SHARK (Show Animals Respect and Kindness) who infiltrated the event (SHARK 2014, at http://www.sharkonline.org/).

8. Critics of this approach refer to its potential for ‘species apartheid’ and argue that it is neither ethical nor practical, given that humans do not in fact live separately from animals as part of the natural world. Moreover, many argue, as Donaldson and Kymlicka (2011) do, that humans have particular responsibilities towards domesticated animals that are distinct from those towards wild animals.

9. In a far more wide-ranging discussion of this theme in relation to animals, Adams (1990) intersects the exploitation of animals with the exploitation of women in the context of the historical roots of patriarchy and the emergence of domination (see also Donovan and Adams 2007).

10. It should be noted that in many parts of the world this is still the case.

Chapter 15
Deep Green Violence: Our Animal Bodies as Sites of Resistance

Todd LeVasseur

Introduction

In this chapter I situate the phenomenon of nonviolence and its historical, ethical, and political implications within the emerging eco-crisis. I take as valid consensus science that suggests humans broadly have precipitated both the planet’s sixth mass extinction event and triggered new climatic and oceanic regimes, both of which, from an evolutionary point of view, are going to become increasingly inimical for most extant life forms, including our own. Within this discussion, I want to explore the development of radical environmentalism, focusing especially on Deep Green Resistance. This group specifically challenges many preconceived notions of what counts—tactically, ethically, and strategically—in nonviolent social movements given the larger context of the eco-crisis. It is my hope that this discussion might generate a space for those who both study and practice nonviolence to entertain tough decisions that historically might be seen as taboo avenues of inquiry. This taboo, or at least silently discussed space, might become more critical and might need to become more public, as the human-induced environmental trajectory of the planet presages a very troublesome, radically impoverished future.

Radical Environmentalism

Radical environmentalism is an outgrowth of North American, and especially US, forms of environmentalism. Progenitors to radical environmental actions, such as torching and defacing billboards in the American desert Southwest, can be traced to the 1950s. The modus operandus of the movement, however, is the essayist, novelist, and eco-philosopher Edward Abbey’s 1975 publication of The Monkey Wrench Gang. This novel features an entertaining yet fictitious account of four eco-saboteurs motivated by perceptions of an intrinsically sacred and sublime beauty of the American Southwest desert being systematically destroyed by development, especially for
coal, nuclear, oil, rangeland, and residential/tourism reasons. In large part, the book is a summary of Abbey's own views and moral justification for acts of eco-sabotage that he himself clandestinely committed in the region.

As Abbey wrote elsewhere,

There may be some among the readers of this book, like the earnest engineer, who believe without question that any and all forms of construction and development are intrinsic goods, in the national parks as well as anywhere else, who virtually identify quantity with quality and therefore assume that the greater the quantity of traffic, the higher the value received. There are some who frankly and boldly advocate the eradication of the last remnants of wilderness and the complete subjugation of nature to the requirements of—not man [sic]—but industry. This is a courageous view, admirable in its simplicity and power, and with the weight of all modern history behind it. It is, however, quite insane. (Abbey 1968: 47)

In this passage, we encounter key tenets of radical environmentalism, including a widely held conviction regarding the intrinsic and often sacred value of the natural world, where such value is present despite possible instrumental uses of this world for human ends. Such views of a sacred, intrinsically valuable natural world are often mixed with a concomitant concern with the destruction of a pristine, unspoiled wilderness by urbanization and industrialization of the American landscape. Important, especially given the theme of nonviolence, is Abbey's political and ideological critique of the US's and industrial civilization's telos or end game, which is a manifest destiny of perpetual growth that comes at the expense of the natural world, and ultimately and ironically, of human survival. Thus, for Abbey, replacing the natural world in which we evolved with the detritus of industrial civilization and seeing this as beneficial, desirable, and good, is literally insane. This key conviction has mobilized the tactics, ethics, and political critiques of radical environmentalism since.

While a cult classic to this day, Abbey's The Monkey Wrench Gang played a pivotal role in the development of subsequent forms of radical environmentalism, including the development of Earth First!, whose four founders were directly informed by Abbey's writing (see, e.g. Taylor 2005: 2561-66). Dave Foreman, one-time editor for The Earth First! Journal and co-founder of Earth First!, the leading radical environmental group of the 1980s and the 1990s until the onset and rise of the Earth Liberation Front and Animal Liberation Front, even generated a field manual for 'monkeywrenching'. This term is radical environmental parlance for various forms of property destruction undertaken in defence of the natural world.

In the book's 'Forward' [sic], Abbey uses an analogy of a stranger invading the reader's home, threatening the family. In such a scenario, 'the householder has both the right and the obligation to defend himself [sic], his family, and his property by whatever means are necessary... Self-defense against attack is one of the basic laws not only of human society but of life itself, not only of human life but all of life' (1993: 3). Readers should note a few key moves in this passage as here again, Abbey provides justification for the ethics, tactics, and political philosophy of radical environmentalism with deep implications for discussions about nonviolence. First, he generates a naturalistic fallacy, but one that he accepts: all life defends itself from attack, so human individuals and/or communities, as evolutionary animals, also have the right to protect themselves from attack. Abbey calls this self-defence a basic law of life.

Second, Abbey points out that in this process of self-defence, those defending themselves are justified in using whatever means are necessary. For radical environmentalists, such means have historically been at odds with historically privileged tactical nonviolent actions, especially the strident practice of property destruction advocated by some radical environmentalists. Their justification is that in order to save wilderness, which is conflated with the self and thus home, radical environmentalists are ethically and tactically allowed to use whatever means are necessary to self-defend their ecological home from the attacks of industrial civilization.4

Such views are echoed by Foreman, who in chapter 1 of Ecodefense, offers key insights into strategic monkeywrenching. His purpose in generating this list of insights that begins the field manual is to recognize that radical environmentalists should embrace other tactics more often associated with nonviolent protests aimed at social change. However, given the slow and at times anaemic success rates of such movements, coupled with the rapid destruction of our wilderness home, sometimes moving beyond typical nonviolent actions are morally justified and politically beneficial. Foreman writes that monkeywrenching is individual; targeted; timely; dispersed; diverse; fun; not revolutionary; simple; and key, deliberate, and ethical (1994: 9-11). On this last attribute, he states,

Monkeywrenchers are very conscious of the gravity of what they do. They are deliberate about taking such a serious step... Monkeywrenchers—although nonviolent—are warriors. They are exposing themselves to possible arrest or injury. They remember that they are engaged in the most moral of all actions: protecting life, defending Earth. (Foreman 1994: 11)

Here, Foreman is building on Abbey's ethical justification of self-defence. He also adds to it, calling such self-defence the most moral of all actions, with Earth Firsters and other monkeywrenchers being warriors for life. Notice, too, that Foreman describes actions such as spiking trees that are to be logged; engaging in arson; sugaring the gas tanks of bulldozers;
pulling up survey stakes in areas to be developed; and other forms of property destruction as nonviolent. For radical environmentalists, the distinction about nonviolence does not hinge on property destruction, which is seen as tactically (it saves nature, it hurts the bottom line of companies destroying nature, it raises awareness) and ethically (defending Earth, defending one’s home) justified, but on whether or not an action will hurt another human (historically seen as not tactically or ethically justified for most radical environmentalists).

Deep Green Resistance and Decisive Ecological Warfare

It is upon the above historical trajectories that contemporary radical environmentalism is built. The movement is now a pan-global phenomenon, ranging from Indigenous resistance to globalization to urban punks liberating minks from fur farms in England to food activists uprooting test plots of genetically engineered plants around the world. What has grown since the start of Earth First! in the early 1980s is the consensus science about what industrial, carbon-based human lifeways are doing to the habitat fitness of planet earth, where the survival of all terrestrial and aquatic species is increasingly at risk. Radical environmentalists have a detailed political critique in which such ‘omnicidal assault’ on the planet is premeditated and systematically undertaken by ‘powerful and greedy forces, above all, by transnational corporations, national and international banks, and G8 alliances [for which] these menacing foes are part of a coherent system rooted in the global capitalist market currently in the final stages of the privatization and commodification of the natural and social worlds’ (Best and Nocella 2006: 8). Importantly, and pace Aboe’s conjecture that unchecked growth at the expense of the natural world, our home, is insane, is the analysis that ‘the very concept of “civilization” is problematic as Western cultures have defined it in antithesis to everything wild, non-domestic, animalic, primal, emotional, instincual, and female, all forces to be subdued and conquered’ (Best and Nocella 2006: 9).

Two things should be noted about the above: first, while Best and Nocella prefer the term ‘revolutionary environmentalist’, I will use the more common term, ‘radical environmentalist’. Second, radical environmentalists contextualize their actions within the larger conviction, based on their reading of politics and the anthropological record, that civilization is built upon endemic, often hidden forms of violence that target the Other. Furthermore, civilization is built upon systemic exploitation and violence (see Derrick Jensen’s premises below), and thus, to end the destruction of the natural world, this system must be stopped by any means necessary. This is a key insight that becomes the basis of radical environmental tactics in regards to property destruction. In other words, civilization is built upon entrenched hierarchies of what ecofeminists call the ‘logic of domination’, in which binary dualisms are established that conceptually codify and justify the oppression of minority voices and bodies. These possible voices and bodies range from those in the natural world (seen as inferior to the human world) to women (seen as inferior to men) to non-whites (seen as inferior to whites) to the privileging of human culture and society (often assumed to be based on capitalism) over non-human communities.

Given the above dualisms and view of civilization, coupled with concerns about an intrinsically valuable natural world being rapidly altered and destroyed, I want to condense my focus. For the remainder of this chapter, I want to investigate what I take to be the most extreme voices of extant radical environmentalism found today and explore the implications their tactics have on the concept and practice of nonviolence. Here, I want to focus immediately on the tactics, ethics, and political philosophy of Derrick Jensen, Lierre Keith, and Aric McBay, as articulated in their movement manifesto, Deep Green Resistance (DGR) (2011).

In this book, the public face and voices of DGR advocate that readers participate in both aboveground and underground activities to bring about what they call decisive ecological warfare. Taken from their website about the book, the authors write:

Decisive Ecological Warfare (DEW) is the strategy of a movement that has too long been on the defensive. It is the war cry of a people who refuse to lose any more battles, the last resort of a movement isolated, co-opted, and weary from never-ending legal battles and blockades. The information in the DEW strategy is derived from military strategy and tactics manuals, analysis of historic resistances, insurgencies, and national liberation movements. The principles laid out within these pages are accepted around the world as sound principles of asymmetric warfare, where one party is more powerful than the other. If any fight was ever asymmetric, this one is.6

This chapter is in many ways shaped by my own trajectory struggling with the implications raised by the above analysis of DGR and their call for DEW. The struggle largely results from the implications of their position, which I feel must be taken seriously by those engaged in issues devoted to nonviolence. This is because of the urgency with which they justify their tactics, their reading of power dynamics on the global stage, and the unapologetic tone they take with expressly advocating actions that might strike many people who would otherwise be sympathetic to their concerns as being far too violent.

First, in regards to the quote shared above, notice that their position builds upon the ‘warrior’ call of Foreman and the frustration felt by revolutionary environmentalists Best and Nocella. We see that DGR is, therefore,
situated in long-standing radical environmentalist tributaries. More so is the fact that their tactics and strategy are based upon a nuanced understanding of violence. For those in DGR, violence is a product of interlinked oppressions, including those of imperialism, neocolonialism, racism, and misogyny, which together make up a larger system that is not redeemable by votes, economic pressure, or creating self-sufficient sustainable ‘life-boats’ outside industrial civilization (Keith et al. 2011: 79). Their definition of violence is built upon distinctions between the violence of hierarchy vs. the violence of self-defence, in which ‘The violence of hierarchy is the violence that the powerful use against the dispossessed to keep them subordinated’ (Keith et al. 2011: 80); violence against people vs. violence against property, in which ‘Destroying property can be done without harming a single sentient being and with great effect to stop an unjust system’ (Keith et al. 2011: 81); and violence as self-actualization, especially based on male entitlement vs. violence for political resistance. Given we are all moral agents, we must navigate understandings of violence and actions that are either violent or that defend against violence within a larger context of hierarchy and imperialism, through which, to use their understanding and rationale for strategic violence,

We can decide when property destruction is acceptable, against which physical targets, and with what risks to civilians. We can decide whether direct violence against people is appropriate. We can build a resistance movement and a supporting culture in which atrocities are always unacceptable; in which penalties for committing them are swift and severe; in which violence is not glorified as a concept but instead understood as a specific set of actions that we may have to take up, but that we will also set down to return to our communities. Those are lines we can inscribe in our culture of resistance. That culture will have to include a feminist critique of masculinity, a good grounding in the basics of abuse dynamics, and an understanding of posttraumatic stress disorder. We will have to have behavioral norms that shun abusers...[a] support: network for prisoners...and an agreement that anyone who has a history of violent or abusive behavior needs to be kept far away from serious underground action. (Keith et al. 2011: 83)

DGR posits that vertical violence is endemic to civilization, but not to humans and societies per se. Rather, those in DGR focus on one way of living: that based on hierarchy. DGR points to the onset of the agricultural revolution as the beginning of our unsustainable, hierarchical path. For DGR, civilization today is now global, with the violence of hierarchy, patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and neocolonialism: stretching throughout the globe, impacting all terrestrial and aquatic habitats and thus all organisms. For DGR, the only way to counteract this violence is by building a culture of resistance committed to aboveground and underground acts of DEW.

Some symptoms cited of the violence of fossil fuel and agricultural revolution-based hierarchical industrial civilization include the potential for up to a possible 16-degree Celsius temperature increase by 2100; the reality that 100 to 200 species are killed a day, for up to 73,000 a year, with almost half of all species threatened with extinction due to industrial civilization; that 80 percent of the world’s old growth forests and 90 percent of large fish in the ocean are gone; that the breast milk of mammals have carcinogens; that one of three women and one of seven men are sexually assaulted in their lifetimes; and that the acidification of the oceans is killing plankton, which may cause humans to asphyxiate as plankton is actually the biggest producer of oxygen on the planet. When taken together, such figures, backed by sophisticated models and forms of measurement, especially when compared to baseline historical records that predate the agricultural revolution as well as the industrial revolution, are for those in DGR indeed insane.

For these reasons, those in DGR call this an ‘omnicidal system’, as it destroys landbases in their entirety (Keith et al. 2011: 14). For DGR, this destruction is guaranteed because by definition such destruction is seen as success in the eyes of industrial, patriarchal capitalism. Such omnicidal activity is also a manifestation of the political and social organization of global civilization, which those in DGR claim is mechanized; urban; based on a division of labour and social stratification; militarized; predicated on perpetual growth; defined historically by collapse; hierarchical and centralized; undergoing steadily increasing forms of behaviour regulation; sold to largely passive recipients via monumental architecture and propaganda; and lastly, making the planet uninhabitable for humans and the majority of our non-human kin. They conclude,

The dominant culture isn’t only a serial killer—it’s also an amnesiac. Entire species and biomes are not just wiped out, but forgotten. And worse, they are deliberately erased, scratched out of history. People don’t recognize this culture’s pattern of ecocide because they don’t mourn for all that has already been lost, been killed. (Keith et al. 2011: 79)

DGR urges their readers and sympathizers to realize that we are losing our icecaps, a stable atmosphere below 350 ppm of carbon dioxide, biodiversity both aquatic and terrestrial, and the last window of time we have to make a truly sustainable society, all so Exxon and Halliburton, and a few others can reap record profits in this short blip of geological time and of human history. Their strong, pointed political critique is based upon recognizing that the violence of the state and here, the corporate-military-industrial state, against the natural world is justified and propped up by economic incentives, and that this violence will not willingly stop by those who profit from this destruction. This last is a key insight, as according to
DGR, the only way to get the destruction of our planet to stop, and thus the destruction of the rest of the life forms who live on this planet, is to actively stop industrial civilization through any means necessary, meaning asymmetrical DEW.

Violence (?) and Tactics

I begin this section by borrowing an insight from the anthropologist Ta'al Asad, who writes, ‘A secular state does not guarantee toleration; it puts into play different structures of ambition and fear. The law never seeks to eliminate violence since its object is always to regulate violence’ (2003: 8). According to radical environmentalists, the state regulates violence so that those in the Global North benefit at the expense of the Global South and at the expense of the planet and the rest of all life forms. Such benefits are based on the rest of the life forms, which have as much right to their homes as we do to ours, which are in the midst of the sixth extinction crisis brought about by a way of living that is based on the most extreme forms of violence ever seen for 10,000 years and growing. This reality and attendant analysis makes me question our roles as animals dependent on certain environmental parameters for our continued survival. It should also present a strong occasion to pause and deeply question our own identities and understanding of nonviolence, given that most of us reading this book, as well as those who are committed to nonviolence, are probably predominantly liberal, progressive in our politics, and who are, understandably, champions of nonviolence. Lastly, most of us are willing to work with the state and want to eschew property destruction while working to create social change.

I think DGR and their call for DEW prompt us to ask a key question: what are we obligated to do to stop this omnicidal destruction? If Jensen is correct (see below premises), then we must deal with the reality that we are surrounded by state-sponsored violence, especially against the natural world, and this state violence will never willingly be stopped by those in power. So, what are we to do? This is the question radical environmentalists attempt to answer and their insights in regards to various discussions and strategies about nonviolence might be hard for us to stomach. Given what is at stake (our survival), these insights at least deserve our sustained and honest discussion, with responses ranging anywhere from active and sophisticated rebuttals to tacit agreement.

Jensen is the most prominent eco-anarchist writing today against civilization, and in his book *Endgame*, he shares 20 premises about industrial civilization.7 Because of space constraints, I can only share some key ones, which, similar to DGR, point to a systematic form of violence that we often do not recognize. This form of violence is much more maladaptive to our own survival chances, and I argue that moving forward, Jensen’s premises must be factored into any political, ethical, and tactical discussions of nonviolence.

Jensen’s first premise is ‘Civilization is not and can never be sustainable’, because ‘Our way of living—industrial civilization—is based on, requires, and would collapse quickly without persistent and widespread violence’, his third premise.8 This leads to his fourth premise:

Civilization is based on a clearly defined and widely accepted yet often unarticulated hierarchy. Violence done by those higher on the hierarchy to those lower is nearly always invisible, that is, unnoted. When it is noticed, it is fully rationalized. Violence done by those lower on the hierarchy to those higher is unthinkable, and when it does occur is regarded with shock, horror, and the fetishization of the victims.9

This leads to premise 5:

The property of those higher on the hierarchy is more valuable than the lives of those below. It is acceptable for those above to increase the amount of property they control—in everyday language, to make money—by destroying or taking the lives of those below. This is called ‘production’. If those below damage the property of those above, those above may kill or otherwise destroy the lives of those below. This is called ‘justice’.10

Another key premise derives from premise 5 and in part gives rise to the impetus behind the present chapter, as the implications are unsettling and I feel deserve to be grappled with. Jensen’s claim in premise 6 is:

Civilization is not redeemable. This culture will not undergo any sort of voluntary transformation to a sane and sustainable way of living. If we do not put a halt to it, civilization will continue to immiserate the vast majority of humans and to degrade the planet until it (civilization, and probably the planet) collapses. The effects of this degradation will continue to harm humans and nonhumans for a very long time.11

Jensen offers another key premise, 8, which is:

The needs of the natural world are more important than the needs of the economic system. Another way to put *Premise Eight*: any economic or social system that does not benefit the natural communities on which it is based is unsustainable, immoral, and stupid. Sustainability, morality, and intelligence (as well as justice) require the dismantling of any such economic or social system, or at the very least disallowing it from damaging your base.12

And premise 15 is: ‘Love does not imply pacifism’. And finally, premise 19 is: ‘The culture’s problem lies above all in the belief that controlling and abusing the natural world is justifiable’.13 Taken together, Jensen and DGR broadly argue that we live in a hierarchical culture in which hegemonic
violence is allowed to flow only one way, and this defines the culture, and the impacts of this are a destroyed planet.

If love does not imply pacifism, and if we are animals, then our bodies become sites of resistance to the violence of industrial civilization. The question becomes: who are we as animals on a planet with other kin and what are our duties to our biological family, given they are under systematic assault? In Abbey's terms, do we have a right to defend our home, and in Foreman's terms, are we called to be warriors for Earth who are guided by his vision of strategic monkeywrenching?

As a writer, teacher, activist, and, importantly, an animal living in increasingly brittle and degraded habitats that are being destroyed, I personally do not have an answer to these questions, except to note that I largely agree with the analysis—political, economic, social, and ethical—of DGR.¹⁴ Furthermore, the emerging scientific record matches up with 10,000 years of a clear trajectory that echoes Jensen's premise 6: this culture is not redeemable or sustainable, and things are about to get even more perilous once carbon dioxide and methane from the last 20 years begin to impact our climate. So what do we do? What counts as nonviolence and violence if we are worried about defending our beloved? What counts as violence and nonviolence if we want to try to halt the sixth largest extinction crisis? What tools are at our disposal, what tactics should we adopt, and what conversations do we need to have about violence and nonviolence given what is at stake—which may include our own species' survival as well as the wellbeing of our progeny for the rest of our time here as a species on Earth?

Active Resistance

There are no easy answers to the above questions and nothing redeeming about possible scenarios that may include human extinction and the extinction of up to half of other life forms sometime in the coming decades. Instead, I want to end this chapter and add to the volume's discussion about nonviolence by drawing on insights from the eco-phenomenologist and neo-animist, David Abram. In an articulate essay 'Reciprocity', Abram relates that while kayaking through Alaska, he had a deep encounter with migrating salmon and their bodies. As the proverbial totem species of the Pacific Northwest, Abram relates how salmon unite the ocean and land, people and nature—they teach wonder, humility, the importance of place and bioregion, and also, especially, a form of ethics. For Abram, this form of ethics is reciprocity, based on the sacrifice of the salmon back to the rivers and other-animal bodies that make up the ecosystem where their own young will be born. Abram titles this insight of reciprocity the 'silver rule', based on the silver scales of the salmon,¹⁵ and writes,
elsewhere targeting the infrastructure that powers the industrial civilization that they claim is violently destroying the planet.

In their understanding, 'Ultimately, success requires direct confrontation and conflict with power; you can't win on the defensive' (Keith et al. 2011: 263). If radical environmentalists are correct in arguing that success is averting, or at least slowing the eco-crisis, and if by definition allowing industrial civilization and its inherent violence to continue keeps such success from occurring, then future forms of nonviolence may have to grapple with the reality of having to confront and enter into violent conflict directly with power. DGR asks those who care about life, who have compassion and concern about rejecting all forms of injustice, to be open to the legitimacy of underground acts of decisive ecological warfare, in which for them our animal bodies become sites of active resistance to planetary omnicide.
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Notes
1. I say 'broadly' to recognize the extreme differences, past and present, of colonial and imperial trajectories as well as issues of gender, class, and race, and how these relate to resource use, population size, and other factors that contribute to the eco-crisis.
2. For an early critique of this geographical outlook, see the works of Ramachandra Guha (2000).
3. On the fetishization of wilderness by early radical environmentalists and the environmental movement more broadly, see Cronon (ed., 1996).
4. For insights on divisions that developed through the 1980s and that continue to this day within Earth First! on tactics and ethics regarding property destruction, see Taylor (2005: 519-21).
5. Best and Nocella use the term 'revolutionary environmentalism' to signal the call for a more robust, confrontational form of environmentalism that stands in solidarity with communities of colour, Indigenous resisters, and feminist and social revolutionary movements, all of which are justified because, 'increasingly, calls for moderation, compromise, and the slow march through institutions can be seen as treacherous and grotesquely inadequate. With the planet in the throes of dramatic climate change, ecological destabilization, and the sixth great extinction crisis in its history, "reasonableness" and "moderation" seem to be entirely unreasonable and immoderate, as "extreme" and "radical" actions appear simply as necessary and appropriate' (2006: 238).
14. For important criticisms of Deep Green Resistance, see LeVasseur (forthcoming).
15. And thus not to be confused with the Confucian Silver Rule.
16. I want to point out the distinction that, having read and taught Deep Green Resistance in a seminar on radical environmentalism, as stated I agree with their ethical, political, and tactical analyses. I also recognize that their three scenarios of the future are plausible and worthy of sustained discussion: (1) no DEW warfare occurs, so the earth is rapidly destroyed, leading to failed states and final strangleholds of industrial power; (2) aboveground actions (see below) occur, somewhat slowing eco-collapse, but that does not halt the inevitable; and (3) active aboveground and underground (see below) actions become sustained and concerted, with inevitable repercussions for those in power, leading to DEW in very real terms. DGR feels this final scenario is the only one that might halt the eco-crisis, possibly giving future generations a chance to restore the planet. For those in DGR, the sooner we enter into stage three of DEW, the better. However, I personally am ambivalent, seeing both pros and cons of DEW as articulated in their missive. Having invited other viewpoints represented by both activists and scholars to my class, the reader should recognize DGR has many critics and others advocate equally plausible tactics to help halt and reverse the eco-crisis. Such discussions are beyond the scope and space allotted for this chapter, but I encourage readers to not only read Deep Green Resistance and grapple with its implications for nonviolence; but also actively seek out criticisms of DGR and DEW.