

COMMUNITY-BASED LABOR-ENVIRONMENTALIST COALITIONS:
STRIVING FOR ECONOMIC AND ECOLOGICAL STABILITY

by


GREGORY A. HOLMES

A THESIS


Presented to the Interdisciplinary Studies Program:
Individualized Program
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Science

June 1992

APPROVED:

 6-1-92
Dr. Gregory McLauchlan, Chair

 6-1-92
Dr. Steven Deutsch

 6/1/92
Dr. Jeffrey Ostler

An Abstract of the Thesis of
Gregory A. Holmes for the degree of Master of Science
In the Interdisciplinary Studies Program: Individualized
Program

to be taken

June 1992

Title: COMMUNITY-BASED LABOR-ENVIRONMENTALIST COALITIONS:
STRIVING FOR ECONOMIC AND ECOLOGICAL STABILITY


Approved:


Dr. Gregory McLauchlan, Chair

6-1-92


Dr. Steven Deutsch

6-1-92


Dr. Jeffrey Ostler

6/1/92

The idea that the interests of working people differ from the interests of environmentalists is a myth perpetuated by an economistic view of the world. Workers and environmentalists are the same people. Their interests lie in sustaining healthy selves, communities, and ecosystems. As currently structured, the national labor and environmental organizations do not adequately represent those interests.

Two community-based coalitions between labor and environmental groups or activists were studied to determine how such coalitions might contribute toward the protection and promotion of those interests. The experiences of the Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy and the Industrial Workers of the World Local No. 1 suggest that on a community level workers and environmentalists can agree on and work toward common goals. The major challenge such coalitions face arises when the outside organizations whose privilege or hegemony they threaten assert themselves to protect that privilege.

VITA

NAME OF AUTHOR: Gregory A. Holmes

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon
University of California, Santa Barbara

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Science, 1992, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts, 1985, University of California, Santa
Barbara

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Energy Policy and Planning
Perception of the Environment and Framing Environmental
Discourse

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Graduate Teaching Fellow, Department of Planning,
Public Policy, and Management, University of Oregon,
Eugene, 1991.

Research Associate, Department of Public Works,
Transportation Division, City of Eugene, Oregon,
1991.

Environmental Technician, Lane Regional Air Pollution
Authority, Springfield, Oregon, 1989-1990.

Associate Consultant, MHB Technical Associates, San
Jose, California, 1985-1989.

AWARDS AND HONORS:

Oregon Laurel Merit Scholarship, 1990-1992.

PUBLICATIONS:

Holmes, Gregory A. "Environmental Studies at UCSB: Where We Came From and Where We're Going." Senior Thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara, March 1985.

_____. Direct Testimony of Gregory A. Holmes on behalf of California Public Utilities Commission, regarding Diablo Canyon Rate Case, Design Verification Program History, Application Nos. 84-06-014 and 85-08-025, Exhibit No. 12,735. March 1987.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION: WHY WE NEED COALITIONS BETWEEN WORKING PEOPLE AND ENVIRONMENTALISTS | 1 |
| II. THE STATE OF OUR WORLD: GETTING THE LABOR MOVEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT BACK ON TRACK | 8 |
| The Rise and Decline of the Labor Movement in the United States | 11 |
| The Rise and Decline of the Environmental Movement in the United States | 21 |
| Lessons From the 1980s | 33 |
| What's Been Missing: Labor and Environment As Part of a Broad Social Movement | 46 |
| III. A UNION-ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP COALITION: THE ROGUE INSTITUTE FOR ECOLOGY AND ECONOMY, JACKSON COUNTY, OREGON | 54 |
| Creating a Coalition and Establishing Goals | 57 |
| Goal Implementation Meets Reality | 71 |
| Current Status and Future Directions | 80 |
| IV. A WORKER-ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVIST COALITION: THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD LOCAL NO. 1, MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA | 93 |
| Creating a Coalition and Establishing Goals | 97 |
| Goal Implementation Meets Reality | 113 |
| Current Status and Future Directions | 125 |
| V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 135 |
| Summary | 137 |
| Conclusions | 142 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 152 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: WHY WE NEED COALITIONS BETWEEN
WORKING PEOPLE AND ENVIRONMENTALISTS

One of our deepest frustrations as a culture, I think, must be that we have made so extreme an investment in mining the continent, created such an infrastructure of nearly endless jobs predicated on the removal and distribution of trees, water, minerals, fish, plants, and oil, that we cannot imagine stopping. . . . [We] are trying to live out an American nightmare which our system of schools and our voices of government never told [us] was ill-founded. There is not the raw material in the woods, or beyond, to make all of us rich. And in striving for it, we will only make ourselves, all of us, poor.

Barry Lopez, The Rediscovery of North America

In Working Class Hero, Stanley Aronowitz picks up on Michel Foucault's "Discourse on Language"¹ and advances the notion of a discursive rule, which he defines as

the informal imperative that political and other social relations be framed within the hegemonic discourse. This rule frames the boundaries of discourse, sets the agenda of debate, and has the force of law insofar as other discourses are precluded from consideration.²

Both the labor movement and the environmental movement began to develop in the latter nineteenth and early twentieth

¹Michel Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language, trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972).

²Stanley Aronowitz, Working Class Hero: A New Strategy for Labor (New York: Adama Books, 1983), 98-102.

centuries as separate parts of a bigger movement calling for social reform in the US.³ Individually and as a part of the whole, these movements challenged the dominant rules of discourse of the time.

Since then the labor and environmental movements have developed along distinctly separate, but strikingly similar courses. Throughout the first half of this century, large organizations arose within each of these movements. In the post-World War II period, the national labor and environmental organizations have come to stand for many people as the movements themselves. During this evolution, the leadership of the organizations have slowly been given legitimation and power by the forces they formed to oppose in exchange for agreeing to operate under certain rules of discourse, some of which called for the abandonment of past goals and practices. For the most part, there has been nothing malicious about this trend. The leaders of these organizations gained influence in places where they have been able to make positive contributions to the causes of their constituents, and the organizations gained national political clout. The problem is that, as the organizations

³Whether this was a citizen-driven movement, as was popularly believed until recently, or a movement driven by corporate interests looking out for themselves, as Gabriel Kolko suggested in The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967), the fact remains that the social reform movement of the period was bigger than either the labor or the environmental movements.

have essentially replaced the movements, they have also narrowed the potential of each of the movements. Because the large organizations have agreed to largely work within rather than challenge the prevailing rules of discourse, there are important issues that respectable labor organizations just do not discuss in their day to day business.⁴ The same is true of environmental organizations.⁵

The 1980s brought Ronald Reagan to the presidency, and with him a concerted attack on both the labor and the environmental movements. By this time the labor and environmental organizations, and hence the movements, were perceived by many as special interest groups each with its own separate, narrow agenda.⁶ Whether true or not, this

⁴Stanley Aronowitz presents a persuasive case that since World War II the discursive rule within the union movement has been "that all class interest must be subordinate to growth and industrial survival." Thus, union policies have been and continue to be limited to those that promote this goal, whether or not such policies are in the best interests of working people. Ibid., 98-102.

⁵Mark Dowie advances an argument that the environmental organizations have been stuck since the early 1980s in a discourse that treats environmental problems as technical, rather than political challenges. This restricts political or social change from playing a factor in the resolution of environmental problems. Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 73.

⁶Stanley Aronowitz argues that, whether it is actually true or not, by the end of the 1960s and to the current day a large percentage of the US population believes the organized labor movement to be an interest group that serves only its members. Stanley Aronowitz, Working Class Hero: A

perception has made it possible for the corporate and government interests that the movements originally opposed to isolate them from each other, making the members of one perceive a threat to their cause in the agenda of the other. This situation manifests itself most obviously in cases of "job blackmail," wherein industry threatens the jobs of workers if they are forced to comply with environmental regulations designed to protect the ecosystems surrounding communities where they conduct their business.⁷

These same tendencies have isolated each of these movements from broader social movements. When the Chicano residents of the Sawmill barrio of Albuquerque, New Mexico, organized to fight health problems they attributed to the mill in their neighborhood,⁸ or when the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe sued mining companies and the state of Idaho over the loss of a sustainable supply of fish on their reservation due to poisoning from upstream mining

New Strategy for Labor (New York: Adama Books, 1983), 88-89. Mark Dowie argues that the same is true of the organized environmental movement. Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 70-71.

⁷A good history of this phenomenon appears in Richard Kazis and Richard L. Grossman, Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982).

⁸Elizabeth Martinez, "When People of Color Are an Endangered Species," Z Magazine, April 1991, 63-64.

operations,⁹ our society saw groups fighting issues of health and safety, race, class, or social justice, rather than labor or environmental issues. And by refusing to make these and similar issues their own, mainstream labor and environmental organizations have reinforced the societal mis-perception that they are somehow movements with separate, distinguishable, possibly conflicting interests. According to Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, during the 1980s this isolation resulted in

plummeting union membership, falling real wages, a "new labor force" of workers needy enough to work under abusive conditions, job-hungry communities competing to offer tax concessions to corporations, and an electorate willing to tolerate pointless military waste and unlimited degradation of the environment.¹⁰

The outrageous aspect of this is that nearly all of us work for a living. We all have interests in good working conditions, whether we work as homemakers, millworkers, secretaries, computer analysts or subsistence farmers. In the same way, we are all environmentalists. We all have an interest in clean air, clean water, open spaces, standing forests and clean beaches. People inside factories have an interest in clean and safe work environments. People in

⁹Kathie Durbin, "Tribes Sue Mining Companies, Idaho, Over Cleanup of Waters," (Portland) Oregonian, 7 April 1992, sec. B, pp. 1, 4.

¹⁰Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, "Labor-Community Coalitions and the Restructuring of Power," in Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community, ed. Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990), 325.

communities downstream or downwind from these factories, including those who are workers and those who are not, have an interest in what comes out of the smokestacks and effluent pipes into their living environment. The issues that surround making our communities economically, socially, and environmentally stable are all related. The movements that profess to speak in our names should be protecting all of these interests. We should be directly challenging a system that offers us only a choice between environmental degradation with jobs or a clean environment with economic and social collapse of communities. These are not the only options.

The idea that the interests of working people are not the same as the interests of environmentalists is a myth perpetuated by an economistic view of the world.¹¹ We are the workers, and we are the environmentalists. Our interests lie in sustaining healthy selves, communities, and ecosystems. The purpose of this thesis is to explore the

¹¹I do not wish to debate the opinion that there is somehow a fundamental difference within the category of "working people" between the traditional proletariat, industrial production workers, and so-called "new working class" of brain workers whose work has, in a Marxist analysis, become proletarianized. Nor do I wish to distinguish these people from management, who are also working for someone else. On some level these differences are real, however, for the purposes of this paper they are irrelevant. The point of the paper is to focus on the similarities that people who can be placed in any of these categories have with people who can be put into any of the number of categories one might find under the broad label of "environmentalist."

possibilities that community-based coalitions between labor and environmental groups or activists offer toward the protection and promotion of those interests. In form, such coalitions are attempting to bring the two movements together; in function, they are serving to re-unite these movements to each other and to the broader movement for social justice.

The separate but parallel histories of the labor and environmental movements in the US, and the lessons that the movements should have learned during the 1980s, are discussed in Chapter II. Chapters III and IV explore in some detail the history of two relatively recent community-based coalitions that have formed between people who might be considered "environmentalists" and those who are advocates for working people. A summary of findings and the conclusions are provided in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

THE STATE OF OUR WORLD: GETTING THE LABOR MOVEMENT AND
THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT BACK ON TRACK

The crisis of industrial civilization is not new. Perhaps 30 civilizations have come into existence and then perished, unable to effectively adapt to social, political, economic, and environmental crises spawned by their very success. Rather than moving toward greater diversity, symbiosis, and stability, as is the case in organic evolution, human ecologies guided by conscious purpose have systematically evolved in the direction of simplicity, homogeneity, competitive exploitation, and fragility. If we are to avoid making the same mistakes again, we must come to a better understanding of why that has happened and learn what is necessary to avoid repeating the same dull round of growth and decline.

Gary Coates, Resettling America

In Farewell to the Working Class, Andre Gorz explains that the word "work," as defined in modern western culture, has come to have a very narrow definition:

It means an activity carried out: for someone else; in return for a wage; according to forms and time schedules laid down by the person paying the wage; and for a purpose not chosen by the worker. . . . "Work" nowadays refers almost exclusively to activities carried out for a wage.¹²

This of course removes homemaking, homemade craft production, volunteer activities, and other socially useful

¹²Andre Gorz, Farewell to the Working Class: An Essay on Post-Industrial Socialism, trans. Mike Sonenscher (Boston: South End Press, 1982), 1.

activities from the realm of work. If we adopt Gorz' definition to review the history of the United States, however, a startling trend appears. As late as the end of the Civil War, less than 5% of the residents of the US were wage earners. By 1880, when the industrial revolution was a well-established fact, over 60% were wage earners. A century later, more than 90% of the residents of the US work for someone else for a wage.¹³

Working people are generally categorized under the term "labor"; efforts of working people to unite to promote or protect common interests are generally consolidated under the label of the "labor movement." Unlike in Europe, where politically effective labor parties also developed, in the US unions have remained the only significant organized form the movement has taken.¹⁴ And, just as the term "work" has been narrowed to mean something one does in exchange for a wage, the organized union movement has come to stand as the metaphor for the labor movement as a whole. However, since at the union movement's peak in the mid-1950s union membership only included 35% of the labor force,¹⁵

¹³Richard Kazis and Richard L. Grossman, Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), 156.

¹⁴Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), xiv.

¹⁵Bennett Harrison and Barry Bluestone, The Deindustrialization of America (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 138.

organized labor in the US has always been only a fraction of the movement to promote or protect the interests of working people.

A similar distortion has occurred in the culturally accepted definitions of environmentalists and the environmental movement. Environmentalists, are portrayed as being primarily white, upper-middle- and middle-class people. They are people with some privilege, who can afford the time and or money to be concerned about saving the whales, stopping clearcutting, and shutting down factories that pollute the rivers and the air.¹⁶ They are the people who are dues-paying members of the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and the Audubon Society. And, just as labor unions have become the public face of the labor movement, these and similar groups have become the voice for and de facto equivalent of the environmental movement. But, like the unions, large environmental organizations represent only a fraction of what the environmental movement is about.

In addition, society does not recognize that the efforts of other groups very much represent what these movements were originally about. Although concerned with overlapping issues, these efforts are separated from labor and environmental causes by labels such as "health and

¹⁶Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/92): 84.

safety," "race issue," "social justice issue," and the like. Part of the reason for this is because advocates for these other causes explicitly call for changes that are outside of the discourse agreed upon within the labor and environmental movements (as represented by the organizations), and part is because they have adopted tactics that are not recognized as legitimate by the movements or the forces they challenge.

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly explore how the histories of the labor and environmental movements have brought us to this point and to set the stage for a discussion of what some people are trying to do about it.

The Rise and Decline of the Labor Movement in the United States

The Beginnings of the Labor Movement

The labor movement began in the latter part of the 19th century as a part of a broader movement for social reform that developed as a counterpoint to the industrial revolution. Early shapers of the discourse of the movement included socialists, communists, other visionaries that polite society considered to be radicals, democrats, republicans, and probably a fascist or two. During the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth, ideologies were debated that included goals ranging from slightly modifying to totally overthrowing capitalism, and tactics were employed that

included everything from negotiated contracts and legislation to sit-down strikes and sabotage.

The American Federation of Labor (AFL), founded in 1885, developed a style of unionism that has since become known as business unionism. Business unionism did not seek to overthrow or replace capitalism, but instead sought a partnership with it. Called "pure and simple unionism," this strategy employed collective action only to advance the interests of individual members.¹⁷ Each union would negotiate wages and working conditions on behalf of its members working for an individual employer. Terms were then formalized in trade agreements, or contracts. Adopted for use primarily by the trade unions who organized only the skilled workers, this system had the additional benefit of allowing unions to control the size of the workforce through internal rules and procedures such as apprenticeship programs. Thus unions were able to create scarcity of labor and bid wages up. In exchange for the contract and the control it offered, however, unions often agreed that members would give up direct actions and other militant tactics that had previously been used to leverage employers.¹⁸

¹⁷Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), xiv.

¹⁸Stanley Aronowitz, Working Class Hero: A New Strategy for Labor (New York: Adama Books, 1983), 21.

A more radical approach was favored by the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). Against political involvement except as a supplement to economic power won through direct action, the IWW also rejected the binding trade agreement, reasoning that negotiated agreements could later be violated by the powerful employers, leaving workers with no effective response. The IWW sought to replace capitalism with a system of "anarchist-syndicalism," in which there was no class of employers. In the meantime, they would retain their right to controlling work through direct action in order to protect the interests of all workers.¹⁹ Retaining this right included refusing to follow the AFL's no-strike policy during World War I. The strikes that the IWW led during the war in mining, combined with a threatened "general strike," resulted in quick and heavy-handed response from the government. In the fall 1917, IWW offices throughout the country were raided, and in 1918 101 IWW leaders were convicted of conspiring against the war effort and either jailed or deported.²⁰ The IWW never recovered, and the organized labor movement never had another significant voice opposing capitalism as a system.

¹⁹James R. Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 59-60.

²⁰Dan Fost, "IWW Tries to Shake Wobbly Reputation by Laboring in Bay Area," Chicago Tribune, 12 December 1991, sec. C, p. 29.

Most influential unionists in the history of the movement have favored a modification, without complete overthrow, of capitalism. Social unionism, organizing for the strength to influence government policies, was practiced when convenient by the AFL, and as a dominant ideology in the early days of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO). AFL involvement in the Wilson administration's war efforts resulted in the creation of the Department of Labor and legislation such as the Clayton Act (1914) and the Adamson Act (1916), which gave unions immunity from prosecution under the Sherman Anti-trust Act and mandated 8-hour day and time-and-a-half overtime pay for railroad workers, respectively.²¹

Although organized labor would continue to enjoy some significant legislative victories up to the early 1970s, in terms of influence on government policies the union movement's heyday was in the 1930s and early 1940s. After facing unfriendly administrations in the 1920s, the AFL and later the CIO cooperated with the Roosevelt administration during the New Deal and were rewarded with the Norris LaGuardia Act (1932), which guaranteed the right to strike, the National Industrial Recovery Act (1933) and the Wagner Act (1935), which guaranteed the right to organize and

²¹Richard Kazis and Richard L. Grossman, Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), 171; James R. Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 83.

created the National Labor Relations Board to standardize the process, and the Fair Labor Practices Act (1938), which abolished child labor, established the first minimum wage and the eight-hour day for all workers.²²

In mid-December, 1941, just after Pearl Harbor accelerated US entry into World War Two, leaders of industry and labor agreed to voluntarily end strikes and walkouts for the duration of the war. In return, Roosevelt created the War Labor Board as a means of compulsory arbitration to prevent labor disputes from becoming strikes.²³ The administration also instituted a policy wherein corporations who wanted war contracts with the government were required to bargain collectively with unions.²⁴

The no-strike pledge, combined with the operation of the War Labor Board, gave the national labor leaders a new and more powerful role in the management of union activities. Representatives of the AFL and the CIO were given seats on the board, giving them active roles in designing agreements between labor and industry. Backed by the government, the national leaders took advantage of the

²²Bennett Harrison and Barry Bluestone, The Deindustrialization of America (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 135.

²³James R. Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 181.

²⁴Stanley Aronowitz, Working Class Hero: A New Strategy for Labor (New York: Adama Books, 1983), 79.

growing anti-communist sentiment in the country to remove or isolate dissidents. By 1950 the CIO had expelled eleven unions because their leaders were alleged communists, and set up rival unions in their place. Disagreement with national leaders by rank-and-file protesters was seen as disloyalty to the organization and received the same treatment. This effectively silenced critics not only of the leaders but also of the direction that the union movement took during and after World War II.²⁵

After World War II: Business Unionism
and The "Social Contract"

After the war, AFL and CIO leaders favored continuation of the wartime strategy of cooperation rather than a return to the conflict based strategies that had built the movement. Consistent with this, the CIO again tried to take the initiative in implementing its social unionist strategy. In the last half of the 1940s the CIO pushed for legislation providing for full employment, national health care, comprehensive public housing programs, and economic planning. None of these initiatives made it through Congress.²⁶

²⁵Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), 33-34.

²⁶Ibid., 38-39.

A parallel strategy adopted by CIO officials and shared with the AFL leaders was to continue the wartime no-strike agreement in exchange for governmental support.²⁷ Despite the wishes of the national leadership, overdue wage increases and poor working conditions caused more workers to strike in 1946 than in any previous year in history.²⁸ One result of this was the loss of government support their leadership had cherished, signalled in the form of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. This act established unfair labor practices for which unions could be held legally accountable, including sympathy strikes, secondary boycotts, and strikes called while a contract that included a no-strike clause was in effect. It also allowed states to outlaw mandatory union membership, whether or not a majority of the workers had voted for unionization. Called a "right to work" policy, this provision significantly affected the ability of unions to organize and collect dues in traditionally non-union industries and regions of the country, such as the south.²⁹

Defeats in legislation and increasing hostility toward confrontational disputes combined to put the union movement

²⁷James R. Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 193-194.

²⁸Bennett Harrison and Barry Bluestone, The Deindustrialization of America (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 133.

²⁹Ibid., 136.

on the defensive by the beginning of the 1950s.³⁰ However, as the only major country in the world that emerged from the war with a functioning industrial base, the US was in a position to expand its economy to a global scale. Thus, there were large profits to be made if there could be a peace negotiated between industry and labor. National union leadership were relieved to enter into the "social contract" that emerged from this situation.

This informal pact was based on a pattern established after General Motors and the United Auto Workers (UAW) signed what is referred to as "The Treaty of Detroit" in 1950.³¹ The contract was to last not for the traditional one year, but for an unprecedented five years. While the contract was in effect, the union agreed there would be no strikes for any reason. In exchange for giving up their right use traditional tactics to challenge management decisions and working conditions, workers were guaranteed cost of living raises, pension improvements, welfare and insurance plans, and provisions for bonuses.³²

³⁰James R. Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 209.

³¹Richard Kazis and Richard L. Grossman, Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), 187.

³²James R. Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 208; Richard Kazis and Richard L. Grossman, Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), 187.

In the decade that followed, union leadership routinely negotiated away both the right to challenge management prerogatives and the tactics that workers had traditionally relied upon in exchange for wage and benefit increases. Slowly, union leadership at the national level abandoned adversarial tactics in favor of cooperation.³³ The AFL and the CIO merged in 1955, effectively creating one centralized leadership that could enforce labor's part of the contract over a significant portion of the movement.

As this process matured into the early 1950s, a new form of business unionism became dominant. After the anti-communist, anti-dissident purges of the late 1940s and early 1950s removed any effective critics of cooperation from the movement, most union leaders accepted capitalism and the employer-employee relationship as a given, and saw their job as negotiating, signing, and administering labor contracts.³⁴ This view of their jobs led gradually to the concept that unions were businesses, and should be run like businesses. Union leaders made no apologies for adopting business leadership styles. In order to provide the best services to their members, effectively the consumers of

³³Collective bargaining and grievance handling remained largely adversarial throughout the post-World War II period. However, as a matter of course leaders of unions and industries agreed that adversarial relationships would be restricted to these narrow issues.

³⁴Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), 56-57.

their services, professional staffs were needed and professional level salaries were appropriate. People who were decades or generations away from factory floors were hired to run the unions. By the end of 1957 union executive salaries in excess of \$50,000 a year were not uncommon, and the ratio of full-time union officials to members exceeded Britain's by more than ten times.³⁵

With the evolution of a business mentality, union leadership goals also evolved so that the interests of the members became subordinate to the preservation of the institutions.³⁶ And slowly, they began to see the survival of their organizations as more dependent on the health of their industries than on the collective wisdom of their members.³⁷ For the period from about 1950 until the early 1970s, effective challenge from their membership was forestalled by the fact that the efforts of the leadership paid off for workers in the form of continued improvements in wage and benefit packages.

³⁵Gabriel Kolko, Main Currents in Modern American History (New York: Pantheon Books, 1976), 189.

³⁶Stanley Aronowitz, Working Class Hero: A New Strategy for Labor (New York: Adama Books, 1983), 91.

³⁷Richard Kazis and Richard L. Grossman, Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), 187.

The Rise and Decline of the Environmental
Movement in the United States

The beginnings of the Environmental Movement

Like the labor movement, the environmental movement first developed in the latter 19th and early 20th century as part of a larger movement for social reform. The two movements have evolved along parallel, although distinctly different paths.

Similar to that of the labor movement, the discourse of the early environmental movement produced one ideology that only slightly regulated capitalism, and another that, while not explicitly calling for the overthrow of the system, ran counter to some of its basic tenets. Reform of the prevailing economic system was the key to the ideology popularly labelled "conservation." Advocated as scientific "management" and "wise use" of the country's "natural resources,"³⁸ in practice conservation meant development with careful planning. While the father of the conservation movement Gifford Pinchot called it "the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest time,"³⁹ others contend

³⁸The very term "natural resources" betrays a mindset and world-view of the natural world as a collection of things for us to manipulate.

³⁹Gifford Pinchot, excerpt from The Fight for Conservation, in Roderick Nash, ed., American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990), 76.

that this was nothing more than a partnership between environmentalism and big business designed to provide industry with reliable access to natural resources.⁴⁰ The other major ideology that developed within the movement, now placed under the label of "preservation," called for the removal of vast areas of land from the domain of private capital. Although this ideology did not explicitly call for an end to capitalism, implicit in its values was a question of any system with a decision-making process that applied economic considerations to the exclusion of all others.

From the 1880s through the first decades of the twentieth century, awareness of the issues, passion for places, and a desire to have input into their management, led a number of people around the country to join or form organizations that might improve their political voice. Some of these organizations were formed by leaders of industries who had financial interests in the conservation of resources, such as game animals (National Wildlife Federation, 1936).⁴¹ Others were formed by citizens interested in the preservation of a place (Sierra Club,

⁴⁰See Gabriel Kolko, The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967).

⁴¹For this section, unless otherwise specified, all dates inclosed in parentheses () are from Roderick Nash, "An American Environmental Chronology," in Roderick Nash, ed., American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990), xi-xiv.

1892), of wildlife (New York Audubon Society, 1886; National Audubon Society, 1905), or of certain types of areas based on threats to specific localities (Wilderness Society, 1935). For the most part these organizations were fairly small and either local or regional. But, through contacts with prominent citizens, they gave their members political voice in defining conservation or preservation issues and in deciding the outcomes of public policy debates.

Government legislation and management of federal lands between 1890 and 1950 generally favored the more utilitarian ideology of the conservationists. Conservationist organizations helped in passing the Forest Management Act (1897); the Reclamation Act, which created the Bureau of Reclamation (1902); the Mineral Leasing Act (1920); and the authorization of dams at Hetch-Hetchy (1913) and Boulder Canyon (1928). The Movement gained momentum during the Roosevelt years with passage of the Taylor Grazing Act (1934), the Soil Conservation Act (1935), the Omnibus Flood Control Act (1936), and the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps (1933), the Tennessee Valley Authority (1933), and the Bureau of Land Management (1946).⁴²

Despite the government's primary attention being on conservation, the same period brought important victories for preservationists. Preservationist influenced

⁴²While 1946 is after Roosevelt's administration, this agency was very much the result of New Deal programs.

legislation includes the establishment of Yosemite National Park (1891), formation of the Grand Canyon (1908) and Dinosaur National Monuments (1915)⁴³, creation of the National Park Service (1916), and creation of the first "wilderness area" in Gila National Forest, New Mexico (1924).

The organized environmental movement as it exists today began to define itself when conservationists and preservationists clashed over plans to build dams in Dinosaur National Monument in the 1950s.⁴⁴ Beginning in the 1940s and in to the early 1950s the Bureau of Reclamation began developing the Colorado River Storage Project, which originally included dams at Echo Park and Split Mountain, inside the boundaries of the Monument. When the plan reached Congress for approval, Split Mountain had been dropped, but Echo Park remained.⁴⁵ Perceiving a threat not only to Dinosaur, but to the whole concept of national parks and monuments as places to be free of commercial development, most of the major preservationist organizations

⁴³Roderick Nash, Wilderness and the American Mind, 3rd ed. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982), 209.

⁴⁴Woodrow Wilson created the Dinosaur National Monument in 1915 by setting aside 80 acres in Utah. Franklin Roosevelt added over 200,000 acres to the monument in 1938, including over 100 miles of deep canyon of the Green and Yampa Rivers along the Colorado-Utah border.

⁴⁵Roderick Nash, Wilderness and the American Mind, 3rd ed. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982), 209-210.

backed the effort led by the Sierra Club's Executive Director David Brower to stop the dam.⁴⁶

Brower orchestrated the production of pamphlets, a motion picture, articles and editorials in the mainstream press, Congressional letter-writing campaigns, and the first of the now-famous Coffee-Table Sierra Club books during this battle. In 1954 the House and Senate Subcommittees approved the entire plan, including Echo Park, but due at least in part to an 80-to-1 ratio of House mail in favor of saving the Monument, the bill did not make it to the floor of Congress. In 1955 the Senate passed the entire package, but the House version deleted the Echo Park dam in favor of the dam at Glen Canyon. Leadership of preservationist organizations agreed to this compromise and the Act, including language specifically forbidding dams in National Parks or Monuments, was passed in 1956. Brower and others later saw the compromise and the loss of Glen Canyon, the reservoir behind which flooded part of Rainbow Bridge National Monument in violation of the 1956 Act, as a serious mistake.

In 1963, ironically the same year that the gates were closed at Glen Canyon, the Bureau of Reclamation's Pacific Southwest Water Plan was made public. This project included plans for two dams inside Grand Canyon National Park. That

⁴⁶Howard Zahnister of the Wilderness Society also played a major behind-the-scenes role.

this was even considered was due to a loophole left in the Act creating the park in 1919 that said

Whenever consistent with the primary purposes of said park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the utilization of the areas therein which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of government reclamation projects.⁴⁷

Brower again led the Sierra Club into battle. On 9 June 1966, he placed full page ads in the New York Times and the Washington Post telling readers "NOW ONLY YOU CAN SAVE GRAND CANYON FROM BEING FLOODED . . . FOR PROFIT."⁴⁸ The next day, the IRS hand-delivered notice to the Sierra Club that its tax-exempt status was threatened due to the ad, and subsequently the Club lost this status. This apparent retaliation by the government led to popular and financial support in the fight against the dams not only from wilderness supporters, but from civil-rights activists who viewed the IRS action as an act of intimidation against legal citizen protest.⁴⁹ After other ads, films, coffee-table books, and a very public debate, the Bureau of Reclamation revised their plan in 1967 to drop one of the dams. Brower and others refused to compromise again, and in

⁴⁷Roderick Nash, Wilderness and the American Mind, 3rd ed. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982), 227.

⁴⁸A reprint of the ad and the two that followed appear in David Brower, For Earth's Sake: The Life and Times of David Brower (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1990), 365-368.

⁴⁹Roderick Nash, Wilderness and the American Mind, 3rd ed. (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1982), 230.

1968 Congress passed legislation forbidding dams between Hoover and Glen Canyon, preserving the integrity of the Park.

The Environmental Movement's Social Contract

Prompted by the popular awareness and support generated by the Echo Park and Grand Canyon battles, the membership of the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, and the Wilderness Society more than doubled between 1966 and 1970, and nearly doubled again by 1975.⁵⁰ Politicians began to respond to the expressed interests of organizations that could harness their members, and public outrage over such disasters as the 1969 oil spill in the Santa Barbara Channel, into powerful national voting blocs.⁵¹

Backed by this support, leaders of environmental organizations found they had access to sympathetic politicians. By tapping in to the campaigning apparatus built around the Echo Park and strengthened during the Grand Canyon battle, environmental groups were thus able to influence passage of landmark legislation, including the

⁵⁰Stephen Fox, John Muir and His Legacy: The American Conservation Movement (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1981), 315.

⁵¹Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 70.

Clean Air Act (1963), the Wilderness Act (1964), the Endangered Species Act (1966), the National Environmental Policy Act (1970), the Clean Water Act (1972), and the National Energy Act (1978).⁵² Just as the 1930s and early 1940s marked the heyday of the organized labor movement in legislative effectiveness, the 1960s and early 1970s can be seen as the height of the influence of the modern environmental movement on federal legislation.

In order to assist in the drafting of these bills, and to offset the platoons of lobbyists sent by effected industries to oppose them, the major environmental groups opened or expanded their offices in Washington and between 1969 and 1985 increased the number of registered lobbyists in the Capitol from two to 88.⁵³ In order to staff the new offices and run the expanded organizations, lawyers, accountants, and business school graduates were hired.

Just as the first part of the 1950s saw the development of the Social Contract between labor and industry, the 1970s witnessed the development of a rough equivalent between environmental organizations and the government. Labor's

⁵²For this section, unless otherwise specified, all dates inclosed in parentheses () are from Roderick Nash, "An American Environmental Chronology," in Roderick Nash, ed., American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990), xi-xiv.

⁵³Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 71.

Social Contract established the role that unions would play in the labor movement, and also set the parameters for allowable discourse: organized labor would not advocate the imposition of labor into the decision-making processes of capital, nor would it push for the overthrow of capitalism. In exchange, capital would negotiate in good faith with organized labor and share the profits. Similarly, leaders of the national environmental organizations slowly reached a tacit agreement with their new allies in government over the rules of their participation in and discourse over national politics: these leaders agreed that the environmental movement would not have as a goal "an end to industrial society and its hierarchical system of governance,"⁵⁴ but would rather work within the system for moderate reform of the system. In exchange, the government would negotiate in good faith and allow certain tactics, such as lobbying⁵⁵ and use of the courts, to promote and enforce these reforms.⁵⁶

⁵⁴As advocated by Murray Bookchin. Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 51.

⁵⁵After the IRS took away the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club in 1966 for violating laws that prohibit lobbying by tax-exempt organizations, Congress in 1976 passed tax reforms that allowed for such lobbying. Stephen Fox, John Muir and His Legacy: The American Conservation Movement (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1981), 322.

⁵⁶For general descriptions of this process, see: Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter

Just as conservative union leaders assured organizational compliance with their contract by eliminating dissidents from their ranks in the 1940s and 1950s, advocates of continued direct challenge to the system were removed from their positions in environmental organizations in the late 1960s and 1970s. David Brower, mountaineer and activist, was ousted by a conservative majority on the Board of Directors of the Sierra Club in 1969 for "insubordination" following his Grand Canyon campaign and his refusal to go along with the Club's support of the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant.⁵⁷ In 1973, Sydney Howe, President of the Conservation Society, was fired for trying to make the foundation more responsive to grass-roots concerns.⁵⁸ In 1978, Celia Hunter, Alaskan bush-pilot and outfitter, was forced out as Executive Director of the Wilderness Society and replaced by a businessman who had

1991/1992): 70-72; Dave Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 193-212; and Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 49-60.

⁵⁷Brower went on to form Friends of the Earth, and was ousted from his position there in 1984 for refusing to compromise with a conservative majority of the board who wanted to move the organization from San Francisco to Washington. Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 55.

⁵⁸Ibid.

previously marketed Ansel Adams photographs for a living.⁵⁹ In 1979 Paul Watson was ousted from Greenpeace, which he had co-founded, because of his part in a highly publicized disruption of a seal hunt.⁶⁰

What emerged by about 1980 was a "corporate environmentalism" equivalent of the business unionism that had developed after World War II. As one leader put it:

If we were going to hope to generate the kind of money we needed, we had no choice but to adopt a successful corporate model. If there were to be budgets, someone with a professional background was going to have to implement them and ride herd on everyone involved.⁶¹

With budgets that ranged into the tens of millions of dollars per year, a fair number of these professionals were needed. The corporate metaphor upon which the organizations based their structures, combined with the technicians and specialists that were hired to run the organizations, is arguably responsible for another parallel development. Efficient, business-like operation within budgets, aimed at preserving the viability of the organizations, even at the

⁵⁹Dave Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 15.

⁶⁰Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 109.

⁶¹Robert Hunter, cofounder of Greenpeace. Quoted in Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 57.

cost of addressing the concerns of their members, has become the primary objective of the major national organizations.⁶²

Finally, just as the merger of the AFL and the CIO in 1955 produced a unified, top-down management that could effectively define and control much of the organized labor movement, the ten largest environmental organizations formed a coalition in 1981 that has since come to be known as the "Gang of Ten."⁶³ Membership is restricted to groups who are active, with "active" defined as "regularly going to members of Congress and corporations," and meetings are restricted to the chief executive officers of the organizations.⁶⁴ Through periodic meetings and reports, these ten, highly paid men are able to define (sometimes by omission) the important issues and the acceptable range of solutions to be considered for a significant portion of the organized environmental movement.

⁶²Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 81; Dave Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 204-206.

⁶³Members of the Gang of Ten are: The Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, National Audubon Society, national Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense Fund, Defenders of Wildlife, National Parks and Conservation Association, the Izaak Walton League, and the Environmental Policy Institute (which includes Friends of the Earth). Dave Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 194.

⁶⁴Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 72.

Lessons From the 1980s

The Labor Institutions and the Labor Movement

The period from the end of World War II until about 1970 saw unprecedented growth for the US economy. So long as the economy continued to grow, unions could negotiate salary and benefit improvements that significantly improved the economic well-being of their members. At the same time, union leadership slowly gave up or lost their ability to challenge anything but wage and benefit packages, and thus any ability to serve any but a narrow portion of the interests of the workers who were their members. When the economic expansion began to slow during the 1960s, and was finally turned around in the 1970s and 1980s, one corporate response was to reduce the cost of labor by taking back wage and benefit packages that had previously been won by workers. The national leadership of the unions was not prepared to face the assaults launched by business and the government, and generally offered little resistance outside of the traditional roles they had adopted.

The large-scale assaults by business on unions and working people are well represented by the Chrysler Bailout of 1979. By mid-1979, Chrysler had managed itself into a position of being \$1.5 billion in debt and unable to make the payments. Negotiations with banks and the Carter administration resulted in loans to cover the debt and

federal loan guarantees to back up the loans, but the Loan Guarantee Board set up to administer the plan requested concessions from the United Auto Workers (UAW) as part of their reorganization plan. UAW workers were threatened with plant closures if they did not accept a two-year wage freeze, reductions in paid holidays and \$100 million in deferred pension fund payments. In December of the following year, the Board demanded and received an additional \$1.15 an hour cut in UAW wages, and the reduction of 3 more paid holidays. In all, the concessions were worth over \$1 billion to Chrysler. In return, UAW president Doug Fraser received a seat of Chrysler's Board of Directors, Lee Iacocca was paid a \$1.5 million bonus, and many workers lost their jobs anyway as a number of plants were closed as a part of the restructuring.⁶⁵ By April of 1982, Ford had extracted \$1 billion and GM had an additional \$3 billion in concessions from the UAW. By the end of the year, unions representing workers in airlines, meat packing, agricultural implements, trucking, grocery, rubber, steel, and public employees had given back previously won wage increases and benefits.⁶⁶

Of course, this attack on working people could not have succeeded without a government that was sympathetic to

⁶⁵Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), 152-156, 165.

⁶⁶Ibid., 167-168.

industry. The Reagan administration exhibited not only sympathy but a desire to play an active role, as demonstrated by the operation of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). After leaving seats on the Board vacant and allowing cases to pile up, Reagan appointed 4 corporation lawyers to the board. He also appointed a Chair who had publicly declared that "collective bargaining frequently means the destruction of individual freedom," that unions were "the major contributors to the decline and failure of our healthy industries," and that strikes were "a concerted effort employing violence, intimidation and political intervention to prevent people who want to work from working."⁶⁷ Under this leadership, complaints against employers that were dismissed by the NLRB increased by over 300%, while complaints against unions that were dismissed decreased by over 40%.⁶⁸

The Reagan Administration's anti-labor position was further demonstrated by its reaction to the strike called by the 13,000 member Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO) in 1981. Although Kennedy had given government employees the right to unionize in 1961, strikes by federal employees were still illegal. When air-traffic controllers were negotiating in 1981 over stress-related

⁶⁷Patricia Cayo Sexton, The War on Labor and the Left (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991), 222.

⁶⁸Ibid.

work conditions, they refused to bow to custom and drop their non-wage-related demands in favor of higher wages. The administration took a hard line, and PATCO members voted to press their demands in a strike. Reagan reacted by firing them and bringing in military air-traffic controllers until permanent replacements could be trained. The administration followed with similarly hard-line tactics in negotiating with unions representing postal workers and treasury employees.⁶⁹

The first reactions of many workers to these attacks by industry and the government was resistance. At the local level, workers across the country voted not to accept wage and benefit give backs or poor working conditions. However, in general the national union leadership held to its philosophy of self-preservation through preservation of healthy industries, and reasserted its hegemony in the movement by using the time-honored tactic of stifling unsanctioned activism. In trying to sell the UAW agreement with Chrysler to locals, a representative of the international told members "Those of you who don't want to take a wage cut, go out and find another job. No one's stopping you from leaving this organization."⁷⁰ When Reagan

⁶⁹Stanley Aronowitz, Working Class Hero: A New Strategy for Labor (New York: Adama Books, 1983), 68.

⁷⁰Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), 166.

fired the air-traffic controllers to break the PATCO strike, the AFL-CIO chastised PATCO leaders for acting without consulting their leadership about the wisdom of such a strike.⁷¹ When local P-9 of the United Food and Commercial Workers struck Hormel in 1984 over a 23% wage cut and unilateral changes to grievance procedures, the international responded (with the full backing of the AFL-CIO) by placing the local in trusteeship, calling off the strike, negotiating a contract for new workers that accepted virtually of Hormel's concessions, and letting stand Hormel's firing of 600 employees from other plants who had supported the strike.⁷²

Responses by workers have been various. The most dramatic has been the turning away from the unions entirely.⁷³ In 1954, 35% of US workers belonged to unions; in 1978 this figure had dropped to 24%;⁷⁴ by 1986 it had

⁷¹Ibid., 304.

⁷²Peter Rachleff, "Supporting the Hormel Strikers," in Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community, ed. Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990), 57.

⁷³The fall in union membership is not due entirely to workers giving up on the movement. However, in the face of runaway corporations, a shift in the economy from production to service-sector jobs, and government policies that encourage such changes, unions have been unable mount any effective drive to sustain membership or to organize new workers.

⁷⁴Bennett Harrison and Barry Bluestone, The Deindustrialization of America (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 138.

dropped again to 17%.⁷⁵ Another reaction has been to try and change the union movement from the inside by electing activists to positions within the locals. This tactic has been accompanied by a resurgence of grassroots activism at the local level in defiance of national leadership, as demonstrated by P-9. Still other workers, represented by the more progressive locals or not represented by any union at all, have begun to see common ground with other movements, and have formed coalitions with other groups attempting to gain or regain control over their lives.

The Environmental Institutions and the Environmental Movement

The 1980 election of Ronald Reagan signalled the start of an all-out war by the executive branch of the federal government on the environment that continues today under the "Environmental President," George Bush. Reagan began by appointing James Watt as the Secretary of the Interior. Watt's priorities included opening vast areas of federally held wilderness to oil and mining operations, and the sale or transfer of about 20 million acres of federal land to states and private livestock interests.⁷⁶ The Reagan and

⁷⁵Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), 4.

⁷⁶Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 218-219.

Bush energy policies have stressed increased oil production, even where that meant drilling in designated wilderness areas and wildlife refuges. Reagan slashed the budget of the Council on Environmental Quality and, through Director Anne Burford, gutted the Environmental Protection Agency.⁷⁷ The Task Force on Regulatory Relief, which Bush has continued under the name of the Council on Competitiveness, routinely grants industry exemptions from legislated environmental and health and safety standards. Legislation such as the Clean Air Act of 1970 has been weakened in a series of amendments since 1980,⁷⁸ and both administrations have made policies of not enforcing environmental regulations that are on the books.⁷⁹

For their part, the national environmental organizations have become big business since 1980. By 1990, all but three of the Gang of Ten had relocated their head offices to Washington. Professional staff levels in these groups more than doubled during the decade, and salaries for the leaders of the organizations of between \$70,000 and

⁷⁷Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 71.

⁷⁸Ibid., 75.

⁷⁹See the testimony of John Mumma, Regional Forester, Northern Region, US Forest Service, and Lorraine Mintzmyer, Region Director, Rocky Mountain Region, US Park Service, before the House Subcommittee on Civil Service, 24 September 1991. Reprinted High Country News, 7 October 1991, pp. 10-12.

\$120,000 are not uncommon.⁸⁰ The influx of professionals and astronomical budget increases have combined to produce an economically driven spirit of compromise into the political workings of the groups. Audubon's Don Naish has stated that "Conservationists have just got to learn to work with industry," and National Wildlife Federation's Jay Hair's platform is that environmental policies "must translate into profits, earnings, productivity and economic incentives for industry."⁸¹ As if to illustrate where the priorities of the national organizations lie, in 1986 the outgoing Executive Director of the Sierra Club gave the criteria for his successor as "a person who is strong in finance and budgets, who can offer entrepreneurial leadership, who is alert to changes in the marketplace."⁸²

As in the labor movement, the reaction of activists who live in areas that are being devastated by these policies has been resistance. However, just as the national labor

⁸⁰Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 57.

⁸¹Audubon currently collects over \$400,000 a year for leases to oil companies for rights to drill under Audubon bird sanctuaries; the Chairman of Waste Management Company, one of the worst polluters in the US, sits on the board of directors at National Wildlife Federation. Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 76-79.

⁸²Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 57.

organizations attempted to stifle unsanctioned local protests to the assault on working people, the national environmental organizations have tried to prevent or moderate local activism that they thought might upset delicate political relationships that they had built. When the Forest Service announced in 1979 that less than 15 million of the remaining roadless areas in the US would be considered for wilderness protection status, activists from around the country, some of whom had cooperated with the Forest Service inventory of the remaining areas, were outraged at the overt political manipulation of what should have been a scientific process.⁸³ According to Dave Foreman, who was then the Issues Coordinator for the Wilderness Society in Washington:

we were worried that some local wilderness group might go off the reservation and sue the Forest Service over the clearly inadequate environmental impact statement for RARE II. We didn't want a lawsuit because we knew we could win and were afraid of the political consequences of such a victory. We might make some powerful senators and representatives angry. So those of us in Washington were plotting how to keep the grass-roots in line.⁸⁴

⁸³The Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II) was an inventory of National Forest Service lands to determine which of those might be available for designation as "wilderness." Over 62 million acres considered were to be recommended for designation. Over 18 million additional acres that should have been were not included in the process due to procedural problems and political pressures.

⁸⁴Dave Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 13-14.

The Sierra Club national leadership also actively plotted to keep grassroots activists from challenging the outcome of this process.⁸⁵ In other cases, the President of National Wildlife Foundation met with the EPA and the President of Waste Management Corporation and negotiated approval of a toxic waste incinerator over the protests of residents of the small New Jersey town in which it was to be located;⁸⁶ a representative of the Environmental Defense Fund helped draft the North Carolina Genetically Engineered Organisms Act, which explicitly prohibits municipalities from contesting the release of genetically engineered organisms in their communities;⁸⁷ and the Sierra Club national leadership has discouraged the San Diego Chapter from participating in the Nevada Test Site protests⁸⁸ and helped Senator Mark Hatfield draft legislation which denied private citizens the right to challenge timber sales in the National

⁸⁵Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990), 63-64.

⁸⁶Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 79.

⁸⁷Ibid., 84.

⁸⁸David Brower, For Earth's Sake: The Life and Times of David Brower (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1990), 436-443.

Forests in court, a process that local members had been using to successfully block old-growth logging.⁸⁹

Just as in the labor movement, there have been a variety of responses to actions such as these. After more than doubling in the wake of James Watt and peaking in the late 1980s, membership in most of the Gang of Ten organizations has begun to fall.⁹⁰ The 1980s saw the formation of Earth First!, whose slogan is "No Compromise in Defense of the Earth!," and the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, popularly known as the Earth First! navy. Local chapters of some of the major organizations have shown independence and acted on issues that their members felt were important in defiance of or direct opposition to national leadership.⁹¹ Another reaction has been the creation of regional and local organizations formed around issues specific to those locales.⁹² Alliances are being forged with groups that have traditionally been viewed as

⁸⁹Mark Dowie, "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance," World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 85.

⁹⁰Marc Bender, "Beyond Special Interest Politics," Wild Earth, Winter 1991/1992, 76.

⁹¹David Brower, For Earth's Sake: The Life and Times of David Brower (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1990), 436-443.

⁹²An example might be Headwaters, a group that concerns itself with public-lands forest issues in the Klamath-Siskiyou bioregions of southwestern Oregon and northwestern California.

outside of the environmental movement.⁹³ Some of the issues being defined as important by these people, such as civil liberties, environmental racism, and sustainable communities, are issues that the national institutional leadership either do not or are only just beginning to recognize as relevant to the movement.

Rhetoric and Reality

The rhetoric that Ronald Reagan rode into office in 1980 championed neighborhoods and communities as "arenas for civic action and creative self-help" and called for a "rebirth of citizen activity in neighborhoods and cities across the land."⁹⁴ Once in office, the Reagan reality completely dismantled or eviscerated most of the federal programs that had been established in the past decades to foster this activity. Studies abound that show that the richest few percent of Americans got much richer during the

⁹³An example might include the Southwest Organizing Project (SWOP) in Albuquerque, New Mexico, consisting largely of Native Americans and Mexican Americans who have banded together to protect their neighborhoods from instances of environmental racism. See Elizabeth Martinez, "When People of Color are an Endangered Species," Z Magazine, April 1991, 61-65.

⁹⁴Boyte, Harry C., Community is Possible: Repairing America's Roots (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 30-33, 91-93.

1980s.⁹⁵ At the same time, average real wages for private-sector, nonagricultural workers continued a downward trend so that in 1989 they were lower than at any time since before 1961.⁹⁶ Public opinion polls from 1981 to 1990 consistently showed that Americans overwhelmingly favored stronger environmental laws,⁹⁷ yet the environment and legislation designed to protect it were both severely mauled during the 1980s. Despite his well-demonstrated anti-environment, anti-labor position, Reagan was reelected in 1984,⁹⁸ and his Vice President George Bush was elected to carry on his policies in 1988.

A significant development during this period has been the shift in public discourse. During the 1980s

Equality was redefined in public discourse and public policy as a hindrance to capital accumulation and

⁹⁵For example, see James Risen, "Fed Study Shows Rich Became Richer in Reagan-Bush Era," (Portland) Oregonian, 7 January 1992, sec. D, p. 2.

⁹⁶Lucinda Wykle, Ward Morehouse, and David Dembo, Worker Empowerment in a Changing Economy: Jobs, Military Production, and the Environment (New York: Apex Press, 1991), 33.

⁹⁷Richard Kazis and Richard L. Grossman, Fear at Work: Job Blackmail, Labor and the Environment (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), 220; George Gallup, Jr., The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1988 (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1989), 247-250; Richard L. Berke, "Oratory of Environmentalism Becomes the Sound of Politics," New York Times, 17 April 1990, Sec A, p. 1.

⁹⁸Contrary to what might be expected, Reagan received 46% of the union vote during this election. Kim Moody, An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism (London: Verso, 1988), 160.

economic incentives. Social services were regarded as an unacceptable tax burden. Labor solidarity was treated as a hindrance to international competitiveness. Environmental protection became a drag on profitability.⁹⁹

As discussed above, rather than challenge this discourse head-on, union leaders have sought to make US industry more competitive and environmental organization leaders have sought ways to make environmental policies translate to profit.

If the Reagan and Bush administrations have taught us anything, it should be that the labor institutions and the environmental institutions, under their current structures with their current strategies, no longer adequately represent the labor or environmental movements.¹⁰⁰

What's Been Missing: Labor and Environment
As Part of a Broad Social Movement

Building Coalitions

Of course, there really isn't any such thing as the labor movement, any more than there is something one could

⁹⁹Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, "Labor-Community Coalitions and the Restructuring of Power," in Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community, ed. Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990), 328.

¹⁰⁰To be fair, some reform is coming from within some of the institutions. But big, relatively conservative organizations like those that make up the AFL-CIO and the Gang of Ten are slow to change, and many of the working people and the people who live in environmentally devastated areas cannot wait for that change to happen on its own.

call the environmental movement. Even within the institutions that have come to dominate each of the movements, the degree to which there exists a singular world-view or set of goals is probably overstated in the above. However, sympathetic critics¹⁰¹ argue that, to the extent that one or the other of these movements can be defined, their most significant flaws are in that they recognize themselves and their issues as somehow separate, or apart from, each other's and those of the civil rights, peace, gender, and social justice movements.¹⁰²

During the 1960s and early 1970s, when the complexion of the federal government was comparatively moderate, many the various movements were able to make piecemeal gains for their constituents. To greater or lesser extent, each of the movements had built relationships with appropriate legislators and cabinet officials, and in the spirit of moderation and compromise discussed for the labor and environmental movements above, each pursued its own agenda.

¹⁰¹Sympathetic critics might be those who generally believe in the goals of the movements, but disagree with the approaches taken to reaching those goals.

¹⁰²Stanley Aronowitz, Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, Gabriel Kolko and Kim Moody argue that this is the case for labor extensively in the works cited herein. For the same argument as applied to the environmental movement, see: David Brower and Mark Dowie throughout works cited herein, and Kirkpatrick Sale, "Schism in Environmentalism," in American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History, 3rd ed., ed. Roderick Nash (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990), 285-293.

With only rare exceptions, such as Martin Luther King's fateful trip to Memphis in support of striking garbage collectors, there was little crossover between efforts. The environmental movement was not a significant player in the civil rights movement, and the labor movement was not noticeably involved in the anti-war effort. What might be called "the left" slowly atomized into a number of movements proceeding in approximately the same direction with little or no cohesion.

In the face of the realities of where most working people and their communities find themselves after twelve years of Ronald Reagan and George Bush, and of the condition of regulations put in place in earlier decades to protect workers and the ecosystems surrounding their communities from toxic and other hazards, it is apparent that this strategy is no longer adequate. A hostile government has changed the rules, and corporate interests have adapted to their advantage over the popular movements. During the 1980s the rich got more and the rest were divided and hurt quite badly.

In Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community, Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello argue that through open hostility Reagan and Bush have also created the conditions necessary to unify these movements:

The architects of the corporate-right offensive [of the 1980s] correctly perceived that those who might oppose them were divided. Where they went wrong was in

assuming that workers, women, Native Americans, blacks, Latinos, Asian-Americans, other people of color, gay men, lesbians, farmers, students, the elderly, the handicapped, environmentalists, peace and development advocates, consumers, and all the others they were hurting would remain divided forever.

They failed to anticipate that troublemakers--grassroots activists--would begin to cooperate across the lines that had previously divided them from each other. They did not expect peace groups to back strikers, unions to fight for women's rights, or thousands of previously isolated organizations to cooperate against conservative nominations to the Supreme Court. The leaders of the "corporate community" and their allies had violated one of the first rules of politics: don't unify your opposition.¹⁰³

They contend that such a unification has taken place, and that the results are beginning to show. In their analysis:

Cooperation with other movements is proving to be an important means for renewing the labor movement and overcoming some of its widely recognized ills, such as . . . public perception of organized labor as a special interest group rather than an advocate for the needs of all working people.

The separation of labor from other social movements has been a crucial barrier to social change in the United States, making it easy for those who benefit from the status quo to "divide and rule." An alliance of labor and community movements potentially represents the overwhelming majority of the population--a majority which is today largely excluded from political and economic decision-making, but which if mobilized would represent an enormous social force.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, "Labor-Community Coalitions and the Restructuring of Power," in Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community, ed. Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990), 325.

¹⁰⁴Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, "Preface," in Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community, ed. Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990), 10.

It is easy to see where the above statements would be equally true if the term "environmental movement" was substituted for "labor movement."

Recognition of common interests and agreement to join efforts in pursuit of those interests does not imply, to borrow from the IWW, "One Big Organization." Nor does it necessarily mean that all participants have identical interests across the board. Instead, in the case of Brecher and Costello's work, what it means is the formation of coalitions between groups that represent workers, environmentalists, people of color, women, or other social groups or issues. No group subordinates its identity or interests to those of another, but all work together to understand and realize their common interests. Networks of such unified coalitions could truly present an "enormous social force."

Labor-Environmentalist Coalitions

The history discussed above would seem to suggest a natural tendency for community-based coalitions between workers and advocates for a sustainable relationship with the natural world. The Pacific-Northwest of the US offers examples of communities that are struggling to retain their identity as jobs and the forests they depend on are disappearing at the hands of corporate-owned industrial logging operations.

Logging and wood products manufacturing have played a significant role in the economies of Washington, Oregon and Northern California since these areas were first settled by Euro-Americans. The 1980s saw corporate mergers and buyouts in this industry which consolidated the power over workers and forestry practices into the hands of a relative few, mostly trans-national corporations. These corporations were able to take advantage of the climate established by Reagan and Bush and cut more timber than at any time since the 1950s, with little regard for the environmental consequences. At the same time they have taken advantage of new technologies and their ability to move mills offshore to reduce the regional workforce in the industry between 1978 and 1990 by over 20%.¹⁰⁵ In the process the corporations have broken the unions in some of their mills and demanded give-backs in others.

In 1988 the corporations were presented with the perfect weapon to keep workers and environmentalists from working together when a federal court upheld a lawsuit brought by environmentalists finding that the government had not complied with the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The charge was that the forestry practices on federal lands had failed to protect the habitat of the Northern Spotted Owl. In April of 1990 the US Forest Service released a study of

¹⁰⁵John Bellamy Foster, "Capitalism and the Ancient Forest," Monthly Review 43, no. 5 (October 1991): 11-12.

the status of the owl, and recommended that 5.8 million acres of Forest Service land be set aside as habitat for the owl. In June the owl was listed as a threatened species, requiring government action. The industry responded by claiming that as many as 100,000 jobs would be lost if the owl recovery plan was implemented.¹⁰⁶

Although over 70% of the job loss in the industry that occurred between 1978 and 1990 occurred prior to 1988,¹⁰⁷ timber corporations were able to make the closing of mills and the loss of jobs appear to be the result of the work of the environmentalists. Environmentalists, owls, and the Endangered Species Act thus became the enemies of the workers. Statements by environmentalists equating workers with the corporations or stating that "many loggers simply hate the wild and delight in 'civilizing' it,"¹⁰⁸ have only worsened the situation.

Consistent with policies in other matters, the Bush administration has openly taken advantage of this situation to the advantage of the corporations. The administration has stated that any legislation that included assistance to displaced workers would be vetoed. They also reportedly squelched a report being prepared by the Forest Service

¹⁰⁶Ibid., 2.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 12.

¹⁰⁸Dave Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 32.

entitled "Actions the Administration May Wish to Consider in Implementing a Conservation Strategy for the Northern Spotted Owl." Among the proposals in the report were bans on exports of all logs, increases in timber sales receipts to timber-dependent communities, retraining programs for workers, and an \$86 million public works program modeled after the 1930s Civilian Conservation Corps.¹⁰⁹

The unwillingness of the federal government to allow a resolution to this situation, combined with the failure of the national labor and environmental organizations to come together and demand such a resolution, has created the political space for community-based coalitions to form in attempt to look out for their own interests. The focus of the remainder of this study will be on two such coalitions formed during the late 1980s in Pacific-Northwest communities dependent for their economic survival on the wood products industry.

¹⁰⁹John Bellamy Foster, "Capitalism and the Ancient Forest," Monthly Review 43, no. 5 (October 1991): 15.

CHAPTER III

A UNION-ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP COALITION:
THE ROGUE INSTITUTE FOR ECOLOGY AND
ECONOMY, JACKSON COUNTY, OREGON

The devastation of the human and natural worlds that marked the 1980s was only possible because the people hurt by it were divided from each other. Whether the 1990s will be a time of continued devastation or an era of creative renewal will depend largely on whether their divisions are overcome.

Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, Building Bridges

Jackson County, Oregon, lies at the eastern end of the east-west oriented Siskiyou Mountain Range, where that range joins the north-south oriented Cascade Range. The county is approximately 45 miles wide and 60 miles long. The western boundary is a line parallel to and approximately 60 miles from the Pacific Ocean, Crater Lake National Park is at the northeast boundary, and the southern boundary is formed by the California-Oregon border. Just over half of the 145,000 inhabitants of the county live in the Medford-Ashland urban area at the center of the county. Many of the smaller outlying communities owe their existence to the mills they were built around.¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰Rebecca Reed, Regional Services Institute, Southern Oregon State College, telephone interview, 30 March 1992.

For most of this century the harvest and manufacture of timber products has played an important role in the makeup of Jackson County's economy. Weyerhaeuser, Boise Cascade and MedCo are the largest corporations in the industry in this area. However, these corporations do not control the industry. In 1988, only one-quarter of the wood products industry workers worked for companies that employed 50 or more people, while more than half worked for companies that employed fewer than ten.¹¹¹ According to Census Bureau data, while the absolute number of people working in the timber industry in Jackson County rose slightly between 1980 and 1988, the percentage of workers in the county directly dependant upon the industry fell from about 16 percent to about 14.5 percent.¹¹²

One of the major unions representing workers in the timber industry has been the International Woodworkers of America (IWA), Local No. 3-436. During the decade of the 1980s the membership of the IWA nationally dropped from about 50,000 to the present level of about 25,000.¹¹³ In 1980 the local that served Jackson County had only about 300

¹¹¹US Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, Oregon, 1988 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1990), 45-46.

¹¹²Ibid., 45-46; US Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, Oregon, 1980 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1981), 38-40.

¹¹³Bill Street, Research Director, International Woodworkers of America, telephone interview, 2 March 1992.

members. After a prolonged strike and litigation deepened the financial instability of the local, it merged with the local that served Roseburg, in neighboring Douglas County. From a high of nearly 1,600 just after that merger, membership is now at about 1,350, with only a small percentage of those workers in Jackson County.¹¹⁴ Concessions forced on the workers by Weyerhaeuser in 1986, the buyout of MedCo by a Texas-based corporation, and cutbacks by the larger corporations due to mechanization are among the major reasons for this decline.¹¹⁵

During the summer of 1988 residents of Southern Oregon communities participated in the debate that spanned the Pacific Northwest regarding the listing of the Northern Spotted Owl under the Endangered Species Act,¹¹⁶ and the impact that would have on business-as-usual timber harvesting. The debate was given considerable attention in the press, and several public meetings were held in Jackson County to discuss the issues with County Commissioners. Unfortunately, the terms of the debate were usually oversimplified by corporate industry groups to a question of "jobs vs. owls," and the press dutifully reported the issue

¹¹⁴Dennis Dawson, Business Agent, International Woodworkers of America Local No. 3-436, telephone interview, 22 March 1992.

¹¹⁵John Bellamy Foster. "Capitalism and the Ancient Forest," Monthly Review 43, no. 5 (October 1991): 12.

¹¹⁶As discussed in Chapter II.

to the public in those terms. This over-simplification resulted in a situation where corporate industry groups were able to use job blackmail in order to separate workers from community activists demanding initiatives to reform timber harvesting processes. Disgusted with what they saw happening to their community, two IWA members began talking with representatives from some of the local environmental groups to look for solutions outside of the terms in which the debate was being framed.¹¹⁷

Creating a Coalition and Establishing Goals

The People and the Organizations

The initial meetings of the group that formed the Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy were held in the summer of 1988 in the Ashland area in Jackson County, Oregon.¹¹⁸ During several discussions, retired International Woodworkers of America (IWA) Chief Economist Roy Ockert and IWA Local No. 3-436 President and Business Agent Dennis Dawson shared their frustration over the local's inability to reframe the issues in more productive terms. After

¹¹⁷Roy Ockert, co-founder and former board member, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, interview by author, 30 December 1991, San Jose, California.

¹¹⁸Most of the information in this section comes from interviews with Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy Co-Founders Chris Bratt, Dennis Dawson, and Myra Erwin, and Roy Ockert, unless otherwise noted.

separate but similar discussions with Myra Erwin, Chair of the Rogue Group Sierra Club, Ockert decided to bring the IWA and the Sierra Club together in his living room to try and get beyond the "jobs vs. owls" rhetoric. After a couple of meetings the group was expanded to include Chris Bratt, member of the Board of Directors for Headwaters¹¹⁹ and a member of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners Local No. 35, and Doug Frank, co-founder of the Friends of the Greensprings.¹²⁰

This core group met regularly for nearly a year discussing the perspectives and concerns of the members of the groups they belonged to and attempting to overcome mutual misunderstandings regarding the positions of others. They also invited guests to address the group and went into the field to witness conditions for themselves. The goal of the meetings became to conceptualize "an effective local response to the environmental, economic, and social turmoil"¹²¹ that gripped the region. The plan the group developed was a bold one: rather than attempting to apply pressure from the outside to change the way the traditional

¹¹⁹Headwaters is a watershed protection group in the southern Oregon region.

¹²⁰Friends of the Greensprings (FOG), is a watershed protection group based in the Greensprings watershed, east of Ashland, Oregon.

¹²¹Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, "Statement of Purpose," draft version completed late 1990, p. 1.

players framed the issues and their possible resolutions, they planned to expand the range of possible solutions by making players out of the local people and organizations whose livelihoods depend on healthy forests and a healthy forest-products industry.

Because much of the problem leading to the listing of the owl had to do with what is harvested from the forest lands and how it is harvested, the first plans centered around a creating company that would serve as a model of how to manage and harvest products from forests. The search for a system that would maintain the biological diversity of the forests while allowing the harvesting of products, and would allow for the management of forests for something other than conifer production, led the group to the Forest Farm Association and Orville Camp. Camp had researched and developed a system he called "Natural Selection Forestry" (NSF) on his land in southern Oregon.¹²² Discussions with Camp led to the conceptualization of the purpose and methods of the Rogue Sustainable Forestry Company (RSFC).¹²³

The RSFC was planned as a forest management and harvesting company. Using NSF, the RSFC would contract with

¹²²Camp established the Forest Farm Association to carry out research in NSF, and published his system and its results in The Forest Farmer's Handbook: a Guide to Natural Selection Forest Management (Sky River Press, Ashland, Oregon, 1981).

¹²³Roy Ockert, interview by author, 30 December 1991, San Jose, California.

landowners and managing agencies to provide intense management of large areas of forest land. With a large land-base, the company would harvest just a little bit at a time, and would utilize not only mature conifers, as is current practice, but hardwood, small poles, cones, herbs, mushrooms, fungus, and other products that grow in the forest. The rate of harvest under this system would not be determined by economic demand, but by what the forest was able to supply while maintaining its health. These plans were a radical departure from the industrial clear-cut operations that currently dominate practice in the industry. An industry based on businesses that operated this way would be more labor intensive (create more jobs), require less expensive and smaller equipment, fewer and smaller roads, and would theoretically be sustainable, improving both the health of the forest and the economy of the region.¹²⁴

As the planning for the RSFC progressed, the need for an entity that would mill, manufacture, and market the forest products became apparent. The group felt that, in order to assure that the milling and manufacturing portions of the operation did not come to dictate the pace of harvest, a separate company should be established for this purpose. The Rogue Forest Products Company (RFPC) was

¹²⁴Roy Ockert, presentation, "Labor-Environmentalist Cooperation: Creating a Sustainable Forest Products Economy," 16 May 1990, Eugene, Oregon.

created to meet this need. Its original goals were to provide milling, secondary manufacturing and marketing for hardwoods, while providing firewood and other byproducts from the surplus. As planning progressed, the goals of the RFPC were expanded to include providing secondary manufacturing and the marketing and distribution of various types of forest products as provided by the RSFC, with an eye toward the eventual possibility of marketing and distributing locally produced non-forest products such as hand-made crafts.¹²⁵

In the same way that the RSFC would provide a livelihood for foresters and loggers left out of work under the current system, the RFPC was intended to provide work for millworkers and craftspersons. And in the same way that RSFC and RFPC sought to redefine the timber industry by changing what was done and what it was done, the way the companies were to be organized was designed to add to who had a role in decisions in these matters. The ownership of both of the companies was to be based on "employee stock ownership plans" (ESOPs) developed under Roy Ockert's guidance. Under the scheme developed, ownership of the companies would break down as follows:

¹²⁵Roy Ockert, interview by author, 30 December 1991, San Jose, California; and Roy Ockert, presentation, "Labor-Environmentalist Cooperation: Creating a Sustainable Forest Products Economy," 16 May 1990, Eugene, Oregon.

40% production and maintenance workers ESOP
20% management ESOP
20% founding entrepreneurs and organizations
20% outside investors

Among other ideals, this structure was designed to: assure control of the companies by the totality of workers, without the management domination that often occurs when all workers are grouped into one ESOP; avoid management disaffection as a result of the complete exclusion of management from ownership, as has been the case in some worker-owned enterprises; prevent capital flight through worker control; and take advantage of private capital without losing control to it.¹²⁶

Resolution for Action

Up to the summer of 1989, all of the group's work had been in discussions and on paper. The members had developed a vision of the framework under which they wanted the future to develop, and a system under which local people would participate in creating that future. The next phase was to go outside of their private discussions and find out what support existed for their proposals.

The first step in this process was to return to the boards and members of the organizations they represented and find out if the members supported their efforts. Accordingly, a resolution entitled "Saving the Jobs of

¹²⁶Ibid.

Woodworkers" was presented to the Executive Board of the IWA Local No. 3-436 at a meeting held 29 July 1989. The resolution noted that

Woodworkers in the Rogue Valley and adjacent areas are threatened with continuing loss of jobs in the foreseeable future;

Woodworkers are being squeezed between cutting tactics of companies and protectionist actions of environmentalists;

The wood industry is the backbone of the economy of this region, as it is of Oregon;

The crucial situation requires creative approaches, with the union taking the initiative;

Public forest agencies have a legal mandate to provide for community economic stability; and

Federal, state and county funds exist to save the jobs of woodworkers if appropriate plans and projects are proposed.¹²⁷

The funding was to be used to support

A. The creation of a company for supplying hardwood lumber to the growing secondary hardwood products industry in the Rogue Valley --

. . . [and] . . .

B. The establishment of a company . . . which would . . . [s]ign long-term contracts with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), state forest and/or private timber owners to provide a stewardship method of managing large areas of public and private forests throughout all stages . . . and [p]rovide special management prescriptions for certain areas.¹²⁸

¹²⁷International Woodworkers of America, Local No. 3-436. "IWA-US Local Union No. 3-436, Local Union Resolution: Saving the Jobs of Woodworkers," 1989, p. 1.

¹²⁸Ibid., 2-3.

The Resolution specified that the companies would be owned according to the ESOP plan outlined above.¹²⁹

Finally, the resolution stated that:

the local union officers are hereby instructed to contact other organizations requesting support for our petition to government and other relevant agencies for action projects designed to save our jobs.¹³⁰

The IWA Local No. 3-436 Executive Board voted unanimously to recommend that the resolution be adopted at the membership meetings to be held in August of 1989.¹³¹ At the four membership meetings the members also adopted the resolution unanimously.¹³²

Copies of the resolution were also discussed among the boards of directors of Friends of the Greensprings, Headwaters, and the Rogue Group and Oregon Chapter of the

¹²⁹Ibid., 2.

¹³⁰Ibid., 3.

¹³¹Dennis Dawson, President and Business Agent, IWA Local No. 3-436, letter to Congressman Peter DeFazio, 3 August 1989.

¹³²Dennis Dawson, telephone interview, 22 March 1992.

It is interesting to note also that the IWA International, an AFL-CIO union, communicated through its President to Local No. 3-436 that the International's name was not to be used in connection with the coalition. As the locals are autonomous, vote of the membership to endorse the coalition authorizes use of the local's name.

Sierra Club. These discussions resulted in organizational endorsements of the coalition.¹³³

The Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy

The RSFC and the RFPC were incorporated as for-profit, employee-owned corporations in November of 1989.¹³⁴ Boards of Directors were established and began meeting and planning. In January of 1990, Brett KenCairn, an experienced worker with non-profit organizations, was retained as Executive Assistant for the two companies.¹³⁵ The core group of organizers, still meeting under the title of "Labor-Environmental Group"¹³⁶ began to discuss the elements that were still missing from their plan with KenCairn. These discussions resulted in the plan to develop a non-profit organization that could attract funding and

¹³³Chris Bratt interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon; Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

The resolution was presented before the Executive Committee of the Oregon Chapter of the Sierra Club. No action was taken, and no communication, positive or negative, was received from the national offices of the Sierra Club. Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

¹³⁴Robert Sterling, "Unlikely Foes Fix Future in Forests," Medford (Oregon) Mail Tribune, 17 December 1989, sec. A, pp. 1, 5.

¹³⁵Rogue Sustainable Forestry Company, Board of Directors, minutes of meeting of 29 January 1990.

¹³⁶As listed in meeting minutes at the time.

conduct research, training, and outreach that was either not possible or not practical for the for-profit companies.¹³⁷

On 23 April 1990, Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Secretary of State of the State of Oregon incorporating the Rogue Institute of Ecology and Economy (RIEE) as a non-profit corporation. According to Article 9 of the amended Articles:

The purposes of the corporation are to engage in scientific research and education in forest ecology and economics in the public interest and such other lawful activities supportive of environmentally-sound forestry programs. The corporation will work to identify and implement means to advance the public interest in a bio-diverse forest ecosystem and also the public interest in economically productive and sustainable use of the forest ecosystem.¹³⁸

More specifically, the RIEE was designed to serve to train the RSFC and RFPC workers and educate the public in the techniques of NSF. It would also assist with the development and conversion of environmentally sound businesses, networking with suppliers and sellers for the products, and networking with organizations in other parts of the country attempting similar goals. Finally, the RIEE would undertake the scientific studies necessary to determine how to implement NSF on a regional scale.

¹³⁷Roy Ockert, interview by author, 30 December 1991, San Jose, California.

¹³⁸Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, "Articles of Amendment for Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy," 1 February 1991, p. 1.

The makeup of the board of directors for the RIEE was designed in order to provide, as nearly as possible, an equal voice for each of the groups that made up the coalition. Of the twelve members on the board, three were to be selected by the coalition of environmental groups represented in the initial meetings, three were to be selected by members of IWA Local No. 3-436, three were to be selected by the RSFC, and three by the RFPC.¹³⁹ KenCairn was hired to a part-time position as the Acting Executive Director of the RIEE, and the full Board of Directors met for the first time as such in August of 1990.¹⁴⁰

The Goals of the RIEE and Associated Corporations

According to the first paragraph of an early draft "Statement of Purpose" written in the fall of 1990, the RIEE was envisioned as

a grass-roots effort to join environmental and labor concerns into a new model for community-based sustainable forest product businesses. Members of these two groups have come together on the common ground of concern for the future of their communities and the forest ecosystems on which they depend.¹⁴¹

¹³⁹Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, "By-Laws," Draft #2, 3 April 1990, pp. 1-2.

¹⁴⁰Brett KenCairn, memo to the RIEE Board Members regarding next board meeting, August, 1990.

¹⁴¹Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, "Statement of Purpose," draft version completed late 1990, p. 1.

Discussing the future, the document continued:

The guiding vision shared by Institute board members is of a Pacific Northwest comprised of communities of various sizes, many of which derive stable economic livelihood from sustainable interactions with their surrounding natural environment. In this vision, the majority of workers in these communities would have direct power over their own economic well-being [sic] as owner or joint-owners of the [enterprises] for which they work.¹⁴²

The three goals that the RIEE identified as necessary in manifesting this vision were set forth as:

1. The development of a standard for forestry which is sustainable for both the community and forest ecology.
2. Support and enhance the stability of resource based communities through the development of sustainable resource businesses, economic diversification, and long-range planning assistance.
3. Create educational programs and settings which will provide greater dialogue and communication between a wide variety range [sic] of forest resource users.¹⁴³

A series of objectives with methods for accomplishing each of these goals was set forth in a later section of the document.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴²Ibid., 2.

¹⁴³Ibid., 2-3.

¹⁴⁴This document was written for the RIEE board members by Brett KenCairn. Although it was never formalized and never officially endorsed by the board, the goals and objectives set forth are accurate representations of the board's concerns at that time. Roy Ockert, interview by author, 30 December 1991, San Jose, California; Chris Bratt, interview by author, 30 November 1991, Ashland, Oregon.

Of the three goals, the development of a standard for forestry which is sustainable both to the community and to the forest ecosystem was seen as both the most important and the most difficult. The RIEE's stated mission was to create a Pacific Northwest in which the small communities dependent on their natural surroundings for economic survival would have control over the development and use of those resources and could thus manage them to provide economic stability indefinitely. Thus, defining "sustainable" in a way that can be practiced by the managers in real situations was crucial. Given the mounting evidence that current US Forest Service and corporate timber practices are not ecologically sustainable and ignore community stability entirely, the RIEE planned to look at other models, starting with NSF, to determine what truly "sustainable" forestry might look like. The board also planned the creation of a certification board, which would establish a method for certification of products produced by sustainable enterprises.¹⁴⁵

The second goal, that of supporting and enhancing the stability of resource-based communities through the development of sustainable resource businesses, was to be pursued in a number of ways. The first was to identify those workers most likely to be put out of work in the next

¹⁴⁵An important part of this process was to develop a trademarked stamp or seal that could be applied to these products to give consumers the information they need to consciously support such operations.

five years and determine their skills, resources and attitudes toward participation in worker-owned enterprises. The second was to inventory the human and material resources available to create a network of such enterprises. The third was to assist in the start-up of such enterprises, beginning with the RSFC and the RFPC. Finally, the RIEE would work with the Small Business Administration (SBA) to develop a business education program for forest product company start-ups.

The third goal, that of education and communication, was to be achieved through joining with other groups for the organization of and participation in various conferences to be held throughout the state. The RIEE planned to take the lead in organizing an annual Sustainable Forestry Conference, based largely on annual Sustainable Agriculture Conferences held in California and an Alternative Forestry Conference that was held near Eugene in November of 1990. The RIEE also planned to join with the Eugene/Springfield Solidarity Network (ESSN)¹⁴⁶ and the Labor-Environmental Solidarity Network (LESN)¹⁴⁷ in planning for an annual

¹⁴⁶ESSN was born during the 1988-1990 strike at the Morgan-Nicolai door manufacturing plant in Springfield, Oregon. The purpose of the group is to build a permanent community-wide network of people in the Eugene-Springfield area to support and defend the economic and political interests of working people.

¹⁴⁷LESN is a state-wide network of organizations and individuals working to bring the environmental and labor movements together to create an ecologically sustainable

Labor/Environment Summit, to be based largely on the "Striving for Unity: Workers in Transition" conference held in Eugene in December of 1990.

Goal Implementation Meets Reality

Efforts Toward Organization, Outreach, and Funding

By the fall, 1990, the RIEE had a full Board of Directors in place. The members selected by the environmental coalition were Chris Bratt, Myra Erwin and Doug Frank. The members selected by the IWA Local were Dennis Dawson, Roy Ockert, and Don Kruger, Vice-President of IWA Local No. 3-436 and a mill electrician at MedCo. The RSFC positions were filled by Anthony Boutard, Forester and Economist of Thousand Friends of Oregon¹⁴⁸; Mike Maas, President of the Forest Farm Association and private forestry consultant; and Jim Workman, a small-business consultant. The RFPC was represented by Ron Hodgdon, an advertising and marketing consultant; Pam Morey, the owner of a video production company; and Cheryl Smith, an investment counselor.¹⁴⁹

economy that provides decent, living wage jobs and health communities.

¹⁴⁸Thousand Friends of Oregon is state-wide citizen's land-use watch-dog group based in Portland, Oregon.

¹⁴⁹Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, "Description of the Institute Staff and Board," last quarter, 1991; RIEE Membership list, Board of Directors and Staff, 1 March 1991; and Brett KenCairn, memo to the Board

The Institute received a small grant almost immediately to support startup and additional grant-writing activities.¹⁵⁰ As the work on other issues progressed during the first part of 1991, efforts at grant-writing and fundraising were successful enough to fund the position of Executive Director full-time for the summer of 1991.

During the first year-and-a-half after incorporation, the RIEE embarked on many projects in pursuit of the goals it had set for itself.

Progress Toward the First Goal

The end-result of the work toward establishing a standard for sustainability was envisioned as some sort of a copyrighted logo or stamp that could be applied to products that were produced by sustainable forest-products operations. RIEE organizers hoped that when consumers were given enough information to make the decision, they would support sustainable forestry through their purchasing, much in the same way consumers seek out "organic" produce. Early discussions encountered two serious problems almost immediately. The first was regarding how to publicly distinguish their brand of sustainable forestry from those

of Directors regarding next board meeting, August 1990, pp. 1 and 2.

¹⁵⁰The grant was from the McKenzie River Gathering Foundation. Brett KenCairn, memo to the Board of Directors regarding next board meeting, August 1990, p. 1.

in practice by such diverse groups as the US Forest Service and corporate timber interests. The second problem arose over developing a standard that was flexible enough to be applicable to different operations working with different products under varying terrain and climatic conditions.

One difficulty in applying the idea of sustainable forestry arises with the definition and application of the term "sustainable"--what is it exactly that is being sustained? There currently exist any number of operations that claim to be doing ecologically sustainable forestry. The US Forest Service even practices what it calls "sustained yield" forestry, which implies some element of sustainability. Whether or not any of the models available would provide a truly ecologically sustainable forestry, however, was not enough for the RIEE organizers. Just as important was sustaining the workers and communities who depended on the forests for their livelihoods. Thus, any RIEE standard for sustainable forestry would necessarily include not only ecological standards for forest lands but standards for social and economic needs of workers and of their resource-based communities.

According to RIEE Board member Anthony Boutard, the ecological standards for setting up a sustainable forestry operation would be a relatively simple matter. The more difficult part was changing the way people think about sustainable forestry and what it is that is to be

sustained.¹⁵¹ The RIEE members recognized that entering a long-raging debate and attempting to redefine a key buzz-word was not the best use of their time or efforts. Because protecting workers and their communities from the boom-bust cycles and unfair and often hazardous labor practices of the corporate industry was every bit as important as ecological sustainability, the term "Community Forestry" was coined to more adequately express what the RIEE efforts were all about.¹⁵²

Once a definition of the objective was clarified, it became clear that establishing criteria by which to certify specific operations would be difficult. This led the group to tend away from very specific operational models in favor of broad guidelines.¹⁵³ Accordingly, they decided against adopting Camp's NSF as the sole method under which products could be certified.¹⁵⁴ A subcommittee was set up in the spring of 1991 to begin compiling information to be used in developing a Community Forestry standard based on the above. The group sought input from members of the labor and

¹⁵¹Anthony Boutard, telephone interview, 21 January 1992.

¹⁵²Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

¹⁵³Anthony Boutard, telephone interview, 21 January 1992.

¹⁵⁴Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

environmental organizations that founded the RIEE, scientists, community activists, residents, planners, economists, public officials, industry groups and small landowners. They also began to study the successful portions of models that have been used, including NSF and the system used by the Pacific Lumber Company in California prior to their corporate takeover in 1985.¹⁵⁵

Progress Toward the Second Goal

The RIEE was brought into being as a body that would support the development of the RSFC and the RFPC, but at the end of 1990 board members were having difficulty determining the appropriate relationship between the Institute and the companies.¹⁵⁶ This confusion was heightened by the fact that the companies themselves were in states of turmoil. The boards of directors for the two companies were identical, with the exception that Orville Camp served only on the RSFC board. According to a memo to the RIEE board members from then Executive Director KenCairn, since with the exception of Camp no one serving on the boards of the companies wanted to be actively involved in company

¹⁵⁵See Chapter IV.

¹⁵⁶Rogue Institute of Ecology and Economy, Minutes for Board of Directors meetings held 2 November 1990, and 7 December 1990.

business, they had "two businesses which are built largely on a hollow core."¹⁵⁷

Early discussions surrounding how to best support the RSFC focussed on the role of Orville Camp and NSF to the company and on whether the company would be able to begin by hiring qualified workers to do work directly or would have to contract work out to qualified companies. These questions were complicated by the fact that Camp already had a business that was doing NSF.¹⁵⁸ When the Institute decided early in 1991 that NSF would not be the exclusive method under which Community Forestry operations would be certified, Camp's role was defined as that of a potential contractor who could provide certified services to the RSFC. In February of 1991, John Dunn, an experienced forest manager and business student at Southern Oregon State College, joined the board of the RSFC and began to develop a business plan that called for the RSFC to develop as a marketing and administrative hub bidding jobs out to certified contractors. It was planned that, once a flow of contracts and capital were in place, the RSFC would begin hiring employees and doing the work directly.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷Brett KenCairn, memo to the Board of Directors regarding status of RSFC and RFPC, 5 November 1990, p. 1.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., 1-2.

¹⁵⁹Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Minutes for Board of Directors meeting held 1 February 1991; Brett KenCairn, memo to the Board of Directors regarding status of

The first opportunity for a RSFC forest management contract began to develop in 1990. A project first known as the "Stella Project" and later renamed the "Prospect Project"¹⁶⁰ was set up under the auspices of the Forest Service's New Perspectives program in the Rogue River National Forest. New Perspectives projects were set up in ranger districts throughout the western states between 1988 and 1991 as a way of allowing public involvement in the restructuring of Forest Service forest management practices. Each district implemented its own program with little guidance from above. The RSFC submitted proposals for a Forest Service contract or grant to assist the Forest Service in preparing an environmental assessment of an area near the Rogue Wild and Scenic River. Using the information obtained in that study, the RSFC then planned to work with the community to develop a model for sound management that would sustain jobs, forest products, and the environment of the area.¹⁶¹

RSFC and RFPC, 5 November 1990, pp. 2-3; and Brett KenCairn, interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

¹⁶⁰The project has since been renamed again as the "Peak Demonstration Project."

¹⁶¹Brett KenCairn, interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon; Chris Bratt, interview by author, 30 November 1991, Ashland, Oregon; Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon; and Chris Bratt, "Headwaters Continues to Promote Jobs Through Community Forestry," Headwaters Journal, Fall 1991, p. 25.

Early discussions surrounding how best to support the RFPC centered around the fact that the company had no entrepreneurial core.¹⁶² Although a number of schemes were discussed and a number of operational models were reviewed, the lack of a dedicated entrepreneur prevented this company from becoming established. A lack of funding has also prevented the surveys of workers and resources that were planned as part of the process of getting this entity up and running.

Progress Toward the Third Goal

The original strategy for achieving the third goal, that of creating educational programs and settings to foster communication between forest resource users, was to assist in the organization of two annual conferences. With their attention focussed on meeting the other two goals, RIEE board members had neither the time nor the resources to address this goal effectively. Brett KenCairn attributes this in part to the fact that their potential funding sources found this emphasis relatively less interesting than the other two.¹⁶³

¹⁶²Brett KenCairn, memo to the Board of Directors regarding status of RSFC and RFPC, 5 November 1990, pp. 2-3.

¹⁶³Brett KenCairn, interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

By March 1992, neither of the conferences specifically mentioned in the draft "Statement of Purpose" had occurred. However, RIEE board members have attended numerous conferences, workshops and meetings held throughout the western United States to share ideas and programs with groups promoting similar projects. They have also developed a slide-show and talk outlining their efforts, which Brett KenCairn presented before the Jackson County Labor Council.¹⁶⁴ RIEE members have maintained contacts with organizations such as the Labor/Environmental Solidarity Network and the Eugene-Springfield Solidarity Network, and have worked with education and information groups such as the Timber Crisis Clearing House¹⁶⁵ and the Working Group to Explore Timber Crisis Transition Policy Alternatives.¹⁶⁶

Although the original strategy for implementing the third goal did not materialize, the RIEE did become involved directly in the administration and development of a new

¹⁶⁴Ibid.; Chris Bratt, interview by author, 30 November 1991, Ashland, Oregon.

¹⁶⁵The Timber Crisis Clearing House is connected to the Labor Education Research Center at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. The Group's purpose is to collect, index, and make publicly available information regarding the timber crisis in the Pacific Northwest.

¹⁶⁶The Working Group, also based in Eugene, Oregon, put together a report on transition assistance programs recommending policies for sustainable forest management, restoration, log exports and value-added production, and assistance for individuals, families, communities and businesses in transition.

educational endeavor in Southern Oregon called The Ecoforestry Institute.¹⁶⁷ The Institute was formed in 1991 to use Orville Camp's Natural Selection Forestry as the mechanism by which to train and certify ecoforesters. In November of 1991 the Institute was given a \$150,000 grant,¹⁶⁸ to be dispersed over the following three years, to establish itself.¹⁶⁹ The RIEE agreed to administer the grant and provide other assistance to the Institute, one of whose explicitly stated goals is to provide qualified, certified Ecoforestry workers for the RSFC.¹⁷⁰

Current Status and Future Directions

After almost four years of work, and almost two years after incorporation, the RIEE has some victories and some setbacks, and has learned some lessons which will guide the future directions of the Institute. A review of the status of the Institute, the goals, and the corporations as of

¹⁶⁷Chris Bratt, interview by author, 30 November 1991, Ashland, Oregon.

¹⁶⁸The grant was given by the IRI-HITI Foundation for Deep Ecology. This foundation, begun by the founders of ESPIRIT clothing, has put over \$18 million into forest related environmental issues in recent years. Randy Hill, "Forestry Training School Organized in Selma," Medford (Oregon) Mail Tribune, 21 December 1991, sec. A, p. 4.

¹⁶⁹Ibid.

¹⁷⁰The Ecoforestry Institute, "Organization, Objectives and Development Plan," n.d., p. 4.

March 1992 serves as a good prelude to discussing the future plans of the RIEE.

Status of the RIEE

Following the busy summer of 1991, Brett KenCairn resigned his position of Executive Director and became a member of the Board of Directors for the RIEE. Jim Workman became Executive Director on a half-time basis in September of 1991.¹⁷¹ At that time, the RIEE was expecting income to be generated from the approximately 15 grant proposals they had outstanding.

The members of the board and staff of RIEE held a weekend retreat in October of 1991 to evaluate their progress and re-evaluate their goals.¹⁷² At the end of the retreat, the RIEE goals were stated as follows:

1. Define and advocate Community Forestry standards which sustain growth of the community and the forest ecosystem.
2. Advance the stability of resource-based communities through development of businesses which further economic and ecological diversification consistent with the goals of Community Forestry.

¹⁷¹Jim Workman, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

¹⁷²Brett KenCairn, interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

3. Create educational settings and programs fostering fruitful communication among the wide range of forest users.¹⁷³

With the important addition of the term "Community Forestry" in the first goal, as of October 1991 the stated goals of the RIEE remained essentially the same as those first set forth.

Also in October, the RIEE hosted a fund-raising dinner during which the board members shared the Institute's successes with about 130 members of the local community.¹⁷⁴ During this meeting a promotional pamphlet describing the RIEE's goals and programs was distributed, and supporters were promised a periodic newsletter updating them on the RIEE's efforts.

A major source of disappointment for the organizers of the RIEE has been the lack of involvement by the IWA Local No. 3-436. Despite the unanimous support for the "Saving the Jobs of Woodworkers" resolution, the Local never provided much active support to the Institute. This situation has been attributed to a number of causes. These include the change to a less favorable makeup of the Local's Executive Board,¹⁷⁵ and the fact that corporate timber

¹⁷³Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, promotional pamphlet, no date.

¹⁷⁴Brett KenCairn, interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

¹⁷⁵Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

industry propaganda has stirred up animosity toward anything labelled "environmental" over the past few years while perpetuating the "jobs vs. owls" myth, thus alienating workers from efforts such as this.¹⁷⁶ Whatever the cause, as early as December of 1990 RIEE board members were discussing whether or not, and how, to continue their efforts without participation of the Local.¹⁷⁷

One response has been to continue to court support of the Local, while actively seeking support from other unions. Brett KenCairn's presentation before the Jackson County Labor Council during the summer of 1991 was a first step in this direction. While this presentation generated positive feedback from unions representing teachers, office workers, and government employees, it also represented a broadening of scope that the RIEE was structurally unable to accommodate at the time. This tactic has not been actively pursued since that time.¹⁷⁸ A second approach, that of involving workers directly regardless of union affiliation, has not been actively pursued due to lack of resources.

As of March 1992, the founders and current board members do not consider the RIEE to be a true labor-

¹⁷⁶Dennis Dawson, telephone interview, 22 March 1992.

¹⁷⁷Rogue Institute of Ecology and Economy, Minutes for Board of Directors meeting held 7 December 1990.

¹⁷⁸Brett KenCairn, interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon; Chris Bratt, interview by author, 30 November 1991, Ashland, Oregon.

environmentalist coalition.¹⁷⁹ Dennis Dawson remains the only IWA Local No. 3-436 member active on the RIEE board.¹⁸⁰ Although Dawson feels that his position with the union is jeopardized by his continued affiliation with the RIEE, he intends to continue his work with the Institute.¹⁸¹ The prevailing opinion amongst the board members is that, ultimately, their vision cannot come to fruition without the full participation of working people in the community.

A second problem that has become acute in early 1992 has been a lack of funding support. The grant proposals that went out during the summer of 1991 did not provide the expected income, and by December funding for the position of Executive Director ran out. Accordingly, Jim Workman resigned from that position and resumed his seat on the Board of Directors in December of 1991.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹Brett KenCairn, Roy Ockert, Chris Bratt, Dennis Dawson, Jim Workman and Myra Erwin were all asked this question and responded negatively.

¹⁸⁰Roy Ockert resigned his position and moved out of the state at the end of 1990. Don Kruger, the third IWA Local No. 3-436 member elected to the board, still holds his seat. However, he has not been active since early 1991, and as of March 1992 is considering resigning. Dennis Dawson, telephone interview, 22 March 1992.

¹⁸¹Ibid.

¹⁸²Jim Workman, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

Current Status of the Goals

The bright spot in the RIEE activity in early 1992 has been in the effort to develop standards for Community Forestry. After more than a year of actively collecting and sifting through information, the sub-committee working on standards has developed a draft for peer review. Peer review is scheduled to end in May of 1992, after which time a broader public review period is scheduled to begin. In the meantime, discussions have begun with groups who are attempting to put together similar certification programs, such as the Institute for Sustainable Forestry, in Briceland, California.¹⁸³ RIEE organizers hope to have a certification program with consumer stamp, coordinated and consistent with other such programs, fully operational by the end of the 1992 calendar year.¹⁸⁴

Because the development and funding of the Ecoforestry Institute depended in part on the existence of an operating company that would employ certified Ecoforesters, Orville Camp and John Dunn accelerated the development of the RSFC. In order to get the company up and running as soon as possible, business plans have been drawn up and set in motion to establish the RSFC as an administrative and

¹⁸³The possibility of joint grants for development of this program is also being pursued.

¹⁸⁴Jim Workman, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon; Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

marketing body that will contract work out to certified Ecoforesters. In order to minimize the amount of startup capital necessary, the corporate structure was reorganized to eliminate the ESOP feature.¹⁸⁵ This development of the RSFC has proceeded largely independently of the RIEE.¹⁸⁶

Although the RSFC has begun to develop independently and the RFPC is currently in limbo, the Prospect Project continues to be pursued as an RIEE project. After the RSFC/RIEE reached initial agreement with the local ranger district over the project, the Forest Service was supposed to have entered into a memo of understanding with the group. For reasons attributed to pressure from higher up in Forest Service management, the ranger district backed away from that position and required that all commercial interests be represented by one group. After backing off yet farther and losing most of the budget for the project, the Forest Service changed the location of the area that the program was to be applied to and has once again begun collecting biological information, looking for volunteers, and seeking public input into the type of project to be put in place

¹⁸⁵Brett KenCairn, interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

¹⁸⁶While some RIEE board members feel that it was a mistake to let the RSFC be developed and tailored more to the needs of the Ecoforestry Institute, most felt that the accelerated development was beneficial. All felt, however, that the elimination of the ESOP was not a positive step, and hoped that it would be reinstated in the future.

there. RIEE members are attending all public meetings and are proposing a survey to determine how people in the local communities want to see the forest managed.¹⁸⁷

The RSFC's sister company, the RFPC, recently renewed its corporate status with the State of Oregon, but as of the end of March 1992, there is no board of directors and no planning activity.¹⁸⁸

Finally, the RIEE has been involved in planning for a sequel to the December 1990 "Striving for Unity: Economic Transition Programs for Workers and Communities in the Timber Crisis" conference. Tentatively entitled "Facing the Challenge Together: Economic Transition in the Pacific Northwest," the conference is scheduled to take place in Eugene in May of 1992.

Reevaluation of the RIEE and its Goals

Following the resignation of Jim Workman in December of 1991, the board members of the RIEE found themselves without an Executive Director or the funds to hire one. A committee of board members met four times in the last half of December 1991 to discuss "the Institute's purpose, personnel, accomplishments to this point, and realistic future

¹⁸⁷Myra Erwin, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon; Chris Bratt, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

¹⁸⁸Jim Workman, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

prospects."¹⁸⁹ The results of these meetings were summarized in a report that was presented to and discussed by the full board at their January 1992 meeting. The report broke the discussions down into three categories: the RIEE goals as set forth in the "Statement of Purpose"; the RIEE personnel and how best to accomplish their new goals; and, finally, the RIEE constituency, and how best to work with those people.¹⁹⁰

At the January board meeting, the directors decided that, at least on an interim basis, the mission of the RIEE was to promote "Community Forestry," which it defined as

the kind of forestry, on public and private lands, that contributes to the long-term sustainability of life in the forest and in the community, and the kind of economic development that enhances this same forest/community sustainability.¹⁹¹

As goals toward implementing this mission, the directors agreed

That the establishment and promotion of a workable system for certifying forest products, milled lumber, and secondary wood products become the primary focus in the immediate future.

¹⁸⁹The Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, report of the committee to re-think and focus the Institute's work, 7 January 1992, p. 1.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., 1-3.

¹⁹¹Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Minutes for Board of Directors meeting held 17 January 1992, p. 1.

That the Stella [Prospect] project be pursued actively as a community forestry demonstration and a source of certified wood from public lands.¹⁹²

It was decided that all other projects should temporarily be placed "on the back burner."

In order to carry out this work, the board decided to reorganize their structure. Committees were thus established as follows:¹⁹³

1. Steering/Development Committee, responsible for general administration, board and advisory board development, public relations and publications, and fund-raising. Members: Doug Frank (Chair), Jody Hodges,¹⁹⁴ Cheryl Patten,¹⁹⁵ and Jim Workman.
2. Certification Committee, responsible for developing and implementing the Community Forestry certification process. Members: Anthony Boutard and Michael Maas (Co-Chairs), Ron Hodgdon, and Brett KenCairn.
3. Prospect Project Committee, responsible for the Community Forestry demonstration project. Members: Myra Erwin and Chris Bratt (Co-Chairs), and Dennis Dawson.

It was decided that each committee would meet at least once between each monthly board meeting and would report to the board at each meeting. Finally, each committee was to develop a work plan, including goals, means of accomplishing their goals, a timeline for the year, and budgets.

¹⁹²Ibid., 1-2.

¹⁹³Ibid., 3.

¹⁹⁴Jody Hodges replaced Pam Morey on the RIEE Board of Directors.

¹⁹⁵Original board member Cheryl Smith.

Although no decisions were made at the January Board meeting regarding the report's recommendations on constituency, the proposals presented in the report have formed the bases for planning since January. Relevant to the idea of this being a labor-environmental coalition, the key amongst these proposals was

That as the International Woodworkers of America are not presently capable of becoming full partners in our work, the Institute style itself a community organization instead of a labor/environmentalist coalition, while keeping whatever lines of contact we can with the union.¹⁹⁶

The committee recommended that, as such, the Institute should put together a program of constituency development, focussing at first on small woodland owners, forest stewards, small wood products producers, and community supporters. The committee also recommended that the Institute become a membership organization charging a membership fee, and that a RIEE newsletter be published and sent to known supporters as soon as possible.¹⁹⁷

Outlook for the Future

According to Jim Workman, the Board of Directors of the RIEE is just now coming into its own. Rather than relying on an Executive Director or some other person, the board is

¹⁹⁶The Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, report of the committee to re-think and focus the Institute's work, 7 January 1992, p. 2.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., 2-3.

working as a group to define their priorities and implement appropriate programs.¹⁹⁸ With the help of an outside consultant, the board has begun a strategic planning process designed to produce a mission statement and an organizational strategy. As of the end of March 1992, the Community Forestry certification standards are undergoing peer review and a newsletter is being edited into final form.

Perhaps most exciting to some of the directors is the fact that the Institute's first product certification project is underway. The Avocet Corporation, distributors of bicycle components, has contracted with local producer Chinquapin Mountain Designs to provide 5,000 display boxes of certified blue-stain pine. RIEE board members have been involved in creating the prototype display box, educating those involved about the certification process, and procuring certifiable lumber. Production of the boxes is being viewed as a pilot project for working the bugs out of the certification process, and, once complete, will result in nation-wide distribution of a product displaying the certification stamp.¹⁹⁹ It is hoped that getting a product

¹⁹⁸Jim Workman, interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

¹⁹⁹Ibid; Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, "Steering Committee Report," 20 March 1992, p. 1.

on the market will stimulate the demand that will lead to further development of the overall efforts of the RIEE.

Although the RIEE continues to operate, and although some of the goals that the organization set for itself are apparently being or about to be met, the identity of the coalition has undergone a significant alteration during the first part of 1992. The recognition that the IWA Local has not been able to be a full partner in the organization has resulted in a fundamental change in how the RIEE is defining itself for the communities of Southern Oregon. What this change from a union-environmental group coalition to a "community organization" says for the future of the RIEE or the concept of labor-environmentalist coalitions will be discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

A WORKER-ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVIST COALITION:

THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

LOCAL NO. 1, MENDOCINO

COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

If experts, distant problem-solvers, and the rich and powerful seem perplexed, impotent, and avaricious, the appropriate solution is to devolve authority to those closer to home and to institutions grounded in the life of actual, textured communities.

Harry C. Boyte, Community is Possible

Mendocino County covers approximately 120 miles of coastline in Northern California, between Humboldt and Sonoma counties. The county's eastern border parallels the coast about 45 miles inland. The major population centers are the County Seat of Ukiah, inland, and Fort Bragg, on the coast. More than two-thirds of the population of 75,000 live in unincorporated, rural areas. Within the county, economic emphases can be divided into three regions. Along the coast, tourism dominates, while significant timber operations still exist at Fort Bragg. In the northern inland region, timber dominates, while the economy of the

southern inland region is based in timber, wine grape and pear growing, and government.²⁰⁰

Louisiana Pacific (L-P) is the largest private landowner and the largest single employer in Mendocino County.²⁰¹ By dominating the majority of what is left of the timber industry, Georgia Pacific (G-P), and Pacific Lumber Company (PALCO) combine with L-P to control a significant portion of the economy.²⁰² Indeed, a county Agricultural Commission report showed the value of timber harvested in 1989 to be in excess of three times greater than the value of wine grapes, the second most valuable crop.²⁰³

The same report showed that the timber harvest in 1989 was approximately 150% (in board feet) of the harvest in 1980.²⁰⁴ During that period, Census Bureau data show that the number of workers in the timber industry fell by 17%, resulting in the percentage of the population directly

²⁰⁰James Anderson, Deputy County Administrative Officer, County of Mendocino, interview by author, 25 March 1992, Ukiah, California; Mendocino County, Data Finder: Budget and General Information Booklet, 1989-90 (Ukiah, California: County of Mendocino, 1991), ii, 21.

²⁰¹Keith Michaud, "L-P Fined \$1,200 in Worker's Death," Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 21 December 1989, p. 1.

²⁰²"The Last Forests: Who's Taking What," Northcoast California Earth First! Newsletter, Earth Day 1987, p. 9.

²⁰³Mike Geniella, "Timber Production, Profits Soar," Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 4 April 1990, p. 1.

²⁰⁴Ibid.

dependent on the industry dropping from over 19% to about 13.5%.²⁰⁵ This drop can be attributed largely to the fact that during the 1980s the large corporations moved to replace their workers with automation and by contracting out some of their work. The latter trend has resulted in a rise in "Gyppo" operations, small independent companies who do the actual cutting and bring logs to the mills. L-P and G-P have also taken advantage of their trans-national status to close mills in this county and move them (both the machinery and the system capacity) to Mexico in search of cheaper labor and lax environmental standards.²⁰⁶

The major union representing workers in the industry has been the International Woodworkers of America (IWA), Local #3-469. During the 1980s the IWA membership nationally dropped from over 50,000 to the present level of about 25,000.²⁰⁷ During the same period, membership in the

²⁰⁵United States Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, California, 1980 (Washington DC: Government Printing Office), 99-101; United States Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, California, 1988 (Washington DC: Government Printing Office), 85.

²⁰⁶The most infamous of these was L-P's closing of the mill at Potter Valley in 1989, resulting in 136 workers losing their jobs. The equipment in the mill was subsequently shipped to a plant L-P built 70 miles south of the border in Mexico. See Mike Geniella, "'Global Economy' Pressures North Coast," Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 11 December 1989, sec. A, pp. 1, 11.

²⁰⁷Bill Street, Research Director, International Woodworkers of America, telephone interview, 2 March 1992.

local declined to the present level of about 460.²⁰⁸ This drop is largely attributable to an active union-busting campaign begun by L-P in 1983 that resulted in workers at 18 mills losing IWA representation,²⁰⁹ and by G-P's 1989 elimination of the Woods Division that resulted in total reliance on gyppos for all woods work, thus removing G-P loggers from IWA representation.²¹⁰

During the 1980s, increasing cut levels were combined with changing corporate practices, including instituting clear-cutting in areas previously managed otherwise, "liquidation" of old-growth forests to pay off the debt of corporations owned outside of the area, and the logging of smaller and smaller trees to be chipped rather than made into sawtimber. Seeing these trends, local community and environmental activists began to publicly insist on reforms to protect the ecological integrity of the region. The corporate industry's response was a high profile public relations campaign to frame the debate in terms of environmentalists trying to take the jobs of the workers through shutting down the industry. The mainstream press in

²⁰⁸Richard Carpenter, President, International Woodworkers of America Local No. 3-469, telephone interview, 2 March 1992.

²⁰⁹John Bellamy Foster, "Capitalism and the Ancient Forest," Monthly Review 43, no. 5 (October 1991): 12.

²¹⁰Mendocino Environmental Center, The Redwood Summer Information Packet (Ukiah, California: By the Mendocino Environmental Center, 1990), 21, 25.

the region faithfully reported the "environmentalist vs. workers" debate to the people in the region, while little was publicly reported outside of the area. Disgusted with what was happening, a small group of people began to work in the late 1980s to recast the terms of the debate in order to protect their communities from the ecological devastation and economic cycles they saw being inflicted upon them by outside corporations.²¹¹

Creating a Coalition and Establishing Goals

The First Catalyst: MAXXAM and PALCO

The first series of events that sparked community activists into action was initiated by the surprise leveraged buyout of PALCO by the MAXXAM Corporation in 1985. Locally owned and family operated for over a century, PALCO had been lauded by environmentalists as a good example of a large-scale operation that could be operated without clear-cutting large tracts of the native redwood forest. The company also had a reputation as having been careful to avoid displacing workers through automation. As of 1985 PALCO held about 98,000 acres of prime redwood groves, including some of the largest intact old-growth groves left

²¹¹Judi Bari, telephone interview, 10 February 1992.

in the world.²¹² Company assets and estimated lumber that could be taken from these groves were valued at about \$1.8 billion.²¹³

The MAXXAM buyout of PALCO was engineered by Texas millionaire Charles Hurwitz, already infamous as a corporate raider and developer of environmentally disastrous resorts. The Houston-based high finance holding company financed the \$1 billion buyout with junk bonds.²¹⁴ In order to pay the debt on the bonds, MAXXAM immediately began to liquidate its "assets." Accordingly, MAXXAM changed PALCO's selective logging policy to one of clear cutting, doubled the rate of cut within a year (and tripled it within three), and began

²¹²Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 24.

²¹³Mendocino Environmental Center, The Redwood Summer Information Packet (Ukiah, California: By the Mendocino Environmental Center, 1990), 23.

²¹⁴An interesting aside that goes some distance in explaining the community outrage that followed: Michael Milken and Boyd Jeffries, later convicted of felonies related to stock manipulation and fraud, assisted Hurwitz in the buyout by buying PALCO stock and transferring it to him. Ivan Boesky, also later convicted of related felonies, reportedly made millions of dollars through insider information on the deal. Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 22.

In addition, Columbia Savings & Loan, which held about \$70 million worth of the bonds, became another casualty in the savings and loan disaster when it failed in January of 1991. These bonds are now held by the federally operated Resolution Trust Corporation. Robert Reinhold, "Failure of S&L in California Could Save a Redwood Forest," New York Times, 27 March 1991, sec. A, p. 1.

working crews overtime.²¹⁵ In addition, through a refinancing scheme MAXXAM removed over two-thirds of the assets from the employees' \$90 million pension plan.²¹⁶

Although public reactions to this situation by environmentalists tended to be separate from those of the workers, some of the early work in forming a coalition of radical environmentalists and radical labor activists began at this time. Because of PALCO's long history as a company with a reputation of fairness toward its workers and communities, PALCO workers were not represented by unions, and unionization was not their first choice of recourse against the MAXXAM policies. One reaction was to bring in an outside consultant and try to set up an Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP), so that the workers could buy back the company and operate it with longer-range goals in mind.

²¹⁵Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 22; "MAXXAM: State Supported Terrorists," Northcoast California Earth First! Newsletter, Earth Day 1987, p. 1.

²¹⁶As further evidence of how deep this all went, it has subsequently been disclosed that the refinanced pension plan was purchased with junk bonds through Executive Life Insurance Company. Executive Life was itself a junk-bond financed company, which was the largest single buyer of the Drexel-Burnham junk bonds that financed the MAXXAM buyout of PALCO, owning one-third of the company's debt.

Executive Life was seized by insurance regulators in the state of California after failing in April 1991. In June of 1991, the federal government filed suit in federal court against MAXXAM over these arrangements. Judi Bari, Timber Wars and Other Writings (Ukiah, California: By the author, 1992), 65; Richard Stevenson, "2 Concerns Sued Over Pensions," New York Times, 13 June 1991, sec. D, pp. 1, 18.

When Hurwitz refused to even discuss selling the company to the employees, the ESOP plan died.

In their search for strategies of what to do next, some of the more radical workers met with then relatively unknown community activist Judi Bari. Bari showed them copies of Postal Strife, an underground newspaper she helped publish during a 1977-78 labor dispute at a bulk-mail center in Washington, DC. The paper used bitter sarcasm and cartoons to lampoon both management and their union leadership, which was actively working against them in the dispute.²¹⁷ The PALCO workers took the cue and started an underground paper of their own. Entitled Timberlyin' (as opposed to the Company paper, called Timberline) the paper told the workers what the bigger picture looked like and what PALCO's parent company was up to. Like Postal Strife, the paper mocked management and business unionism while calling for the workers to organize themselves for self-protection. Unfortunately, since the company fired or provoked the resignations of all of the people who were active in producing the paper, the third issue was its last.²¹⁸

²¹⁷Kathy Sawyer, "Long Hours, Job Hazards Fuel Strike Talk at Mail Center," Washington Post, 31 July 1978, sec A, p. 2.

²¹⁸Judi Bari, "Timber Wars," Timber Wars and Other Writings, (Ukiah, California: By the author, 1992), 4-5;

Earth First! and the Industrial Workers of the World?

Judi Bari dropped out of college and began her working career in factories in her native Baltimore. She spent two years as an organizer with the Retail Clerk's union there and five more years as an organizer for postal workers in Washington DC. She moved to Northern California in 1979, where she took a job as a carpenter for a small company building homes in rural Mendocino County.²¹⁹ While driving between her small, rural, working-class neighborhood and various job-sites, she witnessed firsthand the devastation of current logging practices near her home. When one day she realized that she was assembling a 25,000 square-foot weekend house for a wealthy San Franciscan using thousand-year-old redwood clear-cut from the forests near her home she decided that something had to change. She thus claims to have "come to environmentalism through being a carpenter."²²⁰

Bari was first attracted to the radical movement Earth First! (EF!) as a way to do something about the devastation of the place she lived because of its strategy of direct

Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²¹⁹Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 23.

²²⁰Trip Gabriel, "If a Tree Falls in the Woods, They Hear It," New York Times Magazine, 4 November 1990, 62.
Judi Bari, telephone interview, 10 February 1992.

action and its irreverent attitude, both strong elements in her past labor organizing efforts.²²¹ Formed in 1980 in response to a perceived lack of vision and effectiveness in the institutionalized environmental movement, EF! rallies around the slogan "No Compromise in Defense of the Earth!." EF! uses humor, music, and guerrilla theater to communicate issues as it sees them, and advocates tactics such as civil disobedience and sabotage where the tactics of more traditional organizations fail.²²² As with many environmental groups and the environmental movement in general, EF! membership grew dramatically throughout the 1980s.²²³

Being somewhat versed in radical labor movement history, Bari was also impressed with the apparent conscious modelling of much of the EF! movement on the traditions of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). The IWW, whose members are called "wobblies," was founded in 1905 and had its greatest successes organizing in the timber industry of

²²¹Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²²²For a description of the founding of EF!, see Dave Foreman, "Earth First!," in Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 11-23.

²²³Since EF! is a movement rather than an organization and keeps no membership list, it is difficult to say exactly what the membership was at any point. One probably conservative estimate is that it grew to 15,000 members by 1990. Trip Gabriel, "If a Tree Falls in the Woods, They Hear It," New York Times Magazine, 4 November 1990, 58.

the Pacific Northwest in the early part of the 20th century. The radical union, which still believes in "radical action and no compromise for worker-rights,"²²⁴ also has a tradition of using humor and song to define issues, as well as a history of direct actions which often resulted in violent reactions. The union never recovered after a 1917 peak of over 100,000 members was quickly eroded by mass government raids and arrests. When union headquarters were moved from Chicago to San Francisco in 1991 membership totalled less than one thousand.²²⁵

As she got involved in the EF! movement, Bari began to be appalled at the predominating environmentalist's anti-worker attitudes and the equating of loggers with the trans-national corporations that they worked for. Since the conditions of her life were much closer to those of the workers than to those of "environmentalists," she began to look for ways of joining these two related radical movements together to fight off the threats of forest ravishment and gentrification that she and her friends saw ruining their community. She started by presenting a workshop on the history of the IWW at the first EF! California Rendezvous

²²⁴Billy Don Robinson, as quoted in "Wobblies Bargaining in Oregon Again," Chicago Tribune, 12 October 1988, sec. F, p. 12.

²²⁵Carl T. Hall, "Historic Union Relocates to San Francisco," San Francisco Chronicle, 24 July 1991, sec. C, p. 1.

she attended, in 1987.²²⁶ Still relatively unknown in EF! circles, Bari's presentation, and the presence of IWW organizers she invited, attracted the attention of many EF!ers. By the end of the rendezvous, she had recruited a small number of Mendocino and Humbolt County EF!ers as card-carrying members of the IWW.²²⁷

IWW Local No. 1, Advocating for Workers

The second thing Bari did was to start telling local EF!ers about worker issues like those at PALCO, and to begin making those issues public as part of EF! demonstrations. It was this work that led Anna Marie Stenberg to contact Bari in February of 1989. Stenberg ran a day-care center near the G-P mill in Fort Bragg. One afternoon the father of one of her clients, a worker at the mill, came to pick up his child. He was in a rage over the management's response to an accident that had sent one worker to the hospital and contaminated several others, including himself, with PCBs.²²⁸

²²⁶EF! regional and national gatherings are called "rendezvous," and are generally held outdoors in wilderness areas.

²²⁷Gary Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California; Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²²⁸Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

Frank Murray, a mechanic at the mill, had a capacitor rupture in his face, forcing him to swallow mineral oil laden with PCBs. When he got to the hospital the shift manager arrived to tell doctors it was only mineral oil and there was no need to pump his stomach.²²⁹ Back at the plant, a garbage bag was taped over the leak, and paper towels used to clean up the mess by unprotected workers were burned, releasing dioxin. When three shifts later a number of workers had become ill and still G-P refused to close the area, workers called an OSHA emergency number and requested an inspection.

The subsequent OSHA investigation resulted in the plant being shut down for three days and cost the company \$435,000 in fines.²³⁰ When the workers union, the IWA, refused to press the matter with the company to get compensation for them, Bari and Stenberg agreed to represent them before OSHA. IWW Local No. 1 was chartered for this purpose, and twenty workers from the plant joined, against the express wishes of the IWA Local. They succeeded getting G-P cited

²²⁹A blood test taken at the time showed that it was indeed PCBs. The results of that test were subsequently "misplaced." Because after 72 hours PCBs do not show up in the bloodstream, a new test would not have shown the same results. Judi Bari, telephone interview, 10 February 1992.

²³⁰Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 23.

for "willful poisoning" of 17 employees, opening them up to civil suits and criminal charges.²³¹

In April of 1989, L-P closed Potter Valley mill, blaming the move on a log shortage caused by environmentalists. 136 people lost their jobs with that closure.²³² L-P subsequently shipped the equipment to a mill they were opening in Mexico, where they would pay the workers \$20,000 less per year to operate it and mill Mendocino County lumber.²³³ In the tradition of both EF! and the IWW, EF!/IWW co-organizer Darryl Cherney wrote a bitterly satirical song called "Potter Valley Mill," which included not-so-subtle references to sabotage. He and Bari recorded the song and took it to local country-western station KUTI, where it enjoyed several weeks as the station's number one requested song.²³⁴

²³¹Ibid., 23; Judi Bari, Timber Wars and Other Writings (Ukiah, California: By the author, 1992), 4.

G-P appealed this decision, and it was reversed on appeal. IWW Local No. 1 then appealed to the Department of Labor, which refused comment on the poisoning and dismissed the case, ruling the local did not have standing to represent the workers. Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²³²"L-P to Close Red Bluff Mill," Eureka (California) Times-Standard, 11 December 1988, p. 18.

²³³Mike Geniella, "'Global Economy' Pressures North Coast," Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 10 December 1989, sec. A, pp. 1, 11.

²³⁴Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 23.

In September of 1989, Fortunado Reyes, an L-P employee who had been laid off at Potter Valley and was subsequently re-hired for the night shift at L-P's Ukiah mill, was crushed to death as he was adjusting lumber being sorted automatically by heavy machinery. A subsequent OSHA investigation found that workers including Reyes had been discouraged from using safety procedures that stop machinery while they cleared jams because of the resulting loss in productivity. In December 1989 L-P was cited for three safety violations and fined \$1,200. Incredibly, the company appealed the fine. Criminal charges were later filed against L-P management in the case.²³⁵

At the end of 1989, Bari summarized these events and the work of local EF!/IWW organizers in an article published in Mendocino County's weekly Anderson Valley Advertiser. The article, entitled "Timber Wars," recast the

²³⁵Keith Michaud, "Worker Killed at Ukiah's L-P Mill," Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 15 September 1989, p. 1; Keith Michaud, "L-P Death Probe Reveals 3 Safety Violations," Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 21 November 1989, p. 1; Keith Michaud, "L-P Fined \$1,200 in Worker's Death," Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 21 December 1989, p. 1.

In September of 1990, L-P President Harry Merlo used this issue to perpetuate the "workers vs. environmentalists" debate in a memo sent to the employees of the Ukiah mill. In the memo, Merlo responded to negative press coverage of the criminal charges by stating that "L-P and its employees are the object of bitter criticism by the Mendocino County media, much of it, I believe, fueled by inflammatory claims by a few groups of rabid preservationists." Harry Merlo, memo to Ukiah employees, 18 September 1990.

"environmentalist vs. worker" debate into terms of "corporations vs. our community," and ended with the following observation:

Historically, it was the IWW who broke the stranglehold of the timber barons on the loggers and the millworkers in the nineteen teens. The ruling class fought back with brutality, and eventually crushed the IWW, settling instead for the more cooperative Business Unions. Now the companies are back in total control, only this time they're taking down not only the workers but the earth as well. This, to me, is what the IWW-Earth First! link is really about. And if the IWW would like to be more than a historical society, it seems that the time is right to organize again in timber.²³⁶

Gaining Momentum and Broadening Support

According to Bari, the effort reached its high point at the approximately concurrent conclusion of two further events. On 28 March 1990, L-P announced that it was going to close its mill in Covelo and end its night shift at the Ukiah mill, resulting in the laying off of 195 workers. L-P spokespersons attributed the closures to reduced timber sales on public lands and "the combined effects of preservationist pressures, the uncertainty of the designation for the spotted owl, and expanding parks and wilderness areas."²³⁷ On the same day, L-P released its

²³⁶Judi Bari, "Timber Wars," Anderson Valley Advertiser, October 1989, as reprinted in Timber Wars and Other Writings (Ukiah, California: By the author, 1992), 3-5.

²³⁷Mike Geniella, "L-P Cutting 195 Mill Jobs," Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 29 March 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 12.

1989 annual report, which announced all-time record sales and earnings for the company for the third year in a row. The same report told stockholders that L-P would be opening a "remanufacturing facility" in Mexico during the spring where they would mill "rough, green lumber" barged down from northern California mills.²³⁸

Workers, community members, local and state politicians, and environmental groups were all quick to condemn the L-P plans, noting that this combination of actions was further evidence the corporation cared less for the workers and communities than for the bottom line.²³⁹ Riding this tide of public opinion, on 3 April 1990, a united group of IWW Local No. 1 members, L-P workers, and EF! spokespersons, appeared together publicly for the first time in front of the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors. Drawing on legally upheld precedents in Ohio and

²³⁸This is the same mill that the equipment from the Potter Valley mill was sent to. The semantics of the "remanufacturing" of "rough, green lumber" should also be examined. L-P claimed that it was exporting milled lumber to Mexico to be "remanufactured." Thus they were able to legally claim that they were not exporting raw logs, and hence the mill jobs of Californians. For the purposes of the law, however, a log cut in half qualifies as "rough, green lumber." It takes considerably fewer people to cut logs in half than it does to make them into finished lumber. Mike Geniella, "Stockholders Get Better News," Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 29 March 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 12.

²³⁹Ibid.; Keith Michaud, "Valley L-P Mill Closures Shock Lawmakers, Locals," Fort Bragg (California) Advocate-News, 5 April 1990, p. 1.

Pennsylvania, they demanded that the county use its power of eminent domain to confiscate the L-P forest lands and mills in the county and operate them in the public interest for the community. Bari and Cherney ended the demonstration by playing a song promoting the use of "right brain activity."²⁴⁰ Although the Board took no action that day, Supervisor Norman de Vall met with the group in a public restaurant during the lunch break to discuss their proposal.²⁴¹

At about the same time, Bari had attended the Public Interest Law Conference in Eugene, Oregon.²⁴² As a speaker invited to discuss "labor and the environment," Bari was concerned that there was not actually a "worker" scheduled to speak. To remedy this, she invited Gene Lawhorn, a

²⁴⁰Mendocino County Board of Supervisors, minutes of meeting held 3 April 1990, p. 291; Keith Michaud, "Board Asked to Take Over L-P," Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 3 April 1990, p. 1; Mike Geniella, "Earth First! Protests L-P Layoffs," Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 4 April 1990, sec. B, pp. 1, 4.

²⁴¹As evidence of how seriously the proposal was taken, an aide from the office of State Senator Barry Keene appeared at this lunch-time meeting, obviously very upset, demanding to know what was happening. Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²⁴²Bari and conference organizers were "warned" by members of the AFL-CIO unions that she should not attend this conference. Mark Stein, "Victims of Blast Arrested: Earth First! Activists Blamed for Explosion," Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 26 May 1990, sec. A, p. 4.

millworker from Roseburg, Oregon, to join the panel.²⁴³ Lawhorn discussed the EF! endorsed practice of tree spiking,²⁴⁴ and the recent history of a man in a mill in Cloverdale, California, who was nearly killed when a saw-blade shattered after hitting a spike.²⁴⁵ He suggested that if EF! wanted to get the support of workers, it would renounce the practice of tree-spiking.²⁴⁶ Bari agreed, and received a standing ovation. About one week after the meeting with the Mendocino County Commissioners at which the eminent domain issue was discussed, Bari, Cherney, several other northern California EF! spokespersons, and a number of IWW representatives, publicly renounced the practice of tree spiking in a press release, which read, in part:

Through the coalitions we have been building with lumber workers, we have learned that the timber corporations care no more for the lives of their employees than they do for the life of the forest. Their routine maiming and killing of millworkers is coldly calculated into the

²⁴³Lawhorn was also warned not to appear at this conference. Gene Lawhorn, interview by author, 21 March 1992, Portland, Oregon.

²⁴⁴Perhaps ironically, the first use of tree spiking can be traced to the IWW as a method of stopping strike breakers. Dave Foreman, Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 152-153.

²⁴⁵Although it was determined that EF! was not responsible for that spike, timber corporations and Yellow-Ribbon organizers were able to generate negative feeling through liberal access to a sympathetic press. Ironically, the worker who was hit by the blade now has the carpentry job that Bari held before she was disabled.

²⁴⁶Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 24.

cost of doing business, just as the destruction of whole ecosystems is considered a reasonable by-product of lumber production. These companies would think nothing of send [sic] a spiked tree through a mill, and relish the anti-Earth First! publicity that an injury would cause.

. . . [I]n our area, the loggers and millworkers are our neighbors, and they should be our allies, not our adversaries. Their livelihood is being destroyed along with the forest. The real conflict is not between us and the timber workers; it is between the timber corporations and our entire community. . . .

Equipment sabotage is a time-honored tradition among industrial workers. It was not invented by EF!, and it is certainly not limited to EF!, even in our area. But the target of monkeywrenching was always intended to be the machinery of destruction, not the workers who operate that machinery for \$7/hour. This renunciation of tree spiking is not a retreat, but rather an advance that will allow us to stop fighting the victims and concentrate on the corporations themselves.²⁴⁷

Although EF! organizers in southern Oregon issued a similar, softer worded statement, EF! members in other parts of the country were adamantly opposed to such a stance.²⁴⁸ This action touched off a controversy over goals and tactics at the national level of EF! that continues today.

²⁴⁷Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney, "Tree Spiking Renounced Behind Redwood Curtain," Earth First! Journal, 1 May 1990, p. 13.

²⁴⁸Tree spiking is one of the basic tactics that has been endorsed by EF! at the national level since very early in the movement. For a justification of the practice, see Dave Foreman, "Is Tree Spiking Necessary?," in Confessions of an Eco-Warrior (New York: Harmony Books, 1991), 144-160.

Goal Implementation Meets Reality

The Status of IWW Local No. 1, Spring, 1990

As of the Spring of 1990, the IWW Local No. 1 was still a small group of people. It consisted of primarily of Bari and Stenberg, a number of workers, most of whom were G-P employees working on the PCB issue, a small number of local EF! organizers, including Cherney, and the directors of the Mendocino Environmental Center, Gary and Betty Ball. Although small, the group was very visible and was gaining support in the community. Workers began slowly to trust the organizers, and contacted them with information from inside or with pleas for support in battles against the corporations they worked for.

It was still too early in the organizing process to start making concrete plans for the future, but organizers did begin to make their framework public. The entire struggle was based on perceptions of what large, outside corporations were doing to their community. They believed that if an area did not have to supply timber to Mexican mills or feed corporate debts and the salaries of far-away millionaires, then comfortable, sustainable, resource-based lifestyles were possible in their communities. Therefore, their first priority was to rid the region of industrial corporate logging and its practices of cutting old-growth, clearcutting, and turning whole forests of immature trees

into chips for particle-board. This system would ideally be replaced by a locally owned and controlled, small-scale, restoration-based sustainable economy. They had not yet defined all of the terms or developed any concrete plans for implementing this change when the next round of activity changed the nature of their group and their efforts.²⁴⁹

The "Forests Forever Initiative"

The Forest and Wildlife Protection and Bond act of 1990 ("Forests Forever Initiative") qualified for California's November ballot in spring of 1990. The initiative would have prohibited clearcutting, adopted sustained yield standards, and provided for the protection of wildlife. It would also have provided funds to purchase several thousand acres of MAXXAM-owned virgin redwood forest.²⁵⁰ The timber corporations, sensing possible restrictions on their operations, mounted several high-powered responses. The first was to qualify a more moderate initiative for the ballot.²⁵¹ Another response was to step up the cut to the

²⁴⁹Gary Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California; Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²⁵⁰The area of particular interest, the "Headwaters Forest," was the largest unprotected, undisturbed grove of redwoods left in the world at that time. Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 24.

²⁵¹By the time of the vote in November, a third, compromise initiative was on the ballot.

highest levels their workers and equipment could maintain in order to get out as many logs stockpiled as possible before the vote.²⁵²

The local EF! organizers responded to these developments in March by calling for "Mississippi Summer in the Redwoods." Shortened to "Redwood Summer," it was modelled both in design and in rhetoric after the civil-rights rally in the 1960s. The idea was to bring in as many peaceful people to do civil-disobedience as possible with the object of slowing logging to a level such that the Forests Forever Initiative would be applicable to something other than stumps. Information packets and press material specifically stated that tree-spiking and property damage would not be endorsed as a part of the activities. Pledges of non-violence, which included prohibitions on property damage and physical or verbal abuse of loggers and police, were mandatory for all participants. Non-violence training was offered, as were forest safety and first aid workshops, sessions on local flora, fauna, culture and politics. The calls for participants included language calling for the end

²⁵²State figures showed that, even after the record harvest of 1989, lumber companies in Mendocino were cutting at a rate that was 320% greater than the rate at which replanted forests were growing. Linda Goldston, "Tempers Could Flare As Summer of Protests Over Forests Heats Up," San Jose Mercury News, 20 May 1990, sec. A, p. 24.

of a form of bigotry they called "speciesism," in effect calling for civil rights for other life forms.²⁵³

Organizers therefore were careful in their statements and published materials to define the issues such that they would promote an attitude that would avoid bigotry between human groups as well. Bari was quoted in an article making this point as saying "The battle is not between the timber workers and environmentalists, it's between giant logging corporations and our community."²⁵⁴ She knew at the time that focussing her efforts on this issue would be at the expense of working on the labor coalition, and that the possible effect of bringing students and other activists to the community would be to alienate the workers away from her forever. To counter against this possibility, an attempt was made to make Redwood Summer a coalition-sponsored event. The IWW, the Mendocino Environmental Center, and Seeds of Peace, a San Francisco-based group known for providing logistical support to Nevada test-site demonstrators, became co-sponsors in April 1990.

²⁵³Darryl Cherney, "Freedom Riders Needed to Save the Forest," Earth First! Journal, 1 May 1990, pp. 1, 6; Linda Goldston, "Tempers Could Flare As Summer of Protests Over Forests Heats Up," San Jose Mercury News, 20 May 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 24; Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 20; Karen Pickett and Woody Joe, "Redwood Summer Goes On!," Earth First! Journal, 21 June 1990, p. 1.

²⁵⁴Darryl Cherney, "Freedom Riders Needed to Save the Forest," Earth First! Journal, 1 May 1990, p. 1.

Assassination Attempt

From the beginning of the planning for Redwood Summer, the corporations, their newspapers, local politicians and law enforcement officials defined the issues of the impending summer of activities as a bunch of liberal activist-environmentalists coming from the cities to take jobs away from the local people. They stated over and over again that these outsiders intended violence against the workers, their families, and their communities. Copies of press releases the companies knew to be phony, supposedly written by EF!ers and calling for EF!ers to spike trees, destroy property and use violence "if necessary," were distributed in PALCO and L-P mills.²⁵⁵ Fanning the flames, in May of 1990 IWA Local No. 3-469 Financial Secretary and Business Representative Don Nelson wrote a letter to the editor of a local paper stating

Environmentalists-Preservations, [sic] of whatever stripe, are our enemies. They are out to get us. When the fight comes on the initiatives in November, there may be no middle ground. . . . Now they have driven us to join with some strange bedfellows in opposing them every step of the way.²⁵⁶

²⁵⁵Judi Bari, Timber Wars and Other Writings (Ukiah, California: By the author, 1992), 24.

²⁵⁶Don Nelson, "Treat Us With Respect," letter to the editor of The Country Advocate, 18 May 1990. Reprinted in Mendocino Environmental Center, The Redwood Summer Information Packet (Ukiah, California: By the Mendocino Environmental Center, 1990), 262.

Repeated statements predicting violence came from such diverse people as State Senator Barry Keene, the Sierra Club's California State Forest Practices Task Force Chair Gail Lucas, and several representatives of the Mendocino County Sheriff's Department.²⁵⁷

From the outset the corporations and their supporters suggested and applauded violence against organizers and demonstrators.²⁵⁸ In addition, Bari and other organizers began to get an increased number of death-threats. One of the threats was particularly disturbing. It arrived in the form of a photo nailed to the front door of the Mendocino Environmental Center in Ukiah. The picture of Bari's head with the cross-hairs of a rifle scope superimposed over it was made from a newspaper photo taken at the County Supervisor meeting where she and other activists had requested the use of eminent domain against L-P. In response to her report of the death threats, the local police stated that they did not have the man-power to do

²⁵⁷Linda Goldston, "Tempers Could Flare as Summer of Protests Over Forests Heats Up," San Jose Mercury News, 20 May 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 24; Keith Michaud, "Valley L-P Mill Closures Shock Lawmakers, Locals," The Fort Bragg (California) Advocate-News, 5 April 1990.

²⁵⁸A disturbing sample of memoranda distributed within PALCO and between PALCO and L-P is provided by Judi Bari in "The PALCO Papers," Earth First! Journal, 21 March 1991, p. 38.

anything, but that they would investigate if she turned up dead.²⁵⁹

In response to the threats of violence surrounding the summer's activities, the Mendocino County Supervisors made discussion of Redwood Summer a special agenda item for their May 1, 1990 meeting and requested that EF! organizers come and explain their supposed threats of violence against the community. Put on the defensive in a very hostile atmosphere, the organizers again reiterated their pledge of non-violence, and took control of the situation by offering to meet with representatives of corporations, gyppo operators, workers, and local law-enforcement people in order to assure peaceful demonstrations.²⁶⁰

The result of this offer was a series of meetings held in Willits and other communities to organize the summer's activities. By again recasting the debate in terms of large, outside corporations vs. the community, organizers were able to appeal to locals as neighbors and to the local gyppo owners as part of a fight to give them more control over their businesses. A result of these meetings was that, prior to the beginning of the Redwood Summer activities, a group of 21 environmentalists and small logging and mill

²⁵⁹Judi Bari, telephone interview, 10 February 1992; Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 26.

²⁶⁰Mendocino County, Board of Supervisors, minutes of the meeting held 1 May 1990, p. 323.

companies signed an "no first-strike" agreement containing ground rules to keep the demonstrations non-violent.²⁶¹

Immediately after the second of these meetings, organizers Bari and Cherney left Willits for a planning session in Santa Cruz. The following morning, May 24, while in Oakland, a pipe-bomb exploded in their car, nearly killing Bari and seriously injuring Cherney. The two were arrested the next day on charges of "illegal possession and transport of explosives," and the national press tried and convicted them within a few short days.²⁶²

The charges were dropped and no case ever filed against the two, presumably for lack of evidence. The real bomber has not been publicly identified. A number of theories exist, and the Oakland Police Department and the FBI have been named in a suit charging complicity.²⁶³ But the effect of harassment by federal and local law enforcement agencies in Oakland and Mendocino county, combined with the conviction by the press, did serious damage to the EF!/IWW coalition. Past members and allies, ranging from workers

²⁶¹Gary Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California; Elliot Diringer and Sharon McCormick, "'Avenger' Claims Earth First! Bomb," Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 1 June 1990, sec. A, p. 4.

²⁶²Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 26; Mark Stein, "Victims of Blast Arrested," Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 26 May 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 4.

²⁶³Bari v. Held was filed in May of 1991.

and gypso owners to the county commissioner who supported the eminent domain request, questioned claims of non-violence and turned away from the movement, either because they believed the press or they feared similar treatment.²⁶⁴

Redwood Summer

Despite the attempted assassination and the campaign to discredit the organizers that followed, Redwood Summer occurred as scheduled. There are some signs that, despite the obvious damage done by the bombing, Redwood Summer may have had some beneficial results for the IWW/EF! coalition.

Bari was disabled for the entire summer and Cherney spent much of the first part of the summer recovering physically and fighting FBI charges that he was involved in the bombing. Other key Redwood Summer organizers also spent much of their time supporting Bari and Cherney. The gap was filled primarily by EF! organizers from other parts of the country, but, whether due to the original issues or the perceived government oppression around the bombing, additional support came from a broad coalition of groups. Before the summer was over, physical or financial support had been offered or received from groups including Greenpeace, Rainforest Action Network, International Indian Treaty Council, Earth Action Network, Seeds of Peace, the

²⁶⁴Betty Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

National Toxics Coalition, Mendocino Environmental Center, American Civil Liberties Union, American Peace Test, Amnesty International, the Center for the Practice of Nonviolence, and the National Layer's Guild.²⁶⁵

It is estimated that as many as 3,000 people from all over the country participated in Redwood Summer activities. In what has to be viewed as a tribute to organizers, with the exception of a few cases of assault initiated by counter-demonstrators or sheriffs deputies, the protests remained non-violent.²⁶⁶ The most visible measure of victory, however, is in the way that the local community responded to the final large-scale demonstration, held in Ft. Bragg, on 21 July 1990.

The demonstration began when about 2,000 people gathered at the south end of town. At the same time, about 1,500 counter-demonstrators gathered at the north end of town. At about 2 pm, Redwood Summer participants began to march toward the center of town to the G-P mill that was to serve as the site of the demonstration. They were met there by several hundred counterdemonstrators. Once in position,

²⁶⁵Karen Pickett, "Redwood Summer Retrospective," Earth First! Journal, 1 November 1990, pp. 8, 9.

²⁶⁶Several protesters were beaten at various protests during the summer, and four men had their heads forcibly shaved after being arrested at a protest in Humboldt County. The ACLU later filed charges against the sheriff's department over this incident. "Redwood Summer Activists Harassed by Police," Earth First! Journal, August 1, 1990, p. 7.

the demonstrators set up a sound-truck and a small stage, and began to perform music and to listen to speakers. A part of the demonstration was the symbolic deeding of the mill to the people of Fort Bragg. Speakers also called for the end to plant emissions of dioxins and other toxics. Then, two of the counterdemonstrators were invited to address the crowd.²⁶⁷

The first expressed confusion over what was happening to the community in general and over what was happening that day. The second speaker was Fort Bragg native Duane Potter. He shared his experiences as a fisherman and a logger with the crowd, and explained that he could no longer do either because there were no fish and there were no logs. He stated that the corporations were to blame for this. He then stated his support for the demonstrators and their goals. In an interview given two weeks later, Potter, who had no previous contact with Redwood Summer organizers, was asked "what prompted you to get up on the truck . . . and talk to both crowds?" He responded, in part:

At the logger's rally that day [State Representative] Doug Bosco told folks to go home and clean up their own back yards. What I got there was that he didn't want any communication. Which is ridiculous because we're all in this boat together. . . . What I want to do is get in there and get some talking going between the owners of the operations and the loggers and get them to listen to their workers and the environmentalists and

²⁶⁷"Two Thousand Rally at Fort Bragg," Earth First! Journal, 1 August 1990, p. 7.

come to some neutral ground. . . . But nothing will take effect if there's no communication.²⁶⁸

In the final analysis it appears that Redwood Summer was a success in this regard. For the first time, issues of the impacts of large-scale corporate logging on the environment and on local communities was given meaningful press coverage outside of the region.²⁶⁹ An important network was established regionally as well. The meetings that began in Willits between loggers, workers and Redwood Summer organizers spread and continued throughout the summer. Meetings were held every week from May to September in locations in Sonoma, Mendocino and Humboldt counties. Regular attendees included County Supervisors, gyppo owners, loggers and millworkers, IWW members, and EF! activists.²⁷⁰ Computer information networks and phone-banks were set up to provide up-to-date information to all of these groups. These networks of people provided the basis of the organizing that continues today.

²⁶⁸Lynne Dahl, "One Worker Speaks Out: An Interview With Duane Potter," Anderson Valley Advertiser, 15 August 1990, p. 1.

²⁶⁹Articles discussing "the corporate plunder of the forests" appeared in Newsweek, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and The London Times, for example. Karen Pickett, "Redwood Summer Retrospective," Earth First! Journal, 1 November 1990, pp. 8, 9.

²⁷⁰David Chism, interview by author, 25 March 1992, Arcata, California.

Current Status and Future Directions

Status of IWW Local No. 1, March 1992

The organization and the movement that gave birth to this coalition have undergone significant change since the summer of 1990. Facing heavy pressure of his own from the FBI, Dave Foreman, co-founder of the Earth First! movement, very publicly left the movement in September of 1990. In a none-too-subtle reference to the Northern California activists and their programs, Foreman cited as the reason for his departure his discomfort with a "transformation to a more overtly counterculture/anti-establishment style, and the abandonment of biocentrism in favor of humanism."²⁷¹

Bari countered

we are too irreverent and we have too much a sense of humor to be considered leftists. Besides, we are not trying to overthrow capitalism for the benefit of the proletariat. In fact, the society we envision is not spoken to in any leftist theory I've ever heard of. Those theories deal only with how to redistribute the spoils of exploiting the earth to benefit a different class of humans. We need to build a society that is not based on the exploitation of the earth at all--a society whose goal is to achieve a stable state with nature for the benefit of all species.²⁷²

When the dust settled and the nationally recognized names in the movement had all chosen sides, there was confusion from

²⁷¹Dave Foreman and Nancy Morton, "Good Luck, Darlin'. It's Been Great," Earth First! Journal, 22 September 1990, p. 5.

²⁷²Judi Bari, "Expand Earth First!," Earth First! Journal, 22 September 1990, p. 5.

within and from outside as to what (and who) was Earth First!

Early in 1991, most of the EF! groups on California's northcoast came together under the moniker of Ecotopia Earth First!, after the vision of novelist Ernest Callenbach.²⁷³ As the groups had been working together closely for years, this consolidation did not represent anything new in the way they operated. It did offer a way, however, to deal with outside groups in a unified manner.

In a series of events slightly reminiscent of Foreman's departure from EF! a year earlier, a controversy erupted in early 1992 regarding the editorial policies of the Earth First! Journal and the directions the movement seemed to be headed in. In March of 1992, after a stormy national conference held in Portland to discuss these issues, Ecotopia EF! voted to secede as a whole from the EF! movement. After a meeting held to decide what they should become, they decided that they had always been Ecotopia Earth First!, and therefore they would retain the name. They also voted that future emphasis would be placed on Ecotopia rather than on Earth First!. They have begun work

²⁷³Ernest Callenbach, Ecotopia (Berkeley, California: Banyan Tree Books, 1975).

on a statement clarifying their ideology, which they plan to issue soon.²⁷⁴

In addition, in 1991, after being headquartered in Chicago for 86 years, the IWW moved its offices and leadership to San Francisco. This move followed a slow decline in membership worldwide to a low of about 500, and a loss of key organizers in Chicago. The new general secretary-treasurer, Jess Grant, noted that the goals of the IWW had not changed with the move. "We're trying to fundamentally alter the social system. We're trying to create a better world in which workers have control over their lives."²⁷⁵

Consistent with its parents, as of the end of March, 1992, IWW Local No. 1 is "in complete disarray."²⁷⁶ Following the final appeal of the G-P case before OSHA, many of the original workers left the group. By the time Bari came back from injuries suffered in the bombing, Redwood Summer was over and there was not an employed logger or millworker left in the local. Shortly thereafter, co-founder Anna Marie Stenberg resigned as well. As of March

²⁷⁴Betty Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California; Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²⁷⁵Dan Frost, "IWW Tries to Shake Wobbly Reputation by Laboring in Bay Area," Chicago Tribune, 12 December 1991, sec. C, p. 29.

²⁷⁶Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

of 1992, all of the handful of members of the local are also members of Ecotopia EF!.²⁷⁷ Organizers hope that this will change, however, as the groups they are working with become more diverse.

Status of Work

Bari spent most of the first year after the bomb in hospitals and physical therapy, and is still spending a large percentage of her time pursuing the truth and trying to expose the role of the FBI in the bombing and the subsequent investigation. These time constraints, combined with a physical inability to travel like she used to, have forced a change in her role from that of organizer and spokesperson to that of a behind-the-scenes strategist. She has been writing a semi-regular column for the Anderson Valley Advertiser, and only recently began to make public appearances again.²⁷⁸

Fellow IWW Local No. 1 members Betty and Gary Ball, who run the Mendocino Environmental Center in Ukiah, have been working with Bari to try and arrange a series of community meetings to discuss options for the future of Mendocino County with the people who live there. The idea is to hold

²⁷⁷Gary Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

²⁷⁸Judi Bari, telephone interview, 10 February 1992; Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

a free public discussion in Ukiah with four to six panelists, including Bari and Jerry Philbrick, a gyppo owner who began working with EF!/IWW organizers during Redwood Summer. As planned, this presentation would be followed by public comment and small-group discussions, and the day would end with the full group re-convening to discuss what was learned. Ideally this process would be repeated in other communities. Since L-P (through members of the community) has become involved in the planning process and begun to try and influence when and where the meeting would take place and who would be on the panel, progress toward holding the first meeting has slowed considerably.²⁷⁹

A slightly perverted version of this meeting did take place in Ukiah at the end of March, 1992. Dubbed the "Economic Summit," the conference was held on two consecutive week days and attendees were charged \$30. The process of panels and small group discussions planned for the above talks was used at this summit. Betty and Gary Ball surprised many by attending and participating in the summit. They find that people are still surprised that they are not unreasonable extremists out to disable the entire economy, but that they can be talked with rationally. They feel that participating in meetings such as these, as well

²⁷⁹Betty Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California; Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

as participating in ongoing EF! meetings, IWW meetings, and less formal meetings with community members, helps in fostering the mutual understanding that is necessary in creating a dialogue.²⁸⁰ While Bari agrees with this assessment, she was critical of the summit, which by virtue of its design prohibited any meaningful participation of working people, who largely cannot afford 2 weekdays and \$30. She feels that such an important segment of the population should not be excluded from a process as important as planning the economic future of a region. She intends to hold a true community forum if she and Jerry Philbrick have to plan it themselves.²⁸¹

The IWW Local No. 1 group is also lobbying in support of the efforts of the Mendocino Forest Advisory Committee (FAC). This citizen committee was formed by the Board of Supervisors in 1989 to develop forest practices to be used within the county. The FAC, which was given increased political space and a renewed sense of urgency during Redwood Summer,²⁸² issued its final report in January of

²⁸⁰Betty Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California; Gary Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

²⁸¹Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

²⁸²James Anderson, interview by author, 26 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

1992.²⁸³ The rules proposed in the report, designed to promote sustainable forestry and remove incentives for short-term management practices, are more stringent than those enforced by the State. County Supervisors are currently holding hearings to decide whether or not to adopt the rules.²⁸⁴

On a less formal basis, organizers are networking with and supporting the efforts of people and organizations trying to create a sustainable forest-products economy in the region. One such group is the Institute for Sustainable Forestry, located in Briceland, in southern Humboldt County. The Institute is dedicated to public education and professional training for the development of an ecologically sustainable forest products industry, and one of its goals is to establish a certification and labelling program that it calls Pacific Certified Ecological Forest Products. Institute staff and advisors have agreed on the principals and are currently developing an exact procedure for attaining this certification.²⁸⁵ IWW Local No. 1 organizers

²⁸³Mendocino County, Forest Advisory Committee, "Final Report To the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors From the Mendocino County Forest Advisory Committee," January, 1992.

²⁸⁴Glenda Anderson, "County Will Hire Mediator for Future Forest Advisory Hearings," Fort Bragg (California) Advocate-News, 26 March 1992, p. 7.

²⁸⁵This Institute is one of the organizations that the Rogue Institute of Ecology and Economy is working with on a how best to implement a certification process. Institute

have arranged for community members, foresters and woodworkers to tour the Institute facilities.

Outlook for the Future

Given the well-funded and lethal opposition that this coalition has been faced with, the slide of the parent movements, and the current membership makeup of the group, it is difficult to say that IWW Local No. 1 is a true "environmentalist-labor" coalition. What does exist, however, is a small group of community organizers who are dedicated to continuing the work of the IWW local. And while they agree that it is too early yet to discuss concrete plans for how they want the future to look, they do agree on the problems they face and the process they need to undertake to overcome those problems.

Organizers agree that the big logging corporations are currently implementing a "mop up" operation as they prepare to leave the area. This opinion would seem to be supported by reviewing the recent history of L-P, which, since 1988, has closed mills in Cloverdale, Oroville, Potter Valley, Covelo, and Big Lagoon (Eureka), cut back at plants in Ukiah, Fort Bragg, and Willits, laid off over 1,000 people, and opened a new facility in Mexico which will employ 1,000

when fully operational.²⁸⁶ Additional evidence is suggested by the recent disclosure of internal L-P memos which suggest that L-P corporate executives were told by their own managers and outside consultants from 1988 through 1991 that their policies were bringing ecological and economic ruin to the region.²⁸⁷

Organizers agree that, if left unchecked, these policies will leave ecological and economic devastation in their wake. The proper response, then, is not to organize the workers into bargaining units against the timber corporations. Nor is it to organize environmentalists against the timber industry. The proper response is to organize the community, including environmentalists, workers, and everyone else, to attempt to minimize the corporate damage, help the corporations leave gracefully, and pick up the pieces and rebuild the community as the corporations become less of a presence.

As for the final form that this rebuilt community should take, Gary Ball feels that the exact structure is not as important as the fact that it should be defined and controlled by the communities involved.²⁸⁸ Judi Bari adds

²⁸⁶Mike Geniella, "Scathing Memos Warned L-P Boss of Overcutting," Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 5 January 1992, sec. A, p. 1.

²⁸⁷Ibid.

²⁸⁸Gary Ball, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

some detail to the picture by promoting the IWW philosophy, with a biocentric twist. While the IWW advocates workers running the factories, Bari complains, this presumes a large-scale industrial society. She proposes instead that there should be no factories, and that workers should then control the resulting small-scale workplace.²⁸⁹

The EF!/IWW coalition was first formed as a community-based defense against devastation being visited upon the community by outside interference. Due to the circumstances under which it developed, IWW Local No. 1 was almost constantly on the defensive. The few occasions when the group appeared to be ready to take proactive measures were met with renewed and stepped up opposition. For this reason, IWW Local No. 1 still has not been able to fully develop or begin to implement a path to the future that organizers would like to see. The prospects for developing such a plan and the effect that the loss of the labor portion of the coalition might have on future efforts will be discussed in the final chapter.

²⁸⁹Judi Bari, interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

If you don't change your direction, where you are headed is where you will wind up.

Chinese Proverb

Jackson County, Oregon, is about half the size and contains about twice the population of Mendocino County, California. Timber controls relatively less of the economy, and large corporations control less of the timber industry in Jackson County.²⁹⁰ By comparison, timber plays a relatively large role in the economy of Mendocino County, and large, outside-owned corporations control most of the industry.²⁹¹ These corporations thus control a larger portion of the overall economy in Mendocino County.

By the end of the 1980s, in Jackson and Mendocino Counties, as in many other areas in the US, government policies and corporate conglomeration had resulted in a situation where an increasing amount of the economic

²⁹⁰US Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, Oregon, 1988 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1990).

²⁹¹US Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, California, 1988 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1990).

planning affecting the communities was in the hands of bureaucrats and businessmen who lived in other parts of the country. Cutting levels in the National Forests, which provide a significant portion of the wood products in Southern Oregon, were being decided by Congress or at the national level of the Forest Service, where big-business can exert influence that communities cannot match. For Mendocino County, where much of the forest land is privately owned, these decisions were being made in the headquarters of corporations based in Oregon and Texas and endorsed by state government agencies that are supposed to regulate the industry. The decisions regarding the methods of cutting, the amount and location of milling and secondary manufacturing, and the employment of local people were also slipping from the control of the communities.

Also during the 1980s, the national labor and environmental organizations continued to shift most of their decision-making and accountability away from the community level, lessening their ability to understand or respond to local needs. In response to these changes, people from the labor and environmental movements have come together within Jackson and Mendocino Counties in an attempt to reassert some control over these decisions and their communities. The Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy and the Industrial Workers of the World Local No. 1 are two results of these efforts.

Summary

The RIEE is a coalition that was born of highly respectable parents: the Sierra Club is perhaps the best recognized name in the national environmental movement, Headwaters and the Friends of the Greensprings have broad-based support within the communities of Jackson County, and the International Woodworkers of America Local No. 3-436 is connected through the international union to the heart of the organized labor movement, the AFL-CIO. The RIEE organizers were all officers or employees of the organizations involved. Their publicly stated plan from the beginning was to develop two businesses and a network support system that would increase local control over decisions related to the economy and to the local environment. The founding groups, whether liked or not, were at least recognized and understood by most people. Their goal, the creation of new businesses, creating new jobs in an industry that appeared to be dying, without bringing environmental devastation, was also understood and acceptable to most people. Creation of the RIEE did not pose much of a threat to most people in relatively urban, relatively affluent Jackson County. The threat this coalition posed was in its challenge to the trend of consolidation of power in far-off places.

Name recognition for Earth First! and the Industrial Workers of the World may approach that of the Sierra Club and the IWA, but these groups represent less understood and less widely supported elements of the environmental and labor movements. The organized environmental movement has gone to great lengths to distance itself from Earth First! and anything that Earth First! is associated with. In large part, organized labor marginalizes the IWW by simply refusing to acknowledge it as anything other than a historical curiosity. Despite the apparent wishes of the mainstream, both of these groups are active, and neither of these is afraid to directly challenge prevailing societal norms. Popular culture and the national media keep alive the more sensational aspects of the rhetoric of the groups, without providing any real education about the worldviews that underlie the rhetoric. Because of this, most people do not understand these groups or what they stand for. A coalition between them was bound to threaten some members of the community. When this coalition directly challenged and explicitly called for the removal of the corporations which so dominated the local economy it was bound to draw opposition and hostility from outside of the community. Finally, since it is easy to confuse the subtleties between being biocentric and being misanthropic, or between calling for the end of corporate dominance and calling for an end to

private property, the opposition generated could be predicted to be deceitful but effective.

Despite the differences outlined above, it may surprise people to learn that these two apparently very different coalitions are made up of people who share strikingly similar worldviews and goals. Although the rhetoric of the EF!/IWW organizers is more explicitly biocentric, both groups were formed to promote the creation or continuation of communities that would live in harmony with their natural surroundings. The RIEE envisioned a region of small communities which "derive stable economic livelihood from sustainable interactions with their surrounding natural environment."²⁹² The IWW Local No. 1 organizers envisioned "a society whose goal is to achieve a stable state with nature for the benefit of all species."²⁹³ The RIEE attempted to make this vision reality by incorporating two worker-owned companies and a non-profit organization and involving a broad spectrum of community members on the boards of directors and as advisors. IWW Local No. 1 organizers have used education and outreach and public advocacy in support of the concept of locally-owned, worker-controlled businesses in the wood-products industry.

²⁹²Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, "Statement of Purpose," draft version completed late 1990, p. 2.

²⁹³Judi Bari, "Expand Earth First!," Earth First! Journal, 22 September 1990, p. 5.

The RIEE and the EF!/IWW coalitions have also met with some similar obstacles. Job blackmail is very real in both of the communities, and, given a dearth of economically viable career alternatives, employed wood products industry workers have felt pressure not to publicly support these coalitions. RIEE President and IWA Local No. 3-436 Business Agent Dennis Dawson is currently feeling that his position with the union may be in jeopardy due to his continued involvement in the RIEE.²⁹⁴ The G-P, L-P and PALCO employees who have publicly worked with IWW Local No. 1 organizers are no longer employed by those corporations.²⁹⁵ These pressures are even felt by supporters who are not directly connected to the groups and do not work within the industry. For instance, a journalist for the Santa Rosa Press-Democrat who wrote comparatively unbiased coverage of Redwood Summer activities and later stated in an interview for another paper that he felt Redwood Summer was successful and that organizers deserved credit for that success was subsequently forbidden from writing any more stories covering timber industry issues.²⁹⁶

Due to these conditions and the inability of the coalitions to summon support with offsetting clout, as of

²⁹⁴Dennis Dawson, telephone interview, 22 March 1992.

²⁹⁵See Chapter IV.

²⁹⁶Judi Bari, Timber Wars and Other Writings (Ukiah, California: By the author, 1992), 21.

the end of March 1992 neither the RIEE nor the IWW Local No. 1 considered itself to be a true worker-environmentalist coalition. Organizers of both coalitions hope to bring labor back in the future. In the meantime, they are expanding the bases of their coalitions and have taken short-term steps to continue their work. In January of 1992 the RIEE board formally recognized that the IWA Local was "not presently capable of becoming full partners in our work," and has since styled itself a community organization.²⁹⁷ They hope that development of the certification process and subsequent demand for products, combined with continued affiliation with the RSFC and the Eco-Forestry Institute will facilitate the re-entry of labor into this coalition. The EF!/IWW organizers are continuing to work with gyppo owners, small woodland owners and other small business owners to keep a community dialogue open in the hopes of creating an atmosphere in which workers can participate in their own future by coming forward with their ideas on how survive under and work to end the corporate dominance of the region's economy.

²⁹⁷The Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, report of the committee to re-think and focus the Institute's work, 7 January 1992, p. 2.

Conclusions

The removal of barriers to big business and the accompanying "trickle-down" theory of Reaganomics that have served to consolidate economic and political power in the hands of relatively few people have been an unmitigated disaster for the rest of us. Working people are worse off, our communities are worse off, the environment is worse off, and the laws that were put in place to protect all of these interests are worse off. Tragically, the large organizations that profess to represent the interests of workers and environmentalists have emulated the structures and values of big business and big government. They have tended to become more bureaucratized, focussed on institutional self-preservation, and led by a centralized, elite group that is disjointed from and not directly responsible to the people they represent. It is appropriate, then, for people to come together at the community level to fill the vacuum left by all of this activity and look out for their own interests.

History has shown that narrow, special interest movements are able to achieve, at best, narrow and temporary victories. The diverse nature of society today also suggests that any movement that tries to be everything to all people is doomed to failure for lack of agreement on anything. Coalitions of diverse, autonomous groups, each

small enough to truly represent the interests of its members, but together large enough to have some real power to influence issues that affect their members, seem to offer one real alternative.

The limited sample of the two groups studied here appears to indicate that the true challenge for coalitions such as these lies not in community members agreeing on common interests, but instead in the resistance they face from the bigger power structure that they challenge. Critics might charge that the loss of the organized labor element in the RIEE and the IWW Local No. 1 illustrates a failure in the concept of such coalitions. This viewpoint fails to recognize that on a face-to-face level workers and environmentalists in these communities have been able to work together. These coalitions have stepped across the bounds of the traditional labor and environmental movements and have opened the channels of communication between groups of people within the communities. As people from different groups emphasized their similarities rather than their differences, a new kind of dialogue developed to challenge to dominant rules of discourse. People who thought of themselves as environmentalists saw the relevance of including the social and economic stability of their communities, and the conditions under which people are forced to work, as part of their cause. People who had worked as advocates for the rights of workers saw the

relevance of demanding corporate accountability not only for their jobs but for the environmental and economic stability of their communities. In coming together, they challenged the role of the federal government and corporations to exercise unchecked control over the natural environment or the economy that their communities depend upon for survival. A whole new realm of possibilities of what society might look like and who should make those decisions becomes possible when the discourse is expanded in this way.

Where these groups have faced their most significant problems is when the outside organizations whose privilege or hegemony they threaten have inserted themselves into the dialogue to protect their interests. The most obvious resistance came from the giant timber corporations operating in the region, who pledged a budget of \$12 million between 1989 and 1991 for advertising alone,²⁹⁸ much of which was used on propaganda designed to polarize the issues and prevent any reform to the way they practiced business in these communities. Open hostility was also supplied by federal bureaucrats and policy-makers under Reagan and Bush who fought throughout the 1980s to make communities and their surrounding ecosystems safe for the pursuit of corporate interests. Actions such as Congressionally mandated cutting levels in National Forests and Bush

²⁹⁸Leslie Hemstreet, "Earth First! and Cointelpro," Z Magazine, July/August 1990, 23.

Administration threats to veto any spotted owl protection legislation that includes relief for dislocated workers have also served to polarize the issues and paralyze efforts to resolve the problems that these communities face.

These obstacles may not have been so difficult to overcome if not for another form of opposition these groups met with that is indicative of the trends discussed in Chapter II. From the beginning the structures and the missions of the RIEE and the IWW Local No. 1 have challenged not only industry and government, but also the hegemony of the national labor and environmental organizations in identifying labor and environmental issues and framing debates about those issues. As discussed in Chapters III and IV, the major ecological and economic problems faced by communities in Jackson and Mendocino counties have been grossly over-simplified and defined in terms such as "jobs vs. owls," "old growth forests vs. jobs," or "environmentalists vs. workers." Framing the problems in these terms has served to divide workers from environmentalists by guaranteeing that any resolution to the problems would mean a loss to one or the other.

Reframing the issues in terms of "community vs. outside corporations," "long-term health of people and nature vs. short-sighted greed," or in some other terms, would serve as a crucial first step in breaking out of this trap. Despite the national political clout of the AFL-CIO and the Gang-of-

Ten, and cross-over bodies within them such as the Sierra Club National Labor Liaison Committee or various AFL-CIO environmental committees, the national labor and environmental organizations have failed miserably in challenging or changing the terms of discourse over these issues. Instead, leadership of the national groups have embraced the business-dominated discourse and sought solutions to worker issues through making US industries more competitive, and solutions to environmental problems by making environmentalism translate into profit. When the RIEE and the IWW Local No. 1 rose up from their communities to challenge this trend, the national labor and environmental organizations might have provided support for their efforts. Instead, for the most part they have either stepped aside or actually hindered the efforts of these coalitions.

The RIEE would appear to have been in a position from the start to take advantage of the influence its mainstream parent organizations had at the national level. The IWA has some clout within the AFL-CIO, and the Sierra Club is a significant force within the Gang-of-Ten. The RIEE has not strayed too far from the philosophies or tactics of the parent organizations, setting up formally elected governing bodies made up largely of local officers and employees of these national groups. Tactically, the RIEE has shunned direct action in favor of working with local, state, and

federal agencies in an effort to modify the way business is carried out in their communities. RIEE organizers have met with, sent information to and requested assistance from a wide range of government representatives and bodies, including Jackson County Commissioner Jeff Golden, State Representative Nancy Peterson, the Small Business Administration, Congress-member Peter DeFazio, Senators Mark Hatfield and Bob Packwood, and the US Forest Service. With the exception of the idea of a locally-initiated coalition between the organizations, nothing about their approach or tactics has been radically different from those of the parent organizations.

Despite this fact, meaningful support from outside of the coalition has been hard to come by. The RIEE's efforts have attracted little public attention outside of the area, and only one newspaper article locally.²⁹⁹ Golden and Peterson have left office, and the support they provided left office with them. The response from most of the rest of the government officials whose support they courted runs along the lines of "maybe if we ignore them, they'll go away." The responses from the parent labor and environmental organizations have largely been the same. The IWA International was at first strongly opposed to

²⁹⁹See Robert Sterling, "Unlikely Foes Fix Future in Forests," Medford (Oregon) Mail Tribune, 17 December 1989, sec A, pp. 1, 5.

participation by the Local in this coalition. Since the Local is autonomous, the International had no choice but to allow participation, but issued the warning that the International's name was not to be used in connection with the RIEE. The Sierra Club's Oregon State Chapter and national offices have simply not acknowledged any tie to the RIEE's efforts.

IWW Local No. 1 never had the possibility of assistance from strong national parent organizations. Both EF! and the IWW are anti-hierarchical bodies that, as a matter of philosophy, avoid involvement in politics at the national level. True to the philosophy of its parents, IWW Local No. 1 focussed its efforts on direct actions at the local level. Due in part to the sensational nature of some of the activities this group was involved in, its efforts attracted the attention of the national media and was partially responsible for making the clear-cutting of the last ancient forests a national issue. The group also succeeded in making the corporate and government defenders of the status quo feel the necessity of spending large quantities of money and time working against their efforts. Perhaps more insidiously, some of the more mainstream labor and environmental organizations also openly worked against the efforts of this group. In fact, Don Nelson, Financial Secretary and Business Representative of Mendocino County IWA Local No. 3-469, and Gail Lucas, the Sierra Club

California State Forest Practices Task Force Chair, were consistently two of the most vociferous opponents of anything connected with IWW Local No. 1.

The opposition of mainstream labor and environmental groups to an effort such as IWW Local No. 1 should come as no surprise in the context of the developments of the post World War II era. The trend has been that AFL-CIO and Gang-of-Ten affiliated groups have worked concert with corporate and government bodies to rid the labor and environmental movements of radicals and of direct-action tactics. This trend has served to bring much of what our society sees as the labor and environmental movements under the control of the national leadership of these groups. Following the same logic, these groups have tended to stifle local initiatives in order to preserve the hegemony of their national leadership. It has been this latter form of opposition that has most affected the RIEE.

The current national economic, environmental, and social policies of the US by their nature hinder community-initiated efforts such as those of the RIEE and the IWW Local No. 1. Current tax laws, investment incentives and import/export laws tend to favor the dominance of transnational corporations and the federal government in determining the economies of resource-dependent communities. The economic pressures this system allows to be put on workers, combined with use by industry and government

officials of false and inflammatory information, have resulted in the fact that the RIEE and the IWW Local No. 1 are no longer truly "labor-environmentalist" coalitions. One can only speculate as to whether the results would have been significantly different had the national labor and environmental organizations seen their interests as lying with the efforts of these coalitions and provided assistance rather than opposition.

According to Brecher and Costello:

The integration of rank-and-file and broader social interests requires a devolution of power both upward and downward. Economic enterprises, for example, need to be made subject to the control of their workers and the communities they affect; at the same time they need to be subject to national and global regulation to ensure that they do not destroy community and regional economies or the environment. Nation-states need to be radically decentralized with greatly increased power for local communities and regions to shape their own lives; at the same time, their predatory sovereignty needs to be restricted by far stronger international law and regulation, particularly to eliminate their military means of destruction.³⁰⁰

A similar devolution of power would seem to be in order for the national labor and environmental organizations.

Somehow, the people in the position to see the true interests of the movements need to be reconnected to the people who are in positions of influence over policies that work for or against those interests. The single most

³⁰⁰Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, "Labor-Community Coalitions and the Restructuring of Power," in Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community, ed. Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990), 342.

significant weakness in either of the coalitions discussed above appears to be in overcoming this split.

However, both of these coalitions have rejected passive acceptance of others defining or framing the issues that are important to them. They have both taken a community-wide view of those issues and exerted some influence over the terms of discourse. They have also both succeeded in broadening the dialogue within their communities, and in earning concerted opposition from entities that do not represent the best interests of their communities. By these measures, the RIEE and the IWW Local No. 1 have been successful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aronowitz, Stanley. Working Class Hero: A New Strategy for Labor. New York: Adama Books, 1983.
- Bari, Judi. Timber Wars and Other Writings. Ukiah, California: By the author, 1992.
- Boyte, Harry. Community is Possible: Repairing America's Roots. New York: Harper and Row, 1984.
- Brecher, Jeremy, and Tim Costello, ed. Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990.
- Brower, David. For Earth's Sake: The Life and Times of David Brower. Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1990.
- Callenbach, Ernest. Ecotopia. Berkeley, California: Banyan Tree Books, 1975.
- Daly, Herman E., and John B. Cobb, Jr. For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Foreman, Dave. Confessions of an Eco-Warrior. New York: Harmony Books, 1991.
- _____. Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching. Tucson: Ned Ludd Books, 1987.
- Fox, Stephen. John Muir and His Legacy: The American Conservation Movement. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1981.
- Gordon, David, Richard Edwards and Michael Reich. Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Gorz, Andre. A Farewell to the Working Class: An Essay on Post-Industrial Socialism. Translated by Mike Sonenshcer. Boston: South End Press, 1982.

- Green, James. The World of the Worker: Labor in Twentieth Century America. New York: Hill and Wang, 1980.
- Harrison, Bennett and Barry Bluestone. The Deindustrialization of America. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- _____. The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructuring and the Polarizing of America. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
- Kazis, Richard, and Richard L. Grossman. Fear At Work: Job Blackmail, Labor, and the Environment. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982.
- Kolko, Gabriel. The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967.
- _____. Main Currents in Modern American History. New York: Pantheon Books, 1976.
- Manes, Christopher. Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1990.
- Mendocino Environmental Center. The Redwood Summer Information Packet. Ukiah, California: By the Mendocino Environmental Center, 1990.
- Moody, Kim. An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism. London: Verso, 1988.
- Nash, Roderick. Wilderness and the American Mind. 3rd ed. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Nash, Roderick, ed. American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990.
- Sexton, Patricia Cayo. The War on Labor and the Left: Understanding America's Unique Conservatism. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.
- Weinstein, James. The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900-1918. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Wylke, Lucinda, Ward Morehouse, and David Dembo. Worker Empowerment in a Changing Economy: Jobs, Military Production, and the Environment. New York: Apex Press, 1991.

Journal and Newspaper Articles

- Associated Press. "Activists Injured by Bomb: Earth First! Leaders Survive Blast in Auto." Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 25 May 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 4.
- _____. "Arraignments in Bomb Case Get Postponed." Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 30 May 1990, sec. A, p. 10.
- _____. "Group Hires Sleuth to Probe Car Blast." Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 29 May 1990, sec. A, p. 6.
- Anderson, Glenda. "County Will Hire Mediator for Future Forest Advisory Hearings." Fort Bragg (California) Advocate-News, 26 March 1992, p. 7.
- Bari, Judi. "Community Under Siege." Earth First! Journal, 1 May 1991, pp. 17, 27, 36.
- _____. "Expand Earth First!." Earth First! Journal, 22 September 1990, pp. 5-6.
- _____. "The PALCO Papers." Earth First! Journal, 21 March 1991, p. 38.
- _____. "Showdown at the Earth First! Corral." Anderson Valley (California) Advertiser, 25 March 1992, pp. 1, 7, 8.
- Bari, Judi, and Darryl Cherney. "Tree Spiking Renounced Behind Redwood Curtain." Earth First! Journal, 1 May 1990, p. 13.
- Bender, Mark. "Beyond Special Interest Politics." Wild Earth 1, no. 4 (Winter 1991/1992): 76.
- Berke, Richard L. "Oratory of Environmentalism Becomes the Sound of Politics." New York Times, 17 April 1990, sec. A, p. 1.
- Bidinotto, Robert James. "Environmentalism: Freedom's Foe for the '90s." The Freeman 40, no. 11 (November 1990): 409-419.
- Block, Fred. "The Myth of Reindustrialization," Socialist Review, 73 (January/February 1984): 59-76.
- "Bosco Addresses Larouche Rally." Anderson Valley (California) Advertiser, 25 July 1990, p. 1.

- Bratt, Chris. "Headwaters Continues to Promote Jobs Through Community Forestry." Headwaters Journal, Fall 1991, p. 25.
- Cherney, Darryl. "Freedom Riders Needed to Save the Forest." Earth First! Journal, 1 May 1990, pp. 1, 6.
- Cockburn, Alexander. "Terrorist Strikes Earth First!." Anderson Valley (California) Advertiser, 30 May 1990, p. 4.
- Cunfer, Geoff. "Redwood Summer Organizers Sue FBI." Earth First! Journal, 21 June 1991, p. 17.
- Dahl, Lynne. "One Worker Speaks Out: An Interview with Duane Potter." Anderson Valley (California) Advertiser, 15 August 1990, pp. 1, 5, 6.
- Diringer, Elliot, and Sharon McCormick. "'Avenger' Claims Earth First! Bomb." Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 1 June 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 4.
- Dowie, Mark. "American Environmentalism: A Movement Courting Irrelevance." World Policy Journal 9, no. 1 (Winter 1991/1992): 67-92.
- Erwin, Myra. "Labor and Conservation Get Together." Oregon Conifer, January/February 1992, p. 6.
- _____. "Notes from the Chair." The Rogue Walker, May 1991, p. 2.
- Foreman, Dave, and Nancy Morton. "Good Luck Darlin', It's Been Great." Earth First! Journal, 22 September 1990, p. 5.
- "44 Arrested at L-P Mill." Earth First! Journal, 1 August 1990, pp. 1, 7.
- Fost, Dan. "IWW Tries to Shake Wobbly Reputation by Laboring in Bay Area." Chicago Tribune, 12 December 1991, sec. C, p. 29.
- Foster, John Bellamy. "Capitalism and the Ancient Forest." Monthly Review 43, no. 5 (October 1991): 1-16.
- Gabriel, Trip. "If a Tree Falls in the Woods, They Hear It." New York Times Magazine, 4 November 1990, pp. 34, 58-59, 62-64.

- Geissinger, Steve. "New Anti-Logging Protest Starts: Earth First! Declares 'Redwood Summer.'" (Eugene) Oregon Daily Emerald, 4 June 1990, p. 9.
- Geniella, Mike. "Earth First! Protests L-P Layoffs." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 4 April 1990, sec. B, pp. 1, 4.
- _____. "Few Openly Criticize L-P Mexico Plan." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 11 December 1989.
- _____. "'Global Economy' Pressures North Coast." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 10 December 1989, sec. A, pp. 1, 11.
- _____. "Industry Resists Shackles." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 11 December 1989.
- _____. "L-P Cutting 195 Mill Jobs." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 29 March 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 12.
- _____. "Scathing Memos Warned L-P Boss of Overcutting." Santa (California) Rosa Press-Democrat, 5 January 1992, sec. A, p. 1
- _____. "Stockholders Get Better News." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 29 March 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 12.
- _____. "Timber Production, Profits Soar." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 4 April 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 10.
- _____. "Trucker Says 'Good Riddance'." Santa Rosa (California) Press-Democrat, 4 April 1990, sec. B, pp. 1, 2.
- _____. "'We Need It All,' L-P Chief Says." Santa (California) Rosa Press-Democrat, 10 December 1989.
- Goldston, Linda. "Tempers Could Flare As Summer of Protests Over Forests Heats Up." San Jose Mercury News, 20 May 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 24.
- Hall, Carl T. "Historic Union Relocates to San Francisco." San Francisco Chronicle, 24 July 1991, sec. C, p. 1.
- Hemstreet, Leslie. "Earth First! and Cointelpro." Z Magazine, July/August 1990, pp. 19-26.

- Hill, James. "A Phobia for the '90s: Fear of Job Termination." (Portland) Oregonian, 8 May 1992, sec. F, pp. 1, 2.
- Hill, Randy. "Forestry Training School Organized In Selma." Medford (Oregon) Mail Tribune, 24 December 1991, sec. A, p. 4.
- Hubbird, John. "Labor-Environmentalists Cooperation: Common Ground for Oregon's Future." Eugene (Oregon) What's Happening, 31 May 1990, p. 7.
- "Judi & Darryl Still Fighting Despite Bomb Damage." Earth First! Journal, 21 June 1990, pp. 1, 4.
- Kerman, Michael. "Joe Hill Remembered: The Activist's Ashes Are Given to Union Leaders." Washington Post, 19 November 1988, sec. C, p. 1.
- "The Last Forests: Who's Taking What." Northcoast California Earth First! Newsletter, Earth Day 1987, p. 9.
- "L-P To Close Red Bluff Mill." Eureka (California) Times-Standard, 11 December 1988, p. 18.
- "Logging Firm Damaging Credibility of Industry." Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 10 January 1992.
- Mann, Eric. "Environmentalism in the Corporate Climate." Tikkun Magazine, March/April 1990, pp. 60-65.
- Martinez, Elizabeth. "When People of Color are an Endangered Species." Z Magazine, April 1991, pp. 61-65.
- "MAXXAM: State Supported Terrorists." Northcoast California Earth First! Newsletter, Earth Day 1987, pp. 1, 9.
- Michaud, Keith. "Board Asked to Take Over L-P." Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 3 April 1990, p. 1.
- _____. "L-P Death Probe Reveals 3 Safety Violations." Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 21 November 1989, p. 1.
- _____. "L-P Fined \$1,200 in Worker's Death." Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 21 December 1989, p. 1.

- _____. "Valley L-P Mill Closures Shock Lawmakers, Locals." Fort Bragg (California) Advocate-News, 5 April 1990, p. 1.
- _____. "Worker Killed at Ukiah's L-P Mill." Ukiah (California) Daily Journal, 15 September 1989, p. 1.
- Michaud, Keith, and Lois O'Rourke. "Louisiana Pacific Action Condemned." Fort Bragg (California) Advocate-News, 5 April 1990, p. 1
- Pickett, Karen. "Redwood Summer Chronology." Earth First! Journal, 1 November 1990, pp. 8-10.
- _____. "Redwood Summer Retrospective." Earth First! Journal, 1 November 1990, pp. 8-10.
- Pickett, Karen, and Woody Joe. "Redwood Summer Goes On!" Earth First! Journal, 21 June 1990, p. 1.
- "Redwood Summer Lives! A Last-Ditch Attempt to Save the Last Stands of Old-Growth Redwood in the World." Earth First! Journal Extra, June 1990, p. 1.
- Reinhold, Robert. "Failure of S&L in California Could Save a Redwood Forest." New York Times, 27 March 1991, sec. A, p. 1.
- Risen, James. "Fed Study shows Rich Became Richer in Reagan-Bush Era." (Portland) Oregonian, 7 January 1992, sec. A, p. 2.
- Sale, Kirkpatrick. "Schism in Environmentalism," 1986. In American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservation History, 3rd ed., edited by Roderick Nash, pp. 285-293. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990.
- Sawyer, Kathy. "Long Hours, Job Hazards Fuel Strike Talk at Mail Center." Washington Post, 31 July 1978, sec. A, p. 2.
- Sayen, Jamie. "Environmental Witch Hunt." Wild Earth 1, no. 3 (Fall 1991): 4-9.
- Stein, Mark. "Victims of Blast Arrested: Earth First! Activists Blamed for Explosion." Eugene (Oregon) Register Guard, 26 May 1990, sec. A, pp. 1, 4.
- Sterling, Robert. "Unlikely Foes Fix Future in Forests." Medford (Oregon) Mail Tribune, 17 December 1989, sec. A, pp. 1, 5.

- Stevenson, Richard. "2 Concerns Sued Over Pensions." New York Times, 13 June 1991, sec. D, pp. 1, 18.
- "2 Say Politics Rules Their Agencies." High Country News, 7 October 1991, pp. 1, 10.
- "Two Thousand Rally at Fort Bragg." Earth First! Journal, 1 August 1990, pp. 1, 7.
- Warf, Barney. "Regional Transformation, Everyday Life, and Pacific Northwest Lumber Production." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 8, no. 2 (June 1988): 326-346.
- "Wobblies Enjoying Modest Renaissance." Chicago Tribune, 27 November 1988, sec. F, p. 12.
- Zuckerman, Seth. "A View From the First and a Half World." Forest Watch, January/February, 1992, pp. 17-21.

Government Publications

- Mendocino County. Data Finder: Budget and General Information Booklet. 1989-1990. Mendocino County, California, Administrative Offices.
- Mendocino County, Forest Advisory Committee. "Final Report to the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors from the Mendocino Count Forest Advisory Committee." January 1992.
- _____. "Report to the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors From the Minority Members of the Forest Advisory Committee." 21 January 1992.
- US Bureau of the Census. County Business Patterns, California, 1980. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1981.
- _____. County Business Patterns, California, 1988. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1990.
- _____. County Business Patterns, Oregon, 1980. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1981.
- _____. County Business Patterns, Oregon, 1988. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1990.

Unpublished Materials

Bratt, Chris. Headwaters. Letter to Roy Ockert, 12 July 1989.

_____. Letter to Mark D. Walker, Congressional Staff, 25 March 1990.

Dawson, Dennis. Business Agent, IWA-US Local 3-436. Letter to Congressman Peter DeFazio, 3 August 1989.

The Ecoforestry Institute. "Organization, Objectives and Development Plan," n.d.

Frank, Doug. Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy Steering Committee. Memo to the Board of Directors, 10 February 1992.

_____. Memo to RIEE Newsletter Contributors, 6 March 1992.

International Woodworkers of America Local No. 3-436. "IWA-US Local Union No. 3-436, Local Union Resolution-- Subject: Saving the Jobs of Woodworkers," as endorsed unanimously by the Union Board and Local membership, 29 July 1989, and August 1989, respectively.

Institute For Sustainable Forestry, promotional flyer, n.d.

Mendocino County, Board of Supervisors. Minutes for meetings: 3, 24 April; 1, 8, 19, 22 May; 5, 12, 19 June; and 24 July 1990. Mendocino County, California, Administrative Offices.

Merlo, Harry. Memorandum to Louisiana-Pacific Ukiah Mill employees, 18 September 1990. Obtained from the Mendocino Environmental Center.

Norman, Julie. President, Headwaters. Letter "To whom it may concern," endorsing the Rogue Institute of Ecology and Economy, 15 January 1991.

"Mississippi Summer in the California Redwoods: Freedom Riders Needed to Save the Forest," promotional flyer distributed as part of the Redwood Summer publicity, n.d.

KenCairn, Brett. Memo to the RIEE Board of Directors, regarding next board meeting, August 1990.

- _____. Memo to the Board of Directors, regarding status of RSFC and RFPC, 5 November 1990.
- Ockert, Roy. Rogue Forest Products Co. Letter to Mark D. Walker, Congressional Staff, 1 April 1990.
- Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy. "Articles of Incorporation: Non-Profit Corporation," as submitted to the Oregon Secretary of State, Corporation Division, 23 April 1990.
- _____. "Articles of Amendment For Rogue Institute For Ecology And Economy," as approved, 1 February 1991.
- _____. "By-Laws of Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy," Draft #2, 3 April 1990.
- _____. "Community Forestry Certification Guidelines," draft sections, February 1992.
- _____. "Description of the Institute Staff and Board," last quarter, 1991.
- _____. Membership list, Board of Directors and Staff, 1 March 1991.
- _____. Membership list, Board of Directors and Staff, November 1991.
- _____. Minutes for Board of Directors meetings: 26 August, 7 October 1989; 30 April, 22 May, 30 July, 11 September, 6 October, 2 November, 7 December 1990; 5 January, 1 February, 1 March 1991; 17 January 1992.
- _____. Promotional pamphlet, n.d.
- _____. Report of the committee to re-think and focus the Institute's work, 7 January 1992.
- _____. "Statement of Purpose," version for discussion, October 1990.
- _____. "Statement of Purpose," Draft version completed late 1990.
- _____. "Steering Committee Report," 21 February, 20 March 1992.

Rogue Sustainable Forestry Company and Rogue Forest Products Company. Minutes of Joint Board of Director meetings: 29 January, 23 February, 27 April, 1 June, 27 June, 27 July, 28 September 1990.

Presentations and Interviews

Anderson, James, Deputy County Administrative Officer, County of Mendocino, Ukiah, California. Interview by author, 26 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

Ball, Betty, Industrial Workers of the World Local #1, Ukiah, California. Interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

Ball, Gary, Industrial Workers of the World Local #1, Ukiah, California. Telephone interview, 17 March 1992;

_____. Interview by author, 27 March 1992, Ukiah, California.

Bari, Judi, Ecotopia Earth First!, Industrial Workers of the World Local #1, Willits, California. Presentation, "Labor and the Environment" Panel, LAW conference, March 1989, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Telephone interview, 10 February 1992.

_____. Interview by author, 27 March 1992, Willits, California.

Bratt, Chris, Headwaters, and Co-Founder and Vice President, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Ashland, Oregon. Telephone interview, 21 November 1991.

_____. Interview by author, 30 November 1991, Ashland, Oregon.

_____. Telephone interview, 2 March 1992.

_____. Interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

Boutard, Anthony, Board Member, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Ashland, Oregon. Telephone interview, 21 January 1992.

Carpenter, Richard, President, International Woodworkers of America Local No. 3-469, Fort Bragg, California. Telephone interview, 2 March 1992.

Cellarius, Doris, Sierra Club National Labor Liaison Committee. Interview by author, 15 February 1992, Olympia, Washington.

Chism, David, Relief Representative, Northern California Area, Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers, Arcata, California. Presentation, "Forest, Community and Jobs - Legislative and Other Initiatives," Jobs, Communities and Ecosystems Conference, 21 March 1992, Portland, Oregon.

_____. Interview by author, 21 March 1992, Portland, Oregon.

_____. Interview by author, 25 March 1992, Arcata, California.

Dawson, Dennis, Business Agent, International Woodworkers of America Local No. 3-436, and Co-Founder and President, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Ashland, Oregon. Telephone interview, 22 March 1992.

Erwin, Myra, Chair of the Rogue Group Sierra Club, and Co-Founder and Board Member, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Ashland, Oregon. Interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

Gilbert, Dennis, Co-Chair, Eugene-Springfield Solidarity Network, Eugene, Oregon. Presentation, "Unions and the Environment" Panel, LAW Conference, 8 March 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Presentation, "Forest, Community and Jobs - Legislative and Other Initiatives," Jobs, Communities and Ecosystems Conference, 21 March 1992, Portland, Oregon.

_____. Interviews by author, various dates 1991, 1992, Eugene, Oregon.

Ingalsbee, Tim, University of Oregon. Interview by author, 23 January 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Interview by author, 6 February 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Telephone interview, 13 February 1992.

KenCairn, Brett, Former Executive Director, current Board Member, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Ashland, Oregon. Presentation, "Striving for Unity: Economic Transition Programs for Workers and Communities in the Timber Crisis" Conference, 1 December 1990.

_____. Interview by author, 7 January 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Presentation to Center for the Study of Work, Economy, and Community, 9 January 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Presentation to Center for the Study of Work, Economy, and Community, 4 February 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Interview by author, 5 November 1991, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Presentation, "Sustainable Jobs, Forests, and Communities," panel at the West Coast Ancient Forest Activists Conference, 1 February 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

Kettleman, Tracy, Institute for Sustainable Forestry, Briceland, California. Presentation, "Sustainable Jobs, Forests, and Communities," West Coast Ancient Forest Activists Conference, 1 February 1992, Ashland, Oregon.

Lawhorn, Gene, Labor Activist, Portland, Oregon. Presentation, "Labor and Environment" Panel, LAW conference, March 1989, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Interview by author, 12 March 1992, Portland, Oregon.

Mazzochi, Tony, Presidential Assistant for the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International. Presentation, "Jobs vs. the Environment: Is There Really a Conflict?," Jobs, Communities and Ecosystems Conference, 21 March 1992, Portland, Oregon.

_____. Keynote presentation, Facing the Challenge Together Conference, 2 May 1992, Eugene, Oregon.

Ockert, Roy, Co-Founder, former Board Member, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Ashland, Oregon. Presentation, "Labor-Environmentalism Cooperation: Creating a Sustainable Forest Products Economy," 16 May 1990, Eugene, Oregon.

_____. Telephone interview, 8 December 1990.

_____. Interview by author, 30 December 1991, San Jose, California.

Reed, Rebecca, Regional Services Institute, Southern Oregon State College, Ashland, Oregon. Telephone interview, 30 March 1992.

Stewart, Connie, Northcoast Environmental Center, Arcata, California. Interview by author, 25 March 1992, Arcata, California.

Street, Bill, Research Director, International Woodworkers of America. Telephone interview, 2 March 1992.

Workman, Jim, Former Executive Director, current Board Member, Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy, Ashland, Oregon. Interview by author, 24 March 1992, Ashland, Oregon.