards. First, these critics signified the tenuousness of postwar calm and consensus. Critiques of Vogt, Carson, Ehrlich, and others not only reflected the fears and anxieties of the time, but they also offered a vehicle to defend and promote a postwar vision of America as affluent, dominant, and unassailable. As international tensions escalated from Moscow to Beijing to Havana and domestic unrest percolated on the streets of Montgomery, Los Angeles, and Newark, critics of environmental writers aimed to reassert a measure of control and postwar optimism. Identifying environmental writers as a tangible threat that could be eradicated easily and didactically, opponents vilified the authors as alarmist, anti-modern, and potentially un-American. In their attempt to bolster the postwar myth of a powerful and ever-prosperous America, commentators exhibited how arguments over resources, population, and pesticides were really about much broader issues of economic growth and national identity.

Secondly, opponents, though few in number, had a significant impact on the lives and careers of environmental writers. For example, by the end of 1949, Vogt resigned as chief of the Pan-American Union's Conservation Section, a position he held since 1943. Though he denied that statesmen and other Pan-American Union members forced him to relinquish his post, the scientific community remained convinced that the mounting criticism of *Road to Survival* and the increased attention on Vogt's birth control stance accelerated his ouster.[84] Likewise, following the publication of "Are Too Many Babies Being Born?," as Vogt submitted subsequent articles to the editors of the nation's leading periodicals, he encountered mounting resistance. Pitching "The Aid That Eats Itself," an article recommending that the U.S.

[84] "Vogt's Stand Costs Job," *Science News Letter* 56 (December 31, 1949): 424.

require pledges of conception control to accompany foreign aid, Vogt struggled and failed to find a venue. The senior editor of *Redbook Magazine*, Robert J. Levin, wrote to Vogt's literary agent at Curtis Brown, Ltd., "Mr. Vogt's suggested article would not be appropriate for Redbook, ever apart from the fact that his point of view leads him to very dangerous conclusions."[85] Vogt's representative at Curtis Brown, Ltd., Edith Haggard, summed exasperatedly, "I don't know where else to send it when POST, LIFE, LOOK, NATION'S BUSINESS, and THE READER'S DIGEST have declined."[86] By the summer of 1962, many readers and editors found Vogt's views on voluntary population control, foreign aid, and ecological balance potentially dangerous. Though Vogt continued to research, write, and lecture about conservation methods and population pressure, opponents effectively limited his public presence.

Finally, the midcentury critics established an ideological precedent and anti-environmental vocabulary. Just as opponents utilized interchangeable arguments to vilify authors as distinct as Fairfield Osborn, William Vogt, Rachel Carson, and Murray Bookchin, critics of environmentalism continued to redeploy the same arguments against green politicians and environmental activists over the next half century. Portraying preservationists, conservationists, and eventually all environmentalists as alarmist, elitist, irresponsible, and un-American, critics cultivated a malleable anti-environmental ideology. In addition, just as commentators in the postwar period used their critique of ecology writings to advance their vision for a

[85] Letter from Robert J. Levin to Mrs. Sewell Haggard, William Vogt Papers, DPL, CONS76, Box 1, Folder FF31.
[86] Letter from Edith Haggard to William Vogt, William Vogt Papers, DPL, CONS76, Box 1, Folder FF31.

prosperous and powerful nation of consumers, future critics of environmentalism employed similar rhetoric to promote their economic and political agendas.

In short, often heralded as an era of unquestioned consensus and confidence, the postwar period had visible signs of fracture and dissent. In an effort to protect and preserve a myth of abundance, optimism, and technological supremacy, critics lambasted generally popular and positively reviewed books such as *Our Plundered Planet*, *Silent Spring*, and *The Population Bomb*. Though their critiques were ostensibly about the authors' qualifications and scientific conclusions, opponents of environmental writers were also steadfastly trying to bolster a postwar vision of America as affluent and invincible.

CHAPTER 2 – Critics of Earth Day, 1970

At its seventy-ninth annual convention in Washington, D.C., in April 1970, the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) declared the environmental movement and its banner event, Earth Day, "one of the subversive element's last steps." Citing the suspicious coincidence that the inaugural Earth Day fell on the same day (April 22, 1970) as the one hundredth anniversary of Vladimir Lenin's birth, the DAR claimed that "pollution of the mind" remained the nation's greatest threat. Worried that environmental education was a subterfuge for communist subversion, DAR delegates voted to boycott Earth Day.[1]

Though millions of Americans across the political and generational spectrum participated in and embraced the first Earth Day, voices of dissent warned that the event represented a dangerous, radical, and ultimately, un-American new movement. Like Rachel Carson's landmark publication, the inaugural "ecology teach-in" served as a watershed moment of definition and intensification of charges against environmentalists. Reflecting the political, cultural, and social changes of the era, critics targeted environmental activists and their fellow travelers as another harbinger of revolution and a threat to peace and prosperity. Applauding the DAR delegates, many citizens sought to protect and perpetuate a postwar vision of America as industrially powerful, proudly affluent, and staunchly anti-communist. By 1970, as international and domestic unrest threatened hopes for a return of calm and consensus, commentators used Earth Day and the surrounding series of events to reassert a vision of postwar order.

[1] Margaret Crimmins, *Washington Post*, April 23, 1970.

This chapter will examine critiques of the first Earth Day. Arguing that criticisms of the inaugural environmental teach-in reflected contemporary fears of student protest, civil unrest, and subversive behavior rather than an innate aversion to environmental reform, I analyze reception of Earth Day in the volatile political and cultural climate of early 1970. Worried that eco-activism was another installment in a litany of late 1960s critiques of U.S. policies and American affluence, opponents strove to denigrate the event as less-than-wholesome and potentially dangerous. In particular, critics cited four frightening themes underlying the celebration of Earth Week: the threat of communist subversion, the menace of radical-inspired violence, the growth of anti-industrial sentiment, and the revival of pagan beliefs. The fact that the day's activities included hundreds of housewives and thousands of school-age children did not mollify the critics' fears, but rather *increased* the sense of imminent danger to the American way-of-life.

In addition to critiques from politically conservative critics such as the DAR representatives and business and industry advocates, by the early 1970s, environmentalists also attracted criticism from social reformers and left-leaning crusaders. Recognizing the late 1960s and early 1970s as a moment of tremendous promise, many activists and reformers hoped to advance their visions for a more just and equitable society. As they argued that environmentalism distracted funds and energy from other causes such as civil rights, the antiwar movement, and the war against poverty, New Left activists and others leveled charges of elitism and biocentrism against environmentalists and their agenda.

As the hope of political revolution and economic transformation swept across Latin America, roiled throughout Europe, and swirled around Asia, politicians, citizens, and other civic leaders in the United States debated the direction of America's future. With the attendant revolution in communications and transportation, news of upheaval in Los Angeles, London, and Rome, student protests in Paris, Munich, and Tokyo, and images of liberation movements in Santiago and Havana circulated around the globe.[2] As such, social reformers in the United States desired to capitalize on this moment of potential while defenders of the status quo aimed to inoculate Americans from the spreading contagion of unrest. Thus, appearing in the midst of a volatile era, Earth Day attracted the ire of a diverse set of commentators. The nationwide environmental teach-in ultimately served as an arena for debating the contested outcome of a tumultuous period.

In short, in the years surrounding the initial Earth Day, new critics and new arguments augmented a growing anti-environmental rhetoric. Although relatively few in number, Earth Day's critics not only signified an enduring pattern of paranoia in American political life, but also advanced a model for future arguments against environmentalists and the environmental movement. As with criticisms of ecology writers such as Fairfield Osborn, Rachel Carson, and Paul Ehrlich, critiques of Earth Day organizers and participants engaged broader issues over the political, economic, and social direction of the nation.



[2] Tulio Halperín Donghi, *The Contemporary History of Latin America* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 300.

Emerging out of an atmosphere of vibrant student activism as well as a growing awareness of environmental degradation, Earth Day embodied the late 1960s political and cultural milieu.[3] As books such as Carson's *Silent Spring* and Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb* brought more attention to ecological concerns such as bioaccumulation of synthetic pesticides and overpopulation, images of events such as the Santa Barbara oil spill and the "burning" of the Cuyahoga River in 1969 further dramatized a growing environmental crisis.[4] While on a trip to California following the off-shore oil spill, Wisconsin senator Gaylord Nelson recognized the need for more dialogue on environmental concerns. Wanting to "get everyone involved," Nelson thought, "Why not have an environmental teach-in?"[5]

By the summer of 1969, the senator was fundraising and organizing for the first Earth Day. In an effort to promote a nonpartisan event, Nelson asked Republican congressman Paul "Pete" McCloskey to co-sponsor the event. With donations from environmental organizations such as the Conservation Foundation and contributions from labor union leaders such as United Auto Workers president Walter Reuther and AFL-CIO president George Meany, Nelson established an organization devoted to planning and publicizing the nation's first environmental teach-in. Tapping Harvard University graduate student and former Stanford University student body president, Denis Hayes to coordinate Earth Day activities through the newly formed nonprofit organization, Environmental Teach-In, Inc., Nelson and McCloskey hoped to inspire a

[3] Kirkpatrick Sale, *The Green Revolution: The American Environmental Movement, 1962-1992* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 11.
[4] Philip Shabecoff, *A Fierce Green Fire: The American Environmental Movement* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2003), 103.
[5] Bill Christofferson, *The Man From Clear Lake: Earth Day Founder Senator Gaylord Nelson* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), 302.

respectable, well-organized, and well-attended event.[6] Originally from Camas, Washington, the son of a paper-mill worker, Hayes fused his concern for environmental issues with his leadership experience and education. In a speech at the Sylvan Theater in Washington, D.C., Hayes summed:

> We are building a movement, a movement with a broad base, a movement which transcends traditional political boundaries. It is a movement that values people more than technology, people more than political boundaries and political ideologies, people more than profit. It will be a difficult fight. Earth Day is the beginning.[7]

Through phone calls, pamphlets, and media interviews, Hayes and other Earth Day organizers aimed to publicize the upcoming teach-in and increase awareness of local, national, and global environmental problems.

Newspaper and television reporters provided widespread coverage leading up to and following Earth Week. In addition to broadcasting schedules of events, media outlets also showcased specific environmental crises to emphasize the timeliness of the teach-in. Features on everyday air, noise, and water pollution supplemented exposés on population growth, oil spills, and nuclear testing. As they offered profiles on national, regional, and local Earth Day leaders, reporters and editors emphasized the behind-the-scenes planning and organization efforts. Showing a generally youth-led and youthful event, articles, photographs, and news reports of Earth Day acknowledged the role of students and often highlighted the peacefulness and predictability of the day's events.[8]

---

[6] Christofferson, *The Man From Clear Lake*, 300-305.
[7] Bill McKibben, ed., *American Earth: Environmental Writing Since Thoreau* (New York: Library of America, 2008), 480-483.
[8] "Young and Old Labor to Make Parts of City Gleam in Earth Day Prelude," *New York Times*, April 19, 1970; Gladwin Hill, "Nation Set to Observe Earth Day," *New York Times*, April 21, 1970; Fred Ferretti, "Broadcasters Give Earth Day Special Attention," *New York Times*, April 22, 1970; "Concerned Nation Focuses Its Attention of Earth Day Activities," *Ada (OK) Evening News*, April 22,

With collegians' schedules in mind, Nelson and the other organizers chose April 22, 1970, for the inaugural Earth Day. Falling in the middle of the week, in between spring break and finals, coordinators were hopeful that the date would assure maximum participation on campuses nationwide. On the designated day, across the United States, nearly twenty million elementary, high school, and college students as well as citizens of all ages participated in neighborhood cleanups, pledged to walk rather than drive, attended concerts and speeches, engaged in eco-theater, and petitioned for expanded recycling programs.[9] For example, twenty thousand people assembled in Philadelphia's Fairmount Park to hear speakers and talk about environmental concerns. Participants held signs and children wore t-shirts with eco-slogans such as "Let Me Grow Up."[10] In New York City, Mayor John Lindsay closed Fifth Avenue and encouraged city residents to walk or use mass transit. Together with the cast of the musical *Hair*, composer Leonard Bernstein, and actors Paul Newman and Dustin Hoffman, Mayor Lindsay hosted the nation's largest Earth Day celebration.[11]

Elsewhere in the nation, citizens engaged in similar festivities on a smaller scale. Tulane University students in New Orleans staged acts of eco-theater. After declaring the oil industry the "polluter of the month," activists squirted oil out of water

---

1970; Joseph Lelyveld, "Million Join Earth Day Observances Across the Nation," *New York Times*, April 23, 1970; "Earth Day Unity Rare in Protest Age," *Albuquerque (NM) Journal*, April 23, 1970.

[9] For more on Earth Day activities, see: Christofferson, *The Man From Clear Lake*, 302-312; Adam Rome, "'Give Earth a Chance': The Environmental Movement and the Sixties," *Journal of American History* 90, no. 2 (Sept. 2003): 525-554; Shabecoff, *A Fierce Green Fire*, 105-112.

[10] AP/Wide World Photo, appeared in numerous newspapers throughout the nation on April 22 & 23, 1970.

[11] David Bird, "City Announces Earth Day Plan," *New York Times*, April 17, 1970; Gladwin Hill, "Earth Day Goals Backed by Hickel," *New York Times*, April 22, 1970.

pistols onto a fellow protestor clad in all-white attire.[12] Participants in Chicago demonstrated a popular and oft-repeated scene. Donning World War II-era gas masks, activists at Civic Center Plaza silently protested pollution. In addition to summoning area high school and college students, organizers encouraged "every lawyer, secretary, and Loop worker" to join the teach-in at the Plaza.[13] Residents in smaller towns throughout the country participated in similar celebrations. For example, Earth Day leaders at Cameron College in Lawton, Oklahoma, offered a full day of activities including, "folk singers, poetry readers . . . and a slide-show on local eye-sores." Lawton's city planner, Joe Crain, concluded the day's ceremonies with a speech on local and regional issues.[14] In short, throughout the nation, citizens participated in a variety of Earth Day activities. Though the events varied in type from mock funerals for humanity to slide shows of "local eye-sores," millions of Americans engaged in and enthusiastically supported the nation's first environmental teach-in.[15]

Despite widespread support of the inaugural Earth Day, many Americans criticized the event and warned that eco-activism portended continued threats to the American way of life and future greatness. In particular, critics worried that the environmental teach-in and other similar events signified an entrée to socialism or communist infiltration of the United States. While the heyday of communist witch-hunting passed with the discrediting of Senator Joseph McCarthy in the mid-1950s, many Americans still considered communist subversion a realistic threat to U.S.

[12] AP/World Wide Photo, *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, April 23, 1970.
[13] Casey Burko, "Today's Earth Day Programs Will Focus on Our Deadly Peril," *Chicago Tribune*, April 22, 1970; "Thousands of Students Join Campaign to Save the Earth," *Chicago Tribune*, April 23, 1970.
[14] *Lawton (OK) Constitution*, April 21-22, 1970.
[15] James Ayres, "Nation Protests Pollution Growth," *Boston Globe*, April 22, 1970.

security and the American lifestyle. As the nation's political and military leaders struggled to contain communism in Southeast Asia, many citizens remained fearful amidst a simmering Cold War. In addition, closer to home, the spread of socialism in Latin America worried other Americans. As Marxist Salvador Allende won popular support in Chile and Cuba's Fidel Castro predicted unprecedented economic productivity such as a ten million ton sugar harvest in 1970, neighbors to the north grew increasingly anxious about the growing power and presence of socialism in the western hemisphere.[16]

It was in this political and cultural milieu that the Daughters of the American Revolution pondered the purpose of the nation's first Earth Day. Fearful that the use of Lenin's birthday signified a celebration if not a call to arms for latent communists, the representatives urged vigilance. Not limiting their concern to a mere coincidence of dates, the alarmed delegates of the DAR Continental Congress surmised that the environmentalists' legislative agenda "may be the vehicle through which the government will assert vast new powers over our personal habits and create added controls over the individual."[17] Warning that Earth Day proponents sought to "undermine constitutional privileges," the DAR's "Total Environment" resolution urged the "federal government to refrain from adopting unnecessary and harmful control programs which the nation would later regret." In addition to motions supporting the space program and voluntary prayer in school, the attendees condemned the recently formed Council on Environmental Quality. Though some DAR delegates opposed the Earth Day resolution, the majority of the two thousand

[16] Halperín Donghi, *The Contemporary History of Latin America*, 301-307, 333-337.
[17] *Redlands (CA) Daily Facts*, April 23, 1970.

representatives supported the measure and proudly defended the DAR's stance in both the national media and their hometown papers.[18]

Not alone in its fears of Earth Day's communist links, the DAR joined a growing cadre of concerned citizens. Throughout the nation, anxious readers submitted letters to the editors of their local papers. For example, L. Ostendorf of Fayetteville, Arkansas, wrote to the *Northwest Arkansas Times* that "the same people who had been so involved in past leftish activities were too prominent again." The letter writer went on to reassert the views of a local politician who alleged that "the environmental binge . . . 'may have roots behind the Iron Curtain.'"[19] Likewise, contributors to the *Albuquerque Tribune's* "Public Forum" echoed Ostendorf's sentiment. Writer and "cowboy poet," S. Omar Barker of Las Vegas argued, "We will be lucky if the demonstration does not spark some destructive violence and rioting in line with the Lenin Plan for the ultimate undermining of our free Republic."[20] Many editorial boards reiterated readers' concerns. In an *Omaha World-Herald* opinion piece, the staff surmised, "There are many who would like to make the popularity of ecological interest a vehicle for the advancement of The Revolution." Ultimately, the editorial hoped "that the movement for a cleaner America does not become a Trojan horse for advocates of political pollution."[21]

In addition, many critics condemned *The Environmental Handbook*, a companion guide to the "First National Environmental Teach-In."[22] Published by

---

[18] Margaret Crimmins, *Washington Post*, April 23, 1970.
[19] L. Ostendorf, letter to the editor, *Northwest Arkansas Times (Fayetteville)*, April 29, 1970.
[20] S. Omar Barker, "Tribune Public Forum: Let's Observe Lenin's Birthday in Reverse," *Albuquerque (NM) Tribune*, April 14, 1970.
[21] "The Great Ed Muskie Earth Day Scare," Editorial, *Omaha World-Herald*, April 23, 1971.
[22] Garrett de Bell, editor, *The Environmental Handbook* (New York: Ballantine, 1970).

David Brower's Friends of the Earth organization, the book offered information on contemporary ecological issues and served as a guide and discussion prompt for Earth Day facilitators. Sold for ninety-five cents, the handbook included essays, poems, suggestions for activities, checklists for teach-in events, as well as bibliographies and addresses for additional material. The last pages contained tear-out membership applications for eco-organizations such as Zero Population Growth and anti-pollution petitions addressed to President Richard M. Nixon.

Critics contended that the eclectic collection of writings by students, scientists, and activists provided a recipe for subversion. For example, Virginia Parmelee of Pasadena, California, argued that portions of the "special textbook" were "taken straight out of the Communist Manifesto" and warned that "now the Marxist-Leninist-Pavlovian apparatus was ready to be utilized in a gigantic demonstration of their power."[23] Numerous other letters from throughout the United States echoed Ms. Parmelee's concern.[24]

Local governments and state politicians shared similar anxieties about the origins and objectives of Earth Day. Colorado's Republican senator, Gordon Allott warned of the "hidden policies" of environmentalists and urged his colleagues to be wary of environmental teach-ins which could be turned into "a nationwide drive to try to destroy the present system of government."[25] Suspicious of the links between environmentalism and communism, the Los Angeles city council reluctantly backed Earth Day at first, but ultimately ordered the library system and department of parks

[23] Virginia V. Parmelee, letter to the editor, *Star News* (Pasadena, CA), April 23, 1970.
[24] See for example, S. Omar Barker, letter to the editor, *Albuquerque (NM) Tribune*, April 14, 1970; Marshall Steele, letter to the editor, *Hutchinson (KS) News*, April 1, 1970; Gene Madsen, letter to the editor, *Waterloo (IA) Daily Courier*, April 21, 1970.
[25] Paul Scott, *Lebanon (PA) Daily News*, March 18, 1970.

and recreation to scrap their Earth Day programs.[26] In short, throughout the nation, in small towns as well as large cities, critics questioned the motives and meanings of Earth Day. Fearing that the seemingly innocuous campaign to eradicate litter and expand recycling concealed a more sinister agenda, newspaper editors, politicians, and average citizens urged restraint in the spring of 1970.

At the federal level, when pressed to justify FBI surveillance of Senator Edmund Muskie's Earth Day speech in Washington, D.C., bureau memoranda cited the presence of suspected Communist Party members such as columnist I.F. Stone and folksinger Pete Seeger.[27] The official report portrayed some Earth Day speakers as alleged or former communists. In memos to the deputy attorney general, bureau director J. Edgar Hoover further explained, "that on March 23, 1970, the Bureau received a request from a representative of the White House for information regarding the extent of radical involvement in the ecology and environmental movement."[28]

Despite President Nixon's televised signing of environmental legislation such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in January 1970, the administration remained distrustful of grassroots environmental activism and fearful of a popular Democratic challenger. Winning his 1946 congressional seat on an anticommunist campaign and famously leading the House Un-American Activities Committee during the Alger Hiss trials in 1948, Nixon had deep and indelible experiences with red baiting and anticommunist tactics. Identifying Muskie as a likely opponent in the

---

[26] *Los Angeles Times*, April 21, 1970; *Redlands (CA) Daily Facts*, April 23, 1970; *Valley News* (Van Nuys, CA), April 21, 1970.
[27] Memorandum, From C.D. Brennan to W.C. Sullivan, "Criticism of the FBI by Senator Edmund S. Muskie," April 16, 1971, Series 1 Box 33 Folder 4, Edmund S. Muskie papers, Edmund S. Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library, Bates College (hereafter cited as ESM).
[28] Memorandum, From Director, FBI to The Deputy Attorney General, "Criticism of the FBI by Senator Edmund S. Muskie," April 15, 1971, Series 1 Box 33 Folder 4, ESM.

1972 presidential election, Nixon and his advisors may have sought to malign the environmentalist candidate by casting aspersions on Earth Day. Viewed in context with other electioneering tactics such as the infamous "Canuck Letter," in which Nixon campaign coordinators allegedly paid a Florida resident to bait Muskie into denigrating French-Americans, the targeting of Earth Day for surveillance emerged as another "dirty trick" by Nixon's Committee for the Re-election of the President.[29]

Many citizens applauded the administration's suspicions of Earth Day and scolded Muskie's defense of the event. The senator from Maine received numerous letters lecturing on the consequences of associating with communists. For example, one constituent pontificated, "Surely you must know that Earth Day meetings are the very type of public gatherings that the Communists and other corrupt individuals and organizations try to infiltrate and use to their own advantage."[30] Another note speculated disapprovingly, "So you have cast your lot with the Communists, and all the other extremist organizations."[31] Though Muskie received numerous letters applauding his environmental record and his participation in Earth Day, other correspondence condemned his association with the event.

Several citizens expressed their fears directly to Hoover. In addition to supporting the director's surveillance of Earth Day and the FBI's ongoing effort to suppress communism, many writers worried about Muskie's patriotism. In a letter to the director, one "Truck Driver," queried about the FBI's plan to fight communism.

---

[29] For more detail on Edmund Muskie and his campaign for the 1972 presidential election against Richard Nixon see: Theo Lippman, Jr. and Donald C. Hansen, *Muskie* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1971); Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, *All the President's Men*, 2nd ed. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994).
[30] Letter to Edmund Muskie, April 23, 1971, Series 1, Box 33, Folder 5, ESM.
[31] Letter to Edmund Muskie, April 23, 1971, Series 1, Box 33, Folder 4, ESM.

After expressing concerns about the potential rise of a socialist government in the United States, the letter writer asked, "Did Muskie have to get an O.K. from Moscow to run for President? . . . We want no dirty Socialist Party in our elections . . ."[32] Another citizen warned Hoover at the outset of the letter, "Maybe I should [have] waited until I cooled off before writing," and proceeded to passionately condemn Muskie's actions and associations. The critic urged Hoover and fellow Americans to address the senator's missteps, "The Fabian Socialists of the New England states are bent on changing the image of America, and for some reason the American people are slow to give political battle against them."[33] Building on a legacy of anticommunist sentiment and reacting to contemporary advances in socialist regimes, many Americans supported the FBI's surveillance of Muskie and other Earth Day participants.

Radio commentator, Melvin Munn of Dallas, Texas, echoed many citizen concerns in his September 18, 1970, program. Titling the episode, "How to Destroy a Nation & Communist Aim: Victory," Munn not only repeated evangelist Billy Graham's list of twenty-two threats to the American way of life, but also alluded to Muskie's participation in suspicious events such as Earth Day. He implored his listeners, "It is time we took a good, hard look at ourselves as a nation and take warning, lest we allow the forces of communism and perdition to destroy this nation which took many years and great effort to build." Munn concluded his address, "The danger from within is even greater than the danger from without."[34] Thus, though over a decade had passed since the Army-McCarthy hearings discredited McCarthy

[32] Letter to J. Edgar Hoover, March 30, 1971, Series 1, Box 33, Folder 4, ESM.
[33] Letter to J. Edgar Hoover, April 20, 1971, Series 1, Box 33, Folder 5, ESM.
[34] Radio Transcript, Melvin Munn, "Life Line Freedom Talk," Series 1, Box 33, Folder 5, ESM.

and scuttled the anticommunist movement, citizens continued to passionately fear a red menace. Munn, Graham, and the many letter writers exhibited the enduring presence of McCarthyism.

From concerned citizens in small towns to meetings of the DAR in Constitution Hall to the offices of the president and the director of the FBI, a pervasive undercurrent of suspicion linked Earth Day to communist infiltration. Arguing that legislation spawned out of the U.S.'s first environmental teach-in could lead to a redistribution of wealth or total government control of the means of production, critics demanded heightened vigilance. Though possibly an electioneering tactic by Nixon's team, the decision to recommend FBI surveillance of Muskie's speeches and other Earth Day activities nonetheless reflected a willingness to equate environmental activists with communists. In an era not that far removed from the rabid anticommunism of Joseph McCarthy, the threatening success of socialist leaders in Latin America and the failure to contain communism in Southeast Asia resurrected fears of infiltration and subversion at home.

Related to the fear of communist subversion, the threat of radical-inspired violence at Earth Day rallies worried some citizens and politicians. Costly and bloody activism filled the years leading up to the inaugural environmental teach-in. Throughout the nation, repeated incidents of combative protest shattered the mirage of postwar calm and consensus. Official studies such as the Kerner Commission Report (1968) confirmed fears and identified persistent links between poverty, racism, and violent protest. Further questioning the myth of widespread abundance and affluence, the report highlighted the rampant economic inequalities throughout the United

States.[35] As the 1960s progressed, activists intensified their tactics as they demanded redress of endemic social and economic injustice. Most notably, civil rights activists moved away from the conciliatory ideology of Martin Luther King Jr. and toward a more militant Black Power activism in the late 1960s. Calling for a radical restructuring of the nation's economic and political system, African-American leaders such as Stokely Carmichael and Black Panther founders Huey Newton and Bobby Seale advocated self-defense and rebelliousness. By the end of the decade, Americans and citizens of the world witnessed the new tone of defiance as sprinters Tommie Smith and John Carlos raised their fists in a Black Power salute on the medal stand of the 1968 Mexico City Olympics.[36]

As war continued to escalate in Vietnam and as federal measures such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Lyndon Johnson's Great Society failed to ensure full equality at home, other minority groups also encouraged a more militant and radical reform program. Celebrating a surge of Red Power, Native Americans, organized as "Indians of All Tribes," occupied Alcatraz in 1969. In addition to demanding acknowledgment of past injustices, Native American activists also pressed for immediate attention to contemporary inequalities.[37] Likewise, using the Black Panthers as a template, Chicano activists assembled the Brown Berets in 1969. Like

---

[35] U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, *Employment and Manpower Problems in the Cities: Implications of the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968.

[36] For more detail on the social and cultural changes of the 1960s, see: Terry H. Anderson, *The Movement and The Sixties: Protest in America from Greensboro to Wounded Knee* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Alexander Bloom and Wini Breines, eds., *"Takin' It to The Streets:" A Sixties Reader*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*, Rev. ed. (New York: Bantam, 1993); Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[37] Alvin Josephy, Joane Nagel, and Troy Johnson, eds., *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*, 2nd ed. (Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, 1999); Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee* (New York: The New Press, 1997).

the Panthers, the Berets aimed to challenge the political, cultural, and economic status quo. Similarly, starting in New York City, Puerto Rican leaders formed the Young Lords to promote ethnic pride and assert greater rights. Though focusing on sanitation and health issues specific to their East Harlem neighborhoods, the Young Lords shared a common mission and sense of militancy with the Black Panthers, Brown Berets, and other rights activists.[38]

Though occupation of an abandoned island and raised fists instilled significant unease among many Americans, the continued flare up of violent riots further increased the fear of radical and contagious unrest. The riots in the summer of 1967 seemed an unprecedented anomaly, involving over twenty cities and forcing President Johnson to summon the National Guard and U.S. Army to restore order. In Detroit, clashes between black protestors and policemen resulted in forty-three deaths and fifty million dollars in property damage. Following the heated strife of '67, each successive summer seemed to welcome a new season of unrest. In August 1968, anti-war activists, "Yippies," and police turned the streets of Chicago into another battlefield. Likewise, bloody violence inaugurated the summer of 1969 as well when police raided Greenwich Village's Stonewall Inn. In contrast to many previous raids on gay bars, patrons fought back, leading to several nights of confrontation and further mobilization. Thus, as 1970 dawned, many Americans feared that protests and other forms of assembly, especially of young people, almost certainly led to violence.[39]

---

[38] Ernesto B. Vigil, *The Crusade for Justice: Chicano Militancy and the Government's War on Dissent* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999).
[39] David Carter, *Stonewall: The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2010); Eric Marcus, *Making Gay History: The Half-Century Fight for Lesbian and Gay Equal Rights* (New York: Harper Paperbacks, 2002).

With images and memories of late-sixties' anti-war protests and civil rights activism still vivid, critics of the new environmental movement feared renewed student activism and militancy. Elected on promises to restore "law and order," President Nixon distanced himself from Earth Day activities. The aforementioned FBI surveillance of Earth Day speeches not only targeted potential communist subversion, but also reflected an intense fear of "militant activities" by "extremist organizations" – two phrases appearing repeatedly both in Hoover's correspondence with the deputy attorney general and in internal bureau memoranda. Bureau agents cited recent violent and costly demonstrations in Washington, D.C., to justify surveillance of Earth Day. For example, analysts itemized the toll of a November 15, 1969, antiwar event to highlight the radical and violent potential of Earth Day. In addition to cataloguing the arrest of "175 individuals" and the "breakage of 17 windows in the Justice Department," the report on "these demonstrations" included:

> Damage to private buildings - $240,000
> Damage to Government-owned or leased buildings - $7,930
> Damage to U.S. parks - $12,000
> Damage to law enforcement facilities - $6,200
> Cost of removing debris - $8,500
> Overtime pay for police – About $500,000
> Expense in deploying Federal troops – About $1,000,000[40]

Though Earth Day promoters promised a peaceful, family-friendly event, FBI agents and other government officials viewed the event in the context of recent violent protests.

Even after Earth Day activities concluded without incidence of violence, some Americans still associated the event with militant potential. In dozens of letters

[40] Internal FBI Memorandum to C.D. Brennan, "Criticism of the FBI by Senator Edmund S. Muskie," April 15, 1971, Series 1 Box 33 Folder 4, ESM.

condemning Muskie's participation in Earth Day and his criticism of the FBI, critics questioned the senator's patriotism as well as his commitment to peaceful demonstrations. For example, one letter castigated, "Common sense would certainly lead one to believe the FBI, the Secret Service Men and the local Police would be on hand to prevent the bombing and destruction of any of our Government buildings during an Earth Day Rally."[41] Not a lone voice of dissent, dozens of other fiery letters filled Muskie's FBI dossier. Another citizen began his correspondence with Muskie, "Apparently you can't stand the heat! You don't like being publicly associated with the assorted creeps who engineer anti war demonstrations, earthdays, etc. [sic] . . . You are bound to be scrutinized if you persist in giving comfort by your participation in weirdo activities."[42]

Though mostly supportive of the environmental teach-in, newspaper coverage of Earth Day also contributed to the association of environmentalism with radicalism and potential militancy. One front-page *New York Times* article discussing upcoming environmental activism began, "As winter relaxes its grip on the nation's campuses, rebellion is in the air once more."[43] Similarly, *Fortune* magazine's feature, "Conservationists at the Barricades," depicted the tone of the new movement as "[n]oisy, militant, litigious, [and] growing in strength and numbers."[44]

Though attempting to provide a more personal angle to environmentalists, media descriptions of individual activists also inadvertently contributed to the aura of militancy. While numerous profiles of Denis Hayes, the national coordinator of Earth

[41] Name redacted, letter to Senator Edmund Muskie (cc: J. Edgar Hoover), May 3, 1971, Series 1 Box 33 Folder 5, ESM.
[42] Letter to Edmund Muskie, April 15, 1971, Series 1, Box 33, Folder 4, ESM.
[43] William K. Stevens, *New York Times*, March 9, 1970.
[44] Jeremy Main, "Conservationists at the Barricades," *Fortune*, February 1970, 144.

Day, emphasized his educational background, calm demeanor, and relatively short haircut (and no beard!), the articles often ran under headlines such as "Angry Coordinator of Earth Day."[45] Similarly, "Portrait of a Young Radical" which profiled Barbara Reid, the Midwest regional coordinator of Earth Day, began, "[She] was in her radical uniform – jeans, NATO jacket, sockless feet in low boots, imitation Vietnam jungle hat . . . ." While the article noted that Reid "has never been arrested" and up "until two years ago was indistinguishable from other well dressed and well mannered young ladies," both the headline and first few lines presented a vivid image of a young, radical woman.[46]

Classifying Earth Day as radical, militant, or just plain "weirdo," critics aimed to challenge the mainstream appeal of the ecological awareness activities. Thus, while many social and environmental activists criticized Earth Day as not militant enough, others believed that the teach-in laid the foundation for renewed violence. Fearing militancy on par with or even greater than the previous decade's demonstrations, these critics applauded Hoover's surveillance of Earth Day and encouraged greater police presence at future "ecology events."

Commentators who portrayed Earth Day as radical or dangerous also argued that environmentalists desired to return the United States to a "primitive" culture. Viewing environmentalism as a critique of American affluence, critics warned that Earth Day promoted an anti-industry, anti-growth, anti-technology, and anti-progress agenda. Despite the fact that many Earth Day speakers such as Senator Muskie argued that environmentalism and economic growth were not mutually exclusive,

[45] "Angry Coordinator of Earth Day," *New York Times*, April 23, 1970.
[46] George C. Wilson, "Portrait of a Young Radical," *Capital Times* (Madison, WI), April 28, 1970.

critics feared that environmentalists sought to impede the growth of the American economy. While many leaders of industry eagerly participated in Earth Day programs, other businessmen and citizens expressed varying levels of displeasure. Some businesses merely worried about the loss of profits on the actual teach-in day due to street closures and an abundance of scheduled activities. Others, such as Consolidated Edison of New York feared that its employees would be likely targets of environmental outrage and anger and repeatedly requested police protection and government intervention.[47]

Broader critiques looked beyond the dollars-and-cents impact of one day of lost business and instead ruminated on the long-term financial implications of Earth Day. Throughout the nation, letters to the editor expressed anger and fear that Earth Day portended dangerous stagnation of the American economy and subsequent loss of jobs. In reaction to planned activities at the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, one writer, Joe Vogler, not only wrote multiple letters to the *Daily News-Miner*, but also placed ads in the paper protesting upcoming events. One of Vogler's ads read, "Every unemployed person attend Earth Day, April 22nd, 1970, University of Alaska to learn why you are unemployed and to celebrate the 100th birthday anniversary of the Father of Communism – Lenin."[48] Though several letters to the editor and editorials condemned Vogler's critique of Earth Day, numerous other writers expressed unwavering support for his message.

---

[47] David Bird, "Traffic Ban on Two City Streets Set in April 22 Pollution Protest," *New York Times*, March 19, 1970; "Con Ed Worried About 'Earth Day,'" *New York Times*, March 27, 1970; "City Announces Earth Day Plan," *New York Times*, April 17, 1970.
[48] *Fairbanks Daily News-Miner*, April 20, 1970.

In addition to complaints from average citizens, economists and other public intellectuals also protested the alleged anti-growth and anti-technology intentions of the new environmental movement. In her essay, "Environmentalism: The Anti-Industrial Revolution," novelist and philosopher Ayn Rand sought to reveal the "real" motive behind the anti-pollution campaign, "Make no mistake about it: it is *technology* and *progress* that the nature-lovers are out to destroy." Rand, like many other critics of Earth Day, viewed environmentalism as a threat to free enterprise and economic innovation. Arguing that conservationists irresponsibly desired to return the United States to a mythic pre-industrial, pre-agrarian state, Rand and others portrayed ecology enthusiasts as both modern-day Luddites and misguided utopians.[49]

Rand's essay also expressed another strand of argument against environmentalists' alleged anti-modern inclinations. As she charged Earth Day advocates of advancing an anti-growth and anti-industrial agenda, Rand and others also warned of the threat of a biocentric worldview and a return to paganism. Arguing that "today, you are asked to sacrifice for the sake of seaweeds and inanimate matter," Rand revealed the "hidden agenda" of environmentalists and elucidated the danger of making nature sacrosanct. With her characteristic novelist flair, she depicted "ecological crusaders" as those who "crawl on their bellies in homage to the reptiles of the marshlands, whom they protect from the encroachments of human airfields."[50] In the weeks surrounding Earth Day, industry executives echoed Rand's critique of biocentrism. For example, Glenn Kimble, a Union Camp papermill senior manager, addressed environmentalists' biocentric "hysteria." He remarked:

[49] Ayn Rand, "Environmentalism: The Anti-Industrial Revolution," (Marina del Rey, CA: The Ayn Rand Institute, 1970), 4.
[50] Rand, "Environmentalism: The Anti-Industrial Revolution," 6, 10.

> People get extremely emotional about losing a species. But animals have been dying out every year clear back to the dinosaurs, and in most cases man had nothing to do with it. For that matter, it probably won't hurt mankind a whole hell of a lot in the long run if the whooping crane doesn't quite make it.[51]

Worried about both the economic and social implications of elevating non-human species above people, Rand and others argued that embracing biocentrism threatened to unravel the United States infrastructure and invite anarchy.

Other critics feared that biocentrism signaled the abandonment of America's Judeo-Christian foundation for twentieth-century nature worship. In their preview of Earth Day, the *Christianity Today* editorial staff proclaimed, "We too want to clean up pollution in nature, but not by polluting men's souls with a revived paganism." Citing several quotes from *The Environmental Handbook*, these critics worried that Earth Day's proponents sought to replace Christianity with "what is essentially old-fashioned paganism."[52] In addition, throughout the nation, small-town newspapers published letters and editorial columns expressing similar concerns of nature worship. In one slightly serious, slightly joking opinion piece, columnist Don Maclean ruminated, "Just the phrase alone ["Earth Day"] makes one recall the ancient Druids, who worshipped the earth, the moon, the sun, etc., and gathered in places like Stonehenge to hold their strange rites."[53]

Likewise, Charles Fraser, developer of South Carolina's Hilton Head Island, drew similar parallels between mythic cultish priests and modern day preservationists. In a conversation with author John McPhee, Fraser elucidated his opinion of late twentieth century environmentalists, "'Ancient druids used to sacrifice human beings

---

[51] William K. Stevens, "First Signs of a Backlash Emerge in Ecology Drive," *New York Times*, May 4, 1970.
[52] "Ecologism: A New Paganism," *Christianity Today*, April 10, 1970, 33-34.
[53] Don Maclean, "Earth Day: Astrology Or Cult?" *Danville (VA) Bee*, May 2, 1970.

under oak trees . . . Modern druids worship trees and sacrifice human beings to those trees. They want to save things they like, all for themselves.'" Combining charges of self-interest with intimations of paganism and biocentrism, Fraser castigated environmentalists and called for greater attention to planned growth and multiple-use principles. Putting people at the center of land use decisions, Fraser criticized "druids" such as David Brower for elevating nature above man. Though the Sea Pines Plantation developer used the term in jest and amicably shared dry martinis with Brower, the "archdruid," other critics of environmentalism deployed the term with a greater sense of dread and imminent fear of rampant biocentrism. In short, like the fear of communist infiltration, the threat of a resurgent paganism inspired many critics to label Earth Day as dangerous, subversive, radical, or just "strange."[54]

Though environmentalists and their agendas attracted opposing arguments before Earth Day, the nationwide event magnified and diversified the critiques. Even after the excitement and publicity of the inaugural "ecology teach-in" faded, the impassioned opposition to environmental legislation and activism persisted. In fact, the years immediately following Earth Day exhibited a strengthening of arguments against environmentalism. Government officials, scientists, concerned citizens, and others continued to craft critiques of the environmental movement and its adherents.

Three figures in particular exemplified the continuation and intensification of arguments challenging the modern environmental movement in the months following the inaugural Earth Day. Though not the only voices confronting the early-1970s environmental agenda, Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, Nobel Prize-winning agronomist Norman Borlaug, and British scientist John Maddox offered

[54] John McPhee, *Encounters with the Archdruid* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1971), 95.

effective examples of the type of arguments of the period. Although not opposed to clean environments in principle, the above commentators objected to the agendas, tactics, and rhetoric of the modern environmental movement. Building on arguments of the previous decade and foreshadowing critiques of the future, Stans, Borlaug, and Maddox emphasized the increasing intensity of the environmental debate.

In the aftermath of the first Earth Day, Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans challenged environmentalists and cautioned Congress against rigid regulations and timetables for pollution abatement. Speaking before the National Petroleum Council, Secretary Stans merged charges of alarmism, biocentrism, and economic irresponsibility against environmentalists and their legislative proposals. As he demanded vigilance of his audience of petroleum engineers, Stans claimed, "The time has come to bring things into better focus and to stop overheating the view that we are killing ourselves." Reanimating charges of exaggeration and emotionalism, the secretary urged Congress to critically reassess conservationists' claims as well as their legislative proposals. Fearful of the mood of "'public and political torment' for American business," Stans asked, "'Are we so afraid of what might happen' to the Alaskan environment . . . 'that we will sacrifice enormous new sources of oil which we need for our homes and our car and our jobs and our country?'"[55] Once again, in linking multiple arguments against environmentalists and in focusing on the impact of legislation on Americans' livelihood, Stans aimed to discredit the movement and stall further regulation and enforcement.

Nobel Peace Prize-winning agronomist Norman Borlaug also merged various approaches to formulate his campaign against environmentalists and their agenda to

[55] James M. Naughton, "Stans Urges Caution in Pollution Fight," *New York Times*, July 16, 1971.

regulate chemical pesticides. A tireless advocate for eradicating world hunger, poverty, and disease, Borlaug argued that chemicals such as DDT saved millions of lives and resulted in minimal impact on wildlife or the "balance of nature."[56] In numerous interviews, congressional testimonies, and appearances at international conferences, Borlaug embraced the desire for clean air and water, but challenged environmentalists' "extremism." Claiming that "the environmental movement was controlled by affluent city dwellers who used their leisure time to 'rediscover nature,'" Borlaug instructed activists and legislators to, "see the misery and poverty before you start philosophizing from a full stomach."[57] In addition to accusations of elitism, he also charged "hysterical environmentalists" with alarmism, biocentrism, and irresponsible use of science.[58] Using somber language, Borlaug often concluded his speeches and writings with warnings about the dangerous and lethal potential of contemporary environmental proposals.[59]

Other scientists expressed concern similar to Borlaug's entreaties. Exemplifying the increasingly international scope of the environmental debate, John Maddox, a British theoretical physicist, challenged the tone and tactics of Earth Day activists and other environmentalists. In light of the increased attention to environmental concerns, Maddox exhumed arguments against the leading writers of the environmental movement. In *The Doomsday Syndrome*, Maddox analyzed the assumptions of Rachel Carson, Paul Ehrlich, Barry Commoner, and other "prophets of

---

[56] William B. Mead, "DDT Ban Would Cause Catastrophe, Borlaug Says," *Cedar Rapids (IA) Gazette*, October 8, 1971.
[57] Mead, "DDT Ban Would Cause Catastrophe."
[58] "DDT Battle Gains Pace," *The Guardian*, November 11, 1971.
[59] Norman E. Borlaug, "Borlaug Says Chemical Use Essential," *Waterloo (IA) Courier*, December 12, 1971.

doom."[60] Arguing that the irresponsible claims of environmentalists threatened solutions to more immediate problems, Maddox accused them of dishonesty, "calculated exaggeration," misuse of science, and hatred of technology.[61] In addition, he offered unabashed optimism about the state of the world and chastised environmentalists' irresponsible pessimism. For example, throughout his writings, Maddox directly challenged the popular "spaceship earth" metaphor and emphasized the durability and resiliency of the planet and its environments. As he concluded *The Doomsday Syndrome*, Maddox reassured readers, "living things have managed to survive for 3,000 million years and, so far, to evolve."[62]

Finally, Maddox also briefly, but passionately argued that the elitism of environmentalists and their agendas threatened to sabotage more important social issues. In elucidating how affluence clouded the decision-making of many modern environmentalists, Maddox wondered "why so much is made of remote and improbable happenings when much less emotional energy is lavished on other threats to human life and happiness—poverty, injustice and avoidable death." Noting that "black people are conspicuous by their absence among the environmentalists in the United States," Maddox stressed the inherent elitism and potential racism of environmentalism.[63] He ultimately concluded that, "the environmental movement tends toward passivity, true conservatism."[64] Thus, while many critics worried about the excessive liberalism and potential radicalism of environmentalists, Maddox asserted that environmentalists were, in fact, rather fundamentally conservative.

---

[60] John Maddox, *The Doomsday Syndrome* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1972), 3.
[61] Maddox, *The Doomsday Syndrome*, 19.
[62] Maddox, *The Doomsday Syndrome*, 280.
[63] Maddox, *The Doomsday Syndrome*, 279.
[64] Maddox, *The Doomsday Syndrome*, 9.

Though focusing predominantly on the scientific methods and misguided assumptions of environmental writers, Maddox also wove social and political commentary into his critique of environmentalism. Like Stans and Borlaug, Maddox utilized numerous arguments to challenge the increasing popularity of the environmental movement and to redirect attention to other contemporary concerns.

Not the only critic to emphasize the environmental movement's effect on social and political causes, John Maddox signified a post-Earth Day trend of castigating environmentalism for distracting attention from other contemporary issues. While the majority of arguments against environmentalists' agenda historically arose from business executives, the political right, and industry representatives, activists representing minority and impoverished populations also offered critical assessments of the new ecology movement. Originating in the months after Earth Day and continuing intermittently into the next several decades, critiques from social reformers and New Left activists challenged the timing and intensity of environmentalists' programs. In particular, advocates of the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement, and the war on poverty criticized environmentalists for redirecting funds and political capital away from their campaigns.

Activists campaigning for African-American social, political, and economic equality not only employed arguments of elitism against the environmental movement, but also charged the new ecology "fad" with diverting the American public's attention from more pressing issues. For example, Richard Hatcher, the mayor of Gary, Indiana, remarked, "The nation's concern with environment has done what George Wallace was unable to do: distract the nation from the human problems of the black

and brown American, living in just as much misery as ever."[65] Likewise, Cleveland's mayor, Carl B. Stokes, stated, "'I am fearful that the priorities on air and water pollution may be at the expense of what the priorities of the country ought to be: proper housing, adequate food and clothing. There is glamour in ecology, and it makes people in the suburbs of the country feel involved."[66] In addition to arguing that repressed populations had lived in polluted, unsafe conditions for decades, African-American activists and politicians also emphasized that the contemporary environmental movement served as a convenient diversion from the civil rights movement.

Echoing Hatcher's sentiment, Muhammad Kenyatta, leader of Pennsylvania's Black Economic Development Conference, argued, "The whole anti-pollution movement, especially Earth Day, is an effort to distract the attention of the public from the issues of racism and the war in Vietnam."[67] A civil rights crusader who worked for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and helped organize Head Start programs, Kenyatta believed there were more important issues plaguing the nation in general and African-American communities in particular. Though Kenyatta eventually addressed various environmental issues such as the danger posed by nuclear power plants, he initially cautioned against environmental zealousness. Worrying that Earth Day and subsequent environmental agitation diverted attention

[65] Jack Rosenthal, "Some Troubled by Environment Drive," *New York Times*, April 22, 1970.
[66] William K. Stevens, "First Signs of a Backlash Emerge in Ecology Drive," *New York Times*, May 4, 1970.
[67] "Earth Day Protests Over State," *The Evening Standard* (Uniontown, PA), April 23, 1970.

from minorities' causes, Hatcher, Kenyatta, and others challenged the prudence of an "ecology movement."[68]

Some activists even organized boycotts to protest Earth Day festivities. Pledging to avoid all "Earth Week" activities, the Young Great Society, a Philadelphia-based community service organization, argued that environmental activists focused on the "wrong kind of pollution." Herman Wrice, founder and head of the Young Greats, queried, "What about the pollution of the mind, the pollution of the houses, the pollution of the dirty, uncared-for systems left to the poor?" An activist and community organizer who later devoted his life to eradicating illegal drugs from inner-city neighborhoods, Wrice questioned the commitment and wisdom of the new movement. Castigating environmentalists for their apparent lukewarm devotion to their cause, he wondered, "How many weekends are those college kids going to go out with their boats and nets to fish for trash? Meanwhile, we've still got sewers stopped up with rats. The best way to let something temporary die is not to mess with it."[69]

In addition to indicting environmentalists as halfhearted activists, a few commentators also boldly charged the environmental movement with promoting racism and eugenics. In "Ecology Is a Racist Shuck," essayist Robert Chrisman not only tagged environmentalists with the well-worn labels of alarmist and elitist, but also argued that the movement's emphasis on population control aimed to create an all-white world. Citing contemporary "ecological literature" such as Garrett De Bell's *The Environmental Handbook* and Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb*, Chrisman

[68] "Blacks Question Safety of Nuclear Power Plants," *Jet*, May 31, 1979, 22.
[69] Jack Rosenthal, "Some Troubled by Environment Drive," *New York Times*, April 22, 1970.

maintained that ecologists' obsession with birth control and deindustrialization targeted African-American communities and "Third World peoples." Now that the white, American, "liberal bourgeoisie" enjoyed the comforts and benefits of industrialization, he argued, they desired to restrict others from reaching the same level of development. In particular, Chrisman argued, through regulating private industry, promoting agriculture over industrialization, and advocating birth control, sterilization, and abortion, "the ecology movement" aimed to halt the economic and demographic progress of nonwhite people in the United States and abroad. Seeing environmentalism as "an unholy alliance between liberals and Birchers," Chrisman declared, "White as Moby Dick, the ecology fad seems bent upon creating some kind of white haven or heaven in what is left of the earth."[70]

Commentators such as Chrisman built upon earlier critiques of environmentalists as alarmist and irresponsible; however, in further emphasizing the upper-middle-class membership and agenda of the environmental movement, these activists linked allegations of elitism to charges of racism. Arguing that widespread, popular support of environmental issues distracted politicians and the public from the plight of African Americans, civil rights advocates challenged the motives and actions of Earth Day and the broader environmental movement.

Proponents of other social causes also echoed the above critiques. Portraying the environmental movement as a heaven-sent diversion for an embattled Nixon administration, a *New Republic* editorial argued, "the ecology binge provides a cop-out for a President and a populace too cheap or too gutless or too tired or too frustrated or too all of them to tangle harder with some old problems that have proved resistant

[70] Robert Chrisman, "Ecology Is A Racist Shuck," *Scanlan's Monthly* (August 1970): 46-49.

and emotionally ungratifying to boot." Noticing the absence of African Americans in the new "ecology craze," the editorial continued:

> If blacks and, in fact, the poor of all colors are missing, who's to notice? *Their* problems with the environment, having to do with things like the next meal and rat-free housing, are too mundane to be subsumed under so grand a sobriquet as 'quality of life.'[71]

Calling for more attention to urban problems, the educational system, race relations, and the "cycle of poverty," *The New Republic* commentary castigated environmentalists for expending philanthropic energy on "what amounts to a national anti-litter campaign."[72]

Other left-leaning publications also offered critiques of Earth Day. In April 1970, the monthly magazine *The Progressive* devoted an entire issue to environmental topics. Titled, "The Crisis of Survival," the issue offered editorials and articles about pollution, overpopulation, and consumerism. The following month, amidst dozens of letters-to-the editor applauding the eco-issue, *The Progressive's* long-time columnist, Milton Mayer, offered a biting and witty response to the popularity of ecology in general and the April 1970 issue in particular.

In his column, "Against Sin," Mayer employed many familiar arguments against environmentalists and their new movement. Charging that the new ecology fad offered President Nixon a way to "take the wilted flower children [and get] them rioting for something nice and wholesome now instead of polluting the landscape with paving-stones thrown at policemen," Mayer argued that environmentalism served as a convenient diversion from other pressing issues. He succinctly argued, "This country is dying of war and greed and inhumanity faster than it is dying of pollution."

---

[71] "This Ecology Craze," *The New Republic*, March 9, 1970, 8-9.
[72] "This Ecology Craze," 8-9.

Utilizing familiar social and racial critiques of the environmental movement, Mayer concluded his column:

> The only people who are not on the ecology jag are the ghetto poor. Fastidiousness doesn't fascinate them. Richard M. Nixon and his barons and his beer-bellies and his jumping johnnies of the campus all cry, 'Ecology;' the poor go on crying, 'Peace,' 'Land,' 'Bread;' and God's justice sleeps a little longer yet.[73]

Concerned that President Nixon and other representatives of the "establishment" used environmentalism to stall meaningful social and geopolitical reform, Mayer's stark cynicism stood out in an issue devoted to applauding environmentalism. Likewise, a political cartoon by Tom Engelhardt of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* illustrated Mayer's concern. The graphic depicted President Nixon sweeping two figures, "Vietnam" and "Racial Justice," under a rug in the Oval Office. Broom in hand, Engelhardt's Nixon stood over the personified figures and remarked, "You fellows wait there—I'm going to clean up the environment."[74] Like Mayer's column, Engelhardt's cartoon expressed many social reformers' fear that environmentalism would provide a convenient distraction from other international and domestic issues.

Though most subscribers praised *The Progressive's* environment issue, reader D. Ivan Fritts of Ontario, Oregon, echoed Mayer's concerns. Expressing "shock and dismay" at the April issue, Fritts argued that the real "crisis of survival is in the millions of children around the world who go to bed hungry and cold." Fritts scolded the "old and responsible liberal" magazine for "climb[ing] on the bandwagon of pollution with the myriad of politicians."[75]

Linking charges of elitism with disregard of social issues, concerned

[73] Milton Mayer, "Against Sin," *The Progressive* 34, no. 5 (May 1970): 28.
[74] Tom Engelhardt, cartoon, *The Progressive* 34, no. 4 (April 1970): 5.
[75] D. Ivan Fritts, letter to the editor, *The Progressive* 34, no. 6 (June 1970): 37.

commentators aimed to defuse the environmental movement's rapid growth and widespread appeal. Reacting to passionate campus support of environmentalism, Bruce E. Johnson, writing in the *Harvard Crimson*, delivered a scathing critique of Earth Day and the accompanying movement. Like previous skeptics, Johnson criticized the elitism of the new movement:

> Most of the focus of the ecology campaign is elitist. . . .Clean rivers, like their pollution, are a bourgeois preoccupation. As though atoning for the poor job their class had done in running the nation, these young middle-class whites demand that the government clean up the Charles River. The government obliges, at heavy expense, and the Charles is cleaner. Because of this, every Sunday afternoon Harvard students may frolic along its grassy banks without fear of death, enjoying the view and throwing Frisbees.[76]

In addition to the charges of elitist membership, Johnson also leveled claims of misguided and irresponsible agendas. He castigated his readership, "these white middle-class reformers often manifest a profound insensitivity to the more pressing problems of continued human degradation in ghettos, defoliated forests, massacred villages, and impoverished mountain communities." Once again, Johnson, like numerous other commentators, linked environmentalists' elitism with a disregard of social issues such as poverty, war, and racial equality.[77]

Commentators from across the political spectrum joined civil rights advocates and New Left reformers in challenging the alleged elitism and misguided focus of environmentalism. In a *National Review* opinion piece, "Do We Want Environment?" Nicholas King questioned the elitist focus and direction of the new movement. After declaring Earth Day "an orgy of middle-class soul searching," King worried, "[s]cience, poetry, elitism—whatever you want to call it—are inevitably bound to

[76] Bruce E. Johnson, "Ecology Is a Dodge," *Harvard Crimson*, April 22, 1970.
[77] Johnson, "Ecology Is a Dodge."

support what is set aside for the favor of the few, for like art in an earlier age the possession of knowledge depends on the appreciation of the elect."[78] Similarly, throughout *In Defense of People*, Richard Neuhaus, activist pastor and philosophical writer, argued "that the ecology movement is a seductive diversion from the political tasks of our time."[79] Worried that the elitism and alarmism of environmentalists threatened to distract attention from a "world of poverty," Neuhaus endeavored to expose ecology's "assault upon the public's consciousness" in order to redirect concern to ending endemic hunger.[80]

Many social reformers feared that the environmental movement threatened to inhibit the development of radical revolution. Believing that the nation and even the world was on the brink of real, fundamental change, impassioned activists criticized Earth Day and the environmental movement for interrupting a moment of tremendous promise. Novel and impassioned criticism from African-American leaders, anti-war organizers, and other social reformers joined the growing roster of critics of environmentalism.

In conclusion, the multi-front criticism of the inaugural Earth Day in 1970 signified that the event was about much more than healthy air, litter-free streets, and clean water. In the handful of years prior to the first environmental teach-in, throughout the nation and the world, young people questioned the legitimacy of governmental power and the validity of cultural norms. As troop levels in Vietnam continued to climb to a peak of 543,000 in 1968, disillusioned students, "hippies," and

[78] Nicholas King, "Do We Want Environment?," *National Review*, June 2, 1970, 557-559.
[79] Richard Neuhaus, *In Defense of People* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), 270.
[80] Neuhaus, *In Defense of People*, 136.

other concerned citizens challenged their leaders and elders more vocally and actively. Countercultural music, clothing, hairstyles, language, and sexual behavior reflected a desire for greater personal liberation and collective freedom. Participants in popular happenings such as 1967's "Summer of Love" and the Woodstock Music and Art Fair in 1969 challenged accepted values and behaviors. Experimenting with fresh coalitions, students and workers mobilized in the streets of Paris and throughout the globe. With the recent amplification of student protests, antiwar rallies, civil rights demonstrations, and urban riots, fervent organizers and fearful observers of the late sixties' volatile uprisings variously identified Earth Day as both an opportunity for continued change and a threat to the status quo. Emerging amidst a climate of intensified social and political action, the first environmental teach-in offered a new venue for citizens, businessmen, and government officials to debate national priorities and the role of activism and protest in a democracy.

Many activists hoped to build on the late-sixties' atmosphere of radical and revolutionary transformation. Sensing an era of unprecedented opportunity, reformers sought to pursue the moment of promise and strive for fundamental and lasting social and political change. As such, many worried that attention to environmentalism distracted from more essential battles for racial equality, social justice, and peace in Southeast Asia. Criticizing Earth Day organizers and participants for playing into the establishment's hands, many activists mourned the expenditure of political capital on superficial anti-litter campaigns. New Left spokesmen lamented that the shift from

"Give Peace a Chance" to "Give Earth a Chance" signified a momentous lost opportunity.[81]

Though some activists and reformers deemed the event too elitist and not radical enough, Earth Day 1970 nevertheless invoked fear of violent revolution among many people throughout the United States. Portrayed as a vehicle for communist infiltration, student militancy, economic stagnation, and paganism, the nation's first environmental teach-in worried some Americans. Concerned about the motives and objectives of Earth Day, a handful of commentators presented an alternate, radical interpretation of a widely embraced, mainstream event.

In short, the popularity of the inaugural and subsequent Earth Days made the event an effective arena to debate America's fears, values, and priorities. Though tangentially about environmental issues, criticisms of Earth Day moreover reflected concerns over the political, social, and cultural future of the United States. Ultimately, the nation's first environmental teach-in reflected the various ways citizens came to terms with the tumult and promise of the late 1960s.

Decades after the first Earth Day, political pundits and commentators continued to use the annual environmental teach-in to advance political agendas and proposed visions for the nation's economic and cultural future. In the 1990s, as the United States and other countries celebrated the twentieth and twenty-fifth

[81] For more on the adoption of the slogan, see Adam Rome, "'Give Earth a Chance': The Environmental Movement and the Sixties," *Journal of American History* 90, no. 2 (Sept. 2003): 525-554.

anniversaries of the inaugural environmental teach-in, conservative commentators exhumed arguments deployed against the first Earth Day.[82]

[82] Berit Kjos, *Under the Spell of Mother Earth* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1992); Rush Limbaugh, *Rush Limbaugh*, television show, April 22, 1993, April 21, 1995, and April 30, 1996; Robert A. Sirico, "The False Gods of Earth Day," *Wall Street Journal*, April 22, 1994.

CHAPTER 3 – Environmentalism in a Time of Recession, 1973-1983

At hearings debating proposals for new wilderness designations in May 1975, Lynn Leitz of Columbia Falls, Montana, passionately implored the Senate Subcommittee on the Environment and Land Resources, "The time has come gentlemen, when we need votes for the truly endangered species—the lower and middle class working Americans."[1] Testifying against the Great Bear Wilderness Act, a proposal to reclassify 378,200 acres of Flathead and Lewis and Clark National Forest as wilderness, the wife and mother of two boys challenged the underlying principles of recent preservationist legislation. Speaking on behalf of WOOD, Women Opposed to Official Depression, Leitz alleged that popular provisions such as the Wilderness Act (1964) and the Endangered Species Act (1973) threatened the livelihood of individual families as well as the economic stability of the nation. In the midst of a significant financial downturn, citizens like Leitz increasingly worried that environmental legislation, regulation, and activism were roadblocks, if not root causes of the mid-1970s era of high inflation, high unemployment, and flagging growth.

Though opponents in previous periods issued vocal and impassioned criticism of ecology writers such as Rachel Carson and environmental events such as Earth Day, conservation and preservation remained relatively popular in the 1960s and early 1970s. Amidst a robust economy, many citizens accepted and even welcomed environmental awareness and regulations in the immediate postwar decades. Policy makers and constituents welcomed landmark legislation such as the Clean Air and

[1] Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on the Environment and Land Resources, *Proposed Wilderness Areas*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975, 75-76.

Water Acts, the aforementioned Wilderness Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act; however, as families struggled in a stagnating economy, more and more Americans vilified environmentalism as a threat to economic solvency.

This chapter will analyze the role the recession of 1973 to 1983 had on the development of anti-environmental rhetoric. In light of the onset of stagflation, many opponents branded the recent flurry of conservation legislation and environmental thought as contributing to the nation's economic woes. Reflecting the fiscal concerns and political visions of the era, anti-environmentalists increasingly argued that environmental regulations threatened the livelihood of American workers and their families. Deploying emotional and passionate language, citizens, politicians, and public intellectuals linked unemployment figures to new environmental standards. Though opponents continued to express concern about environmentalists' links to radicalism and communist subversion, starting in the mid-seventies, critics primarily emphasized the economic toll of environmentalism.[2]

In addition to focusing on livelihood, standard of living, jobs, and the plight of families, anti-environmentalists also portrayed environmentalists as disinterested elitists. Though preservationists and conservationists faced charges of elitism in previous eras, in the midst of rising unemployment and inflation, those who had the discretionary time and income to lobby for the rights of trees, snail darters, and remote wilderness areas were lambasted as inconsiderately effete. As they vilified

[2] For examples of charges of radicalism and communist subversion, see for example: Russ Walton, "The Moth-Eaten Forests," *Daily Review (Hayward, CA)*, December 4, 1973; House Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Forests, *Permit the Use of DDT*, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973, 18, 260-261; Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973, 405-406.

environmentalists and their agendas, critics aimed to ally with the dispossessed American working class and win converts from the popular environmental movement. In short, this chapter will argue that beginning in the seventies, due to the severe financial downturn, opponents adopted a distinct economic line of argument to denigrate environmentalists. Constructing a Manichean ideology that presupposed that citizens must choose between environmental legislation or jobs, anti-environmentalists ultimately warned citizens that they could not have both a healthy economy and a pristine environment. Resource industry executives, local and national politicians, and concerned citizens such as Lynn Leitz aimed to use environmentalism and the 1970's surge in environmental legislation as a scapegoat for the nation's economic ills as well as a way to reassert the need for an ever-growing industrial American economy.



By 1973, many Americans morosely suspected that postwar levels affluence and abundance would not continue into the twilight decades of the century. Due in part to a series of geopolitical events as well as several domestic dislocations, the seventies ushered in an era of economic uncertainty. Thriving new industrial sectors in Germany, Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea, ferried increasingly more exports into the United States, prompting the nation's first trade deficit of the twentieth century. Combined with increased automation of production, the slump in demand for American-made goods contributed to rapid deindustrialization and rising unemployment figures. As domestic growth slowed, President Richard M. Nixon attempted to revive the sluggish economy with a series of reflexive, stopgap measures.

In addition to temporarily freezing prices and wages, Nixon also removed the United States from the gold standard in an effort to make American products more lucrative in foreign markets.[3]

Moreover, developments in international affairs further taxed an already unsteady economy. In reaction to American support of Israel in the Yom Kippur War of October 1973, Arab members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) issued an oil embargo against the United States. Not only reducing the fuel supply available to the U.S. and other Western nations, OPEC leaders also raised the price of oil. Corresponding with the winter heating season, the per barrel quadrupling of costs worried many cash-strapped Americans. By early November 1973, policy analyst, David M. Lindahl summed, "The use of oil as an instrument of diplomacy is not new, but it has never been applied as effectively on as large a scale as at present."[4] Already nervous consumers grew concerned about heating their homes and fueling their vehicles. Fearing a looming mandatory rationing program, panicked drivers lined up at filling stations to top off their tanks.[5] Though OPEC called off the embargo by March 1974, the impact of price hikes and rationing on a stagnating economy reverberated through the industrial and private sectors.[6]

---

[3] The following works provide helpful overviews of the economic changes of the seventies and the political reactions to those transformations: William M. Adler, *Mollie's Job: A Story of Life and Work on the Global Assembly Line* (New York: Scribner, 2001); Jefferson Cowie, *Stayin' Alive: The 1970s and the Last Days of the Working Class* (New York: The New Press, 2010); Daniel T. Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2011); Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2002); Judith Stein, *Pivotal Decade: How the United States Traded Factories for Finance in the Seventies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).

[4] U.S. Congress, Congressional Research Service, "The Arab Oil Embargo and Its Impact on Winter Fuel Shortages," (HD 9560 U.S., 73-189 EP, November 13, 1973), by David M. Lindahl.

[5] Peter Kihss, "Worried Drivers Swamp Stations Selling Gasoline," *New York Times*, February 5, 1974.

[6] For more discussion of the oil embargo and the geopolitics of petroleum, see: Michael T. Klare, *Blood and Oil: The Dangers and Consequences of America's Growing Dependency on Imported Petroleum*

As rising international industrial competition and skyrocketing fuel costs shattered any hopes for a resumption of postwar affluence and abundance, economists and commentators deployed novel terms to describe the seemingly unprecedented financial downturn. Termed "stagflation" in the United States and "slumpflation" in England, the twinned conundrum of stagnant economic growth and high inflation perplexed analysts, politicians, and business leaders.[7] Similarly, the new "misery index" ascribed a concrete number to the combined unemployment and inflation rates. As the sixties drew to a close, the U.S. index lingered under double-digits at 9.0% in 1969. By the dawn of the 1980s, the figure more than doubled, climbing to a miserable 20.6%.[8] In short, the economic changes of the mid-1970s represented a drastic disjuncture from traditional financial cycles. As Representative Richard Bolling of Missouri asked his fellow congressmen in a special session on stagflation, "How long before continuing inflation corrodes the basic institutions of our free society and market economy?"[9] Concerned about the drastic slowdown in productivity, the vice-chairman of the Joint Economic Committee wondered about the social costs of the financial crisis. Businessmen, politicians, and citizens who would not see real wages rise again until 1993 sought explanations, answers, and relief from high inflation, unemployment, and a general fiscal malaise.



(New York: Metropolitan, 2004); Joe Stork, *Middle East Oil and the Energy Crisis* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975); Raymond Vernon, ed. *The Oil Crisis* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1976); Daniel Yergin, *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money & Power* (New York: Free Press, 2008).

[7] Rodgers, *Age of Fracture*, 48.

[8] U.S. Congress, Congressional Research Service, "The Misery Index," (92-656E, October 20, 1992), by Barry Molefsky.

[9] U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, *Special Study on Economic Change: Stagflation*, 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979, 2.

Anti-environmental rhetoric reflected the changes in the nation's economic health. In an atmosphere of job losses, stagnating wages, and rising prices, some critics used environmentalism to explain the causes and continuation of the economic downturn. Arguing that the burst of environmental legislation and regulation in the 1960s and early 1970s unduly stressed the nation's economy, anti-environmentalists alleged that the environmental agenda inhibited individual prosperity and business growth. Opponents used contemporary crises to cast doubt on the popular environmental movement. Reflecting and capitalizing on a climate of economic uncertainty, anti-environmentalists honed a popular ideological critique of environmentalism as fundamentally opposed to a healthy economy.

Many critics argued that environmentalists unreasonably vilified business and depicted economic growth as evil. Citing previous decades' ecology writers as well as recent Earth Day activists, numerous politicians, businessmen, and public intellectuals highlighted environmentalists' condemnation of industrialization. Though not a new tactic, the line of argument was particularly prominent in the contracting seventies. As American factories faced consolidation, closures, and automation, industrial apologists lambasted environmentalists for further questioning the value of business growth. For example, Petr Beckmann, a Czech-born physicist and Ayn Rand devotee, challenged environmentalists and their "small is beautiful" mentality. An advocate of nuclear power and free enterprise, the University of Colorado professor criticized environmentalists' no-growth agenda. In describing the late-twentieth century environmental movement, Beckmann summed:

> There is one thing every movement based on faith rather than reason needs to be effective: a devil. A devil to keep the followers frightened, to raise

> righteous indignation, and to act as a lightning conductor and scapegoat . . . The environmental fanatics have a devil, too: Big Business.[10]

Throughout the 1970s, industry leaders, politicians, and an increasing number of average citizens claimed that environmentalists sought to dismantle the U.S. economy with unnecessary and harmful regulation. Economists and other public intellectuals believed that followers of the contemporary "ecology movement" deliberately desired to slow or halt the nation's economic growth. Denigrating environmental activists and like-minded scholars as fundamentally anti-growth and philosophically anti-capitalist, opponents portrayed environmentalists as contributing to contemporary economic woes and preventing future American greatness.

As they argued that environmentalists' penchant for regulation led to the loss of jobs and stagnation of national economic growth, industry representatives, politicians, economists, and other concerned citizens charged that environmental legislation endangered the economy on three levels. First, many critics argued that individuals and families suffered significant financial loss due to environmental legislation such as the Endangered Species Act, the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act, and wilderness designations. Critics aimed to show a direct correlation between environmental regulation and workers' declining standard of living. Secondly, opponents alleged that environmental regulations hindered local and regional economies and threatened to drive small businessmen into extinction. Finally, critics stressed the short and long-term detrimental affects of environmental activism, lobbying, and legislation on the struggling national economy. Though conservationists and preservationists encountered charges of economic sabotage in

[10] Petr Beckmann, *Eco-Hysterics and the Technophobes* (Boulder, CO: The Golem Press, 1973), 21-22.

previous decades, the claim dominated critiques of environmentalism throughout the 1970s. As unemployment approached double digits, the "jobs vs. environment" argument became a versatile and popular tool in critics' arsenal of rhetoric.

In speeches, editorials, and congressional testimonies, opponents of environmentalism suggested that the deluge of conservation and wilderness legislation sought to undermine hardworking Americans and threatened the welfare of millions of families. In particular, critics repeatedly stressed the looming loss of "livelihood." Throughout the 1970s, as the recession deepened, opponents of environmental proposals deployed the emotional rhetoric of livelihood to question environmentalists' priorities and compassion. For example, in Senate hearings discussing the Endangered American Wilderness Act, numerous witnesses emphasized the legislation's potential impact on jobs and workers' survival. Designed to support study and preservation of potential wilderness areas, the act aimed to "further the purposes of the Wilderness Act of 1964." Worried about the proposal's effect on lumber mill employees, California's Republican senator, Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa asked, "What will happen to the families of these workers once we have robbed them of their livelihood?"[11] A scholar of the English language with specialization in semantics, Hayakawa's phrasing exemplified a significant shift in anti-environmental rhetoric. After earning a doctoral degree from the University of Wisconsin at Madison and authoring and editing several books such as *Choose the Right Word*, *Language in Thought and Action*, and *The Use and Misuse of Language*, Hayakawa choose his words deliberately. Emphasizing "livelihood," Hayakawa and others aimed to stress the personal toll of environmental

[11] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, *Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1977*, 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977, 217.

regulations on individuals and families. In defining wilderness legislation as theft and an injustice to hard-working, virtuous citizens, Hayakawa moved the debate over environmentalism away from ambiguous discussions of policy and toward a more emotional discourse of human welfare.[12]

Similarly, in debates regarding the implementation of the Endangered Species Act, industry executives, representatives of ranchers' associations, and other opponents stressed environmental legislation's adverse impact on family livelihood. Originally implemented in 1973 to protect species and subspecies of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction, the Endangered Species Act elicited charges of environmental extremism and disregard of workers' livelihood. For example, Julian Brzoznowski, speaking on behalf of the American National Cattlemen's Association, the National Livestock Feeders' Association, and the Public Lands Council, summed his personal battle with the both the ESA and area predators, "so I has [sic] to sit back and watch the wolves eat my livelihood on my 900 acres, thinking about those losses and providing a living for my wife and three children."[13] A resident of Orr, Minnesota, Brzoznowski worried that national organizations such as the Sierra Club and local groups such as Help Our Wolves Live (HOWL), lobbied for the welfare of wolves at the expense of the well-being of women and children. Before long, discussions of lost livelihood and struggling families also spilled out of the halls of congress and into the country's popular magazines. For example, *Sports Illustrated*

---

[12] Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), rev. ed. (1939); *Choose the Right Word: A Modern Guide to Synonyms and Related Words* (New York: Perennial Library, 1987), rev. ed. (1968); Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa, ed. *The Use and Misuse of Language* (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications, 1964).

[13] Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Subcommittee on Resource Protection, *Endangered Species Act Oversight*, 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977, 719.

covered Brzoznowski's plight in a May 1977 feature, "Big Howl in Minnesota." Commiserating with the rancher's loss of $58,356 in cattle and property devaluation, the sports periodical detailed the battle between cattlemen and conservationists.[14]

Like Brzoznowski, many other commentators frequently mentioned environmental legislations' impact on wives and children. Throughout the decade, critics deployed a traditional image of male heads of households as the sole breadwinner and depicted wives and children as innocent victims in environmentalists' war against the working class. Testifying in support of a repeal of the ban on DDT, Idaho congressman, Steven D. Symms, related his observations of the Tussock moth infestation in DDT-free northwestern forests. He stated:

> [There was an] awful impact on the small private landowner. Prevented from protecting his property by the federal government, these men and women stood by while their trees died in days. For many of them, this represented income invested for retirement, for the education of their children, as insurance against unexpected financial catastrophe.[15]

An apple grower before entering congress in 1973, Symms infused his testimony with personal observations of the economics and family dynamics of farm life. Abandoning scientific arguments regarding the use of pesticides, Symms and others focused on emotional anectdotes.

Other critics emphasized environmental legislations' less tangible effects on their own children. Linking the declining availability of land with irreparable changes to traditional family dynamics, many feared the consequences of the proposed designation of Hells Canyon as a national recreation area. A measure intended to ensure the long-term protection of areas surrounding the Imnaha and Snake Rivers in

---

[14] Bil Gilbert, "Big Howl in Minnesota," *Sports Illustrated* 46, no. 19 (May 2, 1977): 75-77.
[15] House Committee, *Permit the Use of DDT*, 20.

Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, the Hells Canyon bills would prohibit the extraction of timber and other resources. Oregon's AFL-CIO representative Lloyd B. Knudsen imparted to the senate committee, "It's tough to raise a boy on a 50 by 100 lot and show him the right things." Through the course of his testimony, Knudsen articulated anxiety about the cumulative effect of the energy crisis, a recession, a "depression-type of situation," and the recent stock market "crash down to 788."[16] Thus, in addition to worrying about the financial implications of wilderness designations, Knudsen also revealed that continued preservationist measures could undermine the ethical foundation of child rearing. Expressing frustration and helplessness, politicians, labor representatives, and others argued that environmental legislation such as the DDT ban and wilderness designations threatened men's ability to support their wives and raise their children.

Relatedly, many concerned citizens worried about the extinction or endangerment of particular occupations. Linking children's welfare and moral upbringing with their parents' abilities to maintain secure employment, critics feared that rigorous implementation of the Endangered Species Act and other environmental legislation would eliminate thousands if not millions of jobs. With unemployment figures rising, discussion of job losses infused congressional hearings with emotional and politically powerfully dialogue. In debates over expanding Wyoming's Yellowstone National Park grizzly bear habitat into the nearby Shoshone National Forest, Richard E. Cole, vice president of the Cody Country Outfitters and Guide Association, implored, "We need no more lines or government control or we as

[16] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 180.

Outfitters will become an endangered species."[17] In using the language of extinction to express fear of further job losses, Cole and other witnesses aimed to discredit environmental legislation. Similarly, in hearings regarding marine mammal protection, fishermen and fish-processing industry representatives worried about their future employment prospects. A provision enacted to curtail the illegal harassing, catching, and killing of sea lions, seals, whales, and dolphins, the Marine Mammal Protection Act required that tuna fishermen update their equipment and practices. Frank Burcina, representing the ILWU Local 33 Fishermen's Union of San Pedro and San Diego, feared "that the American tunaboat owners and fishermen will be phased out completely."[18] Often portraying American workers as "endangered species," witnesses such as Cole, Burcina, and Lynn Leitz of WOOD, whose testimony opened this chapter, appropriated the language of "endangerment" and "extinction" to highlight the threatened status of the working class. Ultimately, anti-environmentalists endeavored to move the terms of debate away from obscure insect and animal species and toward struggling fishermen, lumberjacks, and factory workers.

With increasing frequency, critics offered estimates of the number of individual job losses and "families affected." Focusing intently on statistics, anti-environmentalists used the concreteness of numbers to communicate the scale and scope of preservationist legislations' impact on the economy. Opponents in previous

[17] Senate Committee on Appropriations, Special Subcommittee, *Proposed Critical Habitat Area for Grizzly Bears*, 94th Cong., 2nd sess., 1977, 181.
[18] House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, *Marine Mammal Protection Oversight*, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973, 57.

eras argued in broad terms about environmentalisms' effect on business growth and jobs; however, in the stagflating seventies, critics offered much more precise figures and calculations to emphasize the looming dislocations. For example, in the debates over the proposed Hells Canyon National Recreational Area, Glade Jackson, representing Local 2780 of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers, estimated the elimination of "345 jobs in the resource and management area" and "690 plus losses of service jobs" if the Hells Canyon area lost its multiple-use status.[19] In the aforementioned hearings discussing proposed designation of Great Bear Wilderness Act in Montana, WOOD's Lynn Leitz, stressed that the proposal hurt more than her individual family. She implored:

> You are in effect eliminating approximately 140 jobs in logging and milling, and 250 jobs indirectly in our business community. For a family of four, this would mean that 1,596 people in our area alone would be affected by this action.[20]

Other witnesses emphasized that even small numbers of lost jobs were significant to those involved. Gary Smith, representing the Oregon Log Truckers Association, testified against wilderness designations claiming:

> . . . 13 log truckers would be deprived of their livelihood. Possibly there are those among us who would not be concerned about the loss of 13 log truckers' jobs; however, we have faith that you gentlemen [Senators] are more discerning.[21]

Often combining statistics with anecdotes of a particular family, commentators aimed to portray environmentalists and their proposed legislation as heartless and economically irresponsible.

---

[19] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 223.
[20] Senate Committee, *Proposed Wilderness Areas*, 75.
[21] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 222.

Whether utilizing personal anecdotes, employment statistics, or a combination of both, opponents of environmental legislation aimed to communicate the dire impact that increased regulation would have on individuals and families. Lester Kelley, president of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Local 3084 of Cascade, Idaho, summed many critics' view, stating:

> I and the group I represent wonder why environmentalists can't leave some of the public land for us to live and work on. They seem to want us to turn the whole State of Idaho into a wilderness area. We workers and taxpayers of this State want to eat and live. Let the environmentalists go to existing wilderness, let us taxpayers and workers stick to our jobs.[22]

As they framed the environmental debate in terms of basic livelihood, critics of environmental legislation advanced a portrayal of environmentalists as self-interested and unconcerned with the plight of hard-working Americans.

Arguing that environmental legislation not only affected individual welfare, but also local and regional economies, critics emphasized the broader consequences of increased regulation. Contending that the interconnectedness of local economies often tied the success of many diverse businesses to the fate of one industry, boosters and other critics of environmental legislation worried that a law aimed at one particular industry would inevitably threaten entire communities and regions. As such, in debates surrounding proposed wilderness designations, opponents not only focused on the immediate loss of timber jobs, but also on auxiliary services such as restaurants, stores, and other small businesses. For example, Jerry R. Burke, chief forester of the Sierra Division of the Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, a lumber and building product manufacturer, not only stressed the "loss of about 250 primary manufacturing jobs and

[22] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 551.

an annual payroll of approximately $3,000,000," but also emphasized, "this, of course, would not include the countless small businesses that depend on this primary manufacturing facility for additional jobs and services." Burke discussed other businesses, large and small, that "would be affected by a massive unilateral Wilderness classification" and ultimately concluded, "people will be put out of work and the cost of housing will increase nationally and the local economy will have severe disruptions."[23] Similarly, Arnold Ewing, executive vice president of Eugene, Oregon's North West Timber Association, arguing against passage of the Endangered American Wilderness Act, stated that the bill "could have drastic social and economic effects on many parts of the West." Equating "our jobs" with "our survival," Ewing implored the House subcommittee to hold hearings "throughout the West . . . before any further consideration of the bill."[24]

Numerous commentators also discussed environmental legislations' impact on local and regional tax bases. Fearing that stricter environmental regulations would dramatically decrease revenue streams from thriving industries, politicians and citizens fought environmentalists' varied proposals. For example, aforementioned Idaho congressman Steven Symms worried about the fiscal implications of a continued DDT ban on northwestern communities. In October 1973 hearings, the freshman congressman offered bold predictions about the impact of environmental legislation on the people of Idaho and Oregon. He argued:

> Local county government revenues will be reduced over the next 50 years or more. Not only will the economic impact on private business reduce taxable income, but 25 percent of the net receipts from National Forest timber sales are

[23] Senate Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1977*, 345-346.
[24] House Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act*, 346.

> returned to the counties from which the timber was cut to compensate local government for property tax losses under federal ownership. I have seen estimates of up to $600,000 to be lost under this category in selected areas of Oregon, and most feel that this is a highly conservative estimate.[25]

Projecting long-term financial devastation, Symms contended that without the timely assistance of DDT the repercussions of one season's moth infestation would last generations.

In stressing the impact of environmental legislation on regional economies, opponents not only further demonized environmentalists, but they also encouraged the coalescence of anti-environmental groups. Uniting like-minded neighbors, organizers advanced arguments beyond tales of personal hardship and emphasized regional and cross-occupational identity. In addition to various local organizations, groups such as the Pacific Legal Foundation (1973), the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise (1976), the Mountain States Legal Foundation (1976), and the National Inholders Association (1978) organized opposition to environmental activism and legislation. Hoping to broaden local concerns into a regional and, eventually, a national movement, these groups established networks of citizens concerned about the environmental movement's reach.

Many organizations initially organized diverse constituents around a particular issue or a specific location. For example, the Western Environmental Trade Association (WETA) included "a very broad mix of organized labor, industrial management, the major utilities, small businesses, professional firms, and private individuals." Concerned about reclassification of Hells Canyon as "parklands," the organization feared for the region's economic base in grazing, agriculture, and

[25] House Committee, *Permit the Use of DDT*, 20.

tourism. WETA spokesman, David Allen questioned environmentalists' priorities and argued, "We believe that too much public planning has been done without a proper regard for jobs, human livelihood, and opportunity; in short, economic impact."[26] Other groups echoed Allen's anxiety. For example, Associated California Loggers and Women in Timber held rallies to protest the creation of a logging buffer zone around Redwood National Park. Troubled about the health of the region's economy, groups such as WETA hosted special hearings and aimed to stall or scuttle environmental legislation.

Likewise, Anne Basker, representing the Southern Oregon Resource Alliance (SORA), "a young organization conceived in crisis and born in desperation," challenged expansion of wilderness designations in the Pacific Northwest. Attempting to counter the "growing extremism of the very vocal, well-organized environmentalists," SORA pledged to give voice to citizens before the onset of further "desperate and crippling effects on the health, welfare, and economy of our citizens."[27] Often echoing the arguments of individual citizens, these organizations protested environmentalism's cumulative effect on American workers and business owners.

In addition to providing a venue for citizens to air their concerns about environmentalism, some groups also offered legal assistance. Just as environmental organizations became more litigious with auxiliary groups such as the Natural Resources Defense Council (1970) and the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund (1971), likewise, opponents sought to use the courts to challenge environmental laws. Organizations such as the Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF) aimed to overturn

[26] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 164-165.
[27] House Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act*, 133-134.

environmental regulations and ensure economic prosperity for industries and property owners. Donald M. Pach of PLF emphasized the mounting economic toll of environmental legislation, stating, "I could go on and list a bunch of horrible stories of people who have suffered substantial adverse effects." Claiming to represent "the taxpayer-consumer, the citizen, the person, the employed, the unemployed, the person who needs adequate housing," Pach criticized federal regulations such as the Clean Air Act and lambasted states agencies such as California's Coastal Zone Commission. Charged with overseeing the use of land and water in the coastal zone, the commission regulated development and, according to Pach, infringed on free enterprise and property rights. As he enumerated affronts to private property rights, Pach stressed the link between environmental regulation and citizen hardship.[28]

Finally, and increasingly throughout the economically tumultuous 1970s, critics emphasized environmental legislations' negative impact on the national economy and the nation's resource needs. Broadening out claims from the individual and regional levels, many of the above-mentioned organizations argued that environmentalists and their agendas threatened to stall or destroy the nation's economy. For example, in challenging the Endangered American Wilderness Act, SORA's Anne Basker argued that such legislation "will have profoundly negative effects not only on our area, but because of the abundance of scarce, crucial, and renewable resources which it forever locks up, on our entire Nation."[29]

[28] House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment, *Land Use and Resource Conservation*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975, 251-254.
[29] House Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act*, 133-134.

Fusing individual, regional, and national concerns, industry representatives and politicians employed emotional and patriotic language to stress the potential danger of increased environmental regulation. Donald W. Johnson, timber manager for Cabax Mills in Grants Pass, Oregon, testified before the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and Public Lands "on behalf of the wood products industry in southwest Oregon, their employees, and local citizens of southern Oregon who are concerned with local jobs and economic stability." Opposing the Endangered American Wilderness Act, Johnson not only expressed concern for the "local economy and peoples' livelihood" in the Kalmiopsis area, but also for "the supply of wood products for the Nation's needs."[30] Similarly, later in the hearings, North West Timber executive Arnold Ewing passionately implored, "It is high time the garment workers, carpenters, plumbers, farmers, cab drivers, waiters and waitresses in Washington, D.C. ask: If the national forests are for all of the people, how come consideration is not given to my taxes? How come we lock this up and lose money to the Treasury? How come houses are so expensive to buy?"[31] Using language reminiscent of the recent oil embargo and ongoing energy crisis, critics vilified environmentalists for withholding vital resources. Though not directly comparing environmental organizations to OPEC, opponents implied that restricting access to timber products would deliberately hurt American consumers.

In numerous other hearings on conservation and preservation bills, witnesses stressed the national economic consequences of environmental legislation. Othar Hanson, president of the American Seafood Distributors Association, opposed H.R.

[30] House Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act*, 137.
[31] House Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act*, 349.

80, a bill that aimed to protect whales by strengthening import restrictions on Japanese fish. A native of Reykjavik, Hanson studied fisheries sciences and business in both Iceland and at the University of Washington in Seattle. An executive at the Coldwater Seafood Corporation and owner of TOP Seafood in Boston, Massachusetts, he served on several leadership councils for the fisheries industry. In his June 3, 1975, statement before Congress, Hanson argued that, "restriction of fish imports from Japan would be extremely damaging to this country's citizens." In addition to higher food costs, Hanson worried about further domestic job losses. Explaining that nearly a quarter of the nation's fish sticks and "fish blocks" used Japanese fish that was processed throughout the United States, Hanson worried about the cumulative effect of the trade restrictions on America's unemployment figures. He predicted, "The livelihood of thousands of workers in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Ohio, Georgia, and other states depends on a continuous source of raw material which comes from Japan." Hanson concluded his remarks, "Thus, indiscriminate restriction of Japanese fishery products would have the effect of harming our own citizens through an increase in food prices and the disruption of employment in many areas. We do not believe this is in our Nation's best interest."[32]

Similarly, in 1978, in reaction to a proposal to expand Redwood National Park in California, the Republican Policy Committee warned that such legislation "is unwarranted, proposes regional economic disaster and is an open-ended blank check raid on the treasury of the United States." Comparing the number of acres already

[32] House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, *Whaling, Whale Oil, and Scrimshaw*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975, 138.

protected with the countless "direct and indirect jobs" that would be lost, the committee asked rhetorically, "How much is enough?"[33] The report deployed numerous economic arguments to challenge park expansion. Though not directly accusing environmentalists of economic sabotage, the Republican Policy Committee expressed fears that if passed the measure would result in irreversible economic hardship for the region and the nation.[34]

While some critics of environmental legislation conceded that economic stagnation was an irresponsible, but unintended consequence of environmentalists' agendas, others vehemently contended that conservationists and preservationists deliberately sought to ruin the nation's economy. In *The War Against Progress*, Herbert E. Meyer outlined environmentalists' "campaign . . . to slow down the current U.S. economic growth rate [and] . . . to force Americans to live with less."[35] An associate editor of the business and financial magazine, *Forbes*, and president of Storm King Press, Meyer identified an unhealthy anti-growth strain in the green agenda. Discussing both the general rise in environmental consciousness as well as analyzing specific topics such as environmentalists' protest of nuclear power and resistance to the development of Alaskan oil fields, Meyer argued that environmental activism and legislation threatened to "throw our economy into a tailspin."[36] Meyer

[33] Republican Policy Committee, "H.R. 3813—Redwood National Park," February 7, 1978, Box 44, Malcolm Wallop Papers, Collection Number 8011, American Heritage Center, University of Wyoming (hereafter cited as AHC).
[34] For differing perspectives on the conflict over the redwoods see: Alston Chase, *In a Dark Wood: The Over Forests and the Rising Tyranny of Ecology* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1995); Susan R. Schrepfer, *The Fight to Save the Redwoods* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983); Richard Widick, *Trouble in the Forest: California's Redwood Timber Wars* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).
[35] Herbert E. Meyer, *The War Against Progress* (New York: Storm King Publishers, Inc., 1979), 7-8.
[36] Meyer, *The War Against Progress*, 39.

ultimately concluded, "Today the environmental movement is little more than a weapons system in the war against progress."[37] Using Cold War, military-industrial complex language, the *Forbes* editor identified environmentalists as one of the greatest threats to America's economic wellbeing. Building on issue-specific arguments of economic hardship and lost "livelihood," critics like Herbert Meyer broadened their critique to argue that environmentalists threatened the American standard of living.

Similarly, books such as Peter Passell and Leonard Ross's *The Retreat from Riches: Affluence and Its Enemies*, exemplified the trend toward depicting "doomsday environmentalists" as a hindrance to both national solvency and individual prosperity. An economist and lawyer, respectively, Passell and Ross attacked specific studies such as the Club of Rome's *The Limits to Growth* and criticized the general tone of the environmental movement. Produced by a team of authors led by Donella H. Meadows and Dennis L. Meadows, *The Limits to Growth* offered a summary of computer-model calculations that warned of dwindling resources in the midst of a growing world population. Fearing that environmentalists' advocacy of consumer "self-denial" would lead to dangerous economic stagnation, the authors not only promoted the beneficence of economic growth, but also offered their perspectives on potential environmental concerns. Addressing contemporary fears about pollution, malnutrition, and population growth, Passell and Ross casually summed, "But those limits may be so distant that they need not concern us any more than the fact that the

[37] Meyer, *The War Against Progress*, 94.

sun will burn out someday casts a shadow on our lives."[38] Eschewing jargon and dense economic theory, *The Retreat from Riches* offered a readable and upbeat critique of environmentalists as well as an earnest defense of economic growth. While Passell and Ross focused on the connection between "ecological propaganda" and broad economic trends, other critics linked specific environmental legislation with increasing unemployment.[39]

Rather than merely limiting themselves to chastising environmentalists' fiscal policies, several commentators also reasserted the idea of economic growth as inherently positive for the nation. In contradistinction from the alleged anti-growth "ecologists," economists, columnists, and others strenuously stressed the benefits of the capitalist system and fiscal growth. For example, in condemning the "environmental agenda," conservative commentator and political analyst Ben J. Wattenberg implored, "Abundance-lovers of the world unite! Suburban-home lovers, automobile lovers, materialists, you have nothing to lose but your sense of cultural inferiority! Growth is good! Small is beautiful, but big is better!"[40] Castigating environmentalists for endeavoring to "legislate [growth] out of existence or create pseudo-science to provide self-fulfilling prophecies regarding limits to growth," Wattenberg provided a positive affirmation of capitalism.

Similarly, Irving Kristol's *Two Cheers for Capitalism* not only portrayed environmentalists as fiscal villains, but also reinforced faith in free enterprise and bourgeois capitalism. A prolific columnist and one of the intellectual fathers of

---

[38] Peter Passell and Leonard Ross, *The Retreat from Riches: Affluence and Its Enemies* (New York: The Viking Press, 1973), 32.
[39] Passell and Ross, 40.
[40] Ben J. Wattenberg, "Let's Hear It For Growth," *Conservative Digest* (December 1978): 29.

neoconservatism, Kristol aimed to counter environmentalists' critique of America's economic system. Arguing that capitalism "creates the 'social space' within which civil and political liberty can flower," Kristol attempted to answer contemporary critics and their "moral self-righteousness."[41] In celebrating capitalism and encouraging unfettered economic growth, commentators such as Wattenberg and Kristol endeavored to offer a positive image of free enterprise while disparaging the environmental movement.



As economic concerns grew throughout the decade, critics of environmental legislation increasingly argued that the environmental agenda aimed to protect the affluent at the expense of hard-working Americans. Though not a novel invention of this period, the elitism argument gained significant momentum throughout the 1970s due to the dire economic atmosphere. In addition, opponents used the elitism argument to construct a portrait of environmentalists as hypocritical, selfish, disinterested, conservative, and potentially racist. With rising unemployment figures and skyrocketing fuel costs, many citizens embraced critiques of environmentalists as self-interested elitists. Furthermore, as the decade progressed, anti-environmentalists increasingly claimed to represent and "speak for" the "average American."

A variety of critics in numerous contexts relied on depicting environmentalists as elitists. In editorials, congressional testimonies, articles, and other publications, opponents of environmental legislation increasingly warned that environmentalists

[41] Irving Kristol, *Two Cheers for Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977), ix-xiv.

hailed from the ranks of the middle and upper classes and sought to advance a self-serving agenda. Contrasting affluent, elite environmentalists with average, working-class citizens, critics aimed to discredit environmentalists as an untrustworthy minority. For example, in response to the proposed Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), Jack McLeod, member of Local 962 of the United Paperworkers International Union, stated:

> I don't understand it [the proposed wilderness designation] . . . I just don't understand it . . . The average guy just isn't going to see this as wilderness. . . It'll be a private reserve for a bunch of bastards ain't any better than I am.[42]

A bill intending "to preserve unrivaled scenic and geological values associated with natural landscapes," ANILCA not only reclassified 79.53 million acres of land into national parks, national wildlife refuges, and national recreation areas, but it also redefined about a third of that parcel as wilderness. As such, many Alaskans agreed with McLeod that the proposal unashamedly ignored the needs of locals for the sake of elite wilderness enthusiasts.[43]

Likewise, testifying against the designation of the Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore National Urban Park, June Glenn, chairman of the Concerned Citizens for Las Virgenes, stated that the proposal "looks to us like an elaborate scheme to get free land for an elite group of hikers and equestrians." Glenn contrasted "radical ecofreaks" with "the retired postal clerk, the retired fireman, the dental assistant, the retired statistical analyst (myself)."[44] In an era in which the working and middle

---

[42] "Sitka, AK," *New Times* (September 18, 1978): 24.
[43] *Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act*, Public Law 96-487, 96th Cong., 2nd sess. (December 2, 1980).
[44] Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, *National Urban Park*, 93rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1974, 163-166.

classes experienced significant redefinition and restructuring, Glenn and others communicated fears that preservationist legislation further eroded the rights and shrinking assets of the common people. Similarly, Ed Fischer of Vancouver, Washington, opposed the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area using similar claims. He argued that the proposal:

> . . . deprives the people from the enjoyment of their own land, and permits the area to be used by a group that can only be referred to as being among the elite . . . the area is to be protected for those of affluence . . . It places an 'off-limits' sign on this area to 99 percent of the American population.[45]

Fischer ultimately surmised that the new designation would "make it [Hells Canyon] a preserve for the privileged."[46]

Characterizing ecologists and their allies as "suburban liberals who have built their careers on ignoring workers and conserving whales," commentators such as conservative theorist Michael Novak argued that environmentalists "want[ed] to keep the environment free of people – especially dirty people, who lack education and sensitivity, the six-pack set and the welfare set."[47] Establishing environmentalists as the "haves" against working-class "have-nots," critics such as Novak aimed to depict environmentalists as disinterested elitists. In particular, opponents argued that environmentalists positioned their recreational desires over the welfare of the lower classes. Critics claimed that environmentalists pursued an agenda that would preserve remote playgrounds for the privileged few to hike, camp, and fish, while the vast majority of the population struggled to survive. For example, authors Peter Passell

[45] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 447-448.
[46] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 447-448.
[47] Michael Novak, "Zero Growth Gets Zero Support," *Conservative Digest* (January 1978) vol. 4, no. 1: 8.

and Leonard Ross communicated their view of environmentalists' insensitivity as they summed, "But for the most part it is the rich who go sailing while the poor pay sales tax." Arguing against anti-pollution subsidies and tax incentives, Passell and Ross condemned environmentalists' agenda stating, "nothing is said about what the poor gain from pristine lakes which they cannot afford to visit."[48] Likewise, Herbert Meyer summed, "they [environmentalists] focus only on those consequences that affect them . . . they ignore those consequences that affect everybody else."[49]

Senators and other politicians also echoed commentators' representation of environmentalists as elitist preservationists. Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa, California's Republican senator, testified against the Endangered American Wilderness Act proclaiming, "I am one Member of Congress who does not believe that designating our Federal lands as wilderness is truly in the national interest." Arguing that such a policy "actually reserves a parcel of land for an elite group of people," Senator Hayakawa asked, "Although it is nice for the few who are able to enjoy the privilege of using these areas, what about the rest of society?"[50] Throughout the decade, in numerous other hearings on proposed wilderness and recreation classifications, citizens and politicians echoed the critique of environmentalists as elite and privileged.

Editorials and columns in the nation's periodicals also communicated a growing critique of environmentalists as elites. In a *Conservative Digest* article, "The New Elite: Arrogant Leftists," attorney David Lebedoff analyzed the mentality of "Vietnam-era leftwingers" who "spurn mink." Contrasting the Sierra Club as an

---

[48] Passell and Ross, *The Retreat from Riches: Affluence and Its Enemies*, 44.
[49] Meyer, *The War Against Progress*, 86.
[50] Senate Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1977*, 216-217.

organization that "is for protecting the environment for its own sake" with Ducks Unlimited, a group that protects the environment "so that it will be of more use to more people," Lebedoff cataloged differences between the "New Elite" and the "Left Behinds."[51] Other *Conservative Digest* articles and opinion pieces likewise worried about the "elitist overtones" of environmental legislation.[52]

Furthermore, many critics depicted the environmental movement as linked and beholden to elite, liberal academic institutions. Media executives Melvin J. Grayson and Thomas R. Shepard, Jr., authors of *The Disaster Lobby: Prophets of Ecological Doom and Other Absurdities*, vehemently criticized the elitism of environmentalism. Though over a decade had passed since Rachel Carson's famous publication, Grayson and Shepard continued to cite *Silent Spring* as the seminal model of environmental alarmism, radicalism, and elitism. The authors remarked:

> To the left-wing academic brigade, with its command posts in Berkeley and Cambridge and New Haven and Madison and its message centers in New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles, *Silent Spring* was reveille and the cavalry charge rolled into one.[53]

Criticizing "Ivy League pedants," Grayson and Shepard summed, "The ecology crusade was predicated on the right of an intellectual minority to deny the majority the comforts and health benefits of science and technology."[54]

In addition to pointing out that environmentalists often hailed from the economic and social elite, critics also began to highlight the hypocrisy of ecologists' lifestyles. In *Eco-Hysterics and the Technophobes*, Petr Beckmann compared "the

---

[51] David Lebedoff, "The New Elite: Arrogant Leftists," *Conservative Digest* (November 1978, vol. 4, no. 10): 21.
[52] "The Big Federal Land Grab," *Conservative Digest* (December 1978, vol. 4 no.12): 8.
[53] Melvin J. Grayson and Thomas R. Shepard, *The Disaster Lobby: Prophets of Ecological Doom and Other Absurdities* (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1973), 3.
[54] Grayson and Shepard, *The Disaster Lobby,* 12-13.

ghetto inhabitant living in rat-infested quarters next to the belching smoke stacks of his city" with:

> [t]he typical environmentalist [who] lives in the suburban fashionable split-level home; and with the air conditioner and the kitchen range running at full power, he or she is firing off indignant letters to the local power company to stop the pollution.[55]

Similarly, Cy Adler, scientist and author of *Ecological Fantasies: Death From Falling Watermelons* argued:

> It is ironic that environmentalists belong to that segment of the population which lives well because the environment is being exploited to provide them with suburban homes and automobiles, two of the main causes of environmental deterioration in wealthy countries.[56]

Adler's critique of environmentalists' elitism and hypocrisy was particularly revealing. Far from a political neoconservative like Kristol or Novak, Adler sauntered and sang with noted radicals such as folksinger Pete Seeger. In addition, he was somewhat of a grassroots environmentalist himself as he founded Shorewalkers, a non-profit club dedicated to preserving New York and New Jersey shorelines. Thus, allegations of environmentalist elitism emerged not only from the political right, but also from liberals within the environmental movement itself.

Many opponents opted to criticize the lifestyle choices of specific environmental writers. For instance, the authors of *Ecological Sanity*, microbiologist George Claus and clinical psychologist Karen Bolander, castigated Paul Ehrlich, not only for his purported misuse of science, but also for his hypocritical standard of living. Claus and Bolander remarked, "[He] is fond of speaking about de-development, and he likes to tell people that it is the middle and upper classes who

[55] Beckmann, *Eco-Hysterics and the Technophobes*, 15.
[56] Adler, *Ecological Fantasies*, 25.

must sacrifice their unnecessary equipment and cut down on consumption, but he himself is said to fly a private airplane."[57] Commencing a tactic that would continue into the twenty-first century, anti-environmentalists itemized the economic and environmental toll of environmental leaders' lifestyles.

Some commentators alleged that environmentalists were not only hypocritical and selfish, but also racist. Echoing earlier arguments from writers such as Robert Chrisman, critics increasingly portrayed environmentalists and their agendas as deliberately anti-minority. As the 1970s progressed, unemployment and poverty rates hit African-American and Hispanic communities particularly hard. Many anti-environmentalists sought to connect the dismal standard of living to environmentalists' deliberate policy measures. In discussing proposed limits on housing construction, commentator and policy analyst, Herbert Meyer observed that "our country's minority groups, such as our Black and Spanish-American citizens" suffered most from environmental restrictions. He continued:

> It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the most vicious racists in this country today are not those red-necked loudmouths who do the talking, but rather those politicians, bureaucrats, and social activists who struggle quietly to impose artificial limits on the number of new houses and apartment units that may be built in our cities, towns, and non-slum neighborhoods.[58]

Meyer ultimately concluded, "the war against progress will cripple our present drive to end racial discrimination in the United States."[59] In an economically and racially volatile era, Meyer's analysis offered convenient and controversial explanations. While some critics claimed that environmentalists were unambiguously racist, others

---

[57] George Claus and Karen Bolander, *Ecological Sanity* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1977), 15-16.
[58] Meyer, *The War Against Progress*, 42-43.
[59] Meyer, *The War Against Progress*, 125.

argued that the environmental agenda merely served as an impediment to ending racial and class inequality.

In addition to civil rights and housing activists' concerns about the potential racist implications of environmental legislation, other commentators detected broader class agendas. Reformers and scholars such as Bernard J. Frieden, professor of Urban Studies and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, worried about environmental regulations' impact on the middle and lower classes. Throughout *The Environmental Protection Hustle*, Frieden criticized the professional and elitist composition of the environmental movement and argued that environmentalists were selfish conservatives seeking to defend their privileged lifestyles. In addressing "why environmentalists attack homebuilding," he remarked, "Environmental issues have given a new respectability to defenders of the suburban status quo, spreading a cover of the public interest over what would otherwise be a narrow case of self-interest."[60] Condemning both local growth control regulations and the popular national environmental movement, Frieden surmised, "They [preservationists] try to guard well-to-do suburbs against change, and the environment they protect is a local environment their affluent members can afford to enjoy."[61] In an attempt to defuse what he deemed alarmist propaganda about threats to survival, Frieden concluded:

> The only threat is to the pleasures of affluent living, including the enjoyment of not having unwanted neighbors. And indeed, the talk of survival, limited resources, and austerity does not crimp the life-style of suburban environmentalists, but only of the people they keep outside.[62]

---

[60] Bernard J. Frieden, *The Environmental Protection Hustle* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1979), 119.
[61] Frieden, *The Environmental Protection Hustle*, 10.
[62] Frieden, *The Environmental Protection Hustle*, 181.

Ultimately, many critics such as Frieden concluded that environmentalists were decidedly conservative. Arguing that environmentalists were not a reanimation of 1960s radicals, but rather fierce upholders of the status quo, critics attempted to recast the young movement as a defense of privilege.

As the recession persisted into the 1980s, several journalists and public intellectuals sharpened their charges of environmentalism's inherent elitism. Hoping to counter the swelling popularity of the environmental movement, critics such as writer William Tucker argued that environmentalism was an aristocratic and conservative movement. In *Progress and Privilege*, Tucker revisited numerous critiques of environmentalists and their agendas. He not only argued that environmentalists were biocentric, anti-humanist, pagan, and anti-technology, but he also repeated claims that preservationists dangerously desired to stop all economic activity and progress.

Though employing a variety of critiques, Tucker focused mostly on portraying environmentalists as "upper-middle-class" elites concerned with protecting their privileged social and economic status. Claiming that American environmentalists, like the elites of other times and places, acted in defense of the status quo, Tucker depicted the environmental movement as ultimately conservative and "backward-looking." According to Tucker, environmentalists such as Paul Ehrlich worried about population growth because the rising numbers of the poor threatened their own lifestyles and affluence. As he criticized wilderness legislation, endangered species regulation, NEPA, and other provisions, Tucker assessed the self-interest of environmentalists, "All this, of course, only represents upper-middle-class people using their professional

and legal skills to twist and turn environmental concerns to their own purposes."[63] Tucker concluded, "At heart, environmentalism favors the affluent over the poor, the haves over the have-nots."[64]

Other writers echoed Tucker's assessment. In *The Coercive Utopians*, Rael Jean and Erich Isaac endeavored to expose "the well-hidden effort of the privileged, well-educated, affluent elite – who believe this country's institutions are evil and oppressive – to change our way of life, and not for the better."[65] Continuing a tradition linking environmental reform with un-American impulses, the Isaacs compared the modern environmental movement with Marxism, anarchism, and secular messianism. In addition, *The Coercive Utopians* also repeated claims of environmentalist alarmism, anti-technology, and anti-development. Like Tucker, the Isaacs argued that environmentalists disregarded the concerns of the poor in their efforts to create a utopian society for themselves.[66]



As they depicted environmentalists as deaf to lower class concerns, critics of environmental legislation and activism increasingly portrayed themselves as representing or honoring the "average American." Anti-environmentalists capitalized on a cultural trend starting in the mid-1970s which celebrated images and ideals of the working class. Critically acclaimed and popular major motion pictures such as *Dog Day Afternoon* (1975), *Rocky* (1976), *Taxi Driver* (1976), *Norma Rae* (1979), and

---

[63] William Tucker, *Progress and Privilege: America in the Age of Environmentalism* (Garden City: Anchor Press, 1982), 184.
[64] Tucker, *Progress and Privilege*, 36.
[65] Rael Jean Isaac and Erich Isaac, *The Coercive Utopians: Social Deception by America's Power Players* (Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1983), dust jacket.
[66] Isaac and Isaac, *The Coercive Utopians*, 51.

Raging Bull (1980) offered gritty portrayals of working-class heroes and anti-heroes who struggled against tremendous odds to make sense of the changing world around them. Set in urban or industrial locations, the films often depicted the challenges of life in a stagnating economy. For example, though ostensibly about the Vietnam War, the 1978 Best Picture winner, *Deer Hunter*, was also about life in a steel town on the Monongahela River, south of Pittsburgh. Chronicling the experiences and relationships of three men from Clairton, Pennsylvania, *Deer Hunter* exposed the limited choices and opportunities for America's working class.

Movies far removed from the hallowed Academy Awards also engaged the economic plight of individuals and the nation. The campy comedy, *Americathon* (1979), presented a bankrupt United States in the not-too-distant future of 1998 fighting foreclosure. President Chet Roosevelt, played by John Ritter, organized a telethon to stave off repossession by wealthy Native Americans. Popular musicians such as The Beach Boys, Meat Loaf, and Eddy Money, provided songs as well as special appearances for the "telethon." Warning that "we've got thirty days to save the nation," President Roosevelt and his cabinet enthusiastically endeavored to "take up a collection before America is all gone." Thus, from serious dramas such as *Deer Hunter* to over-the-top comedies such as *Americathon*, the films of the seventies not only reflected concerns over the national economic prognosis, but also acknowledged the struggles of workers and provided levity for indebted Americans.[67]

Likewise, mid-seventies' television shows presented working-class protagonists with real-world social and economic restraints. Starring Carroll

[67] *Americathon*, DVD, directed by Neil Israel (1979; Burbank, CA: Lorimar, 2011).

O'Connor as Archie Bunker, an opinionated Queens dock worker, *All in the Family* aired for almost the entirety of the 1970s. Similarly, programs such as *Laverne and Shirley*, *Sanford and Son*, and *Welcome Back, Kotter* presented beer bottlers, junk dealers, and an inner-city teacher, respectively, as generally virtuous and likeable working-class characters in urban settings. Even the opening credits and theme songs of many of the era's shows reflected the economic troubles of America's workers. *Good Times*, a program depicting the life of a struggling African-American family in Chicago, opened with footage of dilapidated, urban neighborhoods with lyrics telling of "temporary layoffs," "easy credit ripoffs," and a life spent "scratchin' and surviving." The theme song as well as the weekly travails of the fictional Evans family commiserated with poor and working class people who celebrated just "keepin' your head above water."[68]

Similarly, country musicians such as Johnny PayCheck and rock artists such as John Cougar and Bruce Springsteen who crooned about the frustrations of the working class also rose in popularity in the mid-to-late seventies. Acknowledging the tough economic times, entertainers modeled their image and crafted lyrics that celebrated blue-collar workers. For example, within weeks of its release, Springsteen's *Born to Run* (1975) album quickly climbed the charts. A blue-jean-clad Springsteen sang, "In the day we sweat it out in the streets of a runaway American dream/At night we ride through mansions of glory in suicide machines." He catapulted into the chorus of his working-class anthem, "We gotta get out while we're young/'Cause tramps like us,

[68] *Good Times*, DVD, directed by Gerren Keith, Herbert Kenwith, Bob LaHendro, and Donald McKayle (1974-1979; Culver City, CA: Sony Pictures Home Entertainment, 2008).

baby we were born to run."[69] Springsteen's fourth album, *Darkness at the Edge of Town* (1978), further explored the challenges and discontentment of working-class Americans. Springsteen and other entertainers not only discussed working-class fears and frustrations, but also cultivated a blue-collar persona.

Anti-environmentalists also capitalized on and contributed to a cultural milieu that celebrated or at least commiserated with the working class. Like many of the films, television programs, and musical groups of the era, anti-environmentalist rhetoric acknowledged and engaged the American worker. For example in early 1977, in hearings on the Endangered American Wilderness Act, Sandra Cook of Brookings, Oregon, not only expressed her opposition to new wilderness designations, but also claimed to speak for "a lot of hard working citizens." A secretary and the wife of a lumber mill worker, Cook contrasted her "average American family" with elite environmentalists. She concluded her testimony, "I am not a politician, but I do speak for a lot of people. People who have faith in me, and want to regain the faith that we all need in our Government. . . For 'We, the people' have a right to be heard."[70] Throughout congressional debates on environmental legislation, critics portrayed members of the working class as noble and stoic victims of elitist environmental controls.

Claiming to represent the voice of local, "hard-working" people against "elitist" environmentalists, critics called for more local hearings, rather than just Washington, D.C.-based debates. For example, in discussions surrounding proposals for expansion of Alabama wilderness areas, Ray Uhrig, an attorney from Huntsville,

---

[69] "The Backstreet Phantom of Rock," *Time* 106, no. 17 (October 27, 1975).
[70] House Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act*, 139-141.

Alabama, and a member of the Society for the Wise Use of Federal Forest Lands emphatically stated, "There have been no public hearings held in north Alabama for the citizens there . . . We request that public hearings be held in Alabama so that the local citizens might give opinions."[71] Likewise, Judge Hardin Franks of Oregon County, Missouri, contrasted the "easygoing and friendly" people of his county with the elite "people trying to escape the pressures of the city for a few days." Though acknowledging that Oregon County's residents were "the best on Earth," he warned that "we can be ornery and bull-headed, contrary, probably as much as a red-headed mother-in-law . . . You don't know the people down there. If it goes into wilderness, you start a civil war, I can assure you."[72] Reviving decades' old critiques of environmentalists as self-interested, upper-class preservationists, critics attempted to ally with gritty, pugnacious, hard-working Americans as the United States struggled through continued economic sluggishness and unemployment. Challengers of the environmental agenda aimed to counter the growing membership of environmental organizations with renewed charges of elitism.

By the mid-1980s, the discussion of elitism entered mainstream periodicals and scholarly journals. A *U.S. News & World Report* article, "Do Environmentalists Care About Poor People?" examined the relationship between minority populations and the "predominantly white, upper-middle-class" ecology movement. Quoting black activists, the article discussed allegations of "green bigotry" where environmental legislation such as the Endangered Species Act prevented the construction of low-

[71] House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, *Addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System*, 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982, 70-71.
[72] House Committee, *Addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System*, 16-17.

income housing. Though the article also addressed issues of what would come to be called environmental racism, the main focus remained on environmentalists, not industrial polluters.[73]

Through the course of the 1970s and into the early 1980s, critics refocused and refined their arguments against environmentalism. In the midst of an escalating oil embargo, climbing energy prices, mounting unemployment, rising inflation rates, and stagnating wages, businessmen, politicians, and concerned citizens increasingly charged that environmental regulations hindered economic recovery and growth. While some critics claimed that economic stagnation was an unintentional byproduct of environmental regulation, others charged that environmentalists deliberately sought to stall the nation's economic growth. In contrast to opponents in previous periods, recession-era critics generally focused on the fiscal implications of environmentalism. Linking wilderness designations and clean air legislation with job losses and economic dislocations, opponents portrayed environmentalism as a threat to the struggling American working class. Though allegations of alarmism, socialism, paganism, and biocentrism dotted the debates over environmental legislation in the 1970s, economic arguments dominated the discourse.

In particular, critics deployed emotional language to emphasize environmental legislations' impact on individual and family livelihood. Highlighting the numbers of jobs lost and workers displaced, politicians such as Senator Hayakawa and laborers' representatives such as cattleman Julian Brzoznowski called for a reevaluation of the

[73] Ronald A. Taylor, "Do Environmentalists Care About Poor People?," *U.S. News & World Report* (April 2, 1984): 51.

nation's commitment to environmentalism. Opponents of environmentalism not only claimed that onerous regulation may have caused the current recession, but also alleged that environmentalists' continued lobbying stalled domestic economic recovery.

As they catalogued environmentalist disregard for the livelihood and well-being of the nation's working class, critics effectively reasserted and sharpened charges of environmentalist elitism. In an era that celebrated or at least commiserated with the working class, anti-environmentalists aggressively portrayed environmentalists as the "other." While charges of elitism were not novel, by the 1980s, the critiques increasingly came from a unified and professional coterie of critics. Arguing that environmentalists were and generally always had been detached middle and upper class intellectuals, commentators such as William Tucker aimed to undermine the popularity of the young environmental movement. Book-length arguments such as Tucker's *Progress and Privilege* as well as articles in popular magazines such as *Harper's* delivered the charges of elitism to a broader public. The economic hardship and general malaise of the working class from the early 1970s through the beginning of the 1980s offered a fertile arena for anti-environmentalists to garner disaffected converts. Desiring to recapture a postwar economic atmosphere of unfettered affluence and abundance, anti-environmentalists vilified conservation measures and preservationist programs as fiscally irresponsible.

CHAPTER 4 – The Rise of Conservatism and the Institutionalization of Environmental Opposition, 1980-1988

On Thursday, November 20, 1980, president-elect Ronald Reagan sent a Western Union telegram to Nevada assemblyman and Sagebrush Rebellion organizer Dean Rhoads. Receiving over ninety-percent of the electoral vote and fifty-percent of the popular vote, Reagan expressed his gratitude to his many supporters for his landslide victory over incumbent Jimmy Carter. In particular, the former California governor thanked Rhoads's Sagebrushers and proudly supported the Western-based movement for greater local control of public land and resources. He stated:

> Dear Dean[:] Please convey best wishes to all my fellow 'Sagebrush Rebels.' . . . I renew my pledge to work toward a 'Sagebrush Solution.' My administration will work to insure that the states have an equitable share of public lands and their natural resources. To all good luck and thanks for your support.[1]

In addition to acknowledging Sagebrush support of his campaign, Reagan's telegram also signaled the growing professionalization of anti-environmentalism and presaged the institutionalization of environmental opposition. Reflecting broader changes in American politics, particularly the resurgence of conservatism, the election of Reagan suggested a redefinition of American values, attitudes, and priorities. Through the course of Reagan's political ascendency and two terms in office, a distinct anti-environmental movement coalesced. No longer a loose collection of disparate voices, by the 1980s, opponents of environmentalism enjoyed remarkable cohesion. In short, the conjoined rise of Ronald Reagan and the anti-environmental movement are

[1] House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, *Sagebrush Rebellion: Impacts on Energy and Minerals*, 96th Cong., 2nd sess., 1980, 287.

attributable to the resurgence of conservatism in the United States in the late-twentieth century.

This chapter will show how the language and goals of political and social conservatism became the rhetoric and agenda of anti-environmentalism and vice versa. As many Republican politicians and their advocates expressed frustration with the stagnating economy and general direction of American society and culture, the political ideology of conservatism enjoyed renewed popularity in the late 1970s and into the 1980s. The growing ranks of conservatives recognized that anti-environmentalists' call for relaxed environmental regulations fulfilled two main planks of the conservative platform: limited government and fiscal frugality. As such, in an effort to rejuvenate the American economy and recapture a postwar vision of the United States as confident and dominant, many conservatives merged their commitment to lower taxes and free markets with anti-environmentalist initiatives.

In addition, this chapter will analyze how the election of Ronald Reagan not only represented a triumph of conservatism, but also a helped anti-environmentalism achieve new levels of professionalization and institutionalization. Following the economically dismal 1970s, Reagan promised a reassertion of American confidence to overturn the nation's collective malaise. Championing deregulation and decreased spending, Reagan not only promoted a New Right agenda of limited government, but also introduced anti-environmental rhetoric into the executive branch of the United States government. With Reagan's election, environmentalism's opponents enjoyed increased presence in significant governmental positions. Critics of environmental regulation entered the White House, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental

Protection Agency, and other federal and local positions. Through executive orders, appointments, press releases, and speeches, Reagan skillfully challenged the environmental movement.

Flush with the imprimatur of the president, organizations opposed to environmental legislation also witnessed an increased professionalization. Not unlike the professionalization of major environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society, groups challenging environmentalists' agendas grew in membership, funding, and media presence. Organizations such as the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise and the Alliance for America provided national agendas and new leadership to previously transient and disparate grassroots groups. Paralleling and often overlapping with the spate of conservative think tanks, anti-environmental organizations suggested a tangible link between conservatism and anti-environmentalism.

Frustrated by ongoing stagflation and a perceived lack of leadership, conservatives and their ideological cousins, anti-environmentalists, hoped to revitalize the postwar myth of economic dominance and national confidence. Eagerly replacing Carter's humble "crisis of confidence" with Reagan's cowboy bravado, conservatives looked to redefine the fraught relationship between the federal government, U.S. citizens, and the American environment. The conservative movement not only signaled a shift in thinking about the size and function of the federal government, but it also heralded a shift in thinking about the purpose of land and resources. In short, as the economic recession continued and political conservatism gained momentum, the environmental movement encountered new and renewed challenges. Building on the

rhetoric and momentum of tax revolts, the Sagebrush Rebellion, and Reagan's election, opponents of environmentalism aimed to address the 1970s decade of environmental legislation and to counter the popularity of the environmental movement. With the election of Ronald Reagan and the formation of new national organizations, environmental opposition experienced increased institutionalization and professionalization throughout the 1980s.

ꕥ

The conservative movement emerged as a response to several midcentury social, cultural, and economic transformations in the United States. Simmering since the early 1960s, the crusade challenged New Deal visions of the federal government and offered an antidote to the era's personal liberation movements. Landmark economic treatises such as Milton Friedman's *Capitalism and Freedom* (1962) provoked popular new critiques of postwar liberalism and Keynesian economics. Promoting privatization and deregulation, Friedman constructed an alluring case for smaller government as well as the implementation of monetarism. *Capitalism and Freedom* offered conservatives a political and economic template to challenge liberal philosophies and policies. With well-managed monetary supply and faith in the market, Friedman and his followers argued, the United States could once again be a prosperous and dominant economic force.[2]

Other intellectuals and public figures advanced complementary suggestions to reclaim America's mythic mission. Politicians such as Barry Goldwater challenged his fellow citizens to question their leaders as well as the nation's commitment to ensuring freedom at home and abroad. The publication of Goldwater's *The*

[2] Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

Conscience of a Conservative in 1960, catapulted conservative candidates and ideology onto the national political scene. Armed with the Arizona senator's forthright treatise on the federal government, the Constitution, and individual freedom, "Goldwater Clubs" and other conservative coalitions endeavored to redirect the national political conversation. By the 1964 presidential campaign, a conservative movement, generally dormant since the 1920s, threatened to reconfigure the electoral map. Ronald Reagan's televised speech in support of Goldwater on October 24, 1964, rallied many Americans to reevaluate the country's leadership. The actor-turned-politician left his national audience with a stark choice, "You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on Earth, or we will sentence them to the last step into a thousand years of darkness."[3] Though Goldwater lost the 1964 contest to Lyndon Johnson, his success in the South and West revealed the growing support for conservative thought in the United States. Garnering votes from white, middle-class suburban residents, Goldwater and other Republicans witnessed grassroots mobilization of conservatism. While neoconservative intellectuals piloted think tanks such as the Cato Institute, the Heritage Foundation, and the American Enterprise Institute, much of the support for conservatism came from average Americans, dubbed "suburban warriors" by historian Lisa McGirr, who expressed unease with the nation's declining diplomatic and economic leverage.[4]

---

[3] Ronald Reagan, "Rendezvous with Destiny," October 24, 1964, Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Museum. http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/reference/timechoosing.html (accessed October 5, 2011.)

[4] Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 3-19.

By the 1970s, in addition to a revival of political conservatism, social and religious conservatism also coursed through the nation. Nervous about a perceived decline in moral standards and respect for authority, conservative commentators, pastors, and other spokesmen sought to reassert the primacy of "family values" in the national culture. In light of momentous proceedings such as the *Roe v. Wade* abortion ruling in 1973 and debates over the Equal Rights Amendment throughout the 1970s, conservatives articulated their anxieties over loosening sexual mores and social norms. Fearing irrevocable threats to the traditional family structure, conservative activists such as Phyllis Schlafly protested the adoption of the ERA. Worried that the amendment endangered "the right to be a housewife," Schlafly mobilized conservative women and ultimately prevented ratification of the ERA.[5]

Relatedly, the coalescence of the "Moral Majority" signified organization of religious conservatives. In the late seventies, Reverend Jerry Falwell rallied fellow Baptists and other evangelical Christians to assert their religious values in the political arena. Through his popular television program as well as numerous speaking engagements throughout the country, Falwell encouraged members of the Christian Right to join Schlafly's campaign to defeat the ERA. He summed, "ERA is not merely a political issue, but a moral issue as well. A definite violation of holy Scripture, ERA defies the mandate that 'the husband is the head of the wife, even as

[5] For more discussion of Phyllis Schlafly's battle against ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, see: Donald Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Donald G. Mathews and Jane Sherron De Hart, *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of the ERA* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Catherine E. Rymph, *Republican Women: Feminism and Conservatism from Suffrage through the Rise of the New Right* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Christ is the head of the church.'"[6] With charismatic and vocal leaders such as Schlafly and Falwell, social and religious conservatism effortlessly merged with political and economic conservatism by the late 1970s.[7] Though not engaging directly with environmental issues, conservative leaders and their enthusiastic followers called for an overall reevaluation of the era's popular movements and governmental initiatives.

With an established ideological foundation, growing grassroots support, and popular leaders, conservatives quickly translated ideas and philosophies into action. Through new publications such as *Conservative Digest*, conservatives shared strategies and motivated one another to advocate for radical changes in the nation's laws. In particular, many Republicans called for drastic reevaluation of taxation. As citizens readied for celebrations of the nation's bicentennial in 1976, calls for tax revolts echoed throughout the United States. From Maine to Pennsylvania to Arizona, residents expressed anger and frustration with stagnating wages and rising taxes.[8] Focusing their ire on federal income and local property taxes, tax fighters aimed to resurrect the spirit of '76 and threatened an all-out tax rebellion. For example, Marvin L. Cooley, author of *Tea Party 1976: A Handbook for Patriots*, called for redress of "the tyrannical practices of the Internal Revenue Service."[9] Convicted of "willfully

---

[6] Jerry Falwell, *Listen America* (New York: Doubleday, 1980), 150-151. For more discussion of Falwell's Moral Majority, see also: Erling Jorstad, *Evangelicals in the White House: The Cultural Maturation of Born Again Christianity*, 1960-1987 (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1981); Michael Lienesch, *Redeeming America: Piety and Politics in the New Christian Right* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); William Martin, *With God on Our Side: The Rise of the Religious Right in America* (New York: Broadway, 1996).

[7] Paul Weyrich, "Building the Moral Majority," *Conservative Digest*, August 1979, 18-19; see also, Jerome L. Himmelstein, *To the Right: The Transformation of American Conservatism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

[8] Alan Crawford, "The Taxfighters Are Coming!" *Conservative Digest*, November 1975, 13-14.

[9] Marvin L. Cooley, *Tea Party 1976: A Handbook for Patriots* (Tri-City Printing Company, 1975).

and knowingly failing to file a federal income tax return" in 1968, 1969, and 1970, the Maricopa County, Arizona, resident continued to challenge the federal government's authority.[10] Sentenced to one year imprisonment and a $2000 fine on each of the three counts, Cooley enjoyed limited success in the battle against what he perceived as onerous and unjust taxation.

A few short years later, residents of California won significantly greater success. Led by retired home-appliance manufacturer and ardent Goldwater supporter, Howard Jarvis, tax rebels pushed through Proposition 13. Capping property taxes at one percent of property values and requiring a popular referendum for future tax increases, California voters approved the proposition on June 6, 1978, by sixty-five percent. California's Proposition 13 and other tax revolts throughout the country signified growing, grassroots support for conservative principles.[11]

Building on tax rebels' questioning of federal authority, activists expanded the conservative agenda into new realms. Increasingly throughout the 1970s, critics of the environmental movement expressed fears about growing threats to American rights and the U.S. system of government. Arguing that environmental legislation infringed upon citizens' and states' rights, politicians, extractive-industry representatives, and others endeavored to weaken or prevent future conservation and preservation measures.

Numerous critics charged that the new era of environmental legislation blatantly and deliberately threatened property rights. Groups such as the Pacific Legal Foundation challenged conservation bills and public lands management proposals.

---

[10] *Marvin L. Cooley v. United States of America*, 501 F.2d 1249 (9th Cir. 1974).
[11] Howard Jarvis and Robert Pack, *I'm Mad as Hell: The Exclusive Story of the Tax Revolt and Its Leader* (New York: Times Books, 1979).

For example, PLF's Donald M. Pach opposed land use legislation submitted by Representatives Morris K. Udall and Alan Steelman. He argued that the federal government must compensate businesses and landowners affected by new environmental regulations or else the new controls would constitute a taking and would infringe on citizens' property rights. Citing "the Fifth Amendment guarantee against confiscation of property," Pach reasoned that it was not "socially desirable to force individuals to absorb the losses which will occur in the quest for a better environment through land use controls."[12] In the same hearing, David K. Witts of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association expressed his view of conservation legislation:

> What is really at issue? Attack on private property and free enterprise. This is a frontal assault on private property rights and the free enterprise system. It opens the door to taking property without compensation through condemnation by proclamation . . . But nobody wants to kiss property rights goodbye in the name of purity.[13]

Deploying terms such as "assault" and "attack," Witts framed the debate in terms of an emotional and ideological battle. As he depicted environmentalists as set on annihilating private property rights, the rancher aimed to steel recruits for the upcoming political war.

Likewise, in hearings discussing the proposed Hells Canyon wilderness area, several witnesses opposed the designation arguing that the classification would violate citizens' property rights. Oregon rancher George Justice implored, "We are of the opinion that the private land in the county should remain private, with all the rights and privileges that are guaranteed by our constitution and laws." Accusing the federal

[12] House Committee, *Land Use and Resource Conservation*, 251-257.
[13] House Committee, *Land Use and Resource Conservation*, 531-533.

government of an illegal "land grab," Justice compared the situation of Wallowa County landowners with the plight of Native Americans. He asserted:

> We now know how Chief Joseph must have felt as he retreated from his homeland with his tribe, pursued by General Howard and his troops . . . I am sure that the landowners along the Imnaha will battle against this confiscation of not only our land but the basic freedoms set forth by our Constitution.[14]

In a period of heightened Native American activism, Justice deployed a powerful parallel to express his disgust with wilderness legislation. Just a year prior, American Indian Movement protestors occupied the Bureau of Indian Affairs headquarters in Washington, D.C., as part of AIM's "Trail of Broken Treaties." Thus, in order to emphasize his opposition to environmental proposals, Justice not only summoned America's constitutional legacy, but he also drew on contemporary rhetoric from the Red Power movement.

Hearings on the Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1977 echoed Justice's charge of rights infringement via a federal "land grab." Dick Moon, chairman of the National Outdoor Coalition, deemed the proposed legislation a "heinous bill" and concluded, "There is no question that these requests for more and more wilderness are not based on any intelligent need, but a gigantic land grab of grotesque proportions for any and all acreage available."[15] Likewise, in response to the proposal to expand grizzly bear habitat in Wyoming, Mr. and Mrs. George Taylor of Willow Creek Ranch wrote to Senator Clifford Hansen expressing, "Our feeling is that this is another land grab to furnish jobs for administrators and other bureaucrats at the taxpayers' expense."[16]

---

[14] Senate Committee, *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*, 165-166.
[15] House Committee, *Endangered American Wilderness Act*, 211. [underlining in original]
[16] Senate Committee, *Proposed Critical Habitat Area for Grizzly Bears*, 199.

Newspaper editorials and magazine opinion pieces echoed the fear of a federal land grab as well. In a December 1978 cover feature, *Conservative Digest* criticized the environmentalists' desire to "lock up over 200 million acres of public lands in Wilderness areas." "The Big Federal Land Grab" outlined the provisions of phase two of the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II) and instructed readers to write their congressmen in order to stall the "land grab" and counter the "unified, anti-growth strategy [of] the Carter administration."[17]

In addition, many politicians and activists argued that environmental legislation threatened the American legacy of states' rights. Throughout debates on wildlife and public lands management, critics asserted that environmental legislation encouraged federal agencies to infringe upon local and regional decision-making processes. For example, in discussions on the expansion of protected grizzly bear habitat, witnesses such as Jay Ward of the Cody Country Sportsman's Club expressed a "growing unrest" that "the U.S. Department of Interior supplanted our State's right to manage the grizzly bear as a game animal."[18]

Furthermore, critics contended that environmental legislation also undermined numerous individual rights of U.S. citizens. Testifying in opposition to the Bureau of Land Management Organic Act, Frank W. Lewis of the Nevada Miners and Prospectors Association not only charged environmentalists with biocentrism and alarmism, but also alleged that environmental legislation threatened numerous inalienable rights. Officially termed the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act of 1976, the Organic Act required environmental impact statements of the public domain

[17] "The Big Federal Land Grab," *Conservative Digest*, December 1978, 7-11.
[18] Senate Committee, *Proposed Critical Habitat Area for Grizzly Bears*, 63.

and authorized "active federal land management" by the BLM. According to the provision, ranchers, prospectors, and others would no longer dictate how federal lands would be used.[19] Worried about the "rights of individuals to conduct mineral exploration . . . [and] the rights of individuals to mine or prospect or conduct any of the activities we now enjoy," Lewis argued, "They don't give a darn about an individual's rights." Stating that all new laws should *expand*, not restrict freedom, Lewis feared the implications of more conservation legislation and implored Congress to rekindle the spirit of laws such as the Mining Law of 1872, which served as a "model of expanded freedom, dignity of an individual, and lasting usefulness to our people." He ultimately concluded that "this bill should not be called the National Resource Lands Management Act of 1973 [but] should be called the Reaffirmation of the Authority of King George and Treaty of Surrender of Everything Gained in 1776."[20] Mike Hinshaw of the American Motorcycle Association echoed Lewis's concern for loss of individual rights. In addition to denouncing environmentalists' alarmism, emotionalism, and "lack of factual evidence," Hinshaw declared, "It is the individual's basic right as a U.S. citizen to enjoy and pursue his outlet."[21] In the years approaching the bicentennial, witness such as Lewis and Hinshaw not only resurrected revolutionary rhetoric to express their disdain for environmental legislation, but they also drew upon growing conservative ideology. Reappropriating and redefining

[19] Richard N.L. Andrews, *Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves: A History of American Environmental Policy*, 2nd ed. (1999; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 96, 172-173, 312, 366.
[20] House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Public Lands, *BLM Organic Act – Part I*, 93rd Cong., 1974, 161-165.
[21] House Committee, *BLM Organic Act – Part I*, 632-635. For more detailed analysis of the opposition to the Bureau of Land Management, see: James R. Skillen, *The Nation's Largest Landlord: The Bureau of Land Management in the American West* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009).

conceptions of freedom and rights, anti-environmentalists capitalized on and advanced the late twentieth century conservative ascendency.

By the end of the decade, a loose coalition of western politicians, ranchers, miners, and boosters protested the infringement on individual and states' rights. Beginning with legislative proposals in Nevada in the late-1970s, Sagebrush Rebels endeavored to transfer control of public lands from the federal government to the states. Often citing many of the traditional arguments against environmental regulation and environmentalists, the rebels depicted legislation such as the Wilderness Act, Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE) programs, and, most notably, the BLM Organic Act as catastrophic infringement of rights. Frustrated by the increased federal presence and control of rangelands and other public property, Sagebrush Rebellion proponents sought to denigrate preservationists and their agendas. For example, in one of the rebellion's first conferences in September 1979, in Reno, Nevada, Utah Senator Orrin Hatch denigrated environmentalism as a "cult of toadstool worshippers" and labeled environmentalists as "extremists," disinterested "dandelion pickers," and irresponsible "land embalmers."[22]

Though often identified as a distinctly western phenomenon, the Sagebrush Rebellion was a continuation and manifestation of a broader national development of both conservative ideology and anti-environmental thought. While new management regulations such as the Organic Act and rising grazing fees sparked the movement, the late seventies' Sagebrush Rebellion was also a distinct product of a resurgent

[22] LaVarr Webb, "Sagebrush Rebels' Wind Up Summit," *Deseret News*, September 7, 1979; Jedediah S. Rogers, "Land Grabbers, Toadstool Worshippers, and the Sagebrush Rebellion in Utah, 1979-1981" (master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 2005); David Helvarg, *The War Against the Greens: The "Wise-Use Movement, the New Right, and the Browning of America* (Boulder, CO: Johnson Books, 2004), 34.

conservatism that called for greater individual rights and less governmental control of public land. As BLM agents and administrators conducted more wilderness reviews and upheld a multiple-use mandate of the public domain, Sagebrushers adopted conservative rhetoric to fight what they perceived as excessive expansion of the federal government. Though short lived, many of the rebels' tactics, networks, and arguments endured into subsequent decades with the maturation of the Wise Use movement.[23]

Not merely a professional thank you to a political supporter, Ronald Reagan's telegram to Sagebrush leader Dean Rhoads also served as an ideological bridge between regional, grassroots opposition to environmentalism and a broader institutionalization of anti-environmental rhetoric. Through informal comments on environmental issues as well as through official executive orders and appointments, Reagan crafted an atmosphere that questioned the rising environmental sentiment of the United States. In his mission to execute a neoconservative agenda of deregulation and fiscal responsibility, the fortieth president of the United States also sanctioned critiques of the popular environmental movement. With the president's support, critics of the environmental movement organized broader campaigns and sought a wider audience.[24]

---

[23] For further discussion of the Sagebrush Rebellion see: R. McGregor Cawley, *Federal Land, Western Anger: The Sagebrush Rebellion and Environmental Politics* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1993); William L. Graf, *Wilderness Preservation and the Sagebrush Rebellions* (Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1990); Jacqueline Vaughn Switzer, *Green Backlash* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997), 171-190.

[24] For further analysis of Ronald Reagan and other presidents' environmental policies see: Byron W. Daynes and Glen Sussman, *White House Politics and the Environment: Franklin D. Roosevelt to George W. Bush* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2010); Tarla Rai Peterson, ed., *Green Talk in the White House: The Rhetorical Presidency Encounters Ecology* (College Station: Texas A&M

In both offhand remarks and prepared speeches, Reagan offered a foil to the popularity of environmentalism. Advancing a philosophy of resource development "for the betterment of man," Reagan challenged the alleged biocentrism and preservationist ethic that characterized the modern environmental movement.[25] First as a political candidate and then as president, Reagan fostered anti-environmental arguments through casual rhetoric. Claiming that trees were a greater source of pollution than industry and that Mount St. Helen's was a greater source of air pollution than cars, Reagan refuted popular environmental beliefs about industrialization and consumption.[26] In addition, he criticized environmentalists directly and humorously. For example, in a March 1983 press conference, in response to a question about the "slowness in getting the Superfund into action," the president quipped, "Well there is environmental extremism. I don't think they'll [environmentalists] be happy until the White House looks like a bird's nest."[27] Though laughter followed the comment and Reagan further qualified his statement ten days later in a subsequent press conference, the offhand remark nevertheless further solidified Reagan's anti-environmental stance.[28] In addition, actions such as removing the solar panels President Carter installed on the White House also reinforced Reagan's image as hostile to alternative energy in specific and the environmental agenda in general. Administration

---

University Press, 2004); John Patrick Diggins, *Ronald Reagan: Fate, Freedom, and the Making of History* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2007).

[25] "Remarks at Dedication Ceremonies for the New Building of the National Geographic Society June 19, 1984," *The Public Papers of the Ronald W. Reagan*. Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1984/61984a.htm (accessed July 30, 2011)

[26] Kathy Koch, "Philosophical Split Divides Candidates on Environment," *Congressional Quarterly* (October 18, 1980): 3132, 3162.

[27] "Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With Reporters on Domestic and Foreign Policy Issues March 11, 1983." *The Public Papers of Ronald W. Reagan*. Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1983/31183c.htm (accessed July 30, 2011)

[28] "Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With Reporters on the Nomination of William D. Ruckelshaus March 21, 1983." *The Public Papers of Ronald W. Reagan*. Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1983/32183a.htm (accessed July 30, 2011)

spokesmen claimed that maintenance crews removed the panels during routine repairs, but neglected to replace them. Though the panels only offset a negligible amount of the building's power, their removal offered a physical manifestation of the president's views on environmentalism and energy alternatives.[29]

Reagan's official pronouncements, executive orders, and appointments provided further institutionalization of environmental opposition. Pursuing a New Right philosophy of limited government, Reagan not only enacted a rigorous agenda of deregulation and fiscal conservatism, but also buttressed anti-environmental sentiment. Proposals such as the aborted "asset management program" expressed Reagan's twined goals of fiscal prudence and decreased environmental regulation. Suggesting the privatization of thirty-five million acres of federal wilderness lands, the plan recommended selling parcels from the national forests, national parks, as well as wilderness refuges.

In addition, within a month of moving into the White House, Reagan issued Executive Order 12290 which revoked Carter's ban on the export of restricted and hazardous substances. Promising "to ensure that the Export Administration Act of 1979 is implemented with the minimum regulatory burden," Reagan advanced an agenda of "regulatory relief" despite environmentalists' concerns.[30] On the same day that he revoked Carter's executive order on hazardous substances, February 17, 1981, Reagan also filed Executive Order 12291 which required a cost-benefit analysis for all

---

[29] *Wall Street Journal*, "Asides: Goodbye to All That," August 25, 1986. After President Reagan had the solar panels removed from the White House, Unity College in Maine acquired the thirty-two thermal solar hot water heaters and installed them atop the school cafeteria.

[30] Jimmy Carter, *Executive Order 12264: Export of Banned or Significantly Restricted Substances*, January 15, 1981; Ronald Reagan, *Executive Order 12290: Federal Exports and Excessive Regulation*, February 17, 1981.

executive agencies. Though not leveled solely at environmental regulatory agencies, the order encouraged budgetary cuts of numerous environmental programs including air pollution control, pesticide management, and wastewater treatment, among others. Four years later, Reagan further strengthened administrative control over environmental regulation with Executive Order 12498 which required executive agencies to submit annual proposals to the Office of Management and Budget. Creating a regulatory planning and review process, the provision not only ensured "Presidential oversight of the regulatory process," but also threatened to reduce the jurisdiction and activities of many environmental agencies.[31]

In the latter half of his second term, Reagan more directly challenged environmental regulation with Executive Order 12630. Requiring Takings Impacts Assessments (TIAs) of proposed federal projects, the order reified the arguments of Sagebrush rebels and others who maintained that the federal government should compensate landowners for loss of profit or potential future profit due to environmental regulations.[32] Citing the just compensation clause of the Fifth Amendment as well as a "regard for fiscal accountability," Reagan broadened the definition of "takings" and threatened the feasibility of environmental legislation such as the Endangered Species Act. Following Reagan's tenure, several lawmakers attempted to codify Executive Order 12630 into law. Senators Steve Symms and Bob Dole introduced takings and private property bills, but both measures failed to pass.

---

[31] Ronald Reagan, *Executive Order 12498*: *Regulatory Planning Process*, January 4, 1985; *Federal Register*, vol. 50, (January 4, 1985): 1036.
[32] Ronald Reagan, *Executive Order 12630: Governmental Actions and Interference With Constitutionally Protected Property Rights*, March 16, 1988; *Federal Register*, vol. 53, no. 53, (March 15, 1988): 8859.

In addition to executive orders, Reagan also expressed his environmental views through opposition to proposed environmental legislation. Ignoring the Clean Air Act reauthorization, vetoing the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1987, and opposing legislation such as the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987, Reagan continued to press his tripartite agenda of limited government, fiscal conservatism, and relaxed environmental regulations. Though defense spending soared, Reagan steadfastly preached austerity in regard to environmental programs.

Relatedly, the administration's budget cuts of environmental agencies also aided in the institutionalization of anti-environmentalism. In his first year in office, for example, Reagan proposed to cut the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency from $4.7 billion to $1.4 billion, including a reduction in 1,500 staff members.[33] Serving to not only reduce budgetary expenditures, but also relax the regulatory burden on businesses and other government agencies, the EPA cuts addressed several of Reagan's stated goals. Likewise, the administration advocated a $250 million reduction in appropriations for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program established in 1964 that reserved money for the purchase of "land, water, and wetlands" for natural resource protection and recreation.[34]

In addition, Reagan's executive appointments also served to further institutionalize opposition to environmentalism. Choosing pro-business advocates of limited government to head key environmental agencies, Reagan recruited an administrative team that would enact his agenda of fiscal conservatism and

---

[33] House Committee on the Budget, Task Force on Energy and the Environment, *Fiscal Year 1982 Budget Proposals for Energy, Environmental, and Natural Resources Programs*, 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981, 445-446.
[34] House Committee, *Fiscal Year 1982 Budget Proposals for Energy, Environmental, and Natural Resources Programs*, 248.

"Regulatory Relief." For example, the president tapped Anne Gorsuch to head the EPA. While a member of the Colorado House of Representatives, Gorsuch advocated conservative reforms of state government and opposed hazardous waste control legislation. Believing that counties should control hazardous waste regulation, Gorsuch fought the adoption and implementation of state waste control laws.[35]

Promising to bring greater efficiency and bookkeeping to the agency, Gorsuch pledged further cuts to the EPA's budget and workforce. Her FY1983 budget proposed a 28 percent cut from the 1981 budget, including a 30 percent reduction in workforce and a 40 percent cut in research funding.[36] In addition to rigorous budget cuts, Gorsuch also aimed to implement significant deregulation and looser standards for industry. Questioning Gorsuch's management of the Superfund program, the House Energy Commission requested documents from the administrator. Concerned that the agency ignored leads about "responsible parties" and "that major chemical companies are not being held liable for the full cost of cleaning up their portion of the wastes at some of the largest waste sites in the country," the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight issued a subpoena to Gorsuch on November 16, 1982.[37] In a November 30 letter, Reagan wrote to Gorsuch, "I instruct you and your agency not to furnish copies of this category of documents to the Subcommittees in response

[35] For detailed perspectives on Burford's political career see: Anne M. (Gorsuch) Burford, *Are You Tough Enough?* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1986); Jonathan Lash, Katherine Gillman, and David Sheridan, *A Season of Spoils: The Story of the Reagan Administration's Attack on the Environment* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984).
[36] Lash et al, *A Season of Spoils*, 56.
[37] House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, *Hazardous Waste Contamination of Water Resources (Access to EPA Superfund Records)*, 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982, 3.

to their subpoenas."[38] Following Reagan's advisement, Gorsuch refused to deliver the documents claiming executive privilege. Cited for contempt of Congress, Gorsuch resigned on March 9, 1983.[39] In addition to the resignation of twenty other appointees, the EPA's director of hazardous waste programs, Rita Lavelle, served six months in jail on charges of perjury and obstruction of justice.[40]

Though Reagan attempted to reward Gorsuch's fidelity and obedience with an appointment as chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, criticism from environmentalists such as Jay Hair, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, stalled the appointment.[41] In addition, Gorsuch herself seemed unenthusiastic about the position, calling the advisory committee "a nothing-burger."[42] In short, despite the controversy surrounding Gorsuch's tenure as EPA administrator, Reagan remained committed to installing environmental skeptics in the nation's top environmental agencies.

One of the most notable and infamous Reagan appointments was the designation of James Gaius Watt as Secretary of the Interior. Though often cited for its role in galvanizing environmentalists against the Reagan administration and increasing the membership rolls of the "Big Ten" environmental organizations, the appointment also served to further institutionalize and legitimize environmental

---

[38] House Committee, *Hazardous Waste Contamination of Water Resources (Access to EPA Superfund Records)*, 70-71.
[39] House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, *EPA Withholding of Superfund Files*, 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982, 3.
[40] Helvarg, *The War Against the Greens*, 41.
[41] "Appointment of Eight Members of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, and Designation of Chairman July 2, 1984," *Public Papers of President Ronald W. Reagan*. Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1984/70284b.htm (accessed 30 July 2011); *New York Times*, "Naming of Mrs. Burford Prompts Confrontation," July 4, 1984.
[42] *New York Times*, "Burford Criticizes Committee," July 29, 1984.

opposition. Prior to his term as Secretary of the Interior, Watt helped to form and direct Joseph Coors's Mountain States Legal Foundation. As Watt explained in his nomination hearing, the Joseph Coors-backed organization "[was] dedicated to the values and concepts of individual freedom, our right to private property and the private enterprise system" and aimed to "defend individuals and the private sector from illegal and excessive bureaucratic regulation."[43]

In addition to an emphasis on individual freedoms and rights, the organization also challenged the environmental agenda. While president and chief legal officer of MSLF, Watt delivered a speech in Dallas, Texas, expressing his assessment of environmentalists. The May 8, 1978 speech before the Conservation Foundation, the League of Women Voters, and the Texas Utilities Company summarized Watt's and the MSLF's anti-environmentalist views. Calling members of the Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, and the Natural Resources Defense Council "extremists" and "zealot[s]," Watt questioned the motives of "activist groups." Stating that "the men and women of the West" were better stewards of the land than outsiders, Watt argued for more local control of resource development and "less regulatory red-tape and delay." Like many critics of environmentalism before him, Watt argued that environmentalists used deception and "emotional appeals" to advance their agenda. Criticizing environmentalists for their "frivolous" use of the courts and "the administrative process," Watt worried that lobbyists and activists prevented the development of domestic energy resources. In addition, Watt contended that the "harassing tactics" of environmentalists threatened the United States with

[43] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, *James G. Watt Nomination*, 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981, 29-30.

"energy shortages," "severe economic hardship," "social dislocation," and the loss of "hundreds of thousands of jobs, of not millions." Ultimately, Watt concluded that environmentalists were "the greatest threat to the ecology of the West."[44]

Upon assuming the office of Secretary of the Interior, Watt endeavored to challenge environmentalists' vision for the nation. He appeared on several national television news programs proclaiming, "I'm a Sagebrush Rebel." When questioned about the genesis and justification of the rebellion, Watt revealed the growing partisan nature of environmental politics, stating, "We're rebelling against those liberal Democrats that would snuff out America if we Republicans don't stop them." Upset with the "arrogance [and] the dictatorial positions the Department of the Interior has taken" in the past, Watt pledged to reevaluate the nation's use of land and natural resources.[45]

Imposing a moratorium on allocations for federal land purchases under the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Watt aimed to redefine the Interior Department's mission.[46] Arguing that "we must take action now if we are to remain a free and prosperous Nation," Watt advocated increased drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf and greater mineral exploration in federal lands.[47] To symbolically mark the agency's change in direction, Watt repositioned the buffalo on the Interior Department's seal.

---

[44] James G. Watt, "Environmentalists: A Threat to the Ecology of the West," speech delivered May 8, 1978, Dallas, TX. Reprinted in: House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Briefing by the Secretary of the Interior*, 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981, 57-68.
[45] *MacNeil/Lehrer Report*, WETA-TV, PBS, December 22, 1980; *Good Morning America*, ABC, February 26, 1981; *CBS Evening News*, CBS, October 19, 1981, Box 15, James G. Watt Papers, Collection Number 7667, AHC.
[46] Keynote Address, Secretary James Watt, Outdoor Writers Association of America, Louisville, Kentucky, June 15, 1981, Box 18, Watt Papers, AHC.
[47] Excerpts of Remarks by Secretary Watt to the National Public Lands Council, Reno, Nevada, September 21, 1982; Excerpts from Remarks by Secretary Watt before the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, New York City, August 12, 1982, Box 7, William Perry Pendley Papers, 1977-1984 Collection Number 9691, AHC.

In a letter to friends, supporters, and colleagues, Watt explained the shift to his conservative compatriots:

> The official seal of the Department of the Interior presents a buffalo which appears to be moving to the left. I have created a personal seal for the Office of the Secretary with the buffalo moving in the right direction . . . We are turning the buffalo around so that he will move in the right direction. With the right support from Congress (which we are getting), and the right support from the American people, we will be successful in bringing about the changes needed to RESTORE AMERICA'S GREATNESS.[48]

To thank recipients for their "loyalty and friendship," Watt included a "right-facing" buffalo pin with each letter. The redirected buffalo offered a graphic representation of the fusion of conservatism and anti-environmentalism.

Like Reagan, Watt's casual comments regarding environmentalists as well as his official pronouncements on environmental management advanced an anti-environmental rhetoric. Through dozens of interviews, speeches, articles, and a few appearances before congressional committees, Watt repeated and popularized familiar arguments against environmentalists. Predominantly, he argued that environmentalists were alarmists who threatened America's prosperity. At an October 1981 speech before the Associated Press Managing Editors in Toronto, Ontario, Watt contrasted environmentalists' dangerous "hysteria" against his efforts to "build our economy and strengthen our national security." Summing that both he and the entire Reagan administration desired "to move the pendulum from the far extreme of preservationism," Watt concluded his remarks, "We seek to restore America to her greatness."[49] Stating that environmentalists promoted an anti-progress and anti-

[48] "Secretary of the Interior—'Buffalo Letter'—1982," Box 9, Folder 1, Watt Papers, AHC. [emphasis in original]
[49] Secretary of the Interior James Watt, Speech to the Associated Press Managing Editors, Toronto, Canada, October 23, 1981, Box 18, Watt Papers, AHC.

growth worldview, Watt argued that environmentalists threatened America's future. In an interview with editors of *LandMARC*, a coal and energy trade magazine, Watt maintained that "commercial environmentalists . . . seek to obstruct progress at every opportunity."[50]

Throughout many of his depictions of environmentalists, Watt worried that environmentalists desired to replace American capitalism and democracy with socialism. In an appearance on CNN's *Evans/Novak Program*, Watt argued that environmentalists "want to change the form of government."[51] Likewise, on Washington, D.C.'s *The Larry King Show*, Watt contended that "they . . . want to elevate the central institutions of government to regulate social behavior and conduct."[52] Reviving previous era's concerns of communist infiltration, the secretary linked past fears with contemporary conservative anxieties. In addition to charges of socialism, Watt also compared environmental leaders with fascist central planners. In a January 1983 interview, he warned, "Look what happened to Germany in the 1930s . . . the dignity of man was subordinated to the powers of Nazism."[53] Though not directly paralleling environmentalists with Nazis, Watt argued that their ability to transform government and society was similar. In numerous speaking engagements throughout the country, Watt rhetorically asked his audience:

> Are we going to allow the centralized dictatorial control of government to manage our economy and our social well being or are we going to let there be freedom of the individual and freedom in the marketplace? Are we going to

[50] Secretary James Watt," *LandMARC*, May/June 1983, Box 19, Watt Papers, AHC.
[51] *Evans/Novak Program*, "Interview with Secretary Watt," CNN, March 26, 1983, Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC.
[52] The Larry King Show, "Interview with Secretary James Watt," Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC.
[53] *Channel 4 News*, "Watt Comments on Environmental Goals," WRC-TV; *CBS Evening News*, Dan Rather, "Watt Praises Reagan; Criticizes Environmentalists;" *NBC Nightly News*, Tom Brokaw, "Watt Comments on Environmental Objectives," January 20, 1983 Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC; Interview with James Watt, "Secretary Watt Fires Back at His Critics," *Business Week*, January 24, 1983, 85-86, 94.

> allow the resources of this land, human and natural, to be allocated by the will of the people, or by the dictates of a centralized economic planning force? That's the battleground . . . Join with me in this battle.[54]

As he contrasted his vision of American freedom with environmentalists' agenda for centralized control, Watt deployed Cold War rhetoric to define his ideological battle with environmentalists.

In addition, Watt repeatedly highlighted the elitist nature of the modern environmental movement. In a September 1982 speech before the National Public Lands Council in Reno, Nevada, epicenter of the Sagebrush Rebellion, Watt proclaimed:

> Some of the Johnnies-come-lately to the environmental ethic confuse preservation with conservation. They think that the only way to protect the environment is to lock away the land so that it cannot be used—except by those with the time, money and good health to trample the wilderness in expensive hiking boots.[55]

Elucidating a distinction between preservationists, conservationists, and contemporary environmentalists, Watt aimed to redefine the boundaries between the groups as those who are for America and its people and those who are elitist challengers of the nation's values. In evaluating the opprobrium leveled at his policies, Watt proudly emphasized, "I haven't had one criticism from a truck driver or coal miner." Perpetuating a strategy begun a few years prior by anti-environmental leaders, Watt extolled the American working class while vilifying environmental initiatives.[56]

---

[54] Speech by Secretary James Watt before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, September 21, 1983, Box 18, Watt Papers, AHC.
[55] Excerpts of Remarks by Secretary Watt to the National Public Lands Council, Reno, Nevada, September 21, 1982, Box 7, Pendley Papers, AHC.
[56] Speech by Secretary James Watt before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, September 21, 1983, Box 18, Watt Papers, AHC.

Like environmentalisms' opponents of the previous era, Watt also expanded his critique of environmentalist elitism into allegations of racism. At an Atlanta, Georgia, meeting of the American Association of Blacks in Energy, Watt listed numerous arguments against environmentalists, but he focused on how demands of "the privileged few . . . would cost minorities hard-won gains." Calling environmentalism "bad for the economy" and "bad for the freedom," Watt ultimately concluded that the modern movement was also "bad for equality."[57] In speeches and panels throughout the nation, Watt's deputy secretaries also advanced the message of environmentalists' inherent racism. For example, one assistant secretary noted at a speech in Ely, Nevada, "It is interesting to note that there are few blacks on the picket lines of the environmental movement." Though focusing mostly on economic growth and expansion of development opportunities on federal lands, this speech and others questioned the composition and motives of the environmentalists.[58]

As tension between the secretary and environmental leaders grew throughout his tenure, Watt increasingly charged environmentalists with deliberate deceit and deception. On a PBS segment, "Promised Land," Watt refuted claims that he planned to open up wilderness refuges for development, arguing, "It was one of those situations where papers were literally stolen from the Department of the Interior and given to a special interest group that twisted it to their advantage."[59] In addition to contending that environmentalists and their allies in government stole documents from federal buildings, Watt also castigated the press for their collusion with

[57] Secretary of the Interior James Watt, Speech to the American Association of Blacks in Energy, Atlanta, Georgia, February 5, 1982, Box 18, Watt Papers, AHC.
[58] Speech, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals, U.S. Department of the Interior, William P. Pendley, "Agenda for Action," September 25, 1982, Box 7, Pendley Papers, AHC.
[59] "Promised Land," PBS, December 9, 1981, Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC.

environmentalists in manipulating facts. To counter the campaign of misinformation, Watt instructed his assistant secretaries and heads of bureaus "to set the record straight" in their travels throughout the country. In an inter-agency memorandum, he intoned, "There has been much misunderstanding of what we are doing and planning to do—some of it based on poorly researched or distorted news accounts." Hoping to separate "the facts" from "rumors and reckless talk," Watt dispatched his subordinates to challenge environmentalist propaganda.[60] Shortly thereafter, the secretary stopped meeting with environmental leaders. Continuing to claim that environmentalists distorted his views to use them for political purposes, Watt also advised his top assistants to eliminate their regular appointments with representatives of national environmental groups.[61]

In addition to complying with his recommendation, Watt's assistant secretaries also repeated his views on environmentalism, environmentalists, and their legislative agenda. For example, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals, William Perry Pendley, denounced recycling and conservation programs arguing that they "involve real, calculable costs—in efficiency and in economic dislocation."[62] In an October 1982 keynote address before the Coal Lawyers Conference, Pendley ridiculed "fifty years of mismanagement of public lands" and asked rhetorically, "Why is this great Nation in such dire straits?" As he answered his own question, Pendley summoned familiar arguments of environmentalists' alleged socialist agenda:

---

[60] Memorandum, from James G. Watt to Assistant Secretaries and Heads of Bureaus, "Conveying Our Policies to the Public," September 1, 1981, Box 7, Pendley Papers, AHC.
[61] *World News Tonight*, ABC, "Watt Says Ecology Groups Distort His Views," December 1, 1981, Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC.
[62] Speech, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals, U.S. Department of the Interior, William P. Pendley, "Promise and Perspective," no date, Box 6, Pendley Papers, AHC.

> The answers lie in past decisions to centralize power in Washington, to restrict public access to the Federal estate, to drive up energy prices and hence the return to the Federal Government by restraining public lands offered for energy development.[63]

Like many other critics of wilderness legislation, Pendley feared that environmentalists sought complete centralization of power and nationalization of energy resources.

Hoping to bring the spirit of the Sagebrush Rebellion to the Department of the Interior, Pendley often celebrated the rebels' goals and brief history. In describing the Department of the Interior's agenda to the Nevada Mining Association, Pendley passionately proclaimed:

> It [the Sagebrush Rebellion] was a rebellion and certainly a revolution. A rebellion against an oppressive and unresponsive Government—a Government truly out of touch with the needs of the American people. We have not forgotten the message of that rebellion, it still flows powerfully through our veins, it still beats strongly in our hearts. The American people wanted change and we are committed to bringing that change.[64]

Thus, as he spoke to leaders of the mining and minerals industry on behalf of the Department of the Interior, Pendley encouraged the continuation of a rebellion against the government and environmentalists. Like Watt, Pendley and other assistants aimed to denigrate environmentalism as a threat to American prosperity.

Echoing familiar arguments against conservationists and preservationists, Watt and his deputies declared that environmentalists were inherently elitist, alarmist, socialistic, and generally dangerous to America's economic and military security. Though alienating and infuriating many Americans, Watt's unabashed critique of

---

[63] Keynote Address, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals, U.S. Department of the Interior, William P. Pendley, before the National Coal Lawyers Conference, National Coal Association, October 8, 1982, Box 7, Pendley Papers, AHC.

[64] Speech, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals, U.S. Department of the Interior, William P. Pendley, "Agenda for Action," September 25, 1982, Box 7, Pendley Papers, AHC.

environmentalists and their agenda inspired continued growth of anti-environmental rhetoric. Politicians, industry representatives, newspaper executives, and average citizens expressed their support of Watt in personal letters and throughout the media. For example, in a laudatory letter to the secretary, A.E. "Dusty" Rhodes of Albuquerque, New Mexico, wrote:

> The changes which you have been able to bring about in the Department of the Interior are certainly welcomed by the industrial community, private enterprise-oriented people, and all who love our great country. The criticism which has been heaped by the Sierra Club and left-wing obstructionists groups is a challenge which you have met head-on, and have gained the respect of all who are interested in progress and the regaining of America's greatness.[65]

As he concluded his letter, Rhodes reiterated that all of "industry, along with all private enterprise-oriented individuals, is supporting you one hundred percent."[66]

Trade journals such as, *Snow Goer* and *Trailer Life Magazine*, published articles and interviews with Watt highlighting his multi-use and pro-development policies and proclaiming him a "20th-century Robin Hood."[67] Similarly, Ray Scott, pioneer of televised fishing tournaments and editor of *Bass Master Magazine*, castigated "tree huggers" and praised Watt's "firm handshake and his no-nonsense manner." Scott concluded his assessment of Watt:

> Here's a guy who has worked for our country for two decades and will continue to do so, yet few seem to be on his side. He's got my attention, I'll tell you, and he should have yours.[68]

---

[65] Letter, from A.E. "Dusty" Rhodes to James G. Watt, March 23, 1982, Box 9, Folder 1, Watt Papers, AHC.
[66] Letter, from A.E. "Dusty" Rhodes to James G. Watt, March 23, 1982, Box 9, Folder 1, Watt Papers, AHC.
[67] Bob Longsdorf, "James Watt: 20th-Century Robin Hood," *Trailer Life Magazine*, February 1983; *Snow Goer*, "James G. Watt," September 1983, Box 7, Watt Papers, AHC.
[68] Ray Scott, "The Ways of Winners Often Raise Criticism," *Bass Master Magazine*, May/June 1981, Box 19, Watt Papers, AHC.

Editorial director of *Drilling Magazine*, Robert O. Frederick, echoed Scott's judgment, simply telling his readers, "The man's right, you know."[69]

As they applauded his candor and courage, many commentators echoed Watt's views of environmentalists. For example, *The Sequent*, a conservative student newspaper by Washington, D.C., area colleges, ran numerous articles on Watt as well as February 2, 1983 cover feature. Depicting Watt's "foes [as] elitists, pursuing their anti-development, anti-growth and pro-scarcity philosophy," the editorial staff summed, "Jim Watt is pro-America . . . his critics are not."[70]

Likewise, the *Phoenix Gazette* passionately supported Watt's environmental initiatives as well as his unconcealed Christian faith. In addition, the *Gazette* editorial staff criticized environmentalists' flirtation with paganism arguing:

> . . . the environmentalists have turned their cause into a religion of its own, the worship of Nature. Their church is the pristine wilderness, and woe betide anyone who desecrates it. Man, according to this environmental faith, is not a part of Nature. He is, in fact, the devil.[71]

Similarly supportive editorials and columns appeared in dozens of papers including the *Anchorage Daily News*, *Denver Post*, *Washington Times*, *Arizona Republic*, *Houston Chronicle*, *Dallas Morning News*, and numerous others.[72] Watt replied to

---

[69] Robert O. Frederick, "Get Off His Back," Drilling Magazine, October 1981, Box 8, Folder 3, Watt Papers, AHC.
[70] *The Sequent*, "James Watt is Right for America," vol. 2, no. 1, February 2, 1983, Box 7, Watt Papers, AHC.
[71] "Editorials: Environment as a Religion," *Phoenix Gazette*, August 24, 1981, Box 8, Folder 3, Watt Papers, AHC.
[72] See for example: *Anchorage Daily News*, February 2, 1983; *Denver Post*, August 23, 1981, September 30, 1981, January 27, 1983, February 2, 1983; *The Tribune* (Mesa, AZ), August 23, 1981; *Washington Times*, November 22, 1982; *Arizona Republic*, January 21, 1982; *Houston Chronicle*, August 18, 1981; *Dallas Morning News*, March 16, 1982.

many of these sympathetic endorsements, thanking them "for [their] perspective and willingness to print the truth."[73]

Numerous elected officials such as Senators Strom Thurmond of South Carolina and Ted Stevens of Alaska also praised Watt and echoed his criticism of the Sierra Club and other "extremists."[74] Representative Richard "Dick" Cheney of Wyoming extolled the secretary as a model for other conservative Republicans who wanted to challenge popular movements such as environmentalists. Cheney summed, "Jim Watt is one tough, son-of-a-gun and that's what it takes."[75]

The "tough, son-of-a-gun" was perhaps too tough. Though able to weather mounting criticism from environmental organizations, including a massive Sierra Club campaign to "Dump Watt," the secretary's candor ultimately led to his resignation. At a September 21, 1983, speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Watt boasted of the diversity of his Linowes Commission, a panel formed to investigate the federal oil and natural gas royalty program. In describing the composition of the group, Watt infamously summed, "Three Democrats, two Republicans. Every kind of mix you can have. I have a black, I have a woman, two Jews and a cripple."[76] Though later in the day, Watt admitted, "My choice of words was unfortunate," the momentum for his ouster picked up apace.[77] On November 8, 1983, Watt announced his resignation as

---

[73] Letter, from James Watt to Loyal Meek, editor, *Phoenix Gazette*, September 3, 1981, Box 8, Folder 3, Watt Papers, AHC.
[74] *NBC Nightly News*, NBC, October 19, 1981, Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC.
[75] *NBC Nightly News*, NBC, "Interior Secretary Watt: An Expose," June 15, 1981, Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC.
[76] Speech by Secretary James Watt before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, September 21, 1983, Box 18, Watt Papers, AHC.
[77] *News 7*, WJLA-TV; *Channel 4 News*, WRC-TV, September 21, 1983, Box 18, Watt Papers, Number, AHC.

Secretary of the Interior.[78] President Reagan publicly praised the secretary's accomplishments, remarking, "[Watt] has initiated a careful balance between the needs of the people and the importance of protecting the environment."[79] In a radio address shortly after the secretary's resignation, the president summed, "James G. Watt has served this nation well." Though serving less than two years as head of the Department of the Interior, Watt's brief tenure nevertheless signified not only a rightward shift of cabinet appointments, but also denoted an implantation of anti-environmental ideology in key federal positions.[80]

In addition to Reagan's election and appointments, other elected officials contributed to the institutionalization of anti-environmental rhetoric. For example, Congressman Don Young of Alaska repeatedly challenged conservationist and preservationist agendas. As ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, he expressed his vehement opposition to environmentalism in general and wilderness legislation in particular. Describing the environmental movement as "anti-human," Young worried that environmentalists' "small is beautiful" philosophy led to economic stagnation and unemployment.[81] In hearings debating the expansion of Missouri's Irish Wilderness Area, Congressman

[78] Letter, from Secretary James Watt to President Ronald Reagan, Box 10, Folder 16, Watt Papers, AHC.
[79] Letter, from President Ronald Reagan to Secretary James Watt, November 8, 1983; Statement of President Ronald Reagan, October 9, 1983, Box 10, Folder 16, Watt Papers, AHC; Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, *William P. Clark Nomination*, 98th Cong., 1st sess., 1983, 230.
[80] "Radio Address to the Nation on the Resignation of Secretary of the Interior James G. Watt November 26, 1983," *Public Papers of President Ronald W. Reagan*. Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1983/112683a.htm (accessed July 30, 2011)
[81] Memorandum, from Department of Interior Legislative Counsel Theodore J. Garrish to Secretary of the Interior James Watt and all Assistant Secretaries, Box 8, Folder "Irish Wilderness," Pendley Papers, AHC.

Young argued, "This has become a sort of socialism, frankly, of trying to decide other people's business instead of letting the people decide their own." Referencing the previous year's debate on Alaskan wilderness designations, Young asserted, "I got raped last year and it don't feel good." Employing descriptive language of sexual violence, Young heightened the emotional impact of anti-environmental rhetoric in national dialogue. With passion, he pledged, "The Lord willing, I am not going to let anymore wilderness out of the Congress." As he concluded his remarks, Young combined several traditional arguments against environmentalists. Arguing that self-interested environmentalists threatened the United States, the Alaskan representative summed, "This Washington-based bunch of environmentalists are crippling this Nation, taking away the rights and privilege of the people to improve their lot."[82]

Wyoming's Republican senator, Malcolm Wallop echoed Young's concern. Speaking in broad terms about a decade of environmental legislation, Wallop steadfastly insisted that environmental regulations "*will drive small business out* of the field." [italics in the original] Furthermore, he summed, "regulatory overlaps and uncertainties threaten to strangle American industry." Not just concerned about businessmen and industrialists, in condemning the Clean Water Act, Wallop also warned that "our policies cannot be so insensitive as to ignore the farmer who prays on his knees that there will be enough water in his stream for him to irrigate, regardless of whether it is slightly below standard."[83] In an interview with Tom Brokaw on NBC's *Today Show*, Wallop questioned the future of the national park system. Stating that "I

[82] House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, *Addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System*, 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982, 24.
[83] Malcolm Wallop, "The Environment: Air, Water, and Public Lands," in *A Changing America: Conservatives View the '80s From the United States Senate* (South Bend: Regnery/Gateway, Inc., 1980), 148-149.

think it is definitely time for a breather in the whole national park system," Wallop promoted "alternatives to acquisition, as a matter of policy."[84] Reiterating Reagan and Watt's contention that maintenance of current parklands was too costly, Wallop urged a moratorium on additional park designations. After a decade of groundbreaking legislation, Wallop and others feared that the environmental movement posed a significant threat to individual farmers and business owners as well as to the nation's economy.

Despite effective bipartisan support of environmental initiatives in previous decades, more rigid boundaries defined the environmental debate in the 1980s. Nixon's embrace, albeit politically motivated, of landmark environmental legislation such as the National Environmental Policy Act (1970) and Republican Congressman Pete McCloskey's co-sponsorship of the inaugural Earth Day seemed evocative of a distant era. As Watt's aforementioned television interviews revealed, late twentieth century Republican leaders increasingly viewed environmentalism as a "Democratic" or "liberal" issue.

A February 1982 Republican Study Committee special report, "The Specter of Environmentalism: The Threat of Environmental Groups," exemplified the new partisan nature of environmental debate. Arguing that "extremist environmentalism threatens to undermine natural resource and economic development," the report warned policymakers to be aware of the influence of environmental organizations such as the National Wildlife Federation, the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, and the Wilderness Society among others. Chaired by California Representative

[84] *Today Show*, NBC, "National Park Uses Debated," June 26, 1981, Box 15, Watt Papers, AHC.

Robert E. Badham, the committee's report concluded that "careful empirical studies and surveys have established that environmentalists are overwhelmingly Democrats and predominantly liberal." [emphasis in original] The study proceeded to echo familiar arguments against environmentalists and their agendas. In particular, the report emphasized "environmentalists are 'fundamentally self-interested' . . . [and] tend to be members of the affluent, upper middle class termed the leisure class." In addition to portraying environmentalists as selfish elitists, "The Specter of Environmentalism" also warned that environmentalists "are self-motivated to thwart economic development." Warning the Republican caucus that environmentalists deliberately manipulated the media and the courts, the report urged members to be aware of distorted facts. In a subsection of the report titled, "Infiltration of Academia," Tim Peckinpaugh, the study's principle author, cautioned:

> . . . some environmental organizations are attempting to collude with respectable learning centers in order to promote environmental interests. The relationship between environmentally motivated organizations and presumably objective tax-supported academic institutions represent an unconscionable conflict of interest and is blatantly wrong.[85]

Thus, the Republican Study Committee's special report not only exhibited the growing partisan nature of environmental politics, but also a sense of paranoia that environmentalism was infiltrating America's key institutions. Fearing the "pervasive specter of unfettered environmentalism," the report advocated vigilance to protect the nation's energy development and economic prosperity.



[85] Republican Study Committee Special Report, "The Specter of Environmentalism: The Threat of Environmental Groups," February 12, 1982, Sierra Club Records, BANC 71/103 c, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (hereafter cited as BANC).

Concurrent with increased institutionalization of anti-environmentalism in the nation's top political offices, groups dedicated to challenging environmental agendas underwent increased professionalization. Building on momentum generated by the Sagebrush Rebellion, Reagan's election, and Watt's appointment, critics of environmentalism looked to broaden their program. In particular, the Wise Use Movement adopted many of the tactics and methods of the environmental movement as they endeavored to popularize anti-environmental arguments.

An umbrella movement of many interests, the Wise Use Movement re-appropriated its name from forester and conservationist Gifford Pinchot. Believing that environmental legislation and regulation threatened industry and the economic health of individuals and the nation, Wise Use advocates supported limited government and the multiple-use of federal lands. In addition, worried that environmental activists exerted disproportionate influence on the nation's lawmakers, Wise Use leaders sought to counter the influence of green lobbyists.

In contrast to earlier groups that centered on a specific piece of legislation or a particular region, by the early 1980s, Wise Use leaders created professional, multi-issue organizations with a broad, national scope. For example, the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, founded in 1976, began to serve as a clearinghouse for a variety of Wise Use initiatives. Headquartered in Bellevue, Washington, the CDFE published books and pamphlets, organized conferences, and fostered a coterie of "experts" to address contemporary environmental issues and proposed legislation.

Led by direct-mail fundraiser Alan Gottlieb and former Sierra Clubber Ron Arnold, the CDFE provided national spokesmen for the Wise Use Movement. Hoping

to counter the omnipresence and popularity of the environmental movement, Gottlieb and Arnold utilized the media to advance the Wise Use agenda. Through press releases, publications, and television appearances, CDFE staffers advocated deregulation and pro-development legislation.

By 1989, the CDFE formulated the "Wise Use Agenda" which included the movement's "Top Twenty-Five Goals." In addition to pledges to support drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (#2) and mining on all public lands (#6), the agenda also called for strident property rights protection and amendments to environmental legislation such as the Endangered Species Act. Presenting the agenda in person to president George H.W. Bush, Alan Gottlieb continued to stress Wise Use's linkages with America's early twentieth century conservation history. In his Letter of Transmittal to the president, Gottlieb proudly stated, "This agenda seeks to identify and promote those policies and technologies that will yield the greatest good for the greatest number over the long run." Encouraging Bush to gradually phase out wilderness designations, Gottlieb and other Wise Use advocates offered suggestions on how the nation could reverse decades of environmental mismanagement and imbalance.[86]

In addition, Wise Use leaders also promoted role models and cultivated heroes for their young movement. Just as the environmental movement revered Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, and Aldo Leopold, the anti-environmental movement elevated figures such as James Watt and others. In 1982, the conservative publishing house Regnery Gateway released Ron Arnold's biography of Watt, *At the Eye of the Storm*.

[86] Alan M. Gottlieb, ed., *The Wise Use Agenda: A Task Force Report to the Bush Administration by the Wise Use Movement* (Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1989).

Offering a glowing and favorable answer to the question, "Who is Jim Watt?," Arnold's biography addressed the numerous controversies surrounding Watt's personal and professional background as well as his first months as a cabinet member. Heralding the secretary of the interior's "deep appreciation of nature [and] admiration of technology and civilization," Arnold depicted Watt as an ideal figure to manage the nation's natural resources.

Arnold not only strove to contextualize and celebrate the controversial secretary of the interior, but also to warn about the "initiatives of environmentalist leaders pushing for more and more centralized federal power and ever-increasing restrictions on our vital economic producers."[87] Employing many of the traditional arguments against environmentalism, Arnold used *At the Eye of the Storm* to advance anti-environmentalist rhetoric. For example, he argued that "environmentalist leaders" encouraged "the twin disasters of a changed form of government and economic collapse."[88] Citing the philosophies of ecology writers such as Aldo Leopold and Garrett Hardin, Arnold claimed, "It is obvious that certain aspects of the land ethic and the environmental ethic are incompatible with numerous American ideals, for example, the protection of individual liberties and an open society."[89]

Believing that industry "is now a tiny minority, some might say a persecuted minority," Arnold feared continued environmental activism and regulation would result in "ultimate economic destruction."[90] As he addressed contemporary issues such as the Alaskan wilderness proposals, Arnold cited critics of environmentalism

[87] Ron Arnold, *At the Eye of the Storm: James Watt and the Environmentalists* (Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1982), xvii.
[88] Arnold, *At the Eye of the Storm*, xvii.
[89] Arnold, *At the Eye of the Storm*, 80.
[90] Arnold, *At the Eye of the Storm*, 123.

from across the nation such as Lew Williams of Ketchikan, Alaska, who "look[ed] upon these environmental groups as organized crime."[91]

In addition to economic arguments, Arnold echoed decades' old critiques of environmentalists as hostile to Christianity, elitist, alarmist, and "anti-humanity." Concluding, "in the last 20 years environmentalism itself has become a religion in a real and structural sense," Arnold argued that environmentalists preternaturally abhorred the devoutly Christian Watt and ultimately sought to engage the secretary in a religious war.[92] Furthermore, Arnold stressed the dangerous tendencies of environmentalism. Employing one of the earliest uses of the term "eco-terrorism," Arnold warned about the consequences of the wave of "eco-tage" by "primitivist activists opposed to industrial civilization itself."[93] In subsequent writings, Arnold focused almost exclusively on "eco-terrorism" and eventually proclaimed himself an "expert on eco-terrorism."[94] Worried that environmentalism threatened the United States' religious and political traditions as well as its economic well-being, Arnold presented Watt as the perfect foil to the popular movement.

Portraying Watt as a hero, Arnold promoted the former secretary as a role model for public servants and average citizens. Other Wise Use leaders sought to cultivate grassroots "heroes" as well. By 1994, William Perry Pendley, former Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals and president of the Mountain States Legal Foundation, compiled a list of Wise Use role models. Published by the CDFE's press division, Pendley's *It Takes A Hero* profiled over fifty individuals who "have

[91] Arnold, *At the Eye of the Storm*, 120.
[92] Arnold, *At the Eye of the Storm*, 76.
[93] Arnold, *At the Eye of the Storm*, 38-40.
[94] See Chapter 5 for more discussion of Ron Arnold's writings on "eco-terrorism."

concluded that environmental extremists and their allies in the U.S. Government are good neither for people nor for the environment."[95] Pendley offered models of Wise Use action for other citizens to emulate as he celebrated landowners, miners, loggers, and property-rights defenders as the "true environmentalists." For example, Pendley profiled Cheryl Johnson, a Wise Use convert who challenged Wild and Scenic Rivers designation of New Hampshire's Pemigewasset River. Home to over nineteen amphibian and reptile species, the Pemigewasset River known to locals as "the Pemi," also supported endangered birds such as the golden eagle, upland sandpiper, peregrine falcon and the sedge wren.[96] As such, in 1989, environmentalists sought protection of "the Pemi" under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. Fearing "environmental socialism," Johnson founded the New Hampshire Landowners Alliance (NHLA) and worked to prohibit federal regulation of waterfront properties. Pendley portrayed Johnson as an overmatched "David" battling the green lobby's "Goliath." As with all of the profiles in Pendley's encouraging and instructional compilation, the hero "won." Through forums, meetings, and rallies, Johnson and the NHLA prevented federal protection of "the Pemi." Demonizing "high rise environmentalists" as inept and uncaring elitists, *It Takes a Hero* ultimately described how average citizens turned anti-environmental rhetoric into action.[97]

In addition to cultivating their own set of heroes, Wise Use leaders also recognized a need to counter environmental organizations' use of statistics and

---

[95] William Perry Pendley, *It Takes A Hero: The Grassroots Battle Against Environmental Oppression* (Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1994), xi-xii.
[96] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, *Miscellaneous Parks and Wild and Scenic Rivers Bills*, 101st Cong., 1st sess., October 1989, 163-179.
[97] Pendley, *It Takes A Hero*, 181-183.

scientists. Hoping to build legitimacy by constructing an image of themselves as experts, Wise Use advocates began testifying at Congressional hearings as more knowledgeable and authentic than professional environmentalists. Identifying themselves as the "real" or "true" environmentalists, opponents claimed that they knew the land and the issues more thoroughly than did members of traditional environmental organizations. For example, in testimony against the proposed designation of Sipsey Wilderness in Alabama's Bankhead National Forest, Leo Yambrek of Killen, Alabama, not only echoed charges of "wasteful spending" and disregard of local unemployment figures, but he also stated, "I am proud to have been asked to represent the real environmentalists, the men and women who truly preserve and protect our forest lands." Representing the "hard-working people" of the timber industries, Yambrek claimed legitimacy as a "real environmentalist" as he argued against "uneconomical, unfair, and unneeded legislation." As with many testimonies of the era, Yambrek fused conservative definitions of freedom with anti-environmental ideology.[98]

Other critics of environmental legislation echoed the sentiment. Arguing against the designation of the Cheaha Wilderness in Alabama's Talladega National Forest, Marshall Frost, a lumberman and president of the Society for the Wise Use of Federal Forest Lands, argued:

> I lived in Bankhead Forest all my life . . . I have logged . . . They have got all the wilderness land that is in the Bankhead Forest already in wilderness right here now, 12,726 acres, and there isn't a man walking under the sun that can walk over that in 2 or 3 days because I know.[99]

[98] House Committee, *Addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System*, 68-69.
[99] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water, *Alabama and California Wilderness Areas*, 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982, 92-93.

Stressing that "I know . . . I have been there," Frost not only established himself as a qualified commentator, but also as more authentic than professional environmentalists.

Industry representatives joined private landowners in co-opting authenticity from professional environmentalists. In addition to stressing their deep knowledge of and connection to the land, extractive industry spokesmen also continued to emphasize the amount of money their companies expended on environmental programs and regulations. For example, in testimony against the designation of the Tallgrass Prairie Preserve in Osage County, Oklahoma, in 1988, Jack Graves, president of Calumet Oil Company, asserted, "I have probably spent more money protecting groundwater and tallgrass than anyone in this room."[100] Arguing that environmentalists only superficially understood the complexity of local ecosystems and economics, individuals and groups argued for less federal regulation and greater attention to Wise Use principles.

The increased professionalization and publicity of the Wise Use Movement encouraged the proliferation of even more grassroots organizations. Throughout the 1980s, regional and industry-specific groups such as the Blue Ribbon Coalition, Our Land Society of Idaho, Timber Resources Equal Economic Stability (TREES), and Shasta Alliance for Resources and Environment (SHARE) emerged to support and spread Wise Use philosophies. For example, in 1988 debates over Idaho wilderness designations numerous Blue Ribbon Coalition members testified in opposition to expanded wilderness areas. Clark L. Collins, the Blue Ribbon executive director from Pocatello, Idaho, relentlessly asked, "How much is enough? When will it end? Will

[100] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, *Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve*, 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 1988, 100.

they ever be content?"[101] Likewise, in response to proposed expansion of Big Thicket National Preserve in southeastern Texas, groups such as Citizens to Save Village Creek formed using Wise Use templates. Described as the "biological crossroads of North America," the Big Thicket region contained ten different ecosystems and provided habitat for over forty kinds of wild orchids and three hundred species of birds including, potentially, the elusive ivory-billed woodpecker. As such, environmentalists sought to add the Village Creek Corridor to the existing preserve. In debates and congressional hearings, Brenda Wright, president of Save Village Creek, deployed familiar anti-environmental rhetoric. Emphasizing the affront to private property, Wright argued, "To strip a landowner of the right to own and manage the land he holds the deed to just because it is beautiful is un-American." As she delivered an impassioned monologue on rights, Brenda Wright engaged conservative conceptions of freedom and redefinitions of patriotism.[102]

In addition to the formation of local groups such as Save Village Creek organization, long-standing conservative think tanks also began to add anti-environmentalism to their arsenal of issues. For example, in 1982, the Heritage Foundation disseminated analyses of "The Environmental Complex." Concluding that "anti-corporate rhetoric is basic to several environmental activist organizations," the foundation profiled how groups such as the Sierra Club, National Resources Defense Council, Friends of the Earth, Environmental Defense Fund, and Environmental Action "operate[d] with an institutional bias against the free enterprise system."

---

[101] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, *Idaho Forest Management Act of 1988*, 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 1988, 168.
[102] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, *Miscellaneous Parks and Wild and Scenic Rivers Bills*, 101st Cong., 1st sess., 1989, 131-135.

Hoping to stem the flow of corporate donations to environmental organizations, senior policy analyst William T. Poole warned that businesses should be careful not "to subsidize its enemies."[103]

In short, groups dedicated to challenging environmentalists' agendas underwent significant professionalization throughout the 1980s. Utilizing many of the same tactics as the recently professionalized environmental groups, organizations such as the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise and the Blue Ribbon Coalition, as well as much smaller organizations such as Brenda Wright's Save Village Creek, cultivated a broad agenda, promoted national spokesmen and "heroes" as experts, and identified themselves as the true stewards of the environment and its resources. Opponents of environmentalism framed their criticism in conservative ideology of rights, freedom, and patriotism. Merging conservative tenets with anti-environmental rhetoric, critics introduced their agenda to a broader public and helped served broader conservative political goals.

ଔ

In his 1990 autobiography, *An American Life*, Ronald Reagan chronicled his early years in Dixon, Illinois, his cinematic exploits in Hollywood, his political ascendency to the White House, as well as the diplomatic challenges of his office.[104] The post-presidential tome carefully, yet candidly discussed the controversial Iran-Contra affair as well as tense arms control negotiations and international crises.

[103] "The Environmental Complex: Part III," The Heritage Foundation, June 1982, Sierra Club Records, BANC 71/103c.
[104] Ronald Reagan, *An American Life*, Reprint ed. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2011).

Interestingly, amidst over seven hundred pages of text, the "Gipper" did not mention James Watt, Anne Gorsuch, or any environmental agency, initiative, or bill.[105]

Through the course of Reagan's two terms in the White House, anti-environmentalism evolved into an organized, cohesive movement. With appointment of environmental skeptics and fiscal conservatives such as Anne Gorsuch and James Watt to key environmental management posts, Reagan helped to further institutionalize environmental opposition. The president's controversial appointments and environmental stances not only spawned a backlash of environmental protest, but it also encouraged the proliferation of dozens of supportive, anti-environmental groups. Often adopting the same strategies and tactics of environmental organizations, groups such as the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise and the Blue Ribbon Coalition, aimed to popularize anti-environmental rhetoric. Though anti-environmental organizations became more numerous and professional, they continued to deploy familiar charges against environmentalists and environmental legislation. Depicting environmentalists as alarmist, elitist, socialistic, and anti-progress, critics portrayed the environmental movement as dangerous to American ideals and prosperity.

Ronald Reagan represented the fusion of conservatism and anti-environmentalism. The late twentieth century conservative movement endeavored to reassert the primacy not only of the American economy, but also the dominance of humans over the earth and natural resources. Redefining freedom as the right to

[105] C. Brant Short, "Conservation Reconsidered: Environmental Politics, Rhetoric, and the Reagan Revolution," in Peterson, ed., *Green Talk in the White House*, 137.

pursue individual profit with limited government intervention, conservative political, economic, and social philosophy merged with anti-environmental rhetoric and action.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Sagebrushers, Wise Use proponents, and other critics of environmentalism joined tax revolters and property rights' advocates in championing conservatism. Politicians such as Ronald Reagan, Malcolm Wallop, and Don Young deployed anti-environmental rhetoric to advance conservative values and priorities. Targeting cumbersome environmental regulations and restrictive federal land management, conservatives used anti-environmental initiatives to spread their proposed agenda for smaller government and greater fiscal accountability. In short, late twentieth century arguments over endangered species classifications and wilderness designations were about environmental issues; however, they were also a manifestation of the contest over the political direction of the nation. Thus, once again, environmentalism became an arena for debating differing visions for America.

CHAPTER 5 – Turn of the Century Violence, Real and Imagined, 1989-2010

In a 1992 interview with ABC News, anti-environmentalist and Wise Use spokesman Ron Arnold summed his view of the contemporary conflict between environmentalists and their opponents, "This is a war zone. Either put your armor on or get the hell out of the way."[1] Images of angry loggers and irate ranchers demonstrating against environmental legislation accompanied Arnold's sound bite on the "American Agenda" segment of *World News Tonight*. In another interview, Arnold told a newspaper reporter, "Our goal is to destroy, to eradicate the environmental movement . . . We're mad as hell. We're not going to take it anymore. We're dead serious – we're going to destroy them."[2] Arnold's fiery remarks reflected a significant change in the rhetorical and physical interaction between environmentalists and their critics. In previous eras, anti-environmentalists deployed emotional language in tense congressional debates and wrote terse opinion pieces in newspapers to express their disapproval of environmental regulation; however, by the end of the century, opponents issued more aggressive pronouncements. Though Arnold did not literally take up arms to "destroy" environmentalists, other critics did. Reports of violence between environmentalists and their opponents escalated toward the end of the millennium. After decades of name-calling and allegations of socialism, paganism, elitism, and alarmism, environmentalists and anti-environmentalists engaged in a multi-front, undeclared war.

---

[1] Ron Arnold, interview with Barry Serafin, *World News Tonight with Peter Jennings*, ABC, April 2, 1992.
[2] Katherine Long, "A Grinch Who Loathes Green Groups," *Toronto Star*, December 21, 1991.

This chapter will examine why the conflict between environmentalists and their critics became much more violent in rhetoric and in action in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. As ever, the tenor of environmental debate in the United States was closely tied to broader political and social transformations at home and abroad. Citizens of the United States and the world experienced an era of unpredictable and unconventional violence in the 1990s and into the 2000s. Despite the promises of many diplomats and politicians, the disintegration of the Soviet Union did not automatically usher in an era of peace and stability. Rather, the post-Cold War period revealed new forms of violence and disorder. As national and international leaders endeavored to define the "new world order," school shootings, government-sanctioned raids, incidents of police brutality, and acts of domestic terrorism fostered an atmosphere of even greater uncertainty.

Anti-environmentalists used this era of chaos, as well as the very real uptick in direct-action environmentalism, to amplify fears of environmentalists and their agendas. As they grew in numbers and political power, opponents of environmentalism deployed more vitriolic language to describe environmentalists, environmental legislation, and environmental activism. Increasingly, critics used metaphors of "war," "battle," and "attack" to describe their relationship with conservationists and preservationists. Ranchers, business owners, and extractive industry workers deployed rhetoric of "genocide" and "cultural cleansing" to explain the impact of environmental legislation on their families and their communities. Most notably, critics cultivated the term "ecoterrorism" to further radicalize and demonize the environmental movement. Ultimately, anti-environmentalists used more

aggressive language and developed the concept of "eco-terrorism" not only to malign "radical" and mainstream environmentalists, but also to reassert a sense of order in a chaotic post-Cold War world. In addition to highlighting environmentalists' alleged use of physical violence and intimidation, some anti-environmentalists also began to use threats and physical force against environmental activists. In short, as the twentieth century rolled into the twenty-first, an ideological battle morphed into a physical clash.

At the same time that anti-environmentalists sought to radicalize environmentalists, they also endeavored to broaden the appeal of their own message and movement. This chapter will also show how critics of environmentalism used new outlets and technologies to reach new audiences, including young people and disenchanted "greens." Moving the debate out of conservative think tank boardrooms and the halls of congress, anti-environmentalists used children's books, DVDs, and eventually, the internet, to spread their message about the dangers of environmentalism. In short, by the end of the century, anti-environmentalists adopted a multi-pronged strategy against environmentalists. Critics aimed to defeat the popular environmental movement through an aggressive propaganda campaign that denigrated environmentalists as radical terrorists and popularized their own movement as consummately American.

Once again, though environmental debates were about wilderness designations, endangered species classifications, resource use, and increasingly throughout the 1990s, global temperature changes, they were also about wider political issues. As with passionate midcentury criticisms of Fairfield Osborn and Rachel Carson,

critiques of late-twentieth century environmentalists expressed an effort to make sense of a world in flux and to dictate the direction of American politics and the domestic economy.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the dissolution of the communist threat, many Americans looked forward to an era of unprecedented diplomatic tranquility and international calm. Throughout the early 1990s, President George H.W. Bush famously, yet cryptically declared the arrival of a "new world order." With traditional Cold War foes vanquished, conservative politicians and commentators celebrated a long awaited ideological victory; however, the heralded end of the Cold War did not signify an end to violence, fear, and uncertainty. In fact, as Soviet nemeses became Russian allies and socialism appeared as less of a threat to U.S. hegemony, new and seemingly unpredictable dangers arose. Though the nation lived in fear of a Soviet attack for decades, practicing for air raids and looking for signs of infiltration, no major incident occurred on American soil. In contrast, in the waning years of the millennium, new subjects threatened new forms of violence. From government-sanctioned invasions and raids to grassroots riots and unforeseen rampages, unconventional violence characterized the 1990s and 2000s.

As a way to declare America's dominant role in the "new world order," President Bush inaugurated the post-Cold War world with Operation Desert Storm. An effort to stand up to Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein and protect America's Persian Gulf oil interests, the February 1991 military engagement in Kuwait was quick yet deadly. Ubiquitously on cable news outlets, U.S. citizens watched sleek precision

bombs seek out well-defined targets; however, on the ground, in addition to 184 American troop deaths, tens of thousands Iraqis died in the short war. Though many Americans initially cheered the efficient and dominating "liberation of Kuwait," the event presaged continued violence and American militarism in the Middle East. Eventually, aggressive international policies inspired attacks on the United States. Operatives trained by the militant, multinational organization, Al Qaeda, carried out acts of terrorism against Americans throughout the 1990s. A truck bomb rattled the World Trade Center in 1993, killing six and wounding over a thousand people. Members of Al Qaeda also organized the bombings of several U.S. embassies throughout the world and a suicide attack which disabled the U.S. Navy destroyer, the *USS Cole*, off the coast of Yemen on October 12, 2000. By the September 11, 2001, attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C., Al Qaeda and its affiliates logged numerous violent assaults against Americans.[3]

Domestically, the rise in violence became more apparent as each spring seemed to host a new manifestation of physical force. Though many of these events were unrelated and seemingly isolated, random acts of violence, taken together, contributed to a disconcerting atmosphere. For example, in March 1991, a bystander videotaped Los Angeles policemen beating Rodney King, a black motorist. The grainy but indelible footage ignited still smoldering racial tensions and highlighted the omnipresence of violence in American culture. The following April, after a jury declared the officers not guilty in the assault, African-American and Latino residents

[3] Michael Gordon and Bernard Trainor, *The Generals' War: The Inside Story of the Conflict in the Gulf* (New York: Back Bay Books, 1995); Douglas Little, *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East Since 1945*, 3rd ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

of Los Angeles expressed their anger and frustration in a week of rioting. Protesting not only the King verdict, but broader racial injustices, social inequality, and urban economic woes, rioters shattered the myth of a post-Cold War calm and post-Gulf War jubilation. With over $1 billion in property damage and more than fifty people killed, the uprising signaled the emergence of a volatile domestic climate.[4]

The very next spring witnessed another demonstration of the nation's unstable internal atmosphere. After a fifty-day siege of a Branch Davidian compound in Waco, Texas, agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms raided the complex on April 19, 1993. Ultimately, four FBI agents and seventy-six members of the religious sect died in the siege and final raid. With the explosions replayed on TV and the mounting toll of women and children killed in the confrontation, many citizens questioned whether the federal authorities used excessive force. After years of investigation and analysis, Department of Justice officials, politicians, and commentators continued to debate the culpability of federal government operatives.[5]

In an alleged response to the raid on the Branch Davidians, Timothy McVeigh orchestrated an attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City on the second anniversary of the Waco incident. Detonating a rental truck filled with ammonium-based explosives, McVeigh killed one hundred sixty-eight people and wounded over six hundred others. Newspaper, magazine, and television coverage of the 1995 bombing offered graphic and stirring images of office workers bandaging co-workers and firemen cradling bloodied toddlers. After the most devastating incident

---

[4] Min Song Hyoung, *Strange Future: Pessimism and the 1992 Los Angeles Riots* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).
[5] Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, *Continuation of Waco Investigation*, 106th Cong., 2nd sess., July 26, 2000.

of domestic terrorism in the nation's history, civic and religious leaders, as well as average citizens sought to make sense of McVeigh's actions as well as the meaning and motivation of political violence. Once again, though not directly linked to other acts of terrorism or aggression, the Oklahoma City bombing captured the violence the era.[6]

Other acts of violence similarly perplexed an uneasy citizenry. Though the 1996 arrest of Theodore Kaczynski, the "Unabomber," shed some light on a string of mysterious mail bombs, many questions remained unanswered about the rise in homegrown acts of terror and violence. More unsettling, new types of violence continued to surface. For example, two high-school students planned and executed a shooting spree at Columbine High School in Colorado, killing thirteen and injuring dozens of others before taking their own lives. In the years following the "massacre," child psychologists, media critics, and others analyzed the perpetrators' upbringing and social surroundings, yet failed to produce convincing answers as to "why Columbine happened."[7]

The above events represent more than a chronicle of grisly acts. An era of unorthodox and unpredictable violence greeted the post-Cold War United States. Far from the "new world order" envisioned by George H.W. Bush, the last decade of the twentieth century witnessed new types of violence and widespread disorder. From government-sponsored demonstrations of force at home and abroad to grassroots acts

---

[6] Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *Terrorism in the U.S.: The Nature and Extent of the Threat and Possible Legislative Responses*, 104th Cong., 1st sess., 1995; Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, *Oklahoma City Bombing*, 104th Cong., 1st sess., 1995; Daniel Levitas, *The Terrorist Next Door: The Militia Movement and the Radical Right* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2003); Edward T. Linenthal, *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[7] Dave Cullen, *Columbine* (New York: Twelve, 2009).

of terror in federal buildings and high schools, American citizens observed an unsettling rise in violence. As the decade and the millennium drew to a close, many commentators were not surprised to see the streets of Seattle erupt in violent clashes between demonstrators and an anxious police force. After deploying tear gas, rubber bullets, and pepper spray on students and labor organizers who were protesting the inequitable effects of globalization on the environment and on the world's poor, riot police eventually arrested hundreds of activists.[8]

☙

It was in this era of uncertainty, disorder, and violence that recently professionalized anti-environmentalists adopted new rhetoric and fine-tuned their focus. Reflecting and capitalizing on the atmosphere of insecurity, opponents portrayed the environmental movement and its adherents as either metaphorically dangerous or as a probable physical threat. In previous eras, critics described the impact of environmental legislation with precise detail, often listing the exact numbers of jobs that would be terminated or the acreage that would be placed off limits. By the end of the century, anti-environmentalists deployed broader yet more aggressive attacks against environmentalism.

In particular, critics of environmentalism increasingly described environmental legislation and activism with language evoking violence and aggression. Numerous commentators adopted phrases such as "under attack" or "held hostage" in describing their interaction with environmentalists or environmental regulations. With increasing

[8] Arthur Santana, "WTO In Seattle – No Secret, But Police Still Prepare in Secrecy," *Seattle Times*, September 24, 1999; Ian Ith, "Retired Officer Makes Clubs – Batons Burnished for WTO Protests," *Seattle Times*, November 29, 1999; Norm Stamper, *Breaking Rank: A Top Cop's Expose of American Policing* (New York: Nation Books, 2006); Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalization and Its Discontents* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2003).

intensity and frequency, witnesses implied that the economic, psychological, and social damage of environmentalism was akin to physical harm.

During the conservative, Republican-led 105th and 106th Congresses, various House and Senate subcommittees held hearings examining the disruptive and potentially violent qualities of environmental laws. Hoping to cut federal spending on conservation programs as well as to foster greater protection of private property rights, late-century conservative leaders such as Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and senior Alaskan senator Ted Stevens sought to undermine support for environmental initiatives. With Alaska's Don Young chairing the House Committee on Resources and Idaho's Helen Chenoweth leading the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, anti-environmentalists secured an effective stage to direct the national conversation on environmentalism. For example, in June 1998 inquiries on the *Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*, Chenoweth conducted hearings to expose the danger of environmental regulations to American workers, families, and communities. Representatives from extractive industries, cattle growers associations, and multiple-use organizations described how environmental legislation "destroyed," "crippled," and "threatened" small towns across the nation. Using language that equated environmental regulations with physical harm or violence, witnesses delivered emotional and stirring sworn statements. In addition to citizens from Montana, Alaska, and New Mexico, speakers from New Hampshire, Maine, and Arkansas filled

out the hearings' dais. Inviting witnesses from every region, Chenoweth underscored the increasingly national focus of anti-environmental sentiment.[9]

To supplement the spoken testimony at hearings, conservative think tanks contributed searing reports and investigations of environmental legislation. Using rhetoric of perceived aggression and violence, analysts echoed the tone and terminology of farmers, small business owners, and other witnesses. For example, the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise released a study, "Battered Communities," which not only aimed to expose "the urban-rural prosperity gap," but also to address the role of environmental legislation in widening the gap. The report concluded that:

> . . . rural counties are finding themselves choked to death by Federal restrictions designed to protect the environment from the people who live and work in the environment. The most disheartening aspect of the conflict over the environment is that rural goods producers, ranchers, loggers, miners, are becoming a despised minority, morally excluded from respect and human decency.[10]

Though a metaphor, phrases such as "choked to death," offered anti-environmentalists convenient and politically powerful talking points to share with constituents and the media. Positioning themselves as spokesmen and defenders of blue collar and extractive industry workers, CDFE representatives such as Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb castigated environmentalists and their agendas as hostile to the rights of hardworking Americans. As in many witness testimonies during environmental legislation hearings, the "Battered Communities" report employed emotional language and personal anecdotes to undermine environmentalists' ethical footing. In addition to

---

[9] House Committee on Resources, *Hearing on Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., June 9, 1998, 1.
[10] Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, "Battered Communities," in House Committee, *Hearing on Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*.

his "Battered Communities" study, CDFE spokesman, Ron Arnold also issued a report, "Power to Hurt," to the House Committee on Resources. Offering examples of how environmental legislation "hurt" individual Americans throughout the nation, Arnold's report used rhetoric of violence to communicate the alleged severity of green laws. Thus, through continued use of terms such as "battered" and "hurt," critics of environmentalism aimed to portray environmentalists as deliberately abusive.[11]

The use of metaphors of "war" also colored congressional testimony by the end of the twentieth century. Many witnesses identified the presence of an ongoing, but undeclared multi-front "war" between powerful environmentalists and embattled landowners.[12] Depicting conservationists and preservationists as well-armed with allies in government agencies such as the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, and Environmental Protection Agency, critics feared they had little chance for victory in their war. In debates on federal land use policies, Melvin R. Brown, speaker of Utah's House of Representatives, called for increased attention to the "War on the West" and stated:

> We feel . . . embattled, locked out and held hostage: embattled because our heritage and lifestyle are under assault; locked out because we are factored out of the public policy decision making equation; and held hostage by dehumanizing public policy developed in a political environment driven by special interests and where conclusions are reached before questions are formulated.[13]

---

[11] Ron Arnold, "Power to Hurt," in House Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, *Funding of Environmental Initiatives and Their Impact on Local Communities*, 106th Cong., 2nd sess., February 15, 2000.

[12] Cold War historian Michael S. Sherry traced the proclivity to use metaphors of war back to the militarization of the United States in the 1930. See: Michael S. Sherry, *In the Shadow of War: The United States Since the 1930s* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

[13] House Committee on Resources, *Citizens' Perspectives on Federal Land Use Policies*, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., June 18, 1996, 6.

According to Brown, environmentalists and agents of the federal government used legislation such as the National Environmental Policy Act to harass farmers, ranchers, and developers. As he deployed multiple metaphors of war, Brown underscored the increased use of rhetoric of violence in environmental hearings. Throughout his testimony, the Utahn argued that environmentalists from organizations such as the Sierra Club targeted rural Westerners. Hoping to communicate a sense of real and imminent danger, Representative Brown used the emotional language of abuse to sway lawmakers.

Likewise, in similar hearings on federal land use policies two years later, Representative John Peterson of Pennsylvania deployed war metaphors to protest expanded wilderness designations of his state's mature hardwood forests. A small town grocer and lifelong resident of Pleasantville, Peterson represented Pennsylvania's rural Fifth Congressional District and implored that "this [is] a war against rural America." Fearful that continued preservation legislation implied that "critters and creatures and insects have a higher value than our children," Peterson sought support in his battle against environmentalists. The congressman informed the House Committee on Resources that his state's Allegheny National Forest:

> . . . is currently under siege by the environmental groups to stop logging there. In the northern tier of Pennsylvania, we used to dig coal, we used to drill for oil, and we used to cut timber. That was very much a part of our quality of life, and all of those have been under attack.[14]

With phrases such as "under siege" and "under attack," Peterson accentuated the war-like atmosphere between environmentalists and their opponents. Emphasizing that the

[14] House Committee, *Hearing on Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*, 11.

sense of persecution and attack was more than a metaphor, Representative Peterson reiterated, "I personally believe that rural America is really under attack."[15]

Other critics expressed their fears in terms of deliberate and calculated "cultural genocide." Chuck Cushman, executive director of the American Land Rights Association and coordinator of the "Keep Private Lands in Private Hands Coalition," worried that the Park Service, in collusion with environmentalists, threatened rural folkways and targeted particular families. In April 1999 hearings before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Cushman testified, "The Park Service has committed 'cultural genocide' or 'cultural cleansing' over and over and Congress often has seemed not to care. But we fight on." A one-time volunteer for the Audubon Society and the son and father of former Park Service employees, Cushman stressed that his pronouncements were not baseless, emotional rants. Evoking the powerful terminology of "genocide," Cushman crafted an image of rural residents as an oppressed and neglected minority.[16] From his office in Battle Ground, Washington, Cushman fought the designation of new parks, wildlife sanctuaries, and wilderness areas throughout the United States.[17]

Many concerned citizens echoed Cushman's call to "fight on" as they adopted the "genocide" rhetoric. Paralleling the modern challenges of natural resource industry workers with the historic plight of Native Americans, critics of environmental regulation employed emotive language. Dave Glowaski, mayor of Orr, Minnesota, argued that environmental "agendas are becoming more of a threat to our very

---

[15] House Committee, *Hearing on Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*, 11.
[16] Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, *Bill and Administrative Proposal to Invest OCS Revenues in Conservation Programs*, 106th Cong., 1st sess., April 20, 1999, 75.
[17] Helvarg, *The War Against the Greens*, 108-112.

existence." Representing a northeastern Minnesota region of forests and lakes, Glowaski charged that the U.S. Forest Service sought to "strangle our economic base." The mayor warned, "It has been difficult to tell our people to not retaliate in the same way that the American Indian did previously. I ask, is the scenario that much different?"[18] Equating rural landowners' struggles against environmentalism with Native American removal and extermination, Glowaski and others portrayed federal environmental legislation as a form of cultural genocide and unjust governmental force. Ultimately concluding that Minnesotans would be justified in taking up arms against environmentalists and federal agents, he reflected the increasingly violent atmosphere and rhetoric of the late twentieth century.

Several other critics echoed Glowaski's reference to Native Americans' past troubles. Diana White Horse Capp, of Curlew, Washington, argued that environmental initiatives not only perpetuated "cultural genocide," but also "raped our culture" and "raped our children's future." Comparing the establishment of protected lynx habitats to the U.S. military's takeover of the land of her "mother's people," White Horse Capp worried that "slick media activists" threatened to usher in another era of Native American displacement and dispossession. As she protested the designation of the Kettle Mountain Wilderness Area, the chairwoman of the Upper Columbia Resource Council paralleled late-twentieth century environmentalist trickery with the U.S. government's historic duplicity in Native American policy. In addition, she contended that the "environmental elite use Native people." Frustrated and offended by environmentalists' casual and inconsistent references to precontact

[18] House Committee, *Hearing on Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*, 95.

America and Indians' alleged predisposition to ecological awareness, White Horse Capp urged her fellow Native Americans to scrutinize green propaganda carefully.[19] Arguing that environmentalists "use[d] Native Americans as 'flagship' species," White Horse Capp feared that the "genocidal juggernaut" of environmentalism prioritized microorganisms over human "minorities."[20] Thus, as she evoked a language of genocide and rape, White Horse Capp exhibited the heightened intensity of arguments against environmentalists and their agenda. Presenting an image of environmentalists as metaphorically violent and cunning, she challenged a movement that many Americans viewed as innocuous if not wholesome.

In the same February 2000 hearings, Antonio DeVargas, president of La Compania Ocho, a logging company in Vallecitos, New Mexico, echoed White Horse Capp's concerns. Claiming that environmentalists used "half-truths, distortion, and outright lies," DeVargas argued that environmentalism was a "campaign to destroy the Hispanic village lifestyle." Like White Horse Capp, DeVargas attacked environmental initiatives and their advocates for their purported threat to indigenous and minority cultures. Throughout the 1990s and into the new millennium, opponents of environmental legislation repeatedly described green initiatives as forceful "takeovers" or "destruction." Representatives from rural white, Latino, and Native American communities concurred that environmentalism was the lasted incursion in a long war against traditional folkways and lifestyles.[21]

---

[19] For more discussion of environmental ideology and Native American culture, see: Shepard Krech III, *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999).
[20] House Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, *Funding of Environmental Initiatives and Their Impact on Local Communities*, 106th Cong., 2nd sess., February 15, 2000, 44-45, 97.
[21] House Committee, *Funding of Environmental Initiatives and Their Impact on Local Communities*, 62.

In short, in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, critics increasingly described environmentalists and environmental regulation as destructive and dangerous. As they protested conservationist and preservationist legislation, anti-environmentalists used phrases that reflected the unpredicted upsurge in new forms of violence as well as the attendant heightened sense of uncertainty of the post-Cold War era. Employing an emotional language of war, battle, rape, genocide, and hostage-taking, opponents summoned a sense of imminent and real danger. As they applied descriptive symbols to argue that environmentalists threatened American values, livelihood, and ideology, critics cultivated a more aggressive anti-environmental rhetoric. In particular, anti-environmentalists used metaphors of force and violence to depict environmentalists as threats to rural communities and individual citizens.

In addition to metaphorical representations of environmental legislation as dangerous and violent, by the end of the twentieth century, anti-environmentalists constructed a case against the physical threats posed by "radical" environmentalists. Capitalizing on the amplified aura of fear and insecurity, critics cultivated a fear of "ecoterror." The rise in use of the term "ecoterrorism" coincided with an increase in direct-action environmentalism. Frustrated by the increased professionalization of the environmental movement, some environmentalists abandoned the conciliatory goals and methods of "mainstream" conservation organizations and adopted more confrontational tactics.

Beginning in the 1970s, members of groups such the Eco-Raiders and Greenpeace directly confronted polluters, seal hunters, and other "despoilers of the

earth." Infamous events such as Earth First!'s "cracking" of Glen Canyon Dam in 1981 introduced "radical" environmentalism into the national environmental dialogue. Not an actual fissure in the concrete, but rather a three-hundred-foot sheet of black plastic unfurled over the edge of the dam, the "crack" attracted significant media attention and inspired numerous other acts of eco-theater. Hoping to reinvigorate what they saw as a watered-down and weakened environmental movement, EarthFirst!ers experimented with new forms of activism.[22]

Throughout the 1980s, 1990s, and into the new century, environmental and animal rights activists pushed the boundaries of civil disobedience and flirted with criminal activity as they "liberated" mink farms, pulled up survey stakes, and staged tree-sits and roadblocks. In addition, more militant organizations such as Paul Watson's Sea Shepherd Conservation Society and the underground networks of the Animal Liberation Front and Earth Liberation Front deliberately flouted local, national, and international laws by ramming pirate whaling vessels and setting fire to research facilities, ski resorts, and construction sites.[23] In addition, lumber workers in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere alleged that biocentric Earth First!ers engaged in tree spiking operations in forests slated for timber harvest. In short, in the last quarter of the century, as the traditional "Big Ten" environmental organizations evolved into bureaucratic lobbying machines, some environmentalists engaged in more "radical" activism. Thus, anti-environmentalists' allegations of criminal and potentially

---

[22] Martha F. Lee, *Earth First!: Environmental Apocalypse* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 44-57.

[23] Peter Heller, *The Whale Warriors: The Battle at the Bottom of the World to Save the Planet's Largest Mammals* (New York: Free Press, 2007); David B. Morris, *Earth Warrior: Overboard with Paul Watson and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 1991).

dangerous activities were not without warrant. Critics of environmentalism capitalized on the uptick in direct-action environmentalism and actively promoted the idea of "ecoterrorism."

Interestingly, the development of direct-action environmentalism also offered another way to define anti-environmentalism. Rejecting the structure, focus, and tactics of traditional environmental organizations, so-called "radical" environmentalists are, in essence, also anti-environmentalists. Vehemently opposing the environmental movement, direct-action environmentalists often recognized many of the same critiques that resource industry representatives and Wise Use leaders leveled at environmentalism. For example, many conservative think tank fellows would likely concur with descriptions of the environmental movement by "radical" environmental scholars, Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella. The editors of *Igniting a Revolution* summed:

> . . . the U.S. environmental movement was largely a white, male, middle-class affair, cut off from the populist forces and the street energy that helped spawn it. Co-opted and institutionalized, in bed with government and industry . . . the Gang of Ten [the ten largest environmental organizations] . . . evolved into corporations and self-interested money-making machines . . . their riches were squandered largely on sustaining bloated budgets and six-figure salaries rather than protecting the environment.[24]

More than a manifestation of internal dissension or ideological splintering, direct-action environmentalists criticized the vision and viability of the environmental movement and offered an alternative understanding of anti-environmentalism. Though many "traditional" anti-environmentalists would disagree with "radical" environmentalists' depiction of mainstream environmentalists as beholden to

[24] Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella, II, eds., *Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2006), 15-16.

consumer culture and supportive of the capitalist structure of American society, both groups criticized the environmental movement's composition and campaigns. Regardless of their shared disdain for the environmental movement, direct-action environmentalists and anti-environmental leaders disagreed over the meaning of "ecoterrorism." While "radical" environmentalists tarred mountaintop coalers, whale hunters, and lumber magnates "ecoterrorists," anti-environmentalists used the term to describe sit-in leaders, animal liberators, and tree spikers.

Critics of Earth First! and other direct-action environmental organizations aimed to further radicalize environmentalism by equating "ecoterrorists" with convicted criminals and suspected domestic terrorists. Throughout the 1990s, anti-environmentalists shepherded discussions of metaphorical violence into allegations of actual physical violence. As they popularized the term "ecoterrorist," environmentalisms' critics used the inflamed rhetoric to further challenge the movement's respectability.[25]

Though employed sporadically in the 1980s, opponents of environmentalism did not widely deploy the term "ecoterrorism" until the closing decade of the twentieth century. Complementing the era's surge in various new types of violence, several

[25] For further analysis and perspectives of "ecoterrorism," see: Patrick Beach, *A Good Forest for Dying: The Tragic Death of a Young Man on the Front Lines of the Environmental Wars* (New York: Doubleday, 2003); Steven Best and Anthony J. Nocella II, eds., *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?: Reflections on the Liberation of Animals* (New York: Lantern Books, 2004); Walter Laquer, *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Donald R. Liddick, *Eco-Terrorism: Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006); Christopher Manes, *Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990); Leslie James Pickering, *The Earth Liberation Front, 1997-2002* (Portland, OR: Arissa Media Group, 2007); Craig Rosebraugh, *Burning Rage of a Dying Planet: Speaking for the Earth Liberation Front* (New York: Lantern Books, 2004); Rik Scarce, *Eco-Warriors: Understanding the Radical Environmental Movement* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 1990); Derek Wall, *Earth First! and the Anti-Roads Movement: Radical Environmentalism and Comparative Social Movements* (London: Routledge, 1999).

controversial and widely reported events involving "radical" environmentalists helped to push "ecoterrorism" into the national conversation. In particular, the May 24, 1990, explosion of a pipe bomb in activist Judi Bari's car ignited years of debate and speculation. In the midst of planning a protest to stall harvesting of northern California's redwoods, Bari and her fellow Redwood Summer organizer, Darryl Cherney, were on their way to Santa Cruz when a piecing blast rocked Bari's Subaru. Positioned under the driver's seat, the device shattered Bari's pelvis and delivered facial lacerations and temporary deafness to Cherney. Immediately after the incident, Oakland police and FBI agents concluded that Bari and Cherney built the homemade bomb for detonation at a lumber office. Surmising that the device accidentally detonated as the activists were transporting it, law enforcement spokesmen insisted that they had their culprits. In a sworn deposition, Oakland Police Sargent Michael Sitterud remarked on his conversations with FBI analysts, "They told us that these were the type of people who would be involved in carrying a bomb . . . these people qualified as terrorists."[26]

Officers arrested the hospitalized Bari and Cherney, but later dropped the charges as evidence failed to substantiate their speculation. Despite the dismissal, federal law enforcement agents continued to link the duo with terrorist activities.[27] Over a decade later, in a 2002 verdict, a jury awarded the activists $4.4 million in a false-arrest suit against the FBI. Though Bari died of breast cancer in 1997, her estate

[26] Judi Bari, *Timber Wars* (Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 1994), 301; *Bari et al. v. Doyle et al.*, No. C 91-01057CW (U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, 1995); Paul Rauber, "No Second Warning," *Sierra* 76, no. 1 (January/February 1991): 24.
[27] Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney, "The FBI Stole My Fiddle," reprinted in *Earth First!* 31, no. 1 (Winter 2010): 18.

received $2.9 million in damages.[28] Many of Bari's supporters celebrated the verdict, but lamented that the crime remained unsolved. Left to wonder whether timber workers, "skinheads," or radical right-wing activists planted the bomb, friends, family members, and justice advocates petitioned to reopen the investigation.[29] The explosion that ripped through Judi Bari's car inaugurated a new era in the relationship between environmentalists and their critics. For the rest of the 1990s and into the next century, opponents expressed fear of a vast conspiracy of green tree spikers, bombers, and arsonists.

Following the 1990 bombing, through publications and media appearances, critics increasingly spoke of the unchecked rise of "ecoterrorism" and "radical environmentalism." Citing books such as Dave Foreman's *Ecodefense*, politicians, extractive industry workers, housing developers, and several conservative commentators warned of a well-funded, well-trained, and well-organized network of "ecoterrorists."[30] In particular, Ron Arnold, Wise Use spokesman and Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise executive, often appeared as an "ecoterrorism expert" on network and cable news programs. Following incidents of alleged acts of "eco-terrorism," Arnold offered analysis and contextualization of events. For example, after the burning of Vail's Two Elk Ski Resort in October 1998, numerous television networks and print outlets courted Arnold as an expert commentator.[31] As he placed contemporary transgressions within a broader history of "ecoterrorism," Arnold

---

[28] Jim Carlton, "Activists Are Awarded $4.4 Million In False-Arrest Suit Against FBI," *Wall Street Journal*, June 12, 2002.
[29] "Stop FBI From Destroying Bomb Case Evidence," *Industrial Worker* 107, no. 8 (October 2010): 8.
[30] Dave Foreman and Bill Haywood, eds., *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, 3rd ed. (Chico, CA: Abbzug Press, 1985).
[31] Daniel Glick, *Powder Burn: Arson, Money, and Mystery on Vail Mountain* (New York: Public Affairs, 2001), 100, 216-217.

crafted a detailed background of "radical environmentalism." Through his repeated "expert analysis," Arnold aimed to legitimize claims of calculated environmental treachery.[32] In addition, in 1997, Arnold published a history of radical environmental action, *Ecoterror: The Violent Agenda to Save Nature*. Cataloging the actions of individuals such as Earth First!ers Dave Foreman and Judi Bari and analyzing the tactics of groups such as the Animal Liberation Front, Sea Shepherd, PETA, and others, Arnold linked the philosophies of environmental activists with the Unabomber, Ted Kaczynski.[33] Validating and augmenting the collective unease of the era, he surmised:

> . . . we simply can't grasp the world of the Unabomber. We just can't believe there is a violent agenda to save nature. But there is. We just can't believe there are people planting bombs, destroying equipment and obstructing workers to save nature. But there are. We just can't believe ecoterror exists. But it does.[34]

Arguing that environmentalist literature informed the Unabomber's worldview and helped him choose his targets, Arnold called for a reappraisal of both "radical" and "mainstream" environmentalism. Hoping to shock complacent Americans out of their disbelief, Arnold dissected Kaczynski's 1995 anti-technology "Manifesto" and compared it to Al Gore's *Earth in the Balance*. Arnold contended that popular environmental writings such as the vice president's global warming treatise promoted hatred of industrial civilization and encouraged future "ecoterrorists." In addition, Arnold emphasized that it was not just a lunatic fringe who committed acts of "ecoterror." With investigative detail, Arnold attempted to expose the financial and

---

[32] Ron Arnold, interview, *ABC World News Tonight*, ABC, October 22, 1998.
[33] Ron Arnold, *Ecoterror: The Violent Agenda to Save Nature* (Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1997).
[34] Arnold, *Ecoterror*, 283-284.

philosophical connections between disparate groups such as the Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, Animal Liberation Front, Earth First!, and the Fund for Animals.[35]

Many other critics also worried about the blurry boundaries between "radical" and "mainstream" environmental organizations. The aforementioned Dave Glowaski, mayor of Orr, Minnesota, expressed concern over the "enviro-pressures" in his rural community. He shared his views as a civic leader and a father:

> As the U.S.F.S. [United States Forest Service] keeps succumbing to the pressures of the eco-terrorists and their nice sounding "parent" organizations (the Sierra Club, etc.), our children's fears keep growing. Are we going to have to leave our homes? Is Dad going to have to lose his job? Is Dad going to get crippled or hurt or even killed by an eco-terrorist because he works in the forest? . . . Everyday questions from the children in our community, including my own.[36]

Casually linking traditional conservation organizations such as the Sierra Club with "ecoterrorism," Glowaski and others endeavored to castigate the entire environmental movement.

In addition to parallels with the Unabomber, critics also linked environmentalists with other domestic terrorists. In the June 1995 Endangered Species Act Reauthorization field hearings, Mack Birkmeier, president of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, protested the proposed critical habitat listing for Chinook salmon. Offering what he termed a "cowboy perspective," Birkmeier contended that the "law is being used as a club" and suggested that the ESA be renamed the "Community Destruction Act." Linking mainline "preservationists who spew vomit" with "Earth First! ecoterrorists," the Joseph, Oregon, cattleman alleged that

---

[35] Arnold, *Ecoterror*, 57-59.
[36] House Committee, *Hearing on Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*, 95.

environmentalists engaged in "killing cattle, burning ranchers' property, ruining water systems, bombing Postal Service offices, [and] spiking trees." Birkmeier ultimately concluded, "They are no less an abomination than the people who bombed the Federal building in Oklahoma City!"[37] Offering this assessment less than two months after Timothy McVeigh's April 19, 1995, bombing of the Murrah Federal Building, Birkmeier exploited a landmark contemporary event to further radicalize direct-action environmentalists. In casually equating the tactics of Earth First! with the most infamous act of domestic terrorism in United States history, Birkmeier and others sought to demonize environmentalists during an era of heightened anxiety.

Other congressional witnesses and elected officials echoed Birkmeier's tactic of seamlessly liniking direct-action environmentalists with domestic terrorists. During June 1998 hearings on "acts of ecoterrorism," Representative Steve Chabot of Ohio, compared animal rights activists who vandalized laboratories with "Theodore Kaczynski, the Unabomber, way out on the extreme . . . a radical environmentalist, somebody who went way beyond the norm; and somebody like Timothy McVeigh." A Republican with a markedly anti-environmental voting record, Chabot earned a "10%" on the League of Conservation Voters "Scorecard."[38]

Like Chabot, radio and television commentators such as Rush Limbaugh also likened the habits of environmentalists with terrorists and criminals. The popular and polarizing media figure commemorated Earth Day on his show by criticizing environmentalists and their initiatives. After listing a few of the suggestions from

---

[37] Senate Committee, *Endangered Species Act Reauthorization Field Hearings*, 336-337.
[38] House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, *Acts of Ecoterrorism by Radical Environmental Organizations*, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., June 9, 1998, 41.

Earth Island Institute's "50 Things You Can Do to Save the Earth" pamphlet, such as "use mass transportation" and "unplug your electronics," Limbaugh asked his audience:

> Does this remind you of anybody? . . . Kaczynski, the Unabomber . . . It sounds just like Kaczynski. He traveled by bus. He didn't believe in electricity. He didn't have a toilet . . . I mention this because these people are real . . . there are more people who believe things like this than you would probably believe.[39]

Thus, in addition to connecting environmentalists with feared figures such as Ted Kaczynski, Limbaugh also implied that such extremism was not limited to a radical few activists, but rather many environmentalists shared such views. Like other critics, from cattlemen to politicians, the famous radio personality exhibited ease in linking direct-action environmentalists, "mainstream" environmentalists, and domestic terrorists.

Throughout the 1990s, numerous commentators like Limbaugh referred to environmentalists as "terrorists" and "wanton criminals," and described incidents of direct-action environmentalism as "hate crimes" and "domestic terrorism" that fostered a "siege mentality."[40] Furthermore, witnesses at congressional hearings argued that "acts of ecoterrorism" were not infrequent, isolated cases, but rather part of a larger, "criminal, nationwide organization that believes in the politics of intimidation and terror."[41] As such, ranchers, fur farm managers, pharmaceutical executives, and numerous think tank policy analysts recommended strengthening the Animal Enterprise Protection Act of 1993, a law which increased the penalties for

---

[39] *Rush Limbaugh*, television show, April 30, 1996.
[40] House Committee, *Acts of Ecoterrorism*, 2, 5, 8, 22, 42-43.
[41] House Committee, *Acts of Ecoterrorism*, *7*.

activists convicted of causing economic damage or physical harm to commercial animal enterprises such as zoos, laboratories, and farms.[42] In addition, in advocating classifying "acts of ecoterrorism" under RICO statues for organized crime, testifiers at congressional hearings reinforced the image of environmentalists as potentially dangerous criminals. At both the state and federal levels, anti-environmentalists sought to strengthen existing laws against "ecoterrorism" and thereby criminalize direct-action environmentalism.

Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, critics reinvigorated discussions of environmentalisms' link to violence. From early concerns that environmentalists may have been responsible for the coordinated attacks to subsequent efforts to use anti-terror legislation against environmental activists, 9/11 intensified the debate regarding the alleged danger of environmentalists. On the day of the Al Qaeda terrorist attacks, Congressman Don Young allegedly "told the *Alaska Daily News* that a 'strong possibility' existed that eco-terrorists were responsible for the attacks.'"[43] Though Young and nearly all Americans quickly came to identify Al Qaeda and its leader Osama Bin Laden as the likely perpetrators, Young's quick fingering of "radical" environmentalists offered telling clues of his views of environmental activists.

In reaction to the historic attacks, the nation's leaders crafted legislation with new definitions of terrorism. In particular, the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act, or

---

[42] *Animal Enterprise Protection Act of 1992*, Public Law 102-346, 102nd Cong., 2nd sess., August 26, 1992.
[43] Dara Lovitz, *Muzzling a Movement* (New York: Lantern, 2010), 56.

more commonly, the PATRIOT Act of 2001, offered novel legal mechanisms for defining and investigating activism. As legal scholar, Dara Lovitz, summed, "The USA PATRIOT Act extended investigative reach into the domestic behavior of individuals, including groups whose political activism might be construed as intimidating." With the sanction of the PATRIOT Act, states pursued eco-terror bills "to criminalize speech activity of environmentalists or animal activists that would otherwise be deemed constitutionally protected."[44] For example, in 2006, lawmakers in Pennsylvania passed House Bill 213. The bill defined an "eco-terrorist" as anyone who "prevent[s] or obstruct[s] an individual from lawfully: (i) participating in an activity involving animals, plants or an activity involving natural resources; or (ii) using an animal, plant or natural resource facility." In addition, the legislation included "mining, foresting, harvesting or processing natural resources" under its definition. Thus, activists who stage a sit-in at a mining road entrance and "obstruct" workers from entering the facility would fall under the eco-terrorist category and face stricter penalties than previously when such activity was classified as civil disobedience and/or trespassing.[45]

The Federal Bureau of Investigation lent their expertise, budget, and manpower to enforce new "ecoterror" laws. In May 2004 hearings before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, John E. Lewis, Deputy Assistant Director of the FBI's Counterterrorism Division, stated, "Because of the sustained, extensive physical and economic damage involved, as well as the growing potential for violence, the prevention and investigation of animal rights extremism/eco-terrorism is the FBI's top

[44] Lovitz, *Muzzling a Movement*, 56-57.
[45] *Ecoterrorism*, 18 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 3311 (2006).

Domestic Terrorism priority."[46] Moving suspected "ecoterrorists" up the list in the agency's "Most Wanted" rankings, the FBI emphasized that radical environmentalists represented a real and present danger to innocent citizens. Though direct-action environmentalists had not been convicted of any deaths, assaults, or injuries, they vaulted known violent offenders on the nation's top law enforcement agency's watch list. In targeting direct-action environmentalists for hindering business operations and loss of profit, Deputy Lewis communicated decades'-old concerns of environmentalisms' threat to the capitalist order.

Other witnesses at "ecoterrorism" hearings offered personal anecdotes to support Lewis's claims. Representatives from Kentucky Fried Chicken's parent company, Yum! Brands, as well as spokesmen from industries that tested pharmaceuticals on animals, presented testimonies of environmentalist harassment of their employees and attacks of their facilities. In addition to detailed descriptions of the actions, witnesses also tallied the economic damages. For example, McGregor W. Scott, U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of California, noted that ALF was responsible for "causing millions of dollars in damage on the campus of the University of California Davis in 1987."[47] Constructing a history of violent and costly action, witnesses urged lawmakers to address this established criminal syndicate. Though often bookending their testimony with fears of violent attack, most witnesses focused on their fear of financial loss.

Not many people noted the mixed motives and inflated claims of "ecoterror"

[46] Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *Animal Rights: Activism vs. Criminality*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., May 18, 2004, 25.
[47] Senate Committee, *Animal Rights: Activism vs. Criminality*, 132.

witnesses. In fact, early twenty-first century hearings offered few voices that suggested an alternative to the view of environmental activism as "eco-terrorism." In a submitted statement, Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont questioned the validity of the charges of "eco-terrorism" and the need for such a hearing. He argued exasperatedly, "I think that most Americans would rather that we address more urgent concerns that really do pose a serious threat to this country and to the world." Linking increased attention to "eco-terrorism," with the Bush Administration's fervor to "aggressively stamp everything with a 'terrorism' label," Leahy expressed frustration with committee chairman Orrin Hatch and the "ever-expanding laundry list of predicate offenses that make up the statutory definition of 'federal crime of terrorism.'"[48] Leahy's statement aside, most witnesses agreed with Senator Hatch that "eco-terrorists . . . promote a grave threat to the well-being and advancement of mankind."[49]

Likewise, subsequent hearings on "ecoterrorism" echoed Hatch's concerns. Though originally organized to examine the criminal activities of direct-action groups such as the Earth Liberation Front (ELF) and the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), the hearings also evaluated the role of more "mainstream animal [and environmental] charities" such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, the Sierra Club, and the Humane Society.

With a sense of urgency, committee chairman Senator James Inhofe opened the proceedings, declaring, "ELF and ALF are terrorists by definition, using intimidation, threats, acts of violence, and property destruction to force their opinions

[48] Senate Committee, *Animal Rights: Activism vs. Criminality*, 67-69.
[49] Senate Committee, *Animal Rights: Activism vs. Criminality*, 2.

of proper environmental and animal rights policy upon society." Insisting that "there is a dollar relationship between them ['eco-terrorists' and 'mainstream environmental groups']," Inhofe implored, "I think every committee of the House and the Senate should get on board and put an end to this thing." Though some speakers, such as Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey, endeavored to highlight differences among types of environmental groups and also distinctions between environmental activists and terrorists, Inhofe and others continued to stress the comparisons. The Oklahoma senator summarized the similarities between "extreme" environmental activists and others groups, "Just like Al Qaeda and other terrorist movements, ELF and ALF cannot accomplish their goals without money, membership and the media." In addition to comparing ELF and ALF with organizations such as Al Qaeda and the Ku Klux Klan, witnesses also continued to equate ELF and ALF actions with the 1995 bombing of Oklahoma City's Murrah Building and the bombing of Olympic Park in Atlanta during the 1996 Summer Games. In short, September 11th had an interesting effect on environmental activism. Rather than further distancing or defining what constituted "terrorism," 9/11 emboldened anti-environmentalists and their conservative allies to reassert parallels between militant jihadists and animal rights activists. Hoping to gather evidence and momentum to strengthen federal laws regarding direct-action environmentalism, post-9/11 hearings aimed to permanently upgrade animal-rights and environmental activism from "crimes of violence" to "ecoterrorism."[50]

Conservative scholars in diverse fields bolstered politicians' case for

[50] Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, *Eco-terrorism – Specifically Examining the Earth Liberation Front and the Animal Liberation Front*, 109th Cong., 1st sess., May 18, 2005, 1-8.

classifying direct-action environmentalism as "ecoterrorism." Scrutinizing the causes and impact of "ecoterrorism" on the U.S. economy and justice system, writers and commentators offered talking points and lengthy reports. For example, economic policy analyst John Berlau examined the "growing threat of ecoterrorism." A senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, a free market think tank, Berlau usually wrote about financial trends and often concentrated on criticizing the Internal Revenue Service. Arguing that direct-action environmentalism portended significant economic losses for individual citizens as well the nation, Berlau examined how environmentalism put the United States "on the brink of disaster." Like other critics, Berlau used the term "ecoterrorism" to discuss loss of potential profit. Instead of limiting his focus to the financial toll of environmentalism, Berlau also examined the impact of "ecoterrorism" on public health. As he examined the targeting of medical research facilities, Berlau reasoned:

> Indirectly, eco-terrorists are killing thousands of people, the most vulnerable or our society . . . When life-saving research is delayed or shut down because of terrorist acts or terrorist threats, the real casualties are the sick and the poor who depend on the ability of scientists to do their work.[51]

Thus, rather than linking "ecoterrorists" with the direct deaths and injury of timber workers, Berlau focused on the less measurable numbers of people awaiting medical breakthroughs from animal research. Just as an earlier generation of anti-environmentalists blamed Rachel Carson for countless malarial deaths since the ban of DDT, Berlau similarly recommended an indictment of manslaughter for late-twentieth century animal liberation activists. In addition, like Ron Arnold and many

[51] John Berlau, *Eco-Freaks: Environmentalism is Hazardous to Your Health!* (Nashville, TN: Nelson Current, 2006), 208.

congressional witnesses, Berlau linked "mainstream" environmental organizations with more radical groups such as ALF and ELF. Contending that "radical and mainstream are too close for comfort," Berlau argued that groups such as the Sierra Club, the NRDC, and others implicitly supported violent environmentalists by not publicly condemning their actions and also argued that "mainline environmental groups" directly encouraged "the spike in eco-terrorism" with their "harsh rhetoric."[52]

In short, by the end of the twentieth century, anti-environmentalists relied on rhetoric of "ecoterror" to guide their critiques of the modern environmental movement. Capitalizing on an atmosphere of increased uncertainty and violence, opponents of environmentalism warned their fellow Americans about the dangers posed by "ecoterrorists" and their mainstream backers. Anti-environmentalists' anxiety over the radicalization of environmentalism reflected broader domestic concerns and debates over the "new world order" and America's values and priorities.

At the same time that critics of environmentalism actively cultivated rhetoric of "ecoterrorism" and "radical" environmentalism, many anti-environmentalists sought to portray themselves as representing and in touch with the mainstream of American culture. As they challenged the popularity of the environmental movement, opponents broadened their appeal to reach a wider audience. Building on the institutionalization and professionalization of environmental opposition during the Reagan years, in the following decade, critics endeavored to popularize anti-environmentalism by using new forms of media. Rather than limiting their

[52] Berlau, *Eco-Freaks*, 212-213.

pronouncements to congressional hearings and trade journal editorials, opponents of environmentalism enthusiastically began to disseminate their messages through radio and TV shows, DVDs, children's books, workshops, and new forms of social media such as Facebook and Twitter.

Throughout the 1990s and into the twenty-first century, opponents of environmentalism used popular, mainstream media outlets and figures to advance their vision and agenda. Most notably, radio and television commentator Rush Limbaugh criticized "environmentalist wackos" for their alleged links with socialism, their biocentric tendencies, and their disregard for the American way of life. In bestselling books such as *The Way Things Ought to Be* (1992) and *See, I Told You So* (1993), Limbaugh interwove several strands of anti-environmentalist arguments in readable, folksy prose. For example, Limbaugh targeted environmentalist alarmism and anti-Americanism, insisting that the movement:

> . . . [is] about panic. It's about fear. It's about instilling the American populace with terror, dread, and apprehension about the future. It's all about making you think that your way of life is 'destroying the world.' America is the root of all evil in the world, according to the environmentalist wackos.[53]

Depicting environmentalists as fundamentally different, bizarre, and anti-American, Limbaugh aimed to unite the rest of the nation in opposition to the "wackos." He aimed to undermine environmentalists' claims as he reassured his followers, ". . . don't panic. The ozone hole is a hoax. It is simply a means by which militant environmentalists, the new socialists-slash-Communists in America can attack the private enterprise system."[54]

---

[53] Rush Limbaugh, *See, I Told You So* (New York: Pocket Books, 1994), 190.
[54] Rush Limbaugh, *Rush Limbaugh*, television show, September 30, 1992.

In addition to tarring *Earth in the Balance* author Al Gore as "a bona fide tree-hugging, spotted-owl loving, snail-darter protecting, Gaia-worshipping, radical doomsday prophet who carries water for Greenpeace, the Sierra Club, and every other powerful environmental fringe lobby," Limbaugh also challenged the popularity of Earth Day.[55] Offering his own Earth Day "celebrations," Limbaugh used his shows on and around April 22 to debunk environmentalists' theories and to discredit environmental movement spokesmen. Through continued ridicule of environmentalist leaders such as Gore and events such as Earth Day, Limbaugh raised suspicion of mainstream environmentalists and their agendas. Making it funny and popular to lampoon environmental initiatives, he fostered a growing anti-environmental following.[56]

Limbaugh's presumed heir and sometimes competitor, Glenn Beck, also highlighted environmentalists' speciousness. Perhaps in an effort to lure some of Limbaugh's followers, Beck often focused his "rants" on environmental issues. Most notably, Beck used the increased attention on global warming debates to popularize anti-environmental ideology as well as his show. Ridiculing environmental philosophy in general as well as specific environmentalists, Beck contrasted celebrities' public statements on environmentalism with their lavish lifestyles. For example, he quoted England's Prince Charles as saying, "'Climate change is the greatest threat facing mankind . . . We must act now. Future generations are depending on it.'" Beck followed the quote by noting:

---

[55] Limbaugh, *See, I Told You So*, 177.
[56] See for example, *Rush Limbaugh*, television show, April 22, 1993 and April 21, 1995.

> Prince Charles recently used a luxury airliner to transport himself, his wife, and a 14-person entourage on a 16,400-mile 'environmental tour of Chile, Brazil, and Ecuador. The plane was a 134-seat Airbus A319 retrofitted into a private jet seating just 29. In total, 322 tons of CO_2 were emitted.[57]

Emphasizing the specific details of environmentalists' transgressions, Beck aimed to discredit environmental spokesmen and leaders with precise statistics. Promoting "The Al Gore Hypocrisy Calendar," Beck drew attention to Gore's lifestyle and carbon footprint. Depicting a cartoon of Gore hovering over a T-bone steak, the November 29, 2006 entry read, "On [this day], the United Nations released a report which found eating meat worse for the climate than the entire transportation sector. Years later, Al Gore is still NOT a vegetarian."[58] Thus, in addition to highlighting Gore's transportation and housing choices, critics also castigated his diet and other aspects of his lifestyle. As they relished examples of the apparent phoniness of environmentalists, opponents encouraged their audiences to question future proclamations of leaders such as Gore.

In addition to radio and television programs, anti-environmentalists also aimed to advance their message to a wider audience through the printed word. In particular, critics began to write and publish humorous, accessible books in addition to dense think-tank policy analyses. For example, Alan Gottlieb and Ron Arnold of the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise published *Politically Correct Environment*, a collection of jokes, anecdotes, and cartoons that "poke fun at the eco-crowd."[59] For example, one of the many jokes reads: "What's the difference between bank robbers

[57] Glenn Beck, *Arguing with Idiots* (New York: Threshold Editions, 2009), 87.
[58] Beck, *Arguing with Idiots*, 105.
[59] Alan Gottlieb and Ron Arnold, *Politically Correct Environment* (Bellevue, WA: Merril Press, 1995).

and environmentalists? Bank robbers steal from folks who HAVE money."[60] Though light-hearted in tone and design, *Politically Correct Environment* also offered instructive lessons in anti-environmental rhetoric. Adding a glossary to help readers decode "enviro-speak," Gottlieb and Arnold defined terms such as, "*multiple use*: Two environmentalists hiking in the same wilderness area during the same year" and identified organizations such as the "*Sierra Club*: A blunt instrument used to put working people in the unemployment line." Like Limbaugh and Beck, the authors of *Politically Correct Environment* fused playful mockery with serious criticism to spread anti-environmental rhetoric.[61]

Anti-environmentalists also attempted to enter the realm of children's books. In response to popular environmental-themed picture books such as Dr. Seuss's *The Lorax*, Terri Birkett wrote *Truax*. Telling the story of a noble logger named Truax and Guardbark, "the protector of trees," Birkett's rhyming and colorful book offered entertainment as well as instruction for young readers. While Birkett presented Guardbark as angry, irrational, ignorant, and uncompromising, she portrayed the timber worker as knowledgeable, respectful, and altruistic. For example when Guardbark championed endangered species protection, Truax responded:

> It takes lots of thought
> To decide what we ought not do, or we ought.
> Would anyone mind if we lost, say, a tick.
> That carried a germ that made Cuddlebears sick?
> Or what about something that's really quite nice
> Like the Yellow-Striped Minnow that lives in Lake Zice?
> How far will we go? How much will we pay?
> To keep a few minnows from dying away?[62]

[60] Gottlieb and Arnold, *Politically Correct Environment*, 58.
[61] Gottlieb and Arnold, *Politically Correct Environment*, 23.
[62] Terri Birkett, *Truax* (Privately printed, 1995).

Incorporating statistics on tree harvesting and seed planting and discussions of old growth forests and biodiversity, *Truax* aimed to refute popular environmental concerns. By the end of the book, Truax succeeded in convincing Guardbark of the benign nature and ultimate necessity of logging. Eschewing his biocentrism and alarmism, the "protector of trees" offered the closing lines, "And perhaps best of all, I think things ARE NOT quite as bad as they seemed!" Though *Truax* failed to secure a major publisher, it continued to circulate years after its release.[63]

Other anti-environmentalist leaders sought to reach children and their parents through DVDs, workshops, and at-home lesson plans. The Cornwall Alliance, "a coalition of clergy, theologians, religious leaders, scientists, academics, and policy experts," worried that environmentalists targeted Christians in their quest for global dominance. With a spirit of crusade, the Alliance aimed to educate and mobilize an army of Christians to combat environmentalisms' forward assault. In 2010 the alliance released, *Resisting the Green Dragon*, a book and DVD series that "explains how the Green movement seeks to co-opt the church [and] . . . shows how and why the church should resist."[64] In addition to identifying how "environmentalism has penetrated the church with anti-human and anti-Christian ideas," *Resisting the Green Dragon* also warned that "Greens want to control how you live, eat, drive, and even the light you use to read by."[65] Arguing that vegetarianism was "unbiblical" ("Do we become wiser than God by deciding that meat eating is ungodly?"), the text's author,

---

[63] Birkett, *Truax*, 20.
[64] James Wanliss, *Resisting the Green Dragon: Dominion, Not Death* (Burke, VA: Cornwall Alliance, 2010), 16.
[65] Wanliss, *Resisting the Green Dragon*, 17-19.

physicist James Wanliss urged readers to pray and question the environmental agenda. Echoing Crichton's speeches and others, Wanliss cautioned his fellow Christians:

> . . . [T]he environmentalist Litany provides the foundation of an alternative religion or worldview for those who reject Western Civilization . . . it is a religion with a vision of sin and repentance, heaven and hell. It even has a special vocabulary, with words like 'sustainability' and 'carbon neutral.' Its communion is organic food. Its sacraments are sex, abortion, and when all else fails, sterilization. Its saints are Al Gore and the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change].[66]

Arguing that the environmental agenda was not an innocuous program of planting trees and picking up litter, Wanliss contended that environmentalists were responsible for the sinful presence of abortion. Like anti-environmentalists of previous decades, Wanliss linked environmental initiatives with other late-twentieth century cultural, social, and political phenomenon. Advocating rigorous defense of the Christian faith in light of the rise of an "environmentalist religion," Wanliss embraced a dragon-slaying metaphor:

> The environmentalist movement is like a great dragon coiled over on itself, consuming its own tail. Sated with human blood, its self-loathing character and self-contradictory existence will end via its own delicate appetite. But as it roars and terrifies the faint of heart, it will also thrash about in its existential rage . . . The Green Dragon must die.[67]

With graphic and passionate description, Wanliss and other members of the Cornwall Alliance sought to enlist foot soldiers in a holy war against environmentalism.

The Alliance also released a compendium DVD series to augment Wanliss's book. Featuring clergy and theologians lecturing on similar themes and topics, the films engaged the metaphors of battle and crusade. Formatted for viewing during Sunday school and home-school teaching sessions, the twelve half-hour episodes

[66] Wanliss, *Resisting the Green Dragon*, 38.
[67] Wanliss, *Resisting the Green Dragon*, 43.

included discussion guides and lesson plans. Segments such as "Rescuing People from the Cult," "Environmental Exaggerations, Myths and Lies," and "How 'Going Green' Leads to Poverty" provided scriptural support and practical applications to challenge environmental agendas. For example, in "Session 4: From *Captain Planet* to *Avatar*: The Seduction of Our Youth," Dr. Michael Farris, founder of the Home School Legal Defense Association and self-proclaimed "dropout of the environmentalist movement," offered parents and students tips and suggestions for recognizing and battling the "Green Dragon worldview of a world, socialist environmental utopia."[68] He warned his live audience and future viewers:

> The Green Dragon wants our kids and he's been actively recruiting them and evangelizing them for years through schools, movies, television, and the Internet. You and I need to be aware of and resist his seductive wiles [and] firm our faith . . .

Like other Cornwall spokesmen, Farris underscored that environmentalisms' threat to Christianity was not a distant threat or even an imminent danger, but it had already infiltrated their faith and their children. Thus, he implored parents to take immediate action and be continuously vigilant.

After denouncing the "anti-human and pantheistic themes" of films such as *WALL-E*, *Avatar*, *Pocahontas*, *Lion King*, *Free Willy*, and *Finding Nemo*, Farris offered suggestions on how to resist the nearly ubiquitous "coercive environmental education." In addition to the *Resisting the Green Dragon* lesson plans, Farris suggested "projects that integrate genuine creation stewardship along with evangelism." As with critics from previous eras, Farris carefully noted that he was not

[68] *Resisting the Green Dragon*, DVD, produced by CDR Communications (Burke, VA: Cornwall Alliance, 2010).

anti-*environment*, but rather anti-environmental*ist*. Citing scripture verses such as Genesis 1:28, which called on man to "have dominion over every living thing," Farris concluded with a plea to "develop a biblical understanding of creation" among young people. Ultimately, both the *Green Dragon* book and DVD series concluded that, "The time is now to stand and resist." Once again, anti-environmentalists deployed rhetoric of war to describe their relationship with environmentalists.[69]

Other critics of environmentalists also entered the realm of DVD production to advance their message. In an attempt to challenge the popularity and acclaim of Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* (2006), actor Leonardo DiCaprio's project, *The 11th Hour* (2007), and other environmental documentaries, opponents crafted their own films. Using similar techniques as *An Inconvenient Truth*, many movies aimed to directly refute Gore's evidence point-by-point. In 2007, British television producer Martin Durkin directed *The Great Global Warming Swindle*. Offering alternative readings of meteorological data, *Swindle*'s on-air scientists and other experts argued against anthropogenic climate change.[70] Likewise, employing a template mirroring Gore's lecture-and-slide format, Lord Monckton released *Apocalypse? No!* (2008). Advising his audience at the Cambridge Union Society and other viewers to "do nothing," Monckton argued that "climate change is a non-problem . . . the correct policy to address a non-problem is to have the courage to do nothing."[71] In television and radio interviews following the release of *Apocalypse? No!*, Monckton continued to refute global warming data and assail Gore's credibility. Appearing on Glenn

[69] "Session 4: From *Captain Planet* to *Avatar*," *Resisting the Green Dragon*, DVD, produced by CDR Communications (Burke, VA: Cornwall Alliance, 2010).
[70] *The Great Global Warming Swindle*, DVD, directed by Martin Durkin (London: WAGtv, 2007).
[71] *Apocalypse? No!*, DVD, (Washington, D.C.: Science and Public Policy Institute, 2008).

Beck's show, Monckton linked funding of Gore's global warming campaign to hostile foreign governments. Monckton contended:

> . . . it [funding] came from a number of sources, all of them undesirable and all of them very unfriendly to the freedoms of the West. I think the Chinese government are involved in this up their neck. I think the Indian government. I think several Arab governments . . . It's very simple really. Who stands to gain if Western governments close down their economies because infatuous [sic] nincompoops like Al Gore come out and say the sky's about to fall in?[72]

Throughout his film and subsequent interviews, Monckton not only highlighted environmental alarmism, but also stressed an impending loss of freedom. Summoning decades' worth of anti-environmental arguments, Monckton attacked Gore's methods, motives, and character.

Several years after the release of *An Inconvenient Truth*, skeptics continued to produce DVDs refuting his message. In 2009, Irish filmmakers Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney wrote, directed, and produced *Not Evil Just Wrong* to expose "the true cost of global warming hysteria." Without a commercial distributor, the duo used online networks to distribute copies of their DVDs. As they pieced together a history of environmental "extremism" and "alarmism," from Rachel Carson to Al Gore, McAleer and McElhinney presented a film that "Hollywood [doesn't] want you to see." As in their earlier film, *Mine Your Own Business* (2006), the filmmakers castigated "environmental elites," including those in Hollywood, for advancing an agenda of "hypocrisy, lies and exaggerations" at the expense of working-class and impoverished populations.[73] Hoping to "balance the debate about global warming," *Not Evil Just Wrong* aimed to debunk Gore's data and highlight the consequences of

[72] Glenn Beck, radio show, March 31, 2008.
[73] *Mine Your Own Business*, DVD, directed by Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney (Dublin: New Bera Media, 2006).

proposed legislation on the world's poor.[74] Worried about the widespread release and free distribution of *An Inconvenient Truth* to elementary and high schools, McAleer and McElhinney offered free educational materials for parents and teachers. Suggesting lesson plans, learning objectives, and resources for further study, the filmmakers aimed to reach a wider and younger audience. Other critics of environmentalism employed similar tactics.[75]

In addition to films, educational materials, and international speaker series, critics also used direct-action protest methods to advance their agenda. For example, in reaction to Live Earth, a climate-change awareness concert on July 7, 2007, volunteers from the libertarian group, BureauCrash, handed out leaflets questioning global warming and other environmentalist topics.[76] During the "7/7/7" festivities, commentator and "junk science" skeptic Steve Milloy hired aerial advertisers to fly over the concert venues with a banner that read: "DON'T BELIEVE AL GORE." Such methods of guerrilla theater, made famous by environmental groups such as Earth First! and PETA, aimed to disrupt the eco-festival and attract "free" media exposure. Borrowing direct-action tactics from "radical" environmentalists, critics sought to reach a broader and hipper audience. [77]

Global warming skeptics and other opponents of the environmental movement also looked to the Internet to broaden their membership base. With increased digital media formats and the ubiquity of personal computers and smartphones, critics delved

---

[74] *Not Evil Just Wrong*, DVD, directed by Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney (Dublin: Greener Horizons Films, 2009).
[75] "The Environment," *Effective Stewardship*, DVD curriculum, (Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty, 2008).
[76] Steve Milloy, *Green Hell* (Washington, D.C., Regnery, 2009), 224.
[77] Milloy, *Green Hell*, 223-224; Dan DeLuca, "A Drumbeat for Action on Warming," *Knight Ridder Tribune Business*, July 8, 2007.

into novel formats in the new millennium. In particular, opponents constructed websites to promote their agendas and discredit environmentalist causes. In addition to posting statistics challenging environmentalists' claims, critics also used websites to promote their books and upcoming media appearances. For example, Milloy founded junkscience.com, a site encouraging people to post their suggestions on how to challenge the green revolution.[78] Wise Use spokesman, Ron Arnold, used undueinfluence.com to maintain a "Green Tracking Library." Offering a list of the institutional and monetary connections between environmental organizations, lobbyists, and politicians, the site proclaimed, "Money is pulling all of the strings. Whose money? And whose strings?"[79] Arnold's multiple websites also listed his numerous publications, uplinks to his appearances on FOX News, and information on how to invite him to speak to concerned citizens' groups.[80] Often mimicking environmental organization homepages, critics' websites offered a clearinghouse of up-to-the-minute information on environmental initiatives as well as an archive of past "victories" over environmentalists.

As "blogging" became a popular vehicle for news and commentary, critics of environmentalism also adopted on-line, public journals. On wanliss.com, *Green Dragon* author, James Wanliss maintained a blog titled, "Eco-Nuts and Fruits." Identifying the site as a "Granola section to keep tabs on general nuttiness as well as violence and threats offered on the altar of environmentalism," Wanliss posted his thoughts on topics such as Greenpeace protests of coal mining, compact fluorescent

[78] http://www.junkscience.com (accessed July 17, 2011).
[79] http://www.undueinfluence.com/guide.htm (accessed July 17, 2011).
[80] http://www.cdfe.org (accessed July 1, 2011).

light bulbs, and ALF activists.[81] A low-cost alternative to glossy books and professionally produced DVD series, blogs, podcasts, and live web chats offered accessible and interactive vehicles to hone anti-environmental rhetoric and educate potential converts. In addition, many anti-environmental organizations quickly joined new social media formats such as, Twitter and Facebook. For example, on June 8, 2009, Arnold "tweeted" triumphs such as, "Climate skeptics won the European elections!" Disseminating updates on legislative hearings or forthcoming rallies, "Tweets" and "Likes" helped anti-environmental organizations cultivate a cohesive network of like-minded individuals.[82]

As mentioned above, many of the DVDs critics produced failed to secure widespread commercial distribution contracts. In another use of the Internet, filmmakers and their followers posted clips or entire films on YouTube in order to advance their message. *Global Warming Swindle*, *Apocalypse? No!*, and many other films appeared on the online video-sharing site and encouraged viewers to comment or "like" the clips. With careful and clever editing, Steve Milloy spliced segments of *Global Warming Swindle* alongside *An Inconvenient Truth*. In positioning Gore's arguments alongside counterarguments in a succinct nine-minute video, Milloy offered an inexpensive and entertaining tool for global warming skeptics.[83] Engaging the democratizing tendencies of the Internet, Milloy encouraged fellow critics to upload their rants about global warming and other environmentalist issues to

---

[81] http://www.wanliss.com/category/projects/eco-hate/ (accessed July 15, 2011).
[82] http://twitter.com/#!/heritage (accessed August 6, 2011); http://twitter.com/#!/Ron_Arnold (accessed August 6, 2011); http://www.facebook.com/ron.arnold (accessed August 6, 2011); http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-the-Defense-of-Free-Enterprise/ (accessed August 6, 2011).
[83] "Al Gore Debates Global Warming," http://youtube.com/watch?v=XDI2NVTYRXU (accessed July 4, 2011).

YouTube.[84]

In short, critics of environmental initiatives embraced twenty-first century technology in order to popularize opposition to environmentalism and to advance anti-environmental rhetoric. Though their arguments remained strikingly "mid-century," opponents modernized how they disseminated their information. In addition to continued use of traditional sources such as self-published books, letters to the editor, and direct-mailings, opponents of environmentalists also ventured into novel venues. Using DVDs, blogs, and new social network tools, anti-environmentalists hoped to reach a broader and younger audience. Spurred by the global popularity of Gore's global warming crusade, critics cultivated an international network of skeptics to challenge environmentalists. Through syndicated radio and television programs as well as picture books and other publications, opponents advanced a national campaign against environmentalists and their agenda.

In the closing decade of the twentieth century, as Americans celebrated the twentieth anniversary of Earth Day and environmental organizations continued to grow in membership, critics intensified their arguments against environmental legislation, activism, and philosophies. Part of the maturation of the anti-environmental movement as well as a product of the turbulent domestic atmosphere, critics developed more popular and emotional arguments against environmentalists, their tactics, and their agenda. Though many citizens hoped the end of the Cold War would usher in a period of peace along with a "new world order," Americans and

[84] Milloy, *Green Hell*, 224.

others instead witnessed novel forms of unrest, violence, and turbulence. Abroad, new types of international military engagements promised minimal civilian casualties, but continued to engulf entire regions in seemingly endless unrest and continued bloodshed. At home, clashes between law enforcement agents and protestors, startling school shootings, and unprecedented acts of domestic terrorism filled newspapers and flashed across twenty-four hour cable news networks.

Amidst the era of uncertainty, anti-environmentalists focused on environmentalists' contribution to late-twentieth century violence and turmoil. With more vitriolic terminology and wider popularization of terms such as "ecoterrorism," opponents of environmentalism aimed to radicalize the popular environmental movement. Comparing environmental activists with people such as Theodore Kaczynski and Timothy McVeigh, critics aimed to demonize environmentalism as a whole. Citing numerous cases of alleged "ecoterrorism," politicians, industry spokesmen, conservative analysts, and commentators such as Rush Limbaugh argued that direct-action environmentalists, or "ecoterrorists," posed a dire threat to innocent homeowners, lab workers, and lumbermen. Though there was an increase in "radical" environmental activism, most of the events involved extensive property damage and no threat to human safety. As such, cultivators of "ecoterror" rhetoric built upon a well-developed line of argument castigating environmentalisms' inherent anti-capitalist and anti-growth tendencies. Like critiques of William Vogt and Rachel Carson decades earlier, late-twentieth and early-twenty-first century criticisms of Earth First!, Sea Shepherd, and Earth Liberation Front focused on activists' alleged danger to individual profit and the American economy.

At the same time that anti-environmentalist commentators aimed to radicalize environmentalism as violent and aggressive, they also sought to cultivate an image of themselves as accessible, wholesome, and patriotic. Through radio and television programming, children's books, humorous comics, and other publications, opponents of environmentalism hoped to popularize their message and to provoke continued questioning of environmentalists' motives, goals, and tactics. Anti-environmentalists recognized that a well-placed sound bite or stunning image could reach millions of people within seconds. They used new technology not only to discredit environmentalists, but also to promote their own vision for America's future.

While arguments over late-century environmental activism centered on issues of biodiversity, resource use, and melting polar ice caps, the debates were also a contest over the direction of the American economy and politics heading into the new millennium. Anti-environmentalists and their conservative allies sought to advance a program of a dominant, assured nation of consumers. Hoping to dictate the domestic and international agenda for the twenty-first century, they castigated environmentalists as violent and dangerous disrupters of the "new world order."

CONCLUSION – The "Paranoid Style" of Environmental Opposition

Arguments over environmental issues are not necessarily just about the desirability of clean water or the number of degrees the average temperature changes. Throughout the late-twentieth century, politicians, businessmen, and other concerned citizens used environmentalism as an arena to debate competing visions for America's political and economic future. A manifestation of a broader dialogue regarding the course of the postwar world, anti-environmentalists' fear of environmentalism and their critique of environmentalists expressed a desire to defend and prolong midcentury ideals of a robust consumer economy, limited government regulation of industry, and faith in technological innovation. Ultimately, anti-environmentalists saw environmental legislation and popular environmental philosophy as a threat to American economic growth and individual liberties.

Emerging battered but triumphant from the horrors of World War II and the preceding depression, the United States enjoyed a postwar surge in confidence and optimism. Though not felt equally or at all by many Americans, notably blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities, the postwar boom in consumption, standard of living, and personal wealth offered an alluring vision of an affluent and indomitable United States. Many civic leaders, industry boosters, and public intellectuals sought to protect and cultivate this new era of affluence and consumption. Termed the "Consumers' Republic" by historian Lizabeth Cohen, the postwar United States was "an economy, culture, and politics built around the promises of mass consumption, both in terms of material life and the more idealistic goals of greater freedom,

democracy, and equality."[1] Thus, when writers such as Fairfield Osborn, Rachel Carson, Paul Ehrlich, and others questioned postwar habits and lifestyle choices, critics aimed to discredit the messages and the messengers. Such criticisms were not necessarily about ecology or the environment, but rather about America's economic and political future.

Though sustained, comprehensive, and often intensely personal, opprobrium leveled at postwar conservation writers and policymakers did not immediately coalesce into a cohesive or professional movement. In an age of political consensus and with a thriving economy, many Americans advocated compromise and welcomed the simultaneous pursuit of economic growth and environmental protection. As such, environmentalist response to their opponents was situational and varied. Often addressing critics in scheduled televised debates or in articles, writers such as Rachel Carson and William Vogt offered measured and professional responses to their detractors.[2] In short, though some opponents passionately lambasted environmental writers who questioned postwar economic, demographic, and technological expansion, most citizens did not deem a healthy economy and a healthy environment as mutually exclusive.

Anti-environmentalist vitriol intensified as drastically changing domestic and international conditions stressed America's economy and tested the nation's optimism. As the mirage of postwar affluence and consensus eroded, a more diverse set of critics attacked environmentalists and their agendas. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, a seemingly endless war in Vietnam, exposure of the Watergate scandal, and economic

[1] Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic*, 7.
[2] See, for example: Lear, *Witness for Nature*, 377-378, 428-438.

stagflation combined to fracture postwar consensus and dash dreams of a continually rising standard of living. In addition, civil rights unrest and a percolating counterculture further stressed the myth of nationwide harmony. Simultaneously, environmental leaders presided over an increasingly popular movement. With widespread support of events such as Earth Day and sweeping legislative initiatives such as the Clean Water Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, environmentalists enjoyed a new cultural and political presence in the nation. As such, opponents amplified their criticism of environmentalists and their agendas. Seeking to resurrect a spirit of optimism, affluence, and an ethic of consumption, critics lambasted environmentalists for destroying jobs and thwarting American economic productivity and industrial growth.

Throughout the second half of the 1970s and into the ensuing decades, as the domestic economy struggled to regain its postwar vitality, anti-environmentalists formed professional organizations and sought to systematically address environmentalism's growing popularity. In the midst of rising unemployment, stagnating wages, and skyrocketing inflation, many politicians and other public figures increasingly employed anti-environmentalist rhetoric to communicate their vision for less governmental regulation of industry, less federal oversight of the public domain, and more individual liberties. From Ronald Reagan and James Watt to George W. Bush and Glenn Beck, public figures relied on anti-environmental language to tarnish their political adversaries and to advance a conservative ascendency.

As anti-environmental rhetoric and action evolved over the course of the second half of the twentieth century, environmentalists' reaction to their critics failed

to mature in tandem. In the postwar period, conservationist writers responded to their opponents in letters to the editor and guest columns in newspapers as well as in publicized debates. Engaging in professional, civil, and generally predictable exchanges with their critics, conservationists steadfastly defended their claims and enlisted qualified specialists to reassert their validity. Beginning in the 1970s, as anti-environmentalists strove to broaden the appeal of their vision for America and their critique of environmentalism, environmentalist leaders made some attempts to address allegations of elitism and biocentrism. Arguing that Americans did not have to choose between jobs or the environment, green spokesmen stressed the compatibility of a healthy environment and a thriving economy. Environmentalists lobbied for safer workplace environments, allied with labor unions, and formed organizations such as Environmentalists for Full Employment (EFFE) to challenge representations of themselves as disinterested elitists and to debunk the popular "jobs vs. environment" dichotomy. As stagflation and unemployment continued to plague the United States throughout the 1970s, environmentalists rigorously attempted to exhibit their concern for jobs, the working class, and working-class environments.

Founded in 1975, EFFE cultivated alliances between labor organizations and environmentalists. Director Richard Grossman summed the relationship between the labor and environmental movements, "The two issues are inseparable . . . and as that becomes clearer to people the two movements can't help but come together." Stressing that environmental regulation and alternative sources of energy offered the promise of *more*, not less jobs, EFFE organizers published pamphlets with statistics on the future of solar power and the endless employment opportunities environmental

cleanup ensured. Much more labor intensive than extraction of resources, revitalization projects offered numerous new jobs, environmentalists argued.[3] In addition, EFFE leader Gail Daneker spearheaded environmentalist support for pro-labor legislation such as the AFL-CIO's Labor Law Reform Bill which promised to grant unions broader organizing power.[4]

Fearing a labor backlash, many environmental organizations sought alliances with unions. For example, in May 1976, attendees of the "Working for Economic and Environmental Justice and Jobs" conference in Black Lake, Michigan, debated the relationship between the environmental and labor movements. Held at a United Autoworkers conference facility, the four-day conference engaged environmentalists, union workers, academics, and community members in discussions about job losses and environmental regulations. Though participants engaged in heated exchanges, many attendees acknowledged that the same individuals and groups who thwarted union organization also protested vehemently against environmentalism.[5] Leonard Woodcock, president of the UAW exposed the historical parallels:

> The idea that business will be driven to bankruptcy and massive numbers of jobs will be lost if strict environmental and safety standards are adopted is the same tired line that has been brought up again and again by companies down through the years. They tried that argument when child labor was eliminated, when the minimum wage was introduced, when Social Security and Unemployment Insurance were developed.[6]

Identifying the opponents of environmental regulation as the same historic enemies of labor reform, Woodcock welcomed an alliance with environmentalists.

---

[3] Richard Grossman and Gail Daneker, *Energy, Jobs, and the Economy* (Boston: Alyson Publications, Inc., 1979).
[4] Harvey Wasserman, "Unionizing Ecotopia," *Mother Jones* 3, no. 5 (June 1978): 31-37.
[5] John Yolton, "Unions: Earth Day '80," *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 22, no. 3 (1980): 2.
[6] Remarks, 2 February 1977, by Arlie Schardt, "The Economic Impact of Environmental Reform," Sierra Club Members Records, BANC 71/103 c.

Throughout the economically tumultuous 1970s, environmental leaders spoke at conferences, workshops, and congressional hearings throughout the United States stressing their organization's concern for jobs. For example, at a December 1975 speech before the Federal Energy Commission in Denver, Colorado, Sierra Club executive, Brock Evans offered statistics and argued that "We think it can be demonstrated that environmental protection requirements produce many more jobs than they may cost." Offering detailed statistics on trends in construction and wastewater treatment employment, Evans calculated that compliance with regulations such as the Water Pollution Control Act indicated significant job growth.[7]

Two years later, Evans continued his attention to the "jobs question" as he addressed the Conference on Jobs, Environment & Community Action in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Directly answering accusations of environmentalists "being 'for trees and against people,'" he argued that leaders of the environmental movement cared deeply about the economy, jobs, and urban environments. In addition to reciting a history of environmentalist concern for economic issues, Evans also acknowledged areas of improvement. Concluding his remarks with a note of optimism and cooperation, Evans suggested, "Let us make sure that the American dream can embrace the vision of clean and safe and beautiful inner-cities, and that this is just as valid a part of our dream and our rights as anything else."[8]

Emphasizing that "environment" was not limited to concern for virgin redwood stands or remote mountains, many environmentalists argued that workplace

[7] Speech, 12 December 1975, by Brock Evans before the Federal Energy Administration Region 8, Sierra Club Members Records, BANC 71/103 c.
[8] Speech, 2 December 1977, by Brock Evans before the Conference on Jobs, Environment & Community Action, Sierra Club Members Records, BANC 71/103 c.

environments, urban-industrial residential areas, and occupational health were essential to modern definitions of environmentalism. Sierra Club lobbyist Linda Billings organized an alliance of over thirty environmental, labor, and public health groups to help pass the Toxic Substances Control Act.[9] Shortly thereafter, environmentalists and UAW researchers tested the power of the act as they demanded action in response to polybrominated biphenyl (PBB) contamination in Michigan.[10]

Furthermore, the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth allied with the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers union to press the Supreme Court to protect the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) right to inspect workplaces without warrants. Likewise, the Environmental Defense Fund also pursued collaboration with labor unions to strengthen OSHA's regulatory power.[11]

In addition to their filing of the *amicus curiae* brief regarding OSHA, in 1973 the Sierra Club also supported striking Shell Oil and Shell Chemical Company workers. Along with eleven other environmental organizations such as the Wilderness Society and the Izaak Walton League, the Sierra Club advocated the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' fight for improved health and safety standards.[12] Many labor organizers and environmentalists applauded the alliance. For example, Sierra Club members, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald C. DeGolier of Mauston, Wisconsin, summoned the words of their club's founder as they expressed their support of the position, "Muir stated, 'all things hang together' . . . We cannot work for a clean environment overall

[9] Senate Committee on Commerce, Environment Subcommittee, *Toxic Substances Control Act of 1973*, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973; Senate, Committee on Commerce, Environment Subcommittee, *Toxic Substances Control Act*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975.
[10] Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, *Toxic Substances*, 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977.
[11] "The Environmentalists Try to Win Labor Over," *Business Week* (October 1977): 104.
[12] Shell Oil Company, "Statement in Support of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers – Environmental Health Struggle," Sierra Club Members Papers, BANC 71/295c.

and ignore an unclean and unhealthy environment in a localized area, such as the refinery, particularly when the people there ask for our support."[13] Many other members did not share the DeGoliers' enthusiasm for the executive committee's decision to support striking Shell workers. In addition to numerous letters demanding that their memberships be cancelled or bequests nullified, many others described the support of striking workers as "incredibly stupid."[14] Boris D. Vishanoff of Santa Barbara, California, began his letter to the club, "Have your Directors lost their minds?"[15] Likewise, Lynn White of Tujunga, California, castigated, "You're sick scoundrels!! . . . You are perfidious scoundrels."[16] By April 1973, the Sierra Club calculated that they received "5 letters applauding the action," and:

> . . . 50 letters were received expressing doubt, puzzlement, or various degrees of unhappiness . . . 9 letters (representing 11 people) resigned and/or withdrew financial support. 6 threatened to do either unless they got an adequate explanation justifying the action or unless the Club refrained from such actions in the future. (One non-member protested and asked how to join!)[17]

Thus, though the membership did not universally support the Sierra Club executive committee's decision to back the OCAW strike and boycott of Shell, labor leaders celebrated the gesture and applauded the widening definition of "environment."

Increasingly, many labor leaders began to recognize the benefits of environmentalism as well as the benefits of alliance with environmental organizations. As United Auto Workers spokesman, Frank Wallick, remarked, "The labor movement owes environmentalists a great debt . . . Without Earth Day and the research that's

---

[13] Letter, 6 June 1973, from Mr. and Mrs. Ronald C DeGolier, Sierra Club Members Papers, BANC 71/295c.
[14] Letter, 8 March 1973, from J.W. Broomhead; Letter, 8 March 1973, from Charles H. Stuckey; Letter, 31 May 1973, from Stephen C. Bates, Sierra Club Members Papers, BANC 71/295c.
[15] Letter, 8 March 1973, from Boris D. Vishanoff, Sierra Club Members Papers, BANC 71/295c.
[16] Letter, from Lynn A. White, Sierra Club Members Papers, BANC 71/295c.
[17] Memo, 2 April 1973, from Gene Coan to the Executive Committee, "Response to Excom Resolution on OCAW," Sierra Club Members Papers, BANC 71/295c.

come out of environmentalism, we would be far behind where we are today in occupational health."[18]

In addition to cultivating alliances with labor organizations and supporting striking workers, environmentalists also endeavored to address ongoing civil rights issues. Black activists encouraged the broadening definitions of "environment" and welcomed alliances with environmental leaders. President of the National Urban League, Vernon Jordan examined the intertwining of urban health issues and environmental reform. Arguing that blacks worked in the most hazardous jobs, lived in the most polluted neighborhoods, and suffered the highest cancer rates, Jordan called for cooperation between blacks and environmentalists. In a May 1979 opinion piece, he contended, "A positive, caring alliance between the environmental movement and the civil rights movement is not only possible, but necessary." Like union participants at the Black Lake conference, Jordan recognized that the same critics sought to vilify both civil rights and environmental reformists. Hoping to diffuse the tradition of tension between blacks and environmentalists, Jordan initiated a dialogue on urban environmentalism. He stated energetically and optimistically, "I think we have finally reached a point where all groups understand their futures are linked."[19]

Though the environmental justice movement was in its infancy and it would be several years before the Big Ten environmental organizations officially incorporated issues of hazardous working conditions and environmental racism into their institutional agendas, many environmentalists attempted to address concerns of the

[18] Wasserman, "Unionizing Ecotopia," 34.
[19] Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., "Forging New Alliances," *New York Times*, May 27, 1979.

laborers and minorities. While some critics elevated charges of socialism in light of labor-environmental alliances such as the Sierra Club's support of striking Shell Oil workers, many union executives and urban spokesmen applauded the effort.

By the 1980s, however, with organizational membership soaring in response to the polarizing Reagan-Watt years, environmentalists' response to critics slackened. Believing that increased membership and bulging budgets signaled a form of response in itself, environmentalist leaders did not address criticism as carefully or systematically as in previous decades.[20] Though they published numerous books and articles challenging anti-environmentalists' assertions, environmental organizations ultimately confined their response to fellow environmentalists rather than to a wider public. Books such as *The Greenpeace Guide to Anti-Environmental Organizations* and articles in the *Earth First! Journal* disputed critics' specific claims; however, these publications and similarly themed conferences merely circulated among environmentalists, a classic case of preaching to the converted.[21] By the turn of the century, environmentalists exerted little effective effort responding to critiques of the contradictory lifestyle of one of the nation's most famous environmentalists, Al Gore. While commentators such as Glenn Beck, Rush Limbaugh, and others calculated Gore's massive carbon footprint, environmental apologists failed to mount a rigorous defense of their globe-trotting and well-living spokesman. Believing that the widespread, popular support of *An Inconvenient Truth* and environmentalism in

---

[20] For further analysis on the relationship between environmentalists and labor see: Gunther Peck, "The Nature of Labor: Fault Lines and Common Ground in Environmental and Labor History," *Environmental History* 11, no. 3 (April 2006): 212-238; Richard White, "'Are You an Environmentalist or Do You Work for a Living?': Work and Nature," in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, ed. William Cronon (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996), 171-185.
[21] Carl Deal, *The Greenpeace Guide to Anti-Environmental Organizations* (Emeryville, CA: Odonian Press, 1993); *Earth First!: The Radical Environmental Journal* 30, no. 3 (March/April 2010): 27.

general rendered public rebuttals unnecessary, environmentalists ignored the growing and enduring litany of accusations.[22]

If the ongoing debate over environmentalism was merely about clean water, ozone levels, or threatened species, environmentalists' casual disregard of critiques would be unremarkable. However, as the discourse is ultimately about competing visions over America's values, economy, and political direction, environmentalists' failure to address criticism has significant influence on broader political debates. For example, despite the popularity of environmentalism in opinion polls, neo-conservatives continually employ anti-environmentalist rhetoric to garner support and attention. Many Republican politicians pillory global warming theories, the EPA, and the Endangered Species Act in order to advance a neo-conservative agenda of small government and to lambaste their Democratic opponents as fiscally irresponsible. For example, as Republican candidates readied themselves for the 2012 primaries, most used anti-environmental rhetoric to expose their conservative bona fides. Kicking off the election season at an Iowa rally, U.S. representative and presidential contender Michele Bachmann of Minnesota not only called global warming a hoax, but also promised the state fair crowds, "I guarantee you the E.P.A. will have doors locked and lights turned off." Proposing that the agency be renamed the "job-killing organization of America," Bachmann elicited hearty cheers and applause for her anti-environmental promises. Though many commentators and pundits referenced conservative

[22] Ronald Bailey, ed., *Global Warming and Other Eco-Myths: How the Environmental Movement Uses False Science to Scare Us to Death* (Roseville, CA: Prima Publishing, 2002), xxiv; Beck, *Arguing with Idiots*, 87; Iain Murray, *The Really Inconvenient Truths* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2008), 50-52; M. David Stirling, *Green Gone Wild: Elevating Nature Above Human Rights* (Bellevue, WA: Merril Press, 2008), 31.

candidates' "bashing" of environmentalism as a new phenomenon, by 2011 the tactic was a familiar theme in political discourse.[23]

In short, beginning immediately after World War II, the debate between environmentalists and their opponents revealed a contest over competing visions for America's future. Reflecting the economic and social concerns of the times, criticism of environmental writings, legislation, and activism aimed to advance an agenda of unbridled economic and industrial growth. In particular, anti-environmental rhetoric, cultivated over the course of decades, became a ready-made template for conservatives and neo-conservatives to advance their agenda for deregulation, fiscal conservatism, and "small government." Although anti-environmentalists lost many of their battles against specific pieces of legislation and though environmentalism grew in popularity as the twentieth century rolled into the twenty-first, conservatives and their ideological allies were able to use environmental politics to discuss and popularize their broader concerns about the direction of the U.S. economy and future policymaking.

In November 1963, historian Richard Hofstadter delivered a lecture at Oxford University discussing "the qualities of heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy" that periodically appeared in American political life. Subsequently revised and published a year later in *Harper's Magazine* as well as in a collection of essays, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* identified common "styles of mind" throughout various episodes in United States political history. Exposing the rhetorical and psychological links among anti-Catholics, anti-Masons,

[23] John M. Broder, "Bashing E.P.A. Is New Theme in G.O.P. Race," *New York Times*, August 17, 2011.

nativists, and Joseph McCarthy followers, Hofstadter examined why some Americans thought that dangerous forces, both external and internal, threatened the American way of life. In addition to arguing that adherents to the "paranoid style" were "more or less normal people" and not cranks, Hofstadter also underscored that political "paranoids" saw themselves as "unselfish and patriotic," fighting against conspiracies "directed against a nation, a culture, a way of life whose fate affects not himself alone but millions of others."[24]

Though never mentioning the modern environmental movement or its opponents, Hofstadter's *Paranoid Style* criteria fit the movement's backlash, particularly as environmental critics increasingly identified themselves as an oppressed minority in the 1990s and beyond. As they denigrated environmentalists and their agendas as alarmist, elitist, socialistic, anti-growth, and dangerous, opponents adopted a "paranoid style." Portraying the environmental movement as dangerous to individuals and the American way of life, anti-environmentalists offered another manifestation of Hofstadter's famous paradigm.

First, Hofstadter argued that subscribers of the "paranoid style" felt a sense of conspiracy aligned against a way of life. As he detailed the basic elements of the "paranoid style," he summed, "The central image is that of vast and sinister conspiracy, a gigantic and yet subtle machinery of influence set in motion to undermine and destroy a way of life."[25] Likewise, fear of a powerful, "green" cabal dominated anti-environmental rhetoric from the mid-twentieth century well into the twenty-first century. For example, Steve Milloy, author of *Green Hell: How*

[24] Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics* (New York: Vintage Books, 2008).
[25] Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style*, 29.

Environmentalists Plan to Control Your Life and What You Can Do to Stop Them, notified his readers that "a powerful network of individuals and organizations is propelling this agenda . . . there is a vast and multilayered network of private organizations working to advance green policy." Like Hofstadter's anti-Illuminati and anti-Catholics, Milloy believed that eco-minded conspirators threatened America's way of life. He argued, ". . . [environmentalists] have sought for decades to transform our economy and our way of life based on various environmental pretexts—looming food shortages, deforestation, population growth, even global cooling."[26] Milloy and other anti-environmentalists worried that the environmental movement was an orchestrated attempt to undermine U.S. economic and political vitality.

Critics of environmentalism expressed their fear of conspiracy to a variety of audiences in numerous formats. Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise executive vice president, Ron Arnold penned essays such as "How Environmentalists Intend to Rule the World" and appeared before Congress warning of the long-term consequences of the environmental agenda. Citing Rainforest Action Network president Randy Hayes's *Restructuring the Global Economy* as a "smoking gun," Arnold aimed to prove how "environmentalists in fact shared the unspoken aim of wielding supreme power over a green future." As he pieced together the collusion of tax-exempt foundations, environmental organizations, and executive branch agencies, Arnold exposed an "iron triangle" set on global governance.[27]

---

[26] Steve Milloy, *Green Hell: How Environmentalists Plan to Control Your Life and What You Can Do to Stop Them* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2009), 3-4.

[27] Ron Arnold, *Undue Influence: Wealthy Foundations, Grant-Driven Environmental Groups, and Zealous Bureaucrats That Control Your Future* (Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1999); House Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, *Funding Environmental Initiatives and Their Impact on Local Communities*, 106th Cong., 2nd sess., February 2000, 11-43; "How

Likewise, the Cornwall Alliance's Dr. E. Calvin Beisner, whose quote opened the introduction to this study, warned, "The Obama Administration, United Nations, European Union, and radical environmentalists are not resting their efforts to advance global governance."[28] Beisner exemplified another of Hofstadter's observations about purveyors of "the paranoid style." Careful to distinguish these practitioners of a political style from clinical paranoids, Hofstadter emphasized that these were "more or less normal people," not "certifiable lunatics." With a BA degree in religion and philosophy from the University of Southern California and a PhD in history from Scotland's University of St. Andrews, Beisner was a well-educated scholar who employed the paranoid's "qualities of heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy."[29]

Just as Hofstadter's subjects feared that "top government officialdom has been so infiltrated by Communists . . . [and] dominated by sinister men who were shrewdly and consistently selling out American national interests," critics such as Milloy, Arnold, and others feared that environmentalists (who may, incidentally, also be Communists) infiltrated the nation's highest offices. Citing vice president Al Gore as merely the most conspicuous example of environmental infiltration of government, opponents worried that environmentalists threatened to relinquish U.S. sovereignty to a mythic green god, or worse, to an international governing body such as the United Nations. For example, in July 2011, Edna Mattos, leader of the Citrus County Tea Party Patriots of Homosassa Springs, Florida, protested U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

---

Environmentalists Intend to Rule the World," http://sovereignty.net/p/ngo/ron.html (accessed July 17, 2011)

[28] Dr. E. Calvin Beisner, June 15, 2011, Cornwall Alliance For the Stewardship of Creation, Burke, VA, in author's possession.

[29] Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style*, 3-4.

(FWS) proposals to expand federal protection areas for manatees in Citrus County. Due to increased human use of Kings Bay and Crystal River and the related increase in the number of manatee mortalities, the North Florida Ecological Services Office of the FWS aimed to use provisions of the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act to create a manatee refuge that included all waters of Kings Bay and its tributaries.[30]

In addition to picketing public hearings and gathering signatures on the Citrus Country Tea Party Patriots website, Mattos argued, "We cannot elevate nature above people . . . That's against the Bible and the Bill of Rights." Speaking for the Patriots, Mattos continued, "We believe that (federal regulators') aim is to control the fish and wildlife, in addition to the use of the land that surrounds this area, and the people that live here and visit." She argued that "As most of us know, this all ties into the United Nations' Agenda 21 and Sustainability."[31]

Adopted at the 1992 Rio de Janeiro UN Conference on Environment and Development, "Agenda 21" promoted local, national, and international templates for a "balanced and integrated approach to environment and development questions." Suggesting actions, initiatives, and implementation of conservation programs, "Agenda 21" aimed to create "a new global partnership for sustainable development."[32] As such, many concerned citizens such as Mattos, feared that "Agenda 21" was the latest in a long-line of efforts to establish a green global

[30] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, "U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Proposes Broadened Florida Manatee Protections in Kings Bay," news release, June 21, 2011.
[31] Craig Pittman, "Tea Party Members Tackle a New Issue: Manatees," *St. Petersburg Times*, July 12, 2011.
[32] United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio* (Geneva: UNCED, April 1993).

government. For example, Donna Holt, a Tea Party activist from Virginia worried that "[it is] a global agenda to abolish private property and abolish the Constitution . . . This basically will turn us into a Soviet state."[33]

In leveling charges of international conspiracy to establish a green global governance, Mattos, Holt, and other concerned citizens exposed the "paranoid style" of anti-environmentalism. Arguing that environmentalists' biocentrism violated both the Bible and the Constitution, critics of environmental regulations and sustainability initiatives worried that environmentalism threatened their way of life. Like Hofstadter's anti-Masons, anti-Catholics, and other "paranoid" figures, anti-environmentalists saw themselves as unselfish and patriotic defenders of national sovereignty and the American way of life. In addition, though the Tea Party movement often focused on issues such as taxation, health care reform, and the national deficit, their adoption of anti-environmental topics such as opposition to the manatee refuge and "Agenda 21" sustainability proposals reflected an overlapping of anti-environmental issues with other contemporary political topics. Like previous paranoids' concerns about obedience to Rome or Moscow, late-twentieth century anti-environmentalists warned of impending subservience to global emissions standards and a resulting loss of American economic and political independence.

In addition, Hofstadter recognized an obsession with facts and a "heroic striving for 'evidence'" among anti-Masons, McCarthy's anti-communists, and other practitioners of the "paranoid style."[34] He noted with interest that paranoids started with "defensible assumptions and with a careful accumulation of facts" and then made

[33] Stephanie Mencimer, "'We Don't Need None of That Smart-Growth Communism,'" *Mother Jones*, March/April 2011.
[34] Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style*, 36.

the irrational leap to conspiracy. Beyond accumulating evidence for personal edification, they also published "paranoid literature" and "paranoid scholarship" to prove the existence of a conspiracy. Like the classic anti-Catholic tomes of centuries past, voluminous anti-environmental writing offered detailed, "intensely rationalistic" descriptions of environmental actions and then made the jump to what environmentalists planned to do to you, your neighborhood, and your country.

In particular, critics of the environmental movement amassed significant data cataloguing the funding and overall ambition of environmental initiatives. Wise Use spokesmen Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb organized their evidence of environmental conspiracy in their 660-page, *Trashing the Economy: How Runaway Environmentalism is Wrecking America*. Offered as a "directory of the environmental movement," *Trashing the Economy* "is a road map to a concentration of money and power unlike anything America has ever seen."[35] With meticulous precision, Arnold and Gottlieb listed exact dollar amounts of environmental organizations' annual budgets, net assets, and "funding sources," the number of staff and members, tax status, as well as addresses, telephone and FAX numbers. Profiling over fifty environmental organizations, the authors emphasized the interlocking directorates of many groups and highlighted the grants each organization won. The entry for each environmental organization also included detailed descriptions of the group's history as well as their recent activities. In their capsule summaries of each environmental organization, Arnold and Gottlieb assessed the group's threat to the U.S. economy. For example, they began their summary of the National Audubon Society, "Economy

[35] Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb, *Trashing the Economy: How Runaway Environmentalism is Wrecking America* (Bellevue, WA: Free Enterprise Press, 1994), vii.

Trasher Number Six . . ." The statistic-laden summary of the birding organization concluded simply, "National Audubon Society: Job killers. Economy trashers." Ultimately, Arnold and Gottlieb aimed to use a staggering amount of data to prove that environmentalism was "wrecking America."[36]

Likewise, other anti-environmental leaders also accumulated facts in order to prove an impending dire future for Americans and for the world economy. Opponents of global warming theories focused on debunking environmentalists' statistics and substituting a new set of climate data and analysis. Many of the films and conferences challenging *An Inconvenient Truth* answered Al Gore's use of presentation slides with even more PowerPoints, graphs, and statistics. In addition, numerous books and websites promoted alternate temperature and sea level numbers to prove that Gore and his followers were poor scientists at best and deliberate deceivers and manipulators at worst.[37]

Finally, in *The Paranoid Style*, Hofstadter identified the importance of the "renegade from the enemy cause." In addition to explaining how ex-Catholics and ex-Communists lent an air of credibility and veracity to the anti-Catholic and anti-Communist crusades, Hofstadter also argued that the presence of these figures also gave paranoids the "promise of redemption and victory."[38] Likewise, former Sierra Clubber Ron Arnold and ex-Zero Population Growth (ZPG) advocate Dr. Michael Farris infused anti-environmental rhetoric with testimonies of their conversion from

[36] Arnold and Gottlieb, *Trashing the Economy*, 224-260.
[37] See for example: *Not Evil Just Wrong*, DVD, directed by Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney (Dublin: Greener Horizons Films, 2009); *The Great Global Warming Swindle*, DVD, directed by Martin Durkin (London: WAGtv, 2007); *Apocalypse? No!*, DVD, (Washington, D.C.: Science and Public Policy Institute, 2008).
[38] Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics*, 35.

environmentalism. For example, Farris began his lecture on the dangers of environmental indoctrination of children by claiming that he was "a dropout of the environmentalist movement." Recollecting his experiences at Whitman College in the early-1970s, Farris told an audience that on the week of the original Earth Day, he delivered an award-winning speech "advocating zero-population growth." The father of ten children, Farris laughed that he eventually abandoned the misguided principles of ZPG and celebrated subsequent Earth Days by purchasing disposable diapers. Though Farris's tone was light and jovial as he reflected on his youthful involvement with environmental activism, he quickly adopted a much more somber spirit as he described the multitudinous ways contemporary environmentalists sought to ensnare America's children.[39]

Ultimately, the last decade of the twentieth century and the opening years of the twenty-first century witnessed the maturation of a "paranoid style" in environmental opposition. In a July 28, 2003, floor speech, Oklahoma's Senator James Inhofe, Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, asked rhetorically, "With all of the hysteria, all of the fear, all of the phony science, could it be that manmade global warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people? It sure sounds like it."[40] One of many speeches Inhofe delivered to challenge a growing consensus regarding the link between carbon dioxide emissions and rising temperatures, "The Facts and Science of Climate Change" epitomized twenty-first century critiques of environmentalists and the environmental movement.

---

[39] "Session 4: From *Captain Planet* to *Avatar*," *Resisting the Green Dragon*, DVD, produced by CDR Communications (Burke, VA: Cornwall Alliance, 2010).
[40] James M. Inhofe, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, *The Facts and Science of Climate Change*, 108th Cong., 1st sess., July 28, 2003, 20.

Charging global "warmists" with emotional alarmism, irresponsible use of science, and deliberate deception of the public, Inhofe and other critics perpetuated anti-environmental rhetoric in a new era.

Senator Inhofe and other opponents of global warming theories argued that environmentalists used emotional and alarmist arguments to advance their case for man-made climate change. Echoing techniques and rhetoric deployed against William Vogt, Rachel Carson, Paul Ehrlich, and others, global warming challengers contended that environmentalists relied on fear to mobilize public opinion. For example, in the aforementioned speech by Inhofe, the senator summed:

> Unfortunately, much of the debate over global warming is predicated on fear, rather than science. Global warming alarmists see a future plagued by catastrophic flooding, war, terrorism, economic dislocations, droughts, crop failures, mosquito-borne diseases, and harsh weather all caused by manmade greenhouse gas emissions.[41]

Worried that such fear mongering and the resulting legislation would lead to "serious economic harm . . . higher prices for food, medical care, and electricity, as well as massive job losses and drastic reductions in gross domestic product," Inhofe urged skeptics to challenge global-warming theories.[42]

Despite new topics of contention and new methods of communication, twenty-first century critics of the environmental movement maintained significant ties to the techniques and arguments of past decades. More than half a century since critics tarred "ecology writers" and early environmentalists as alarmist, elitist, overly emotional, and dangerous to America's future prosperity, opponents continued to deploy similar arguments against animal rights proponents, global warming lobbyists,

[41] Inhofe, *The Facts and Science of Climate Change*, 1.
[42] Inhofe, *The Facts and Science of Climate Change*, 1.

and other environmental activists. Furthermore, critics of the environmental movement persistently argued that environmental legislation and regulation threatened to limit Americans' freedom and economic growth. In short, during the opening years of the twenty-first century, opponents of environmentalists and environmental regulation used the new debate over global warming to revisit traditional arguments.



While topics and communications technologies changed from the mid-twentieth to the turn of the twenty-first century, critics continued to employ enduring arguments against environmentalists, environmental legislation, and the environmental movement in general. Often adopting what Hofstadter would term a "paranoid style," opponents expressed fear that green agendas and their advocates threatened America's prosperity, liberty, and lifestyle. Reflecting contemporary transformations in U.S. politics, economics, and society, anti-environmentalist rhetoric revealed how some Americans came to terms with a drastically changing postwar world. Ultimately a contest over the course of the nation's economy and culture, debates over environmentalism revealed late twentieth-century political tensions and fears.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscript Collections

Lear/Carson Collection. Papers. Linda Lear Center for Special Collections and Archives, Connecticut College, New London, Connecticut

Marist Environmental History Collection. Archives and Special Collections, James A. Cannavino Library, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, New York

Muskie, Edmund S. Papers. Edmund S. Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine

Pendley, William Perry. Papers. American Heritage Center, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming

Reagan, Ronald. Papers. Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Museum, Simi Valley California (digital archives)

Sierra Club. Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley

Vogt, William. Papers. Denver Public Library, Western History Collection, Denver, Colorado

Watt, James G. Papers. American Heritage Center, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming

Wallop, Malcolm. Papers. American Heritage Center, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming

Government Documents

Animal Enterprise Protection Act of 1992. Public Law 102-346, 102nd Cong., 2nd sess., August 26, 1992.

Bari et al. v. Doyle et al., No. C 91-01057CW (U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, 1995).

Carter, Jimmy. *Executive Order 12264: Export of Banned or Significantly Restricted Substances*. January 15, 1981.

Ecoterrorism, 18 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 3311 (2006).

Marvin L. Cooley v. United States of America, 501 F.2d 1249 (9th Cir. 1974).

Reagan, Ronald. *Executive Order 12290: Federal Exports and Excessive Regulation*. February 17, 1981.

Reagan, Ronald. *Executive Order 12498*: *Regulatory Planning Process*. January 4, 1985.

Reagan, Ronald. *Executive Order 12630: Governmental Actions and Interference With Constitutionally Protected Property Rights*. March 16, 1988.

United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio*. Geneva: UNCED, April 1993.

U.S. Congress. Congressional Research Service. "The Misery Index." 92-656E, October 20, 1992.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Forests. *Permit the Use of DDT*. 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

———. Committee on the Budget, Task Force on Energy and the Environment. *Fiscal Year 1982 Budget Proposals for Energy, Environmental, and Natural Resources Programs*. 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981.

———. Committee on Energy and Commerce. Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. *EPA Withholding of Superfund Files*. 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks. *Addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System*. 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. *Briefing by the Secretary of the Interior*. 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment. *Land Use and Resource Conservation*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on Mines and Mining. *Sagebrush Rebellion: Impacts on Energy and Minerals*. 96th Cong., 2nd sess., 1980.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on

Public Lands and National Parks. *Addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System*. 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982.

———. Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight. *Hazardous Waste Contamination of Water Resources (Access to EPA Superfund Records)*. 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on Public Lands. *BLM Organic Act – Part I*. 93rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1974.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Crime. *Acts of Ecoterrorism by Radical Environmental Organizations*. 105th Cong., 2nd sess., June 9, 1998.

———. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment. *Marine Mammal Protection Oversight*. 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

———. Committee on Resources. *Citizens' Perspectives on Federal Land Use Policies*. 104th Cong., 2nd sess., June 18, 1996.

———. Committee on Resources. *Hearing on Impact of Federal Land Use Policies on Rural Communities*. 105th Cong., 2nd sess., June 9, 1998.

———. Committee on Resources. Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health. *Funding Environmental Initiatives and Their Impact on Local Communities*. 106th Cong., 2nd sess., February 2000.

U.S. Congress. Joint Economic Committee. *Employment and Manpower Problems in the Cities: Implications of the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968.

U.S. Congress. Joint Economic Committee. *Special Study on Economic Change: Stagflation*. 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation. *Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act*. 92nd Cong., 1st sess., March 1971.

———. Committee on Appropriations, Special Subcommittee. *Proposed Critical Habitat Area for Grizzly Bears*. 94th Cong., 2nd sess., 1977.

———. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government. *Oklahoma City Bombing*. 104th Cong., 1st sess., 1995.

———. Committee on Commerce, Environment Subcommittee. *Toxic Substances Control Act of 1973*. 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

———. Committee on Commerce, Environment Subcommittee, *Toxic Substances Control Act*. 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975.

———. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, *Toxic Substances*. 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resource. *Bill and Administrative Proposal to Invest OCS Revenues in Conservation Programs*. 106th Cong., 1st sess., April 20, 1999.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. *James G. Watt Nomination*. 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. *William P. Clark Nomination*. 98th Cong., 1st sess., 1983.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation. *Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1977*. 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests. *Idaho Forest Management Act of 1988*. 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 1988.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests. *Miscellaneous Parks and Wild and Scenic Rivers Bills*. 101st Cong., 1st sess., 1989.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests. *Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve*. 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 1988.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests. *Miscellaneous Parks and Wild and Scenic Rivers Bills*. 101st Cong., 1st sess., October 1989.

———. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water. *Alabama and California Wilderness Areas*. 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982.

———. Committee on Environment and Public Works. *Eco-terrorism –*

Specifically Examining the Earth Liberation Front and the Animal Liberation Front. 109th Cong., 1st sess., May 18, 2005.

———. Committee on Environment and Public Works. Subcommittee on Resource Protection. *Endangered Species Act Oversight*. 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977.

———. Committee on Environment and Public Works. *The Facts and Science of Climate Change*. 108th Cong., 1st sess., July 28, 2003.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation. *Hells Canyon National Recreation Area*. 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation. *National Urban Park*. 93rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1974.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. *Animal Rights: Activism vs. Criminality*. 108th Cong., 2nd sess., May 18, 2004.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. *Terrorism in the U.S.: The Nature and Extent of the Threat and Possible Legislative Responses*. 104th Cong., 1st sess., 1995.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts. *Continuation of Waco Investigation*. 106th Cong., 2nd sess., July 26, 2000.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Proposes Broadened Florida Manatee Protections in Kings Bay." Press release, June 21, 2011.

Periodicals

Ada (OK) Evening News

Albuquerque (NM) Journal

Albuquerque (NM) Tribune

Anchorage Daily News

Archives of Internal Medicine

Arizona Republic

Arizona Star

Bennington (VT) Banner

Boston Globe

Business Week

Capital Times (Madison, WI)

Cedar Rapids (IA) Gazette

Chemical Week

Chicago Sunday Sun-Times

Chicago Tribune

Christianity Today

Congressional Quarterly

Conservative Digest

Coshocton (OH) Tribune

Daily Review (Hayward, CA)

Dallas Morning News

Danville (VA) Bee

Deseret News

Dixon (IL) Evening Telegraph

Earth First! Journal

The Evening Standard (Uniontown, PA)

Fortune

Greeley (CO) Daily Tribune

The Guardian

Houston Chronicle

Hutchinson (KS) News

Jet

Knight Ridder Tribune Business

Lawton (OK) Constitution

Lebanon (PA) Daily News

Los Angeles Times

The (Mesa, AZ) Tribune

Monsanto Magazine

Mother Jones

Muscatine (IA) Journal

The Nation

National Review

New Orleans Times-Picayune

The New Republic

New York Times

Northwest Arkansas Times (Fayetteville)

Oakland (CA) Tribune

Olean (NY) Times Herald

Omaha World-Herald

Phoenix Gazette

Pittsburgh Courier

The Progressive

Reader's Digest

Redlands (CA) Daily Facts

San Mateo (CA) Times

Saturday Evening Post

Science News Letter

Seattle Times

Sierra

Sports Illustrated

St. Petersburg Times

Star News (Pasadena, CA)

Time

Toronto Star

U.S. News & World Report

Valley News (Van Nuys, CA)

Wall Street Journal

Washington Post

Washington Times

Waterloo (IA) Daily Courier

Waukesha (WI) Daily Freeman

Published Sources

Allen, Durward L. *Wolves of Minong: Their Vital Role in a Wild Community*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Arnold, Ron. *At the Eye of the Storm: James Watt and the Environmentalists*.

Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1982.

———. *Ecoterror: The Violent Agenda to Save Nature*. Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1997.

———. *Undue Influence: Wealthy Foundations, Grant-Driven Environmental Groups, and Zealous Bureaucrats That Control Your Future*. Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1999.

Arnold, Ron and Alan Gottlieb. *Trashing the Economy: How Runaway Environmentalism is Wrecking America*. Bellevue, WA: Free Enterprise Press, 1994.

Bailey, Ronald, ed. *Global Warming and Other Eco-Myths: How the Environmental Movement Uses False Science to Scare Us to Death*. Roseville, CA: Prima Publishing, 2002.

Baldwin, I.L. "Chemicals and Pests." *Science* 137 (September 28, 1962): 1042-1043.

Bari, Judi. *Timber Wars*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 1994.

Bean, William B. "The Noise of Silent Spring." *Archives of Internal Medicine* 112, no. 3 (September 1963): 311.

Beck, Glenn. *Arguing with Idiots*. New York: Threshold Editions, 2009.

Beckmann, Petr. *Eco-Hysterics and the Technophobes*. Boulder, CO: The Golem Press, 1973.

Beisner, Dr. E. Calvin. Letter, June 15, 2011, Cornwall Alliance For the Stewardship of Creation, Burke, VA, in author's possession.

Berlau, John. *Eco-Freaks: Environmentalism is Hazardous to Your Health!* Nashville, TN: Nelson Current, 2006.

Birkett, Terri. *Truax*. Privately printed, 1995.

Burford, Anne M. *Are You Tough Enough?* New York: McGraw Hill, 1986.

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

Chase, Alston. *In a Dark Wood: The Over Forests and the Rising Tyranny of Ecology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1995.

Chrisman, Robert. "Ecology Is A Racist Shuck." *Scanlan's Monthly* (August 1970): 46-49.

Claus, George, and Karen Bolander, *Ecological Sanity*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1977.

Cooley, Marvin L. *Tea Party 1976: A Handbook for Patriots*. Tri-City Printing Company, 1975.

Darby, William J. "Silence! Miss Carson." *Chemical & Engineering News* (November 5, 1962): 5-6.

Deal, Carl. *The Greenpeace Guide to Anti-Environmental Organizations*. Emeryville, CA: Odonian Press, 1993.

de Bell, Garrett, ed. *The Environmental Handbook*. New York: Ballantine, 1970.

Decker, George C. "Pros and Cons of Pests, Pest Control and Pesticides." *World Review of Pest Control* (Spring 1962): 6-18.

Ehrlich, Paul. *The Population Bomb*. Cutchogue, NY: Buccaneer Books, 1968.

Falwell, Jerry. *Listen America*. New York: Doubleday, 1980.

Foreman, Dave, and Bill Haywood, eds. *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, 3rd ed. Chico, CA: Abbzug Press, 1985.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*, rev. ed. 1964. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001.

Frieden, Bernard J. *The Environmental Protection Hustle*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1979.

Friedman, Milton. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Gottlieb, Alan M. ed. *The Wise Use Agenda: A Task Force Report to the Bush Administration by the Wise Use Movement*. Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1989.

Gottlieb, Alan, and Ron Arnold. *Politically Correct Environment*. Bellevue, WA: Merril Press, 1995.

Grayson, Melvin J., and Thomas R. Shepard. *The Disaster Lobby: Prophets of Ecological Doom and Other Absurdities*. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1973.

Grossman, Richard, and Gail Daneker. *Energy, Jobs, and the Economy*. Boston: Alyson Publications, Inc., 1979.

Hanson, Earl Parker. *Transformation: The Story of Modern Puerto Rico*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955.

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Hayakawa, Samuel Ichiye. *Language in Thought and Action*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978, rev. ed. (1939).

Hayakawa, Samuel Ichiye. *Choose the Right Word: A Modern Guide to Synonyms and Related Words*. New York: Perennial Library, 1987, rev. ed. (1968).

Hayakawa, Samuel Ichiye, ed. *The Use and Misuse of Language*. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications, 1964.

Herber, Lewis. *Our Synthetic Environment*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Isaac, Rael Jean, and Erich Isaac. *The Coercive Utopians: Social Deception by America's Power Players*. Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1983.

Jarvis, Howard, and Robert Pack. *I'm Mad as Hell: The Exclusive Story of the Tax Revolt and Its Leader*. New York: Times Books, 1979.

Johnson, Bruce E. "Ecology Is a Dodge." *Harvard Crimson*, April 22, 1970.

Kjos, Berit. *Under the Spell of Mother Earth*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1992.

Kristol, Irving. *Two Cheers for Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Limbaugh, Rush. *See, I Told You So*. New York: Pocket Books, 1994.

Maddox, John. *The Doomsday Syndrome*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1972.

McPhee, John. *Encounters with the Archdruid*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1971.

Milloy, Steve. *Green Hell: How Environmentalists Plan to Control Your Life and What You Can Do to Stop Them*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2009.

Murray, Iain. *The Really Inconvenient Truths*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2008.

Neuhaus, Richard. *In Defense of People*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971.

Osborn, Fairfield. *Our Plundered Planet*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1949.

Passell, Peter and Leonard Ross. *The Retreat from Riches: Affluence and Its Enemies*. New York: The Viking Press, 1973.

Pendley, William Perry. *It Takes A Hero: The Grassroots Battle Against Environmental Oppression*. Bellevue, WA: The Free Enterprise Press, 1994.

Rand, Ayn. "Environmentalism: The Anti-Industrial Revolution." Marina del Rey, CA: The Ayn Rand Institute, 1970.

Reagan, Ronald. *An American Life*. Reprint ed. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2011.

Sevareid, Eric and Jay L. McMullen. "The Silent Spring of Rachel Carson," *CBS Reports*, CBS, April 3, 1963.

Society of Philatelic Americans, vol. 27, no. 1 (September 1964): 3.

Stirling, M. David. *Green Gone Wild: Elevating Nature Above Human Rights*. Bellevue, WA: Merril Press, 2008.

Sweetman, Harvey L. "Bias, Misinformation, Half-Truths Reduce Usefulness of 'Silent Spring.'" *Agricultural Chemicals* 18, no. 2 (February 1963).

Tucker, William. *Progress and Privilege: America in the Age of Environmentalism*. Garden City: Anchor Press, 1982.

Vogt, William. "Are Too Many Babies Being Born?" *Saturday Evening Post* (January 6, 1962): 11.

Vogt, William. *Road to Survival*. New York: William Sloane Associates, Inc., 1948.

Wallop, Malcolm. "The Environment: Air, Water, and Public Lands." In *A Changing America: Conservatives View the '80s From the United States Senate*. South Bend: Regnery/Gateway, Inc., 1980.

Wanliss, James. *Resisting the Green Dragon: Dominion, Not Death*. Burke, VA: Cornwall Alliance, 2010.

White-Stevens, Robert H. "Communications Create Understanding." *Agricultural Chemicals* 17 (October 1962): 34.

Wolfe, Linnie Marsh. *Son of the Wilderness: The Life of John Muir*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1945.

Websites

"Al Gore Debates Global Warming," http://youtube.com/watch?v=XDI2NVTYRXU (accessed July 4, 2011).

Arnold, Ron. "How Environmentalists Intend to Rule the World," Sovereignty International, Inc. http://sovereignty.net/p/ngo/ron.html .

http://www.cdfe.org (accessed July 1, 2011).

http://www.facebook.com/ron.arnold (accessed August 6, 2011).

http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-the-Defense-of-Free-Enterprise/ (accessed August 6, 2011).

http://www.junkscience.com (accessed July 17, 2011).

http://twitter.com/#!/heritage (accessed August 6, 2011).

http://twitter.com/#!/Ron_Arnold (accessed August 6, 2011).

http://www.undueinfluence.com/guide.htm (accessed July 17, 2011).

http://www.wanliss.com/category/projects/eco-hate/ (accessed July 15, 2011).

Films/Television/Radio Programs

Americathon. DVD. Directed by Neil Israel. 1979. Burbank, CA: Lorimar, 2011.

Apocalypse? No!, DVD. Washington, D.C.: Science and Public Policy Institute, 2008.

Effective Stewardship. DVD. Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty, 2008.

Glenn Beck, radio transcripts.

Glenn Beck, television transcripts.

Good Times. DVD. Directed by Gerren Keith, Herbert Kenwith, Bob LaHendro, and Donald McKayle. 1974-1979. Culver City, CA: Sony Pictures Home Entertainment, 2008.

The Great Global Warming Swindle. DVD. Directed by Martin Durkin. London:

WAGtv, 2007.

Mine Your Own Business. DVD. Directed by Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney

Dublin: New Bera Media, 2006).

Not Evil Just Wrong. DVD. Directed by Phelim McAleer and Ann McElhinney. Dublin: Greener Horizons Films, 2009.

Resisting the Green Dragon. DVD. Burke, VA: Cornwall Alliance, 2010.

Rush Limbaugh, radio transcripts.

World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, television transcripts.

Rush Limbaugh, television transcripts.

Secondary Sources

Books and Articles

Anderson, Terry H. *The Movement and The Sixties: Protest in America from Greensboro to Wounded Knee*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Andrews, Richard N.L. *Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves: A History of American Environmental Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006, 2nd edition.

Beach, Patrick. *A Good Forest for Dying: The Tragic Death of a Young Man on the Front Lines of the Environmental Wars*. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

Beder, Sharon. *Global Spin: The Corporate Assault on Environmentalism*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2002.

Best, Steven, and Anthony J. Nocella, II, eds. *Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth*. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2006.

———. *Terrorists or Freedom Fighters?: Reflections on the Liberation of Animals*. New York: Lantern Books, 2004.

Bloom, Alexander and Wini Breines, eds. *"Takin' It to The Streets:" A Sixties Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010, 3rd edition.

Carter, David. *Stonewall: The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2010.

Cawley, R. McGregor. *Federal Land, Western Anger: The Sagebrush Rebellion and Environmental Politics*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1993.

Christofferson, Bill. *The Man From Clear Lake: Earth Day Founder Senator Gaylord Nelson*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.

Cohen, Lizabeth. *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 2003.

Cohen, Michael P. *The History of the Sierra Club, 1892-1970*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988.

Critchlow, Donald. *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Cullen, Dave. *Columbine*. New York: Twelve, 2009.

Daynes, Byron W., and Glen Sussman. *White House Politics and the Environment: Franklin D. Roosevelt to George W. Bush*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2010.

Desrochers, Pierre and Christine Hoffbauer. "The Post War Intellectual Roots of *The Population Bomb*: Fairfield Osborn's *Our Plundered Planet* and William Vogt's *Road to Survival* in Retrospect." *Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development* 1 (2009): 37-61.

Diggins, John Patrick. *Ronald Reagan: Fate, Freedom, and the Making of History*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2007.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. Rev. ed. New York: Bantam, 1993.

Glick, Daniel. *Powder Burn: Arson, Money, and Mystery on Vail Mountain*. New York: Public Affairs, 2001.

Gordon, Michael, and Bernard Trainor. *The Generals' War: The Inside Story of the Conflict in the Gulf*. New York: Back Bay Books, 1995.

Gottlieb, Robert. *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2005.

Graf, William L. *Wilderness Preservation and the Sagebrush Rebellions*. Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1990.

Grossman, Richard, and Gail Daneker. *Energy, Jobs, and the Economy*. Boston:

Alyson Publications, Inc., 1979.

Halperín Donghi, Tulio. *The Contemporary History of Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Harvey, Mark. *A Symbol of Wilderness: Echo Park and the American Conservation Movement*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994.

Hays, Samuel P. *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Heller, Peter. *The Whale Warriors: The Battle at the Bottom of the World to Save the Planet's Largest Mammals*. New York: Free Press, 2007.

Helvarg, David. *The War Against the Greens: The "Wise-Use Movement, the New Right, and the Browning of America*. Boulder, CO: Johnson Books, 2004.

Himmelstein, Jerome L. *To the Right: The Transformation of American Conservatism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Paranoid Style in American Politics*. New York: Vintage Books, 2008.

Hunter, James Davison. *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Hyoung, Min Song. *Strange Future: Pessimism and the 1992 Los Angeles Riots*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

Isserman, Maurice and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*, 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Jorstad, Erling. *Evangelicals in the White House: The Cultural Maturation of Born Again Christianity*, 1960-1987. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1981.

Josephy, Alvin, Joane Nagel, and Troy Johnson, eds., *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*, 2nd ed. Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, 1999.

Krech III, Shepard. *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999.

Laquer, Walter. *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Lash, Jonathan, Katherine Gillman, and David Sheridan. *A Season of Spoils: The*

Story of the Reagan Administration's Attack on the Environment. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Lear, Linda. *Rachel Carson: Witness for Nature*. New York: Henry Holt, 1997.

Levitas, Daniel. *The Terrorist Next Door: The Militia Movement and the Radical Right*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2003.

Liddick, Donald R. *Eco-Terrorism: Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movements*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006.

Lienesch, Michael. *Redeeming America: Piety and Politics in the New Christian Right*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Linenthal, Edward T. *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Lippman, Jr. Theo and Donald C. Hansen. *Muskie*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1971.

Little, Douglas. *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East Since 1945*. 3rd ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Lovitz, Dara. *Muzzling a Movement*. New York: Lantern, 2010.

Lytle, Mark Hamilton. *The Gentle Subversive: Rachel Carson, Silent Spring, and the Rise of the Environmental Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

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

Marcus, Eric. *Making Gay History: The Half-Century Fight for Lesbian and Gay Equal Rights*. New York: Harper Paperbacks, 2002.

Martin, William. *With God on Our Side: The Rise of the Religious Right in America*. New York: Broadway, 1996.

Mathews, Donald G., and Jane Sherron De Hart. *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of the ERA*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

McKibben, Bill, ed., *American Earth: Environmental Writing Since Thoreau*. New York: Library of America, 2008.

Morris, David B. *Earth Warrior: Overboard with Paul Watson and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 1991.

Nash, Roderick Frazier. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. 4th ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Peck, Gunther. "The Nature of Labor: Fault Lines and Common Ground in Environmental and Labor History." *Environmental History* 11, no. 2 (April 2006): 212-238.

Peterson, Tarla Rai, ed. *Green Talk in the White House: The Rhetorical Presidency Encounters Ecology*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.

Pickering, Leslie James. *The Earth Liberation Front, 1997-2002*. Portland, OR: Arissa Media Group, 2007.

Potter, Will. *Green is the New Red: An Insider's Account of a Social Movement Under Siege*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2011.

Rikoon, J. Sanford, and Theresa L. Goedeke. *Anti-Environmentalism and Citizen Opposition to the Ozark Man and the Biosphere Reserve*. Lewiston, UK: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000.

Rome, Adam. *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Rome, Adam. "'Give Earth a Chance': The Environmental Movement and the Sixties." *Journal of American History* 90, no. 2 (Sept. 2003): 525-554.

Rosebraugh, Craig. *Burning Rage of a Dying Planet: Speaking for the Earth Liberation Front*. New York: Lantern Books, 2004.

Rowell, Andrew. *Green Backlash: Global Subversion of the Environment Movement*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Rymph, Catherine E. *Republican Women: Feminism and Conservatism from Suffrage through the Rise of the New Right*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Sale, Kirkpatrick. *The Green Revolution: The American Environmental Movement, 1962-1992*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.

Scarce, Rik. *Eco-Warriors: Understanding the Radical Environmental Movement*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 1990.

Schrepfer, Susan R. *The Fight to Save the Redwoods: A History of Environmental Reform, 1917-1978*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

Shabecoff, Philip. *A Fierce Green Fire: The American Environmental Movement*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2003.

Sherry, Michael S. *In the Shadow of War: The United States Since the 1930s*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Skillen, James R. *The Nation's Largest Landlord: The Bureau of Land Management in the American West*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009.

Smith, Paul Chaat, and Robert Allen Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Stamper, Norm. *Breaking Rank: A Top Cop's Expose of American Policing*. New York: Nation Books, 2006.

Stiglitz, Joseph. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2003.

Switzer, Jacqueline Vaughn. *Green Backlash: The History and Politics of Environmental Opposition in the U.S*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997.

Vigil, Ernesto B. *The Crusade for Justice: Chicano Militancy and the Government's War on Dissent*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999.

Wall, Derek. *Earth First! and the Anti-Roads Movement: Radical Environmentalism and Comparative Social Movements*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Weyler, Rex. *Greenpeace: How a Group of Ecologists, Journalists, and Visionaries Changed the World*. Emmaus, PA: Rodale Books, 2004.

White, Richard. "'Are You an Environmentalist or Do You Work for a Living?': Work and Nature." In *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, edited by William Cronon, 171-185. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996.

Widick, Richard. *Trouble in the Forest: California's Redwood Timber Wars*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Woodward, Bob and Carl Bernstein. *All the President's Men*, 2nd ed. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.

Worster, Donald. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas*. New York:

Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Yolton, John. "Unions: Earth Day '80." *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 22, no. 3 (1980): 2.

Unpublished Theses and Dissertations

McCormick, Maureen A. "Of Birds, Guano, and Man: William Vogt's *Road to Survival*." PhD diss., University of Oklahoma, 2005.

Rogers, Jedediah S. "Land Grabbers, Toadstool Worshippers, and the Sagebrush Rebellion in Utah, 1979-1981." MA thesis, Brigham Young University, 2005.