

#58

OUT OF THE WOODS  
ESSAYS IN ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORY

---

Edited by Char Miller and Hal Rothman



UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH PRESS

Published by the University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15261

Copyright © 1997, University of Pittsburgh Press

All rights reserved

Manufactured in the United States of America

Printed on acid-free paper

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Out of the woods : essays in environmental history / edited by Char Miller  
and Hal Rothman.

p. cm.

A compilation of essays from the first 19 volumes of *Environmental history review* and  
its predecessor *Environmental review*.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-8229-3982-7 (alk. paper). — ISBN 0-8229-5631-4 (pbk. : alk.  
paper)

I. Environmental sciences—History. I. Miller, Char, 1951– .  
II. Rothman, Hal, 1958– .

GE50.098 1997

363.7—dc21

97-4747

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

William Cronon's "The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature" is  
from *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature* by William Cronon. Copyright © 1995 by  
William Cronon. Reprinted by permission of W. W. Norton Company, Inc.

## Contents

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction xi

### IDEAS MATTER 1

The Ecology of Order and Chaos 3

DONALD WORSTER

The Theoretical Structure of Ecological Revolutions 18

CAROLYN MERCHANT

The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature 28

WILLIAM CRONON

### PLACE SETTINGS 51

The Earliest Cultural Landscapes of England 53

I. G. SIMMONS

*Landschaft* and Linearity: Two Archetypes of Landscape 64

JOHN R. STILGOE

Environmental Change in Colonial New Mexico 79

ROBERT MACCAMERON

### GREEN POLITICS 99

From Conservation to Environment: Environmental Politics in the United States Since World War II 101

SAMUEL P. HAYS

The Evolution of Public Environmental Policy: The Case of "No-Significant Deterioration" 127

RICHARD H. K. VIETOR

ROBERT GOTTLIEB

URBAN FIELDS 161

Searching for a "Sink" for an Industrial Waste 163

JOEL A. TARR

Personal Boundaries in the Urban Environment: The Legal Attack  
on Noise, 1865–1930 181

RAYMOND W. SMILOR

Equity, Eco-racism, and Environmental History 194

MARTIN J. MELOSI

WATER WORKS 213

Rice, Water, and Power: Landscapes of Domination and Resistance  
in the Lowcountry, 1790–1880 215

MART A. STEWART

"Damned at Both Ends and Cursed in the Middle": The "Flowage"  
of the Concord River Meadows, 1798–1862 227

BRIAN DONAHUE

Irrigation, Water Rights, and the Betrayal of Indian Allotment 243

DONALD J. PISANI

GLOBAL VILLAGE 261

Biotic Change in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand 263

ALFRED W. CROSBY

Australian Nature, European Culture: Anglo Settlers in Australia 273

THOMAS R. DUNLAP

*Nataraja*: India's Cycle of Fire 290

STEPHEN J. PYNE

Notes 309

Index 363

## Acknowledgments

No project of this kind is ever  
debted to so many for minim:  
Evelyn Luce, secretary of the f  
gently typed the many essays i  
many other organizational wa  
Eunice Herrington, senior sec  
Kates, the chair. We also coul  
tion of its many contributor:  
would find a new audience! T  
burgh Press, whose insightful  
the marvelous staff at the pres  
we are indeed thankful.

We owe a great deal to ou  
ciously affected not to notice t  
the house; he learned this sto  
also learned to love and value  
his wife Lauralee, daughter T  
idea for this book, for having  
them so that he could comple  
them knows no bounds.

## The Theoretical Structure of Ecological Revolutions

CAROLYN MERCHANT

Environmental history has reached a point in its evolution in which explicit attention to the theories that underlie its various interpretations is called for. Theories about the social construction of science and nature that have emerged over the past decade in the wake of Thomas Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* is one such approach. It accepts the relativist stance toward science set forth in the first edition of his book. (Kuhn backed away from that position toward a view of the progress of knowledge in a second edition.) Marxist theories that attempt to understand history as constructions of the material-social world existing in particular times and places provide a second influence. The theory of ecological revolutions that follows draws on social construction approaches and uses New England as a case study.<sup>1</sup>

Two major transformations in New England land and life took place between 1600 and 1860. The first, a colonial ecological revolution, occurred during the seventeenth century and was externally generated. It resulted in the collapse of indigenous Indian ecologies and the incorporation of a European ecological complex of animals, plants, pathogens, and people. It was legitimated by a set of symbols that placed cultured Europeans above wild nature, other animals, and "beastlike savages." It substituted a visual for an oral consciousness and an image

of nature as female and subservient fabric of symbolic exchanges between

The second transformation, a roughly between the American Revolution was internally generated and and native species. It demanded management, and a legitimating r ness into a disembodied analytic n

My thesis is that ecological revolutions relations with nonhuman nature. r dictions that develop between a so between its modes of production a port the acceptance of new form views. The course of the colonial a land may be understood through production, and forms of consci down, and an analysis of the new r italist society and nonhuman nat

Two frameworks of analysis o of such ecological revolutions. I edition), Thomas Kuhn approach consciousness from a perspective int munity of scientists. One of the : recognition of stable world views but are rapidly transformed durit ions is its failure to incorporate a daily activities of science practitio cial and economic circumstances ries, at least indirectly. A viewpoi logical changes is required for change.

A second approach to revoluti Friedrich Engels. According to the revolutions begin in the economic in a fairly rapid transformation o ture. In the most succinct statem

of nature as female and subservient to a transcendent male God for an animistic fabric of symbolic exchanges between people and nature.

The second transformation, a capitalist ecological revolution, took place roughly between the American Revolution and about 1860. That second revolution was internally generated and resulted in the reintroduction of soil nutrients and native species. It demanded an economy of increased human labor, land management, and a legitimating mechanistic science. It split human consciousness into a disembodied analytic mind and a romantic emotional sensibility.

My thesis is that ecological revolutions are major transformations in human relations with nonhuman nature. They arise from changes, tensions, and contradictions that develop between a society's mode of production and its ecology, and between its modes of production and reproduction. Those dynamics in turn support the acceptance of new forms of consciousness, ideas, images, and world views. The course of the colonial and capitalist ecological revolutions in New England may be understood through a description of each society's production, reproduction, and forms of consciousness, the processes by which they broke down, and an analysis of the new relations between the emergent colonial or capitalist society and nonhuman nature.

Two frameworks of analysis offer springboards for discussing the structure of such ecological revolutions. In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (first edition), Thomas Kuhn approached major transformations in scientific consciousness from a perspective internal to the workings of science and the community of scientists. One of the strengths of Kuhn's provocative account is its recognition of stable world views in science that exist for relatively long periods but are rapidly transformed during times of crisis and stress. One of its limitations is its failure to incorporate an interpretation of social forces external to the daily activities of science practitioners in their laboratories and field stations. Social and economic circumstances affect internal developments in scientific theories, at least indirectly. A viewpoint that incorporates social, economic, and ecological changes is required for a more complete understanding of scientific change.

A second approach to revolutionary transformations is that of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. According to their base/superstructure theory of history, social revolutions begin in the economic base of a particular social formation and result in a fairly rapid transformation of the legal, political, and ideological superstructure. In the most succinct statement of his theory of history, Marx wrote:

its evolution in which explicit at-  
interpretations is called for. The-  
nd nature that have emerged over  
*Structure of Scientific Revolutions* is  
nce toward science set forth in the  
om that position toward a view of  
) Marxist theories that attempt to  
terial-social world existing in par-  
ence. The theory of ecological rev-  
on approaches and uses New Eng-

land and life took place between  
l revolution, occurred during the  
ated. It resulted in the collapse of  
tion of a European ecological com-  
It was legitimated by a set of sym-  
wild nature, other animals, and  
n oral consciousness and an image

At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production. . . . Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.<sup>2</sup>

One weakness of that approach is the determinism Marx assigns to the economic base and the sharp demarcation between base and superstructure. But its strength lies in its view of society and change. If a society at a given time can be understood as a mutually supportive structure of dynamically interacting parts, then the process of its breakdown and transformation to a new whole can be described. Both Kuhn's theory of scientific revolution and Marx's theory of social revolution are starting points for a theory of ecology and history.

Science and history are both social constructions. Science is an ongoing negotiation with nonhuman nature for what counts as reality. Scientists socially construct nature, representing it differently in different historical epochs. Those social constructions change during scientific evolutions. Historians also socially construct the past in accordance with concepts relevant to the historian's present. History is thus a continuing negotiation between the historian and historical sources. Ecology is a particular twentieth-century construction of nature relevant to the concerns of environmental historians.

A scientific world view answers three key questions:

- (1) What is the world made of? (the ontological question)
- (2) How does change occur? (the historical question)
- (3) How do we know? (the epistemological question)

World views such as animism, Aristotelianism, mechanism, and quantum field theory construct answers to these fundamental questions differently.

Environmental history poses similar questions:

- (1) What concepts describe the world?
- (2) What is the process by which change occurs?
- (3) How does a society know the natural world?

The concepts most useful for this approach to environmental history are ecology, production, reproduction, and consciousness. Because of the differences in the immediacy of impact of production, reproduction, and consciousness on nonhuman nature, a structured, leveled framework of analysis is needed. This framework provides the basis for an understanding of stability as well as evolutionary change and transformation. Although change may occur at any level, ecological revolutions are characterized by major alterations at all three levels.

Widening tensions between the re-  
en habitat and between produc-  
Those dynamics in turn lead to t  
ing world views.

Since the Scientific Revolutio-  
nature primarily through the sp-  
and inert, remaining at rest or m-  
less acted on by external forces.  
of a machine. The world is a clo-  
passive and manipulable.

An ecological approach to hi-  
tor. It challenges the mechanisti-  
ergy, materials, and informati-  
natural environment. Nonhum-  
that participates in change over  
Nature is a whole of which hun-  
animals, and soils in ways that s-  
ence and technology, we have g-  
of time.

But like the mechanistic par-  
structured theory. Although it diff-  
and networks into consideratic  
truth than do earlier paradigm  
theories through a socially san-  
tion and deselection of particu-  
texts, and the acceptance of a c-  
munity. But laboratory and fiel-  
ratory conditions in the field. F-  
whole that includes both nonh-  
logical approach of the twentiet  
sulted from a socially construct  
thority and a set of social practi-

Production is the human co-  
duce subsistence to reproduce  
communities with their local e-  
from the elements (or resource  
market exchange are the prima-

ial productive forces of society come  
1. . . . Then begins an epoch of social  
undation the entire immense super-

minism Marx assigns to the eco-  
base and superstructure. But its  
f a society at a given time can be  
of dynamically interacting parts,  
nation to a new whole can be det-  
tion and Marx's theory of social  
ology and history.

ions. Science is an ongoing nego-  
as reality. Scientists socially con-  
erent historical epochs. Those so-  
lutions. Historians also socially  
relevant to the historian's present.  
ween the historian and historical  
ry construction of nature relevant

estions:

ical question)  
question)  
question)

nism, mechanism, and quantum  
ental questions differently.  
ons:

curs?  
rld?

to environmental history are ecol-  
ness. Because of the differences in  
roduction, and consciousness on  
etwork of analysis is needed. This  
nding of stability as well as evolu-  
change may occur at any level, eco-  
major alterations at all three levels.

Widening tensions between the requirements of ecology and production in a given habitat and between production and reproduction initiate those changes. Those dynamics in turn lead to transformations in consciousness and legitimating world views.

Since the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century, the West has seen nature primarily through the spectacles of mechanistic science. Matter is dead and inert, remaining at rest or moving with uniform velocity in a straight line unless acted on by external forces. Change comes from outside as in the operation of a machine. The world is a clock, adjustable by human clock makers; nature is passive and manipulable.

An ecological approach to history asserts the idea of nature as a historical actor. It challenges the mechanistic tradition by focusing on the interchange of energy, materials, and information among living and nonliving beings in the natural environment. Nonhuman nature is not passive, but an active complex that participates in change over time and responds to human-induced change. Nature is a whole of which humans are only one part. We interact with plants, animals, and soils in ways that sustain or deplete local habitats, but through science and technology, we have greater power to alter the whole in a short period of time.

But like the mechanistic paradigm, the ecological paradigm is a socially constructed theory. Although it differs from mechanism by taking relations, context, and networks into consideration, it has no greater or lesser claim to ultimate truth than do earlier paradigms. Both mechanism and ecology construct their theories through a socially sanctioned process of problem identification, selection and deselection of particular "facts," inscription of the selected facts into texts, and the acceptance of a constructed order of nature by the scientific community. But laboratory and field ecology merge through the replication of laboratory conditions in the field. Farm, field, and forest are viewed as an ecological whole that includes both nonhuman nature and the human designer. The ecological approach of the twentieth century, like the earlier mechanistic one, has resulted from a socially constructed set of experiences sanctioned by scientific authority and a set of social practices and policies.<sup>3</sup>

Production is the human counterpart of "nature's" activity. The need to produce subsistence to reproduce human energy on a daily basis connects human communities with their local environments. Production for subsistence (or use) from the elements (or resources) of nature and the production of surpluses for market exchange are the primary ways in which humans interact directly with the



local habitat. An ecological perspective unites the laws of nature with the processes of production through exchanges of energy. All animals, plants, and minerals are energy niches involved in the actual exchange of energy, materials, and information. The relation between human beings and the nonhuman world is reciprocal; when humans alter their surroundings, "nature" responds to those changes through ecological laws.

Production is the extraction, processing, and exchange of nature's parts as resources. In traditional cultures exchanges are often gifts or symbolic alliances while in market societies they are exchanged as commodities. For much of Western history, humans have produced and bartered food, clothing, and shelter primarily within the local community to reproduce daily life. But when commodities are marketed for profit, as in capitalist societies, they are often removed from the local habitat to distant places and exchanged for money. Marx and Engels distinguished between use-value production, or production for subsistence, and production for profit. When people "exploit" nonhuman nature, they do so in one of two ways: they either make immediate or personal use of it for subsistence, or they exchange its products as commodities for personal profit or gain.

New England is a significant historical example because several types of production evolved within the bounds of its present geographical area. Native Americans engaged primarily in gathering and hunting in the north and in horticulture in the south. Colonial Americans combined mercantile trade in natural resources with subsistence-oriented agriculture. The market and transportation revolutions of the nineteenth century initiated the transition to capitalist production. Historical bifurcation points within the evolutionary process can be identified roughly between 1600 and 1675 (the colonial ecological revolution) and between 1775 and 1860 (the capitalist ecological revolution).

To continue over time, life must be reproduced from generation to generation. The habitat is populated and repopulated with living organisms of all kinds. Biologically, all species must reproduce themselves inter-generationally. For humans, reproduction is both biological and social. Each adult generation must maintain itself, its parents, and its offspring so that human life may continue. And each individual must reproduce its own energy and that of its offspring (intra-generationally) on a daily basis through gathering, growing, or preparing food. Socially, humans must reproduce future laborers by passing on family and community norms. And they must reproduce and maintain the larger social order through the structures of governance and laws (such as property inheritance) and the ethical codes that reinforce behavior. Thus, although production is

twofold-oriented toward subsistence and reproduction, it is also fourfold, having both biological and social dimensions.

Reproduction is the biological and social process by which the young are born, nurtured, socialized, and governed. It is a process that is legitimated, population sizes are regulated, property and inheritance practices are established, and economies, production and reproduction are organized within the local community. Under capitalism production and reproduction are organized in different spheres.

Claude Meillassoux's *Maidens* explores the necessary connections between biological and social economies. Production, he argues, is the extraction and exchange of human energy for human life. Food must be extracted and processed to produce adults, to maintain the energy of producers, and to maintain that of consumers. Production of life on a daily (intra-generational) basis is directly to the intergenerational reproduction of life.

Although the biological reproduction and the necessary connections between inter-generational reproduction, the political, legal, or governmental structures of production will play the role of reproduction, the biological reproduction is the primary one.

Whereas Meillassoux was interested in subsistence societies, sociologists have been interested in the division of labor in politics to formulate theories of reproduction. Under capitalism, the division of labor bears the responsibility for the reproduction of commodities, while women bear the responsibility for the reproduction of social relations. Peterson argues:

Women's responsibility for reproducing the species (intergenerational reproduction) is the primary one, and the reproduction of the work force through unpaid labor is the secondary one. The reproduction of social relations—social relations—must be advanced by women.

Under capitalist patriarchy, the reproduction of social relations must be advanced by women. Meillassoux's and Peterson's work on reproduction can be advanced by

the laws of nature with the process-  
All animals, plants, and minerals  
nge of energy, materials, and infor-  
and the nonhuman world is recip-  
"nature" responds to those changes  
  
nd exchange of nature's parts as re-  
e often gifts or symbolic alliances  
as commodities. For much of West-  
ered food, clothing, and shelter pri-  
ce daily life. But when commodities  
es, they are often removed from the  
for money. Marx and Engels distin-  
oduction for subsistence, and pro-  
human nature, they do so in one of  
rsonal use of it for subsistence, or  
r personal profit or gain.  
  
ample because several types of pro-  
ent geographical area. Native Amer-  
ting in the north and in horticulture  
mercantile trade in natural resources  
market and transportation revolu-  
transition to capitalist production.  
lutionary process can be identified  
ecological revolution) and between  
tion).  
  
uced from generation to generation.  
h living organisms of all kinds. Bio-  
selves inter-generationally. For hu-  
social. Each adult generation must  
; so that human life may continue.  
energy and that of its offspring (in-  
gathering, growing, or preparing  
e laborers by passing on family and  
e and maintain the larger social or-  
l laws (such as property inheritance)  
rior. Thus, although production is

twofold-oriented toward subsistence use or market exchange—reproduction is fourfold, having both biological and social articulations.

Reproduction is the biological and social process through which humans are born, nurtured, socialized, and governed. Through reproduction sexual relations are legitimated, population sizes and family relationships are maintained, and property and inheritance practices are reinforced. In subsistence-oriented economies, production and reproduction are united in the maintenance of the local community. Under capitalism production and reproduction separate into two different spheres.

Claude Meillassoux's *Maidens, Meat, and Money* (1981) best explains the necessary connections between biological and social reproduction in subsistence economies. Production, he argues, exists for the sake of reproduction; the production and exchange of human energy are the keys to the reproduction of human life. Food must be extracted or produced to maintain the daily energy of producing adults, to maintain the energy of the children who will be the future producers, and to maintain that of the elders, the past producers. In this way reproducing life on a daily (intragenerational) basis through energy is linked directly to the intergenerational reproduction of the human species.<sup>4</sup>

Although the biological reproduction of life is possible only through the necessary connections between inter- and intragenerational reproduction, the community as a self-perpetuating unit is maintained by social reproduction. In addition, the political, legal, or governmental structures that maintain the mode of production will play the role of reproducing the social whole.<sup>5</sup>

Whereas Meillassoux was interested primarily in the concept of reproduction in subsistence societies, sociologist Abby Peterson examined the gender-sex dimension in politics to formulate an analysis of reproduction in capitalist societies. Under capitalism, the division of labor between the sexes has meant that men bear the responsibility for and dominate the production of exchange commodities, while women bear responsibility for reproducing the workforce and social relations. Peterson argues:

Women's responsibility for reproduction includes both the biological reproduction of the species (intergenerational reproduction) and the intragenerational reproduction of the work force through unpaid labor in the home. Here too is included the reproduction of social relations—socialization.<sup>6</sup>

Under capitalist patriarchy, reproduction is subordinate to production.

Meillassoux's and Peterson's work offers an approach by which the analysis of reproduction can be advanced beyond demography to include daily life and the

community itself. The sphere of reproduction is fourfold, having two biological and two social manifestations: (1) the intergenerational reproduction of the species (both human and nonhuman), (2) the intragenerational reproduction of daily life, (3) the reproduction of social norms within the family and community, and (4) the reproduction of the legal-political structures that maintain social order within the community and the state. The fourfold sphere of reproduction exists in a dynamic relationship with the twofold (subsistence or market-oriented) sphere of production.

Production and reproduction are in dynamic tension. When reproductive patterns are altered, as in population growth or changes in property inheritance, production is affected. Conversely, when production changes, as in the addition or depletion of resources or in technological innovation, reproductive structures are altered. A dramatic change at the level of either reproduction or production can alter the dynamic between them, resulting in a major transformation of the social whole.

Socialist-feminists have further elaborated the interaction between production and reproduction. In a 1976 article, "The Dialectics of Production and Reproduction in History," Renaté Bridenthal argues that changes in production give rise to changes in reproduction, creating tensions between them. For example, the change from an agrarian to an industrial capitalist economy—one that characterized the capitalist ecological revolution—can be described in terms of tensions, contradictions, and synthesis within the gender roles associated with production and reproduction. In the agrarian economy of colonial America, production and reproduction were symbiotic. Women participated in both spheres because the production and reproduction of daily life were centered in the household and domestic communities. Likewise, men working in barns and fields and women working in farmyards and farmhouses socialized children into production. But with industrialization, the production of items such as textiles and shoes moved out of the home into the factory, while farms became specialized and mechanized. Production became more public, reproduction more private, leading to their social and structural separation. For working-class women, the split between production and reproduction imposed a double burden of wage labor and housework; for middle-class women, it led to enforced idleness as "ladies of leisure."<sup>7</sup>

In New England the additional tensions between the requirements of intergenerational reproduction and those of subsistence production in rural areas also stimulated the capitalist ecological revolution. A partible system of patriarchal

inheritance meant that farm sizes dropped to a point that not all sons inherited a farm. The tensions between the requirements of a large family labor force and social norms (all sons must inherit farms) helped to prepare the way for the transition to capitalist agriculture. In its fourfold sense, therefore, capitalism is a subsistence-oriented (use-value) production-intensive market production.

Consciousness is the totality of awareness of one's acts and volitions, shaped by an aggregate of individual and group consciousness. Its characteristics dominate a society's consciousness through which the world is perceived, constructed and subject to change.

A society's symbols and images are part of its consciousness. They appear in mythology, cosmology, and art. Scientific, philosophical, and religious images used by controlling elites provide clues to the consciousness of a society. Legitimate human behavior toward nature, ethics, morals, and taboos. According to these frameworks give rise to a certain consciousness because their related values are not weak, they can be undermined. A society of colonial Americans may have a consciousness that accelerated of commercial change, or among selected elites, legitimated the new economic direction.

For Native American cultures, the primary senses in sustaining life. In the traditional intergenerationally through hunting, and planting. Aural/oral myth and transactions between

is fourfold, having two biological generational reproduction of the intragenerational reproduction of within the family and community, structures that maintain social or fourfold sphere of reproduction extended (subsistence or market-oriented)

ic tension. When reproductive patterns changes in property inheritance, production changes, as in the addition of innovation, reproductive structures either reproduction or production giving in a major transformation of the

1 the interaction between production and consumption. Dialectics of Production and Reproduction shows that changes in production give rise to tensions between them. For example, the transition to a capitalist economy—one that characteristically can be described in terms of tenets of gender roles associated with production in a capitalist economy of colonial America, was dialectical. Women participated in both production and consumption of daily life were centered in the household, whereas men working in barns and armhouses socialized children into production of items such as textiles and tools. In the city, while farms became specialized, production more private, reproduction more privatized. For working-class women, the transition imposed a double burden of wage labor and domestic production. For men, it led to enforced idleness as

between the requirements of intergenerational reproduction in rural areas also increased. A partible system of patriarchal

inheritance meant that farm sizes decreased after three or four generations to the point that not all sons inherited enough land to reproduce the subsistence system. The tensions between the requirements of subsistence-oriented production (a large family labor force) and social reproduction through partible inheritance (all sons must inherit farms) helped create a supply of landless sons, wage laborers for the transition to capitalist agriculture. The requirements of reproduction in its fourfold sense, therefore, came into conflict with the requirements of subsistence-oriented (use-value) production, stimulating a movement toward capital-intensive market production.

Consciousness is the totality of one's thoughts, feelings, and impressions, the awareness of one's acts and volitions. Group consciousness is a collective awareness by an aggregate of individuals. Both environments and culture shape individual and group consciousness. In different historical epochs, particular characteristics dominate a society's consciousness. Those forms of consciousness, through which the world is perceived, understood, and interpreted, are socially constructed and subject to change.

A society's symbols and images of nature express its collective consciousness. They appear in mythology, cosmology, science, religion, philosophy, language, and art. Scientific, philosophical, and literary texts are sources of the ideas and images used by controlling elites whereas rituals, festivals, songs, and myths provide clues to the consciousness of ordinary people. Ideas, images, and metaphors legitimate human behavior toward nature and are translated into action through ethics, morals, and taboos. According to Charles Taylor, particular intellectual frameworks give rise to a certain range of normative variations and not others, because their related values are not accidental. When sufficiently powerful, world views and their associated values can override social changes. But if they are weak, they can be undermined. A tribe of New England Indians or a community of colonial Americans may have a religious world view that holds it together for many decades while its economy is gradually changing. But eventually with the acceleration of commercial change, ideas that had formerly existed on the periphery, or among selected elites, may become dominant if they support and legitimate the new economic directions.<sup>8</sup>

For Native American cultures, consciousness was an integration of all the bodily senses in sustaining life. In that mimetic consciousness culture was transmitted intergenerationally through imitation in song, myth, dance, sport, gathering, hunting, and planting. Aural/oral transmission of tribal knowledge through myth and transactions between animals, Indians, and neighboring tribes pro-

duced sustainable relations between the human and the nonhuman worlds. The primal gaze of locking eyes between hunter and hunted initiated the moment of ordained killing when the animal gave itself up so that the Indian could survive. (The very meaning of the gaze stems from the intent look of expectancy when a deer first sees a fire, becomes aware of a scent, or looks into the eyes of a pursuing hunter.) For Indians engaged in an intimate survival relationship with nature, sight, smell, sound, taste, and touch were all of equal importance, integrated in a total participatory consciousness.<sup>9</sup>

When Europeans took over Native American habitats during the colonial ecological revolution, vision became dominant within the mimetic fabric. Although imitative, oral, face-to-face transactions still guided daily life for most colonial settlers and Indians, Puritan eyes turned upward toward a transcendent God who sent down his word in written form in the Bible. Individual Protestants learned to read so that they could interpret God's word for themselves. The biblical word in turn legitimated the imposition of agriculture and artifact in the new land. The objectifying scrutiny of fur trader, lumber merchant, and banker who viewed nature as resource and commodity submerged the primal gaze of the Indians. Treaties and property relations that extracted land from the Indians were codified in writing. Alphanumeric literacy became central to religious expression, social survival, and upward mobility.<sup>10</sup>

The Puritan imposition of a visually oriented consciousness was shattering to the continuation of Indian animism and ways of life. With the commercializing of the fur trade and the missionary efforts of Jesuits and Puritans, a society in which humans, animals, plants, and rocks were equal subjects was changed to one dominated by transcendent vision in which human subjects were separate from resource objects. That change in consciousness characterized the colonial ecological revolution.

The rise of an analytical, quantitative consciousness was a feature of the capitalist ecological revolution. Capitalist ecological relations emphasized efficient management and control of nature. With the development of mechanistic science and its use of perspective diagrams, visualization was integrated with numbering. The superposition of scientific, quantitative approaches to nature and its resources characterized the capitalist ecological revolution. Through education, analytic consciousness expanded beyond that of dominant elites to include most ordinary New Englanders.

Viewed as a social construction, "nature" (as it was conceptualized in each social epoch—Indian, colonial, and capitalist) is not some ultimate truth that was

gradually discovered through the :  
tation, and mathematics. Rather,  
representations of "reality." Ecolo  
different societies change their re  
between production and ecology  
The results are new constructions  
sciousness.

man and the nonhuman worlds. The  
r and hunted initiated the moment of  
lf up so that the Indian could survive.  
the intent look of expectancy when a  
cent, or looks into the eyes of a pursu-  
mate survival relationship with nature,  
all of equal importance, integrated in a

erican habitats during the colonial eco-  
nt within the mimetic fabric. Although  
still guided daily life for most colonial  
pward toward a transcendent God who  
Bible. Individual Protestants learned to  
ord for themselves. The biblical word in  
lture and artifact in the new land. The  
c merchant, and banker who viewed na-  
erged the primal gaze of the Indians.  
cted land from the Indians were codified  
ie central to religious expression, social

oriented consciousness was shattering to  
l ways of life. With the commercializing  
orts of Jesuits and Puritans, a society in  
cks were equal subjects was changed to  
in which human subjects were separate  
consciousness characterized the colonial

e consciousness was a feature of the capi-  
ecological relations emphasized efficient  
with the development of mechanistic sci-  
s, visualization was integrated with num-  
quantitative approaches to nature and its  
ecological revolution. Through education,  
id that of dominant elites to include most

ture" (as it was conceptualized in each so-  
talist) is not some ultimate truth that was

gradually discovered through the scientific processes of observation, experimen-  
tation, and mathematics. Rather, it was a relative, changing structure of human  
representations of "reality." Ecological revolutions are processes through which  
different societies change their relationship to nature. They arise from tensions  
between production and ecology, and between production and reproduction.  
The results are new constructions of nature, both materially and in human con-  
sciousness.