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Perspectives on wilderness and its definition differ widely. Roderick Nash (Wilderness and the American Mind 1982) explains that there is a "tendency of wilderness to be a state of mind," thus "to accept as wilderness those places people call wilderness. The emphasis here is not so much what wilderness is but what men think it is." (cf. Hendee, Stankey & Lucas who in Wilderness Management call wilderness "the terra incognita of people's minds.").

The term wilderness is loaded with many highly personal conceptions and meanings. It is therefore difficult to cross reference, especially across cultural world views. An example of this cultural loading is the following quote from Chief Luther Standing Bear (Land of the Spotted Eagle 1933):

We did not think of the great open plains, the beautiful rolling hills, and winding streams with tangled growth, as "wild." Only to the white man was nature a "wilderness" and only to him was the land "infested" with "wild" animals and "savage" people. To us it was tame. Earth was bountiful and we were surrounded with blessings of the Great Mystery. Not until the hairy man from the east came and with brutal frenzy heaped injustices upon us and the families we loved was it "wild" for us.

Standing Bear's remarks imply two distinct conceptions of wilderness, as well as a notion of kinship with "wild" nature. The overt view which he terms as the perspective of the "white man" may be referred to as an imperial perspective. Wilderness in the imperial perspective is viewed with forboding and inhospitality. A view which is clearly foreign to Standing Bear's conception of the land. Conversely, the intrinsic valuation of Standing Bear's remarks reveal an attachment to the land, a kinship with it -- a holy land conception that is effectively love of the land and includes an extended social interest in the ecologic commonweal.

The duality of Chief Luther Standing Bear's remarks merit explication, if we are to develop a full and rich understanding of the wilderness concept. The manifold meanings and implications of this famous quote imply two distinct perceptions of wilderness -- imperial and primary.

A. Imperial -- is used in the sense of the "howling" wilderness (cf. Segal & Stineback, Puritans, Indians & Manifest Destiny 1977; Miller, Errand into the Wilderness 1956; and Turner, Beyond Geography: The Western Spirit Against the Wilderness 1980). It is aligned with the Hobbesian myth which postulates the brutal, short, and nasty life of "Primitives." It also reflects the Genesis account of a consummate agriculturalist's dream (cf. Shepard, Nature and Madness 1982). Furthermore, it is the product of consuming self-interest. There is a genuine lack of respect and concern for others which is essential for mental well-being (cf. Alder 1956).
Many scholars interpret wilderness totally in the imperial sense projecting such a view over all primal cultures despite (A's) affinity to the Genesis account. It is as if only the linear history which the Judaic tradition developed matters. They are in effect taking the Biblical doctrine literally as an explanation for the human species' origin and relation to the Earth (cf. Nash, op. cit.; Tuan, Topophilia).

B. Primary -- this sense of wilderness is organically derived in mythic cultures. It is associated with sacred space and the spiritual traditions -- animism, animatism, naturism, etc. -- of primal peoples. The sacred places -- holy lands -- are wilderness. They form the setting for ritual and rites of passage -- e.g., the vision quest. Thus they are places where "Great Mysterious" and sacred ecological realities are most potently manifested.

In contrast with (A), the primary tradition (B) which manifests the sacred sense of Nature is all too often ignored or simply not investigated. I have argued that primal peoples focused their religious traditions upon the "wild" (cf. "Nature Awe," Western Wildlands 1983). The Celtic people worshipped, for example in sacred groves known as nemetons -- nemu, i.e., heaven and ton, i.e., place -- which were far removed from human habitations. The Celts considered these wild places to be "a piece of heaven on earth." This Nature Awe tradition was widespread among early Indo-Europeans (cf. Frazer, The Golden Bough; Keary, "Nature Worship," Outlines of Primitive Belief Among the Indo-European Races; and Taylor "Tree Worship," Mankind Quarterly). This tradition failed when faced with the fused power of Roman federalism and monotheism, a combination that resulted in imperial Christianity.

An important distinction for the primary wilderness perspective is the etymological distinction which I argue over Nash's (op. cit.) derivation. The literal meaning of wilderness is "will-of-the-land." This is partially demonstrated in Nash's argument where wild is presented as a derivation of willed, as in self-willed, willful, or uncontrollable. Thus the concept of wild, when combined with the Saxon term deór (animal), yields self-willed-animal, or wild animal -- undomesticated animal. In these conceptions, will is an indicator of the animistic tradition -- in perceiving a will in nature via the concept of in-dwelling spirit or the ness quality, i.e., spirit of. Also working here is a notion of kinship. This kinship tradition is recognized in totemistic rituals. Kinship values, in turn produce a complex ethical system for relating with wild others.
These antipodal views of wilderness (A. and B. outlined above) are best contrasted in an examination of cultural confrontation. Looming largest among such conflicts is that which occurred in America between Indians and Europeans. The European "Discovery of America" implies invention rather than recognition of Native American cultures. This event in history appears as if the monotheistic God was hiding the continent for His "chosen", in order to carry forth some divine ethnocentric plan of European salvation. The Puritan view epitomizes this delusion through the doctrine of "manifest destiny." It is from such skewed views that we get the "howling" wilderness (A.) conception. The Puritans sought to order nature, in accordance with the Genesis myth which was exemplified by the "garden." Consequently, they killed wildlife indiscriminately -- without discretion, judgment, or need -- simply to be rid of it. They exhibited no concern for the "will-of-the-land"; on the contrary, they sought to alter and pervert it into a consummate vision of the Garden. This process had been "perfected" during the conquest of Europe's primal cultures. Furthermore, it exemplifies the meta-madness of collective cultural insanity.

This meta-madness has manifested itself in violence against Primal Peoples and the land. For example, the "savage" label which the imperial Europeans attached to Native Americans is very inappropriate. Not only is it a basis for collective cultural madness in the form of narcissism, it also misrepresents the complexity of Native American cultures and their relationships with the land. Initial encounters with Native Americans are well documented. Geographer Carl Sauer's classic accounts demonstrate many complex land ideals in practice among American Indians prior to cultural disruption. Moreover, in reviewing Sauer's accounts, we find habitation sites and transport trails, agricultural land, managed wildlands and sacred precincts or wilderness sanctuaries. These sacred geographic wildlands among Native Americans constitute a positive for environmental ethics (cf. Vecsey & Venables American Indian Environments: Ecological Issues in Native American History; Overhold & Callicott, Clothes-In-Fur and Other Tales: An Introduction to Ojibway World View). This sacrality of place -- the awe, veneration and empathy with nature -- among Native Americans demonstrates a non-teleological (non-utilitarian) perspective. It is respect and concern for nature which characterizes this American Indian environmental ethic. Native American peoples celebrated their kinship with nature via ritual, rite and ceremony. They internalized this kinship through their mythologies. The effect upon their societies was an integration with "Great Mysterious" and consequent psychological balance.

Conversely, (viewing nature in a resource sense) the Imperial European perspective is decidedly teleological or utilitarian, it
promotes and rationalizes the belief of the Hobbesian concepts of artificial competition and savagery rather than the more realistic notion of mutual aid. Furthermore, it is grounded in the homocentrism of Genesis. This grounding is a tradition which can be traced through Europe to the Mid-East. It is consumptively neurotic (cf. Shepard, op. cit.; Turner, op. cit.; and Freud, Moses and Monotheism) and consumes cultures with a meta-madness which threatens all life on this planet with annihilation.

The principal purpose of this paper is the presentation of a deeper, broader and ecologically cultural perspective of history. It demonstrates that primal peoples could and often did live in relative balance between culture and nature. In fact the two were not separate entities, the wilderness concept was thus understood in the non-teleological sense of kinship. This moral principle of kinship is active among primal peoples. Furthermore, this principle demonstrates a deeper fundamental religious sense in which sacred values are intrinsic to the modern wilderness concept and experience. Modern wilderness areas are sacred lands in the deepest primal sense. Sacred wildlands have nurtured our psyche since time immemorial. And as Rolling Thunder suggested, there is a connection between our relationship to the land and our psychic well-being (Boyd, Rolling Thunder; cf. Shepard, op. cit.). Modern wilderness areas are counterparts to ancient sacred lands in the primal world. Their place in the primal world view demonstrates an extended social interest and concern for the ecologic commonweal — an empathy with the will-of-the-land. In our modern world view, the presence of wilderness is essential for our psychological well being and it gives us hope for survival against the meta-madness. But in the deepest sense wilderness is essential for itself, for the will-of-the-land — the Earth's wild ecological processes — and we must once again recognize this in a sacred-ethical context.
INTRODUCTION

We did not think of the great open plains, the beautiful rollings hills, and winding streams with tangled growth, as "wild." Only to the white man was nature a "wilderness" and only to him was the land "infested" with "wild" animals and "savage" people. To us it was tame. Earth was bountiful and we were surrounded with the blessings of the Great Mystery. Not until the hairy man from the east came and with brutal frenzy heaped injustices upon us and the families we loved was it "wild" for us (Chief Luther Standing Bear 1933:38).

The term wilderness is loaded with many highly personal conceptions and meanings. It is therefore, difficult to cross reference, especially across cultural world views. Perspectives on wilderness and its definition differ widely. Wilderness historian, Roderick Nash (1982:5) explains that there is a "tendency of wilderness to be a state of mind", thus "to accept as wilderness those places people call wilderness. The emphasis here is not so much what wilderness is but what men think it is." The authors of Wilderness Management (1978:9 Hendee, Stankey & Lucas) agree and call wilderness "the terra incognita of people's minds."

Standing Bear's remarks imply two distinct conceptions of wilderness, as well as a notion of kinship with "wild" nature. The overt view which he terms as the perspective of the "white man" may be referred to as an imperial conception. Wilderness in the imperial conception is viewed with forboding and inhospitality. It is a view
which is clearly foreign to Standing Bear's conception of the land. The intrinsic valuation of Standing Bear's remarks reveal an attachment to the land, a kinship with it -- a holy land conception -- that is effectively love of the land. Among Standing Bear's people -- the Lakota -- there is an acknowledgement of human dependency upon the transcendental potency of the earth.

The old people came literally to love the soil and they sat or reclined on the ground with a feeling of being close to a mothering power. It was good for the skin to touch the earth and the old people liked to remove their moccasins and walk with bare feet on the sacred earth. Their tipis were built upon the earth and their altars were made of earth. The birds that flew in the air came to rest upon the earth and it was the final abiding place of all things that lived and grew. The soil was soothing, strengthening, cleansing and healing [Standing Bear 1933:192].

Similarly, the sweat lodge prayer of the Oglala Lakota Black Elk begins with a kinship plea to the earth -- "All my relatives."

Furthermore, the well known practice of totemism among primal peoples is another example of mythic union and kinship bonding between human, other animals and nature. Many Native Americans, the Lakota among them, believe that one must cry for a vision, in order to be guided through life. In most cases, the vision is disclosed to the human through communications with other creatures. Brave Buffalo of Standing Rock Reservation explains:

Let a man decide upon his favorite animal and make a study of it,... let him learn to understand its sounds and motions. The animals want to communicate with man, but Wakan Tanka does not intend they shall do so directly -- man must do the greater part in securing an understanding... When I was 10 years of age I looked at the land and the rivers, the sky above, and the animals around me and could not fail to realize that they were made by some great power. I was so anxious to understand this power that I questioned the trees and bushes [Brown 1970].
SACRED ECOLOGY AND KINSHIP ETHICS

These primal peoples acknowledge a totality of all aspects of life. In these cultures, an individual is always learning from his or her experiences as he or she walks through life. The natural world is the guide for this walk through life and one learns from each being of creation while reading the lessons of the elements. This practice is "walking in a sacred manner." Thus, the natural world is not perceived as a hostile waste, but is thought to be tame. Tame not in the sense of domestication -- civilized, controlled or conquered -- but tame in the sense of established ties. These are kinship ties which constitute a kinship morality.

The holistic perception of ecosystems among the Lakota results in a sacred reciprocity between human and land. It is a reciprocity between all things both animate and inanimate (although they do not recognize this dichotomy). The primal mind recognizes that there are no walls between the components of the system. Symbolizing this relationship -- sacred ecology -- is the circle. It is the circle which Black Elk called the "Sacred Hoop." In words recorded for him (Neihardt 1932:164-165), Black Elk declares:

You have noticed that everything an Indian does is in a circle and that is because the Power of the World always works in circles, and everything tries to be round. In the old days when we were a strong and happy people, all our power came to us from the sacred hoop of the nation and so long as the hoop was unbroken the people flourished. The flowering tree was the living center of the hoop, and the circle of the four quarters nourished it. The east gave peace and light, the south gave warmth, the west gave rain, and the north with its cold and mighty wind gave strength and endurance. This knowledge came to us from the outer world with our religion. Everything the Power of the World does is done in a circle. The
sky is round and I have heard that the earth is round like a ball and so are all the stars. The Wind, in its greatest power, whirls. Birds make their nests in circles, for theirs is the same religion as ours. The Sun comes forth and goes down again in a circle. The Moon does the same, and both are round.

The circle manifests the greater power — "the Power of the World" — which is a circle of interrelationships and the totality of those relationships between all organisms and their environment. The earth itself is viewed as an organism populated with all manner of beings both animate and inanimate. The modern scientific vernacular for this notion is ecology. Primal peoples recognize this as a sacred ecology.

Among the Lakota, the term **Wakan Tanka** is indicative of this sacred relationship. Professor Joseph Epes Brown explains that **Wakan** is best translated as mysterious powers — sacred — and it is latent to all forms of the phenomenal world. According to Sword, a Lakota,

> Every object in the world has a spirit and that spirit is **Wakan**. Thus the spirit of the tree or things of that kind are also **Wakan**.

> ... The earth and the rock and the mountains pertain to the Chief **Wakan**. We do not see the real earth and rock, but only their **tonwampi**.

> When a Lakota prays to **Wakan-Tanka**, he prays to the earth and to the rock and all other good **Wakan** beings [From J. R. Walker, *The Sun Dance and Other Ceremonies of the Teton Dakota* (1917), quoted out of Tedlock 1975: 206-207].

Furthermore, Professor Brown explains that throughout the Plains Indian cultures, there is an ultimate recognition of the unity of powers — the interrelationship of all things or "**Wakan** beings." This union is expressed as **Tanka**. This mysterious power in holistic interrelationship — **Wakan Tanka** — is best translated **Great Mysterious**. **Wakan Tanka** gives sacred meaning and significance to the modern concept of ecology and ecological principles. Demonstrating **Wakan Tanka**, contemporary
scholars recognize ecology to be a science so "mysterious" that it will be forever beyond complete human understanding.

Equipped with this understanding of kinship ethics and sacred ecology, we are prepared to investigate the duality of Chief Luther Standing Bear's remarks. A complete explication of his perceptions is essential if we are to develop a full and rich understanding of the wilderness concept. The manifold meanings and implications of Standing Bear's remarks imply two distinct wilderness conceptions — (A) Imperial and (B) Primary.

A. IMPERIAL CONCEPTIONS OF WILDERNESS

The Imperial conception is used in the sense of the "howling" wilderness. It implies that wilderness is evil and totalitarian. Imperial wilderness conceptions are born of the homocentric mind. This perception subsumes wilderness categorically to the human mind. Thus wilderness cannot exist of its own volition, but must be controlled, ordered and managed. The rationalization that wilderness is evil re-inforces this dominion over the wild through the early agricultural, domestication and urbanization processes, and the medieval interpretation of the Biblical tradition of the ancient Mid-East.

Concepts of Meta-Madness

Imperial conceptions of wilderness reflect a collective cultural dysfunction. This collective abnormalism may be termed meta-madness. Meta-madness is the collective psychopathological behavior of ecologically dysfunctional cultures. Such cultures have severely impaired their surrounding environments to the threshold of ecologic
collapse. Since cultures are founded upon ecosystems and are therefore grounded in a landed ecological interrelationship, this ecologic collapse results in a cultural dysfunctionalism which is manifest as meta-madness. Thus, the psychopathology of meta-madness is based upon the threatening collapse of ecosystems and subsequent cultural disruption. Collective cultural self-defense mechanisms are developed to cope with the threats posed by the collapsing ecosystems. These self-defense mechanisms constitute an ecologically abnormal behavior which is inconsistent with normative principles at work in the ecosystem. Moreover, the norm is established by the ecosystem while the collective cultural abnormality is largely an abnormal human behavior pattern based upon excessive homocentric desiring. Such abnormal behavior is maladaptive for the survival of the species and the ecosystem at large.

In order to comprehend how meta-madness emerges and works in social psychology, we need to establish an understanding of individual psychology and its interaction within the collective community. The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler (Adler 1956) provides a most appropriate framework for this analysis. "Adler's was the first psychological system in the history of psychology that developed in what we should today call a social-science direction" (Murphy in the History Introduction to Modern Psychology, quoted from Adler 1956:126). Certain characteristics of Adler's Individual Psychology are relevant to the meta-madness condition, these include the notions of inferiority (resulting in human striving for superiority), and secondly a holistic
outlook of extended social interest which may be termed "ecologic commonweal." Moreover, in this framework, the person's psychological processes must be understood within his or her individuality. This individuality only emerges in relation with the larger whole or extended community to which the individual belongs. In this context, the individual must be seen and must see him or herself as embedded in a larger whole -- the social situation. This position of the individual's behavior and beliefs in the context of society is the essence of social psychology. It therefore provides a basis for the psychological analysis of cultures and their interrelations with each other and subsequently to their supporting ecosystems, as well as the planet and cosmos at large.

The sociological considerations of Adler's Individual Psychology emphasize the communal life. This social interest framework includes (1) the individual's means for responding to the social situation; (2) his or her social coping aptitude; and (3) the reaction between the individual and his or her social setting -- first, in reference to intellectual functioning, and secondly with regard to adjustment in general. "The interaction will be successful or unsuccessful, from the point of view of the individual as well as the group, depending upon the amount of social interest present in the process (Adler 1956:126)."

Adler recognized this social interest and the human striving for it as an ultimate evolutionary adaptation. This sense of societal evolution and human striving provides the basis for our analysis of meta-madness.

Societal evolution operates directly by the inheritance of acquired characters, of knowledge and learned activities, including value judgment and ethical decisions, and is subject to conscious control. Man's essential nature is defined by qualities found
nowhere else... It is part of this unique status that in man a new form of evolution begins... Plan, purpose, goal, all absent in evolution to this point, enter with the coming of man and are inherent in the new evolution, which is confined to him. With them comes the need for criteria of choice. Good and evil, right and wrong, concepts largely irrelevant in nature except from the human viewpoint, become real pressing features of the whole cosmos as viewed by man... (Alder 1956:106).

It is this awareness of human societal evolution which the Genesis myth of the Garden exemplifies. Moreover, previous to human speciation, the pre-cursory human existed without the volition of judgment or the knowledge of moral choice. Thus, Adler's conception of societal evolution reveals the underlying principle of the human speciation as recorded in the Genesis mythology. With the recognition of our judgment awareness, Adler (1956:106) contends that:

We must connect our thought with a continuous active adaptation to the demands of the outer world if we are to understand the direction and movement of life. We must think that this is a question of something primordial, of something that was inherent in primeval life. It has always been a matter of overcoming, of the existence of the individual and the human race, always a matter of establishing a favorable relationship between the individual and the outer world... The concept of active adaptation implies that body and mind and the whole organization of living must strive toward this ultimate adaptation, toward the conquest of all the advantages and disadvantages set by the cosmos.

Adler (Adler 1956:107) posits that we, the human species, strive for superiority or perfection; but in this striving for perfection, the goal of an ideal community must be socially fostered "because all that we value in life, all that endures and continues to endure, is eternally the product of social interest." Thus the perfection of the social interest must be the end product of the healthy individual and of the healthy culture. Adler (1956:127) further contended that in all humans exists a social embeddedness which is an absolute truth of communal
life. Moreover,

In order to understand what goes on in an individual, it is necessary to consider his attitude toward his fellow men. The relationships of people to one another in part exists naturally and as such are subject to change. In part, they take the form of institutionalized relationships which arise from the natural ones. Those institutionalized relationships can be observed especially in the political life of nations, in the formation of states, and in community affairs. Human psychological life cannot be understood without the simultaneous consideration of these coherences (Adler 1956: 107-108).

Adler, accordingly emphasized that humans have never appeared otherwise than in society. The social embeddedness of the individual's life is thus transcendentally an absolute truth.

Adler (1956:133) extended the social interest recognizing "the necessity for a human being to preserve life and to further life in the environment in which he finds himself." This suggestion bespeaks an "other-directedness" which when properly cultivated extends beyond human cultures out to ecosystems and to the ecosphere of the cosmos. In positing this Adler (1956:137-139) states:

Social interest remains throughout life. It becomes differentiated, limited, or expanded and, in favorable cases, extends not only to family members but to the larger group, to the nation, to all of mankind. It can even go further, extending itself to animals, plants, and inanimate objects and finally even to the cosmos.

Furthermore, the indomitable progress of social interest, growing through (societal) evolution, justifies the assumption that the very existence of mankind is inseparably tied up with being good. Whatever seems to speak against this assumption is to be regarded as a mistake of (societal) evolution and can be traced to errors.

These errors of societal evolution are grounded in the egocentric conditions of "self-boundedness" and centralized desires for personal gain whether it be an individual or a species as in the case of our
contemporary human chauvinism. It is the failure of extended social interest -- the socio-ecologic commonweal -- which bears the thesis of imperial wilderness conceptions and meta-madness. With this framework of striving for perfection and extended social interest, let us now examine the conditions of meta-madness.

Meta-madness is a complete process of collective cultural dysfunctionalism which appears in successional stages of collective insanity. It begins with deficient perceptions of reality -- i.e., ecologically abnormal fantasies -- where the culture impoverishes reality and abstracts itself outside ecological normative principles. Moreover, this process of fantasy abstraction is based upon the artificiality emergent from excessive human desiring, or the lack of an extended human socio-ecologic commonweal. Humans subsequently seek to alter ecosystems in ways which are inconsistent with natural on-going, ever-active ecological principles which are the foundation of creation and are in fact most potently manifest in the wilderness. In this process of impoverishing reality, the species -- human cultures -- domesticate themselves and lose their fundamental ecological connection which is the basis of their self-knowledge. This impoverished self-knowledge fosters a fraudulent sense of experience.

Since reality is impoverished and experience is fraudulent, it is apparent that virtue, beauty, and purpose are not real facts in nature; they must, then, result merely from the individual's reaction to an interpretation of nature. This means that they are real for each man only as he feels them, and he is to honor and accept no opinion concerning them except his own. Such negation of discipline can but culminate in coercive authority; and such denial of standards must issue in the doctrine that desire measures good and that right is synonymous with power (Jenkins 1942:546).
It is from this impoverished perception of ecologic reality that cultures begin to break down into the *meta-madness* succession. Such cultures fail to exercise voluntary control over their socio-ecologic behavior towards the ecosystems to which they belong. In their desiring, these cultures annihilate their life-giving ecosystems. Their inner perceptions are distorted by fantasy abstractions and a sense of inferiority before nature which produces a not-at-homeness. They become consumed with personal security, preoccupied with human desires and strivings, and can only seek to exploit without reciprocation. This homocentrism is then the opposite of an extended socio-ecological interest or commonweal which Adler posited as necessary for mental well-being. In its lack of regard for the ecosystem, human culture loses its productivity and collapses, thereby stressing the homocentric population into acts of collective psychopathology.

These symptoms are the initial successional stages of *meta-madness*. The anxiety generated at this stage of collective dysfunctionalism constitutes a *meta-neurosis*. Neuroses are most commonly anxiety reactions. In large measure, these anxiety reactions are founded upon a feeling of inferiority. Adler (1956) develops this inferiority centered condition as it pertains to the social interest and in doing so provides us with a clear picture of *meta-neurosis*. The goal of *meta-neurosis* is one of superiority, which emerges out of anxiety. This striving is compensatory on the individual level, "the neurotic is more concerned with his self-esteem, and has a personal goal of superiority (1956:102)." Collectively with regard to ecosystems and wilderness,
this striving translates to centricism or in this case human chauvinism, which is characteristic of homocentric striving. Individual neurotics "strive for conquest, security, increase," and they rationalize this striving on the premises of self-preservation, the pleasure principle and other equalizations. The notion of natural resources exemplifies this neurotic striving on a collective human centered basis. Moreover, all other than human entities are seen as utilitarian resources for the human species rather than existing for themselves. This perspective posits a desire to dominate over non-human others thereby controlling them and managing them for the maximization of human happiness, pleasure and desire. When seen collectively such a position is clearly neurotic, for it is void of extended social interest or ecologic commonweal. In developing the fantasy that humans are somehow separate and apart from nature, meta-neurotic cultures have deluded themselves into a pseudo, enhanced self-esteem. Adler (1956:108-109) contends "That neurotic purpose is the enhancement of the self-esteem" which occurs in this case at the expense of extended social interest. "The tendency in the individual is the aim of getting rid of the feeling of inferiority in order to raise himself to the full height of the self-esteem ...,(Adler 1956:110)." In human chauvinism, this pattern demonstrates itself in fantasies of a separate reality between the human and the non-human, and in the will to power notions of dominion and control which are characteristic of imperial agriculture and domestication. It is thus a basis for the disparagement of nature. Meta-neurosis is grounded in human inferiority feelings before nature and, in passing, Adler
(1956:117) points out that "man" is necessarily inferior before nature. When this inferiority before nature becomes abnormal, these inferiority feelings manifest a selfish, inconsiderate, power centered desire. The goal is to suppress the other, and otherness in general. Neurotic cultures come from this sphere of insecurity. The foundations of their meta-neurosis is a fantasy feeling of not-at-homeness in nature and a subsequent inferiority before nature.

As these meta-neurotic cultures become progressively psychopathic, their anxiety is projected upon nature in the form of fantasy fears. These fantasy fears emphasize human inferiority in an abnormal way. They often take on the form of an anthropomorphic God or other such delusions. The culture subsequently invests powers, both positive and negative, into these delusions. Consequently, in their anxiety the cultures fear their Gods' wrath and seek means to appease the deities. This appeasement process often takes on a deviant and aberrant pattern, including blood sacrifice and other desperate behavior. Thus the people find themselves in extreme paranoia before their Gods. In another way, these Gods are often used to attempt to correct cultural behavior or reverse meta-neurosis. Moreover, proper behavior is prescribed by individuals with concern for the social interest but they couch their "oughts" in fear -- i.e., "if you do not conform then God will get you." These fear-oughts may be founded upon truthful or untruthful principles, but their totalitarian enforcement nature always generates a totalitarian response which results in heightened cultural anxiety or meta-neurosis.
In all cases meta-neurosis is possible only when cultures fail to exhibit an extended social interest or concern for the ecologic commonweal. Without treatment or natural ecosystem salving, meta-neurosis progressively worsens becoming a more complex psychopathology. This worsened state of meta-madness is characteristic of a culture's diminished social interest or concern for the ecologic commonweal. The cultural world view is characterized by gross distortions of reality. There is an inability to distinguish fantasy from reality. These distortions of reality take the form of totalitarian delusions and narcissism. The end product is collective violence. This stage of meta-madness may be recognized as meta-psychosis. Cultures suffering from meta-psychosis have become seriously impaired in their understanding of ecologic process and biologic reality. They can no longer function in relative balance and harmony with their supporting ecosystems. The meta-psychotic world view contains gross distortions of reality. The culture can no longer distinguish between fantasy and reality. Thus, the culture is no longer trying to function within the framework of ecologic process and biologic reality. They have become at this stage so deluded that they have lost contact with earth centered reality. Meta-psychotic cultures suffer total fantasy abstractions and withdraw into their own world. ("World" is most appropriate here because generally it always connotes human invention (OED) rather than planetary volition such as the term "earth" suggests.) These fantasy abstractions are delusions which are totalitarian in compass. They center around a false belief -- that
human culture can manage the wild without doing it harm — despite contradictory evidence or experience. The grandeur of totalitarian delusions is characteristic of the human striving for superiority over nature. They are born of the fantasy abstraction of human apartness from nature and human not-at-homeness on the earth. This condition is in effect a meta-schizophrenia or collective split reality. From this bizarre condition, these disturbed cultures conclude themselves to be superior over others, first in the species sense and secondly in the racial sense. This fascist perspective in relation to others — both human and non-human — culminates in narcissism. Narcissism fosters a rationality of superiority which is a fascist ideology of the homo-, ethno-, and ego-centric chosen. It is useful in meta-stress reactions as a short-term survival technique, but when further compounded it produces ultimate totalitarian threats. Moreover, if you and your kind perceive yourself better than others, then you can justify doing harm to them, rationalizing their degradation — e.g., labeling other cultures as non-human savages and fostering domination of others regardless of what they might be. Narcissism culminates in acts of violence against others — e.g., domestication, slavery and extinction.

The enactment of these narcissistic rationalizations is a foundation for a collectively psychopathic culture or a culture suffering from meta-psychosis. This meta-psychosis is equipped with the means necessary to justify the degradation of others — bondage, domination and annihilation. In action, meta-psychosis results in the extinction of whole species, the collapse of entire ecosystems, the
desacrilization of wilderness and the annihilation of other differing cultures. Furthermore, together with its narcissistic formulation, meta-psychosis threatens the elimination of the living Earth -- the complete extinction of all life on the planet. This threat is possible as a result of the psychic-surrender (cf. Cain 1983) present in meta-psychotic cultures.

The psychically-surrendered populace turns complete control of their life, all responsibility for their total existence, over to someone whom they perceive as stronger and more capable. This is a stance of insecurity and fear which leads to an abdication of life. Cain (1983:9) contends that

Psychic surrender is a last desperate attempt to remove the stress. In psychic surrender, we choose a symbolic rather than a literal death. The ultimate effect is the release of stress.

This stress reaction is clearly a sign of meta-madness. Unlike in narcissism were individuals and cultures become consumed with their own superiority, those suffering psychic-surrender have given up striving altogether. They place all responsibility upon others which are often abstract delusions. In effect, they have opted for nothingness and thus unwittingly aid the psychopathic process of meta-madness. Thus the psychically-surrendered are in effect preparing themselves for meta-suicide.

Meta-madness appears to have its origins in imperial agriculture, urbanization and domestication and from this beginning, the world has become progressively mad.

This insanity is epitomized in the Imperial wilderness perspective. In order to comprehend this problem, we need to investigate the history
of several collectively insane cultures and their subsequent violence to others. This investigation is not intended to condemn the cultures presented as examples; moreover, their madness is often itself the product of a prior cultural disruption emanating from the original meta-madness source or condition. Consequently, meta-madness is a problem we all share in our humanness and it transcends our ancestors' ability to cope with it. We must, therefore, not condemn on the basis of example, lest we fall into the totalitarian delusions which initiated the original meta-madness cycle. Once we recognize and acknowledge this very great problem which knows no racial nor sexual bounds, then we must seek meta-therapeutic means for its treatment. In this spirit, the following examples are offered only as a figurative means for demonstrating the problem we all collectively confront today.

A Beginning of Meta-Madness

The agricultural practices which began in the ancient mid-East provided a basis for the dichotomy of Imperial and Primary conceptions of wilderness. This agriculture was formulated upon monocultural grain crops which at first produced terrific yields. These crop yields, in turn fostered extreme increases in the region's human populations. As these human populations grew, more technology -- irrigation, flood control and the artifices of human dominion over nature -- became necessary to support the cultures. Subsequently, marginal lands were pushed into crop production and the amount of pastoral lands were significantly reduced. The adoption of this agricultural lifestyle led to urbanization which removed the people from a sacred understanding
of the wilderness. In consequence, the people became sedentary and
domestic in a manner similar to the crops and animals which they
controlled. The peoples' life-ways and religious valves turned away
from wildlands and focused upon that which they controlled. This
religious emphasis on the human-controlled environment -- domestic land,
crops, animals and people -- established a basis for natural disaster
and ecosystem collapse.

The checks and balances of the ecosystems had been removed via
human intervention. Along the Nile the river flooded with a predictable
periodicity and the agricultural lands were annually renewed and
revived. Conversely, in the Tigris-Euphrates Basin, flooding was
erratic and destructive. The agriculturalists and pastoralists had
destroyed the watershed and the rivers' abilities to regulate excess
run-off. Natural catastrophes -- erosive floods from stressed marginal
lands, salination and the diseases of domestication -- produced in these
people fears of a totalitarian kind which then reflected onto their
conception of the Gods and nature. These catastrophes reduced crop
yields, thereby stressing the increased populations which were beyond
the ecosystems' threshold carrying capacity. Disease epidemics ran
rampant throughout the populations and infected humans with deadly
contagions. These contagions produced by the domestication of animals
contributed to a collective mental imbalance in the respective
cultures.

Subsequently, the peoples projected their problems onto the land
and the whims of their angry Gods. These Gods were perceived as
totalitarian — that is, they became totalitarian delusions, like in kind to the natural catastrophes which they represented, but which were in fact the product of ecosystem collapse due to excessive human tampering. From this totalitarian cultural perspective a meta-madness developed. A case in point which demonstrates this original meta-madness is the biblical myth of Cain and Abel.

The Cain & Abel Myth

The underlying principles of the Cain and Abel Biblical myth (Genesis 4) substantiate the meta-cultural conflict which developed between sedentary agriculturalists and nomadic pastoralists. Recalling that the ecosystem of the Tigris-Euphrates Basin had come under extreme stress due to the peoples imperial agricultural practices and the pastoral domestication of animals, it follows that competing cultural practitioners would follow suit becoming competitive and combative. In this analysis, Cain represents the sedentary agriculturalists who lived in urban environments surrounded with monocultural crop lands. Conversely, Abel represents the nomadic pastoralists with their flocks of domestic animals.

As the two cultural factions begin competing for the diminishing resources of the collapsing ecosystem, they each suffer the inferiority complex of fear before a totalitarian God — in this case represented by the failing ecosystem. Obliged out of fear-oughts for survival each group — agriculturalists and pastoralists — offer sacrifices of their charge — crops and flocks — to the angry God. The myth implies that the pastoralists' offerings were accepted by the totalitarian God while
the agriculturalists' offerings were rejected. This suggestion indicates that the agricultural lands and crops were no longer productive and failing more quickly than the upland pastures. Feeling extreme anxiety in the face of their God's rejection, the agriculturalists developed a meta-neurotic reaction towards the land and the pastoralists who appeared to have success. Subsequently, the agriculturalists — Cain's culture became "wroth" with "fallen countenance" and began rationalizing a narcissistic retribution against their pastoralists brothers — Abel's culture. When the totalitarian God further compounds this meta-neurotic reaction of Cain's cultural inferiority, their subsequent narcissistic rationalizations are propelled to meta-psychopathic action. Cain's cultural action demonstrates meta-psychosis in the killing or warring upon Abel's culture. Moreover, this meta-psychosis exhibited by Cain's culture against Abel's culture is directly tied to the imbalanced human relationship with the ecosystem — i.e., lack of extended social interest or ecologic commonweal. The impending collapse of the ecosystem is the product of excessive human desiring, controlling and manipulating of the land. This example demonstrates clearly the relationship of Imperial wilderness conceptions — emphasizing control, domination and human management of the land — and the subsequent meta-madness manifested in the brutal frenzy of cultures at war over a collapsing ecosystem.

Further reflective of this meta-madness inherent to the Cain and Abel myth is the story of the Garden. The Garden is the opposite of
desert wilderness. Eden represented "a consummate agricultural dream" (Shepard 1982:26) a land with "no bad weather, no wild beasts, no dependents, no competitors, no risk, no curiosity, no old age, no alienation from God, no death, and no women's troubles." This paradisical Eden represented a fantasy dreamland devoid of biologic reality. In their attempts, however, to accommodate wild creatures, the story tellers seek to domesticate them into Edenic ideals. Moreover, lions are to lie down and eat straw with lambs. This conception is clearly an ecologic delusion. A loathing dread for the ecologic realities inherent in the wilderness emerged from these Edenic fantasies. Thus, the Edenic ideal divorces, in collective mind, the human species from the natural world and ecologic process. Nash (1982:15) concludes that "The story of the Garden and its loss embedded into Western thought the idea that wilderness and paradise were both physical and spiritual opposites."

The story of the Garden may well be a psychologic coping reaction to the stress of a people without a home. Wandering in the desert wilderness, the ancient Hebrew people found existence harsh and difficult. As a self-proclaimed "chosen" people (evidence of narcissism), they had been assured a "Promised Land." Freud's (1949:105-106) "traumatic neurosis" diagnosis of the "Jewish Monotheism" is evidently grounded in this stress reaction.

The Hebrew Experience

It would appear that the ancient Hebrews originated in the Tigris-Euphrates Basin near the great Babylonian city of Ur (cf.
Albright 1963:2; and Genesis 11:31). They were evidently pastoral nomads. Albright (1963:5) explains:

The meaning of the term 'Apiru- "Abiru, later "Ibri, 'Hebrew,' - has now been established; it meant something like 'donkey-man, donkey driver, huckster, caravnner.' Originally it may have meant 'dusty,' with obvious reference to the dust raised by donkeys on a much-travelled road.

Generally, (circa 3,000-1,200 B.P.) Hebrews were a stateless people of varied ethnic stock, scattered from Elam to Egypt. During the Twelfth Dynasty, Egypt extended its suzerainty over much of Palestine, Phoenicia and southern Syria. Semitic influences poured into Egypt during this period.

The Hebrews at this time were not well received and by 1300 B.P. the vast majority had been enslaved by the Egyptians (Albright 1963:10). This enslavement created an inferiority complex in the Hebrews and subjected them to the totalitarian rule of the Egyptians. It was only natural that they should seek their freedom.

Moses who had become a follower of the Aton (sun centered) monotheism turned to them and endeavored to realize his own ideals through them (Freud 1939). Leaving Egypt with his immediate Egyptian followers (the Levites) and those newly chosen people (the Semitic tribes of Goshen), Moses hallowed them. He accomplished this sacralization of a people via the custom of circumcision (an Egyptian practice); by entering into a covenant with them; by giving them divine laws (the ten commandments); by assuring them a "promised land" in which to inherit and prosper; and by introducing them to the Aton religion which the Egyptians had just discarded. During this Exodus from Egypt
(between 1358–1350 B.P.), Moses relinquished the Aton connection with the sun-god of On, to whom On still adhered. In this process, the Aton conception of the sun as the source of all life on earth and the one universal God became subsumed and personalized into a living human, an incarnate yet invisible abstraction -- the monotheistic God.

HEBREWS: The "Chosen" People

Following the death of Moses (at the hands of his followers) and the compromise of the Mosiac tradition, the "chosen people" (Hebrews) declared themselves to be in covenant with their God which they professed to be the one and only universal truth. Based upon this covenant of the chosen, the Hebrews united themselves with another Semitic tribe (lead by a man known as Mosche who in Biblical mythology has been fused with the Egyptian Moses) and forged a new monotheism which included a merger of the Mosiac God with a violent unpredictable God -- Jahve. The subsequent monotheism created a narcissism characteristic of a meta-psychotic culture. The people reasoned that they were entitled to a "land of promise"; after all, they were the "chosen people" and in covenant with their God. They rationalized their belief through the violent Jahve, and with the one "universal truth" doctrine, the Hebrews looked upon the fertile land of Canaan as a promised right. Observing the Canaanites worship practices, they rationalized that the indigenous people were "whoring after false gods" and that a war upon the Canaanites would be justifiable because of their monotheistic truth.
The war upon the Canaanites was not an ordinary war, but a holy war. The "promised land" had to be cleansed of the wicked and the impure. Thus, it was a war of annihilation (a theme dear to the imperial wilderness mentality). This condition of meta-neurosis was manifest through a period of latency. The Jews had been "chosen" by Moses to accept his Aton truth. Moses was harsh, intolerant and jealous; not exactly a pleasant benefactor. So they killed him in the desert. Freud (1939:52) asserts that this led the Hebrews to great anxiety and neurosis because they had murdered their spiritual leader, their father figure. As a consequence, Judaism is a Father religion and the Jews immortalized Moses while developing a superiority complex around his having chosen them. The ideology of the chosen is in fact narcissism which the Hebrews psychotically turned upon the Canaanites. The subsequent action was a war of annihilation designed to purge the land of the wicked and it was carried out in the name of God.

A second way in which the ideology of the "chosen" leads to narcissism and hence, annihilation, is the theme of humanizing the Aton God. Freud (1939:46) explains how the Old Testament characterizes Moses (which closely corresponds to the Judaic God):

It describes him as choleric, hot-tempered - as when in his indignation he kills the brutal overseer who ill-treated a Jewish workman, or when in his resentment at the defection of his people he smashes the tables he has been given on Mount Sinai. Indeed, God himself punished him at long last for a deed of impatience - we are not told what it was. Since such a trait does not lend itself to glorification, it may very well be historical truth. Nor can we reject even the possibility that many character traits the Jews incorporated into their early conception of God when they made him
jealous, stern, and implacable were taken essentially from their memory of Moses, for in truth it was not an invisible god, but the man Moses, who had led them out of Egypt.

Obviously, Freud is pointing towards "the truism that man created God in his own image...." (Shepard 1982:101). This act of defining God via the image of a human committed the Jews to a historical process of surrounding themselves with a world of their own making. The Biblical story of the Garden confirms this creative fantasy. According to Edith Jacobson (Shepard 1982:119) "The psychotic tries to 'change the world' to meet his needs, a fantasy of performing (as opposed to symbolizing) his own impulses." And as Shepard (1982:120) warns -- "The trouble with the eagerness to make a world is that, being already made, what is there first must be destroyed."

Evident in the Hebrews' Edenic fantasy of the Garden is a deep seated anxiety of being strangers in the world and strangers before their god. Thus the ancient Hebrews were not at home in the world and this conception generated a neurosis which is characteristically an attitude of peoples following this spiritual tradition -- Geographer Yi-Fu Tuan explains the ramifications of this worldview:

The destination of the chosen People was the kingdom of God. All intermediate kingdoms were suspect. Unlike the ancient Greeks the Israelites hesitated to establish a political organization that suggested permanence. Earthly places were all temporary, at best states on the way to the ultimate goal. Religions of transcendental hope tend to discourage the establishment of place. The message is, don't hang on to what you have; live in the present as if it were a camp or wayside station to the future. (Tuan 1977:180)

In Nature and Madness, Shepard (1982:53) explains that the Hebrew mythology incorporated a pastoral style founded upon: "patriarchal
authoritarianism; abstractions and distancing; a conscious disengagement and that their God could not be affected by the ordinary." Furthermore Shepard characterizes the Hebrew ideal as one of extraordinary ambition. The Hebrews were self-styled exiles, fugitives and wanderers. They were a community of alienated souls who disavowed both the substance and form of the bonding ties—i.e., extended social interest or ecologic commonweal—by which people had acknowledged kinship with the earth and tribe from the dawn of unconsciousness and which had been given form in the exemplary and metaphorical model of myth. In addition, the Hebrews ignored and fought against the ancient notions of the multiplicity of truth; of hidden spirit in all things; of the mystic simultaneity of past, present and future; of the credence in spoken, sung, carved, drawn, or danced affirmation of the cohesion of all things; and of the reading of nature as divine language. These ideals were all seen in the egos of the "self" chosen prophets and "chosen people" as illusory or perverse, as forms of magic or profane imagery. And in his conclusion to Nature and Madness, Shepard (1982:126 & 128) states:

The West is a vast testimony to childhood botched to serve its own purposes, where history, masquerading as myth, authorizes men, of action and thought to alter the world to match their regressive moods of omnipotence and insecurity...[creating] a world where increasing injury to the planet is a symptom of human psychopathology.

Furthermore, the Hebrews were themselves a very warlike people. The patriarchal father Abram is himself a military leader (Genesis 14:1-21). Subsequent Hebrew leaders continue this practice of warfare; Jacob is characterized as having taken his territory by force from the
Amorites (Genesis 48:22). Moses' first census of the tribes is itself a military head count (Numbers). And in their god's wrath, the Hebrews are commanded to annihilate a people (the Moabites):

And ye shall smite every fenced city, and every choice city, and shall fell every good tree, and stop all wells of water, and mar every good piece of land with stones. (II Kings 3:19).

Continuing this tradition, Judaism demonstrates its intolerance when Jehu plots his intentions to "destroy the worshippers of Baal." (II Kings 11:19). Jehu's zeal is so great he threatens his warriors -- "If any of the men whom I have brought into your hands escape, he that leteth him go, his life shall be for the life of him. (II Kings 11:24)." "Thus Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel." (II Kings 11:28).

Jehu's actions account for the final extermination of the Canaanites from their land. Fredrick Turner (1980:45) sums up this Hebrew policy of annihilation:

It was the Israelites who established monotheism in the spiritual geography of humankind. And with it came the terrible concomitants of intolerance and commandments to destroy the sacred items of others (Exodus 23:23-24; 34:13-16) and to "utterly destroy" polytheistic peoples wherever encountered. Deuteronomy 7:16 commands the holy nation to "consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eyes shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods...." And Deuteronomy 13:16 goes so far as to specify that entire pagan cities must be offered up as burnt sacrifices to the one god, as odors pleasing to him.

The consequences of Hebrew monotheism include the de-santification of nature and development of other worldliness based upon the Hebrew god who is an external abstraction -- a stranger to the world.

Estrangement and abstraction, therefore, have become the dominant theme of the Mosiac monotheism. These are themes which devalue life on
earth and all the "ten-thousand creatures" -- the earth itself. This devaluation is born of the ancient Hebrews regard of wilderness which was perceived "as a cursed land" of forbidding character (Nash 1982:14).

Furthermore, "The identification of the arid wasteland with God's curse led to the conception that wilderness was the environment of evil, a kind of hell (Nash 1982:14-15)." Through this perception, wilderness became the abode of demons and devils. The immorality of wilderness represented by this view of human estrangement is one which is totally lacking in extended social interest or ecologic commonweal.

CHRISTIAN ABSTRACTIONS

Christianity furthers these abstract unearthly notions of monotheism in some extremely dangerous ways. The New Testament is a pure formulation of other worldliness. Shepard (1982:80) contends that "The omission of metaphor and celebrations of the earth's sacredness makes the New Testament 'one of the world's most antisenuous masterpieces of abstract ideology, flaked with raw, ragtag bits of obscure patriarchal genealogy and fixation on vengeance and tribal war."

Christian beginnings include four main threads. First, there is its humanist moral teachings which were principally academic and often failed to touch the common person. Secondly, Christianity was instituted as the state religion by Constantine. The ordinary person acknowledged this as a matter of routine, but as a state religion Christianity became imperialized, lost its pretentions to morality and became purely ceremonial. Thirdly, a tenet of Christianity involved some cults -- for example, Cybele, Isis, Serapis, Mithras -- which were
of Eastern origin and of dubious moral character. And lastly, Christianity retained the strong Judeaic foundations of monotheism, its abhorance of idolatry and its social cohesion, but likewise its too often narrow and intolerant concept of the "chosen" or covenant which amounts to narcissism.

Frederick Turner (1980:61) calls Christianity a "crisis cult" saying,

If Christianity was not to remain just another mystery religion, if it was to take fullest advantage of the leverage that Constantine's visionary conversion had given it, then it would have to become increasingly self-conscious and authoritarian. If it was not to degenerate like Gnosticism into a dark confusion of esoterica, it would have to find a way of limiting speculation and revelation, and of regularizing the preaching of the faith.

Christianity accomplished this goal through its imperial position as the state religion and through its policy of atonement (at-one-ment) which subsequently produced a unity at all costs theology and a policy of the annihilation of opposing others.

In Europe, the Roman Empire served as the principal agent for the spread of this meta-madness. An example of this act is the image of Caesar marching through Gaul and Britain putting the Celtic Druids to death and burning the sacred groves (Vest 1983A). As the Roman State adopted Christianity, the Romans extended their imperial power over the "Barbarians"; that is, the primal peoples of northern Europe. In the Roman synthesis of Christianity and federalism, an imperialism emerged in which the wild took on the evil connotation of a desolate waste -- a cold, gloomy wilderness filled with demons. Responding to the native religious traditions, nature worship, the
imperial Christians called the northern Europeans heathens. Moreover, in their failure to acknowledge the God of the Bible, the primal Indo-Europeans were defined as uncivilized, irreligious and barbaric. Consequently, nature and nature worship were given an evil perception. This imperial Christian attitude towards "wild" nature is well demonstrated in Henry Gilbert's *Robin Hood* (1912). Gilbert's account includes examples of this attitude which influenced the superstitions of medieval serfs. The serfs, fearing the "wild," were required to cross themselves as a sacred sign before entering a forest to ward off evil spirits. Imperial Christianity had so influenced these medieval people that "To their simple minds they were risking the loss not only of their lives, but their immortal souls, by venturing into these wild places, the haunts of wood-demons, trolls and witches." In this conception of the wild, wildlands were the home of witches and wizards who could take the shape of crows and ravens in order to do evil tricks and magic. Imperial Christians used this attitude toward wild nature as a way of overpowering the nature deities that dominated Europe's primal cultures; yet they had no shame about occupying these same "wild" places with their abbey's and cathedrals as a means of winning over those with pagan beliefs (Vest 1983A).

**THE CRUSADES: Holy Wars Against the "Enemies of God"**

Following the at-one-ment of Europe under the mono-universal truth of the Roman Church, Christianity stagnated for lack of diversity and need of renewal. It was the Crusades that attempted to accomplish this renewal. The Crusades were holy wars where the enemy was perceived to
be an enemy of their god, thereby an enemy of the single universal truth conception. Of course such an enemy could not be tolerated and the Crusades became holy wars of annihilation. Christianity was trapped in its own success, that is as the Pagan Heathens of northern Europe were converted or destroyed then the at-one-ment became oppressive, all consuming and directed outward via violence. The history of these events have been passed to subsequent generations under the guise of normal cultural maturation. Frederick Turner (1980:72) explains:

We have learned to take such phenomena as the Crusades, the Inquisition, and kindred forms of religious persecution as more or less normal stages in the growth of our civilization, however, attended by violence they have been. Generally we have not thought these might be symptoms of a deep spiritual pathology that has prevented us from experiencing more authentic forms of renewal.

With no means of experiencing authentic renewal, Christianity had fallen into a pattern of aggression which was directed against the body, the natural world, primal peoples, heretics and all unbelievers. It had become "the vain, tragic, pathetically maintained hope" of winning a lost belief or paradise and "this is the terrific burden Christian history has to bear. It is the classic reaction of those who had lost true belief (or have been robbed of it) that they must insist with mounting strenuousness that they do believe -- and that all others must as well (Turner 1980:73)."

The Crusades began a pattern of large-scale, international Christian violence against all nonbelievers. Admitting to a spiritual crisis, Pope Urban preached the First Crusade at Clermont at the end of November 1095. Turner (1980:77-78) elaborates, "William, Archbishop of
Tyre, late in the twelfth century wrote that when the Pope devised
the idea of the Crusades he did so as much in response to the deplorable
state of Christendom as the defilement of the Holy Land.... William
reports Urban as addressing the general condition in these words:

Turn the weapons which you have stained unlawfully in the slaughter
of one another against the enemies of the faith and the name of
Christ. Those guilty of thefts, arson, rapine, homicide, and other
crimes of a similar nature shall not possess the kingdom of God.
Render this obedience, well-pleasing to God, that these works of
pity and the intercession of the saints may speedily obtain for you
pardon for the sins by which you have provoked God to anger....

Contemporary sources report that when Urban had finished speaking,
a thunderous shout went up to heaven, Deus Lo volit! (God Wills it), and
the fields outside Clermont shook with the stamping of eager feet."

Thus Pope Urban committed Medieval European society to a regeneration
through violence; a continuance of the theology of annihilation that
bears so heavy upon the monotheistic tradition. In explanation, Turner
(1980:78-80) reports:

Only a generally felt spiritual poverty, through unsuspected in its
causes, seems adequate to explain the savagery subsequently
unleashed against the enemies of the faith. For soldiers of Christ
did not wait to blood their swords on the Saracens but rather in
the spring of 1096 attacked and slaughtered Jewish communities at
Worms, Mainz, and Trier. This death in the springtime, a ghastly
perversion of ancient regeneration myths, was, as Cohn has said,
the beginning of a tradition that came in historical time to
include in its insatiable need increasingly disparate groups: Jews,
Albigensians, Saracens, witches, Africans, and at last the
primitives of unsuspected aozic zones. Here it is enough to
observe that in successive expeditions many Crusaders felt
themselves unworthy of the high work of destruction in distant
lands until they had hung that first Jewish scalp to their belts on
the way out.

What else can explain the gang warfare of the Crusades once
they had gotten beyond their geographical limits, released into
spaces unsanctified by Christian history? At Antioch an entire
city razed and its habitants murdered to the last infant. At Nicaea the heads of the slain enemies hurled by catapults into the city as part of the general assault. An offering of sliced thumbs and noses sent to the Byzantine emperor. And at Jerusalem, their goal, in July 1099, after a solemn religious procession around the city's besieged walls that culminated in an accent of the Mount of Olives, the host fell upon city with a ferocity that beggars language. "Regardless of age and condition," wrote the Archbishop of Tyre, "they laid low, without distinction, every enemy encountered. Everywhere was frightful carnage, everywhere lay heaps of severed heads, so that soon it was impossible to pass or to go from one place to another except over the bodies of the slain. Already the leaders had forced their way by various routes almost to the center of the city and wrought unspeakable slaughter as they advanced. A host of people followed in their train, athirst for the blood of the enemy and wholly intent upon destruction." So frightening was this massacre that even the victors experienced sensations of horror and loathing: "It was impossible to look upon the vast numbers of the slain without horror; everywhere lay fragments of human bodies, and the very ground was covered with the blood of the slain. It was not alone the spectacle of headless bodies and mutilated limbs strewn in all directions that roused the horror of all who looked on them. Still more dreadful was it to gaze upon the victors themselves, dripping with blood from head to foot, an ominous sight which brought terror to all who met them. It is reported that within the Temple enclosure alone about ten thousand infidels perished, in addition to those who lay slain everywhere throughout the city in the streets and squares, the number of whom was estimated as no less."

Still, it went on to its appointed ending: "The rest of the soldiers roved through the city in search of wretched survivors who might be hiding in the narrow portals and byways to escape death. These were dragged out into public view and slain like sheep. Some formed into bands and broke into houses where they laid violent hands on the heads of families, on their wives, children, and their entire households. These victims were either put to the sword or dashed headlong to the ground from some elevated place so that they perished miserably. Each marauder claimed as his own in perpetuity the particular house which he had entered, together with all it contained. For before the capture of the city the pilgrims had agreed that, after it had been taken by force, whatever each man might win for himself should be his forever by right of possession, without molestation. Consequently the pilgrims searched the city most carefully and boldly killed the citizens." A second such expedition was mounted almost immediately and, if anything, it was costlier in lives than the first. Indeed, as the Crusades went sporadically onward, if a certain amount of official favor was silently withdrawn from them, the violence of the campaigns seems to have increased both in randomness and
intensity until with the so-called Shepard's Crusade of 1320 the very existence of Christian civilization itself seemed threatened.

This annihilation doctrine finds support in the New Testament, in words reportedly spoken by Christ (Matthew 10:33-39) which especially bespeak meta-psychosis:

Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword (Christ in Matthew 10:34).

Later (Matthew 10:38) the allegorical expression "take up the cross" appears and provides a common reference and explanation for men embarking upon the Crusades.

MEDIEVAL CHRISTIANITY: Unity unto Idolatry

The principal tenets of Christianity produced some bizarre mental conceptions. These world views are the basis for several profound abstractions that created a particularly neurotic society. The resultant meta-psychosis is evident in the medieval era via the wholly possession by which the new Christian ideas dominated the people who were deaf to all discussions and ready for any sacrifice. It was this inflexible and intolerant zeal which became one of the main causes for the spread of Christianity. This ideology amounted to unity in Christian belief at all costs. Furthermore, this universal ideal of unity and its subsequent correlate harmony totally dominated the Middle Ages. Coulton (1964:153) explains:

two generations of great thinkers had toiled to weave the accepted beliefs of their day into one harmonious philosophic whole; and then came the temptation to stiffen in self-satisfied repose. A modern Scholastic can boast, with no more than pardonable exaggeration: 'The thirteenth century believed that it had realized a state of stable equilibrium; and [humans'] extraordinary optimism led them to believe that they had arrived at a state close to perfection. In so far, therefore as medieval thought can be
described with any approach to truth in a single sentence, it may be characterized as a struggle for unity; a worship of unity which amounted almost to idolatry.

This ideology of unity erupted in narcissism and the compulsory conversion of all non-believers or the dispossesson of their humanity. For example, the Spanish Inquisition and its horerible zeal issued the Jews an official ultimatum in 1492: "convert instantly or begone. As many as a quarter of a million of them were forced from their homes, often under the cruelest of circumstances, their houses and possessions forfeit to the Christians (Turner 1980:125)."

Later during the French Revolution the universal unity theme was maliciously applied — "Be my brother, or I will kill thee!" — just as it had been applied by the medieval Christians to the pagans before. All medieval Christian thought was characterized by the conviction that each person had a soul to save, and therefore, that salvation was the main end of every human being. Thus the theme was "Be at unity [in Christ] with me, or be burned." (Coulton 1964). This demonstrates a narcissism which further emphasizes the culture's psychotic fixation upon the monothesitic conception of a single universal truth.

**MEDIEVAL CHRISTIANITY: Apocalypse and the Messiah**

The middle ages never lost its tone of the Apocalypse. Frederick Turner (1980:76-77) explains:

clouds of crisis hung heavy over civilization, and this seems to have played a part in the outward movement. Barbarians, plague, and economic and social disruption worked upon the populace. Around 1,000 apocalyptic views were common, and though civilization persisted through the dreadful visitations of plague and even absorbed the harassing barbarians, apocalyptic views also persisted because the real crisis was inner. Norman Cohn's brilliant study of the mood of this time, *The Pursuit of the Millenium*, places the
emphasis where it should be: the root of this crisis feeling was not merely economic or social (though certainly the periods severe economic and social dislocations were important) but fundamentally spiritual. As Cohn shows, many of the leaders of the dozens of millenarian sects that sang, danced, and flagellated themselves in expectation of the imminent Second Coming were of the upper strata and not of the rootless poor who formed the ranks of these sects, as they did of the crusading armies. What we encounter here is a general, shared condition of the poor in spirit.

Consequently, the theme of purification on via a holocaust -- an Armageddon -- and the Second Advent of Christ were never beyond the immediate horizon. The emerging millenial sects, following the example of orthodox Christianity, took their cues from more militant passages of scripture, especially Revelations and The Book of Daniel. Frederick Turner (1980:80) explains: "These sects too expected victory over the ungodly (the Church) and looked for the regeneration of the world through the violent, swift-destruction of Christ's enemies." This medieval millenarianism reaches its nadir as a militant messiah "urges his followers to rise up and slaughter the fornicators in fine clothes: 'Go on hitting them from the Pope right down to the little students! Kill every one of them!' This messiah estimated that it would be necessary to execute twenty-three hundred clerics a day for four and one-half years to rid the earth of these vermin. It was, of course, the Church that accomplished most of the executions, here as elsewhere showing itself ruthless in its opposition to popular religion and zealous to proclaim each repression a new victory for Christ (Turner 1980:80-81)."

Treatises on the Anti-Christ abounded; for example, Roger Bacon (writing in 1271) spoke of a "common belief among 'wise men' that this
last stage of the world is imminent." Throughout the middle ages, the same belief emerges in almost every generation. Coulton (1964) characterizes this nihilistic view which the principal medieval thinkers held -- "What was the use of painfully beginning a long and continuous chain of facts and inferences which involved the labor of whole generations or centuries, when a few years or weeks might bring the consummation of all things?" Thus the world view of the principal medieval thinkers was predominantly abstract and otherworldly. "So far as this world is concerned... man's first and second and last task is to prepare himself for eternity (Coulton 1964)."

BENEATH HIS HAND: Christian Superiority or Spiritual Fascism?

Emerging from the medieval doomsday, world's end belief, science began to fill the void which historic tradition and the imperial monotheistic religion had created. The mythic zones of the Occidental world had been conquered. Europeans of the fifteenth century were restless with their new science. Demonstrating this, Columbus and his Imperial Christian expeditionary force sought to secure for the Spanish crown, "the mainland of China and adjacent territories, including Cipangu (Japan). With the desperate confidence of those who do not truly believe in their cause yet fear more than anything to question it, the crown assumed that the Great Khan and other Oriental potentates would immediately recognize the superiority of the Europeans and turn into vassals. We might term such an assumption insane were it not plain that so much of the subsequent history of the West reveals that we are the products and practitioners of just this assumption. (Turner
Thus, this superiority conception descends from its fascist monotheistic ideologies.

Columbus returned from Espanola in the spring of 1493 to report that he found the Indies. Instead Christopher (the Christ-bearer) had unconsciously encountered a heretofore unknown world, a world filled with mythic zones. It soon became known as the "New World" but it was in fact an old world, fully inhabited. Imbued by a sense of conquest, the Christians insisted that they had found a "New World." To this extent, they in their minds not so much as discovered America, but "invented" it. Christian civilization was in this encounter confronted with a reality equal in richness of psychic, spiritual and mythic richness to that of pre-Christian northern Europe.

Filled with the zeal of past experience in conquest, Columbus crushed the Arwaks of Espanola. At first he demanded tribute and subsequently enslaved them. Following enslavement, Ferdinand Columbus (the son of the "Christ-bearer") writes that the fortunes of the Christians improved markedly:

In fact, wrote Ferdinand, the Indians would carry him on their backs wherever he wished to go. The Admiral [his father], he concluded, attributed this peace to God's providence, since without such divine help the tiny band of Christians could hardly have subdued so numerous a people. Plainly, God had wanted these natives 'beneath His hand.' (Turner 1980:137-138).

The narrowness and meanness of the Christian view of the "New World" is evidenced by the Requerimento, an official document/weapon drafted by the Spanish Council of the Indies for the arsenal of Cortes' exploration. The fascism of this document is explicit. It insists upon the Biblical notion of creation, an event dated 5,000 years in antiquity
from the time of the document. Furthermore, it asserted the monotheistic notion of one universal god for all people be they "Christians, Moors, Jews, Gentiles or any other sect." Its oppressive cruelty is evidenced through its assertion of European superiority and monotheistic truth. In this act the document makes an offer that can't be refused.

You owe compliance as a duty to the King and we in his name will receive you with love and charity, respecting your freedom and that of your wives and sons and your rights of possession, and we shall not compel you to baptism unless you, informed of the Truth, wish to convert to our holy Catholic Faith as almost all your neighbors have done in other islands, in exchange for which Their Highnesses [King and Queen of Spain] bestow many privileges and exemptions upon you. Should you fail to comply, or delay maliciously in so doing; we assure you that with the help of God we shall use force against you, declaring war upon you from all sides and with all possible means, and we shall bind you to the yoke of the Church and of Their Highnesses; we shall enslave your persons, wives and sons, sell you or dispose of you as the King sees fit; we shall seize your possessions and harm you as much as we can as disobedient and resisting vassals. And we declare you guilty of resulting deaths, and injuries, exempting Their Highnesses of such guilt as well as ourselves and the gentlemen who accompany us. We hereby request that legal signatures be affixed to this text and pray those present to bear witness for us, etc." (quoted through Turner 1980:149-150).

With this official weapon, Hernan Cortes, who had gone from a young man-at-arms during Columbus' destruction of the island cultures to a prominent captain general, began his expeditions of conquest. Cortes was a sincere Christian and he was well aware of the imperial force of his faith. Turner (1980:160-161) explains:

"It is our hope," he wrote, "that His Holiness the Pope will approve the punishment of the wicked and rebellious, as enemies of our Holy Catholic Faith, after they have first been properly admonished. This will inspire fear in those who may be reluctant in receiving knowledge of the Truth." Cortes and his men had been witnesses to the Inquisition and intimately connected to the wars against the Moors. Behind them were the Crusades...."
Equipped with his mono-universal conception of truth, Cortes began his expedition as an annihilation of people holding mythic or converse spiritual views which disagreed with his own monotheism. Following his conquest of the natives outside Vera Cruz, "Cortes ordered his resident friar to give them all a lecture on the True Faith.... If they would consent to Christian instruction, Cortes promised to make them lords over provinces now under the Aztecs. If not, he promised mortal enmity. The caciques' answered that it did not seem good to them to give up their gods and practices, at which Cortes flew into such a fury that he lectured his men to the effect that even if it should cost them their lives to the last man those idols must come down this very day (Turner 1980:161)."

Following the annihilation of these coastal peoples, Cortes began his war upon the Aztecs. On conquering them, the Spaniard Madariaga comments:

'What do you think, gentlemen, of this great favor which God has granted us? After having given us so many victories over so many dangers, He has brought us to this place, from which we can see so many big cities. Truly, my heart tells me that from here many kingdoms and dominions will be conquered, for here is the capital where the devil has his main seat; and once this city has been subdued and mastered, the rest will be easy to conquer.' (Turner 1980:166).

Conquests in the name of destiny, in the name of god — mono-universal truth — led Madariaga to conclude that Cortes was captive to his own conquest. "So were they all, for as the captian general [Cortes] had once written in approbation of their heroic efforts, 'we were only doing what we had to as Christians' (Turner 1980:170)."
THE ERRAND AND MANIFEST DESTINY

Charged with the ideology of 'Manifest Destiny', the Puritans engaged in colonizing America as an "Errand into the wilderness" (Miller 1956). They conceived themselves to be upon a divine errand whereby they would build an ideal order, to which Europe would look with envy. Europe would want them to return and prepare the world for the 'second coming'. Out of this embarkation upon colonization, they developed an overriding objective to establish in New England a "city upon the hill," a new Jerusalem that would be a beacon unto the world. There they intended to complete the Protestant Reformation and usher in the millennium:

The Puritans knew that this sanctuary was not devoid of sin. In fact, they saw the natural world as Satan's domain and all creatures generic to it as mortal enemies of the Lord. As the Israelites in the desert were tested by trial and tribulation, so would the Puritans be tested in New England. For was it not in the wilderness that the faith of the Israelites was purified and the Lord handed Ten Commandments to Moses? Was it not in the wilderness that John the Baptist sought to revitalize the faith? And did not Christ overcome temptation in the wilderness? (Segal & Stineback 1977:105).

The dominant world view of the Puritans was characterized by a compulsion to complete order.

Turner writes (1980:204) that order was so dominant a value that almost every other one was conceived of as subordinate to it. Without order there could be no true worship of God, no society, no profit, no civilization. Essentially what order meant was a political state of the west functioning in its appointed fashion, a condition in which each being knew its place in the vast, God-ordained hierarchy that stretched from the Creator to the inchworm...(they) were obsessed by the fear of chaos. It perpetually gnawed and threatened at the edges of their world like the barbarian hordes of an earlier age.
Perry Miller (1978:105) furthers these notions of Puritan thought and compulsive order, explaining:

The Reformation, and that much we consider distinctively Puritan was really the spirit of the times. No nation of Europe had yet divided the state from the church; no government had yet imagined that religion could be left to the individual conscience. Society, economics, and the will of God were one and the same, and the ultimate authority in human relations was the ethic of Christendom. All the transactions of this world held their rank in a hierarchical structure, with salvation, to which all other activities ministered, at the apex.

Mono-universal truth consummated in the triad -- order, church and state -- convinced Christians of the rightness of their enterprise. As a consequence, they generated a view that their gospel was one and the same with civilization.

This Puritan ideal of an "Errand into the Wilderness" (Miller 1956) and its narcissistic delusion of "Manifest Destiny" is among the most demonstrative examples of meta-psychosis. William Bradford describes the neurosis of his fellow Pilgrims upon landing in America, "what could they see but a hideous and desolate wilderness, full of wild beasts and wild men...." The Native American peoples were seen as less than human and subjected to the harsh annihilation doctrine -- Manifest Destiny. "They discovered in the Indians the antagonists to the new chosen people .... For the Puritans they were primarily the villains in a sacred drama, counterpart of the heathen tribes that Joshua conquered, children of the Devil who tempted Christ in the desert, forerunners of the legions of darkness...." Following their landing, the Puritans developed "a standard Christian argument -- vacuum domicilium -- with which to justify their
occupation of native lands. In the words of John Cotton, one of the leading Puritan ministers, 'where is a vacant place, there is liberty for the son of Adam or Noah to come and inhabit, though they neither buy it, nor ask their leaves.... In a vacant soil, he that taketh possession of it, and bestoweth culture and husbandry upon it, his right it is. And the ground of this is from the Grand Charter given to Adam and his posterity in Paradise, Genesis 1:28. Multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it [Segal & Stinebeck 1977]." Thus the Puritan farmer was perceived as a saint in wresting the "howling" wilderness from the clutches of the Devil. This practice was further rationalized as human repayment to "God" for committing "original sin." Clearly these rationalizations are meta-psychotic delusions.

**CONTEMPORARY META-MADNESS**

These preceding accounts of collective cultural meta-madness return our attention to North America and the duality of Chief Luther Standing Bear's remarks. But before concluding with the Imperial conceptions of wilderness and their fostering parent meta-madness, we should acknowledge a further connection between these psychopathic conceptions and contemporary dilemmas. We often forget in reviewing history to analyze our modern outlook. We can be reminded historically that in our contention of the meta-madness of Nazism, we the American culture re-activated meta-neurotic behavioral patterns. Moreover, the Nazis held a narcissistic superiority complex and in defeating them we used the totalitarian means of force. While this measure appears justified, we in our forcefulness seem to have assumed some of the like
narcissistic qualities. Our creation for ending World War II, was an atomic device the likes of which the world had never known before in destructive power. In using this weapon we rationalized that we were using it only for a moral purpose — the saving of American lives. Following this rationale, we identified our individualistic notions of freedom with right — the highest good. Consequently, the United States embarked upon a narcissistic sense of superiority over all who might oppose its ideals.

In this ideology, we can see a return to the monotheistic superiority delusions. Like the Nazis who inscribed their equipment with "Gott mit uns" — "God with us" — American leaders appear to look upon the state's coinage seeing "Liberty in God we Trust" and reaffirm that the nation's values are a "Manifest Destiny."

Thus, President Ronald Reagan calls the Soviet Union, "The forces of evil in the modern world (National Public Radio 3-8-83)." This slander is ominously reminiscent of the narcissistic rationalizations and justifications which propelled other cultures into psychopathic actions of meta-madness. Sam King, editor of Psychology Today has concluded that Reagan's crusade against communism is like the religious warfare of the medieval crusades. The U.S. and others perceive themselves as divinely inspired. In this modern crusade and like those before, the enemy is perceived as an enemy of God. The most successful means for motivating a population to support a war has proven to be through the vehicle of religion or the ideology of a holy war.

This discussion does not pretend to disclaim that the Soviet Union likewise suffers a similar meta-neurosis. Their is based upon anxiety
fears generated out of World War II when they lost twenty million civilians. Further, in adopting Marxism, they opted for a kind of religious statism or worship of the state. This conclusion is evident in their holiday ceremonies and devotion to state bureaucracy. Soviet fears have largely turned from Nazism to that of the capitalism of the United States. They view themselves as a force in history, therefore affording themselves the rationalization that their actions are necessary and inevitable. This is clearly a narcissistic perspective. In order to preserve this narcissism, they are prepared to defend it with matching nuclear armament. The conflict is clearly evident and the forces for annihilation of all planetary life ominously deployed.

These opposing narcissistic views have arisen from a collective human history of meta-madness. It is founded upon a lack of extended social interest and concern for the ecologic commonweal. This is the basis for all Imperial wilderness conceptions. It is a framework of violence resulting in domestication, domination and annihilation.

**HOBBSIAN MYTH & WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT**

Some associated imperial wilderness conceptions include the Hobbesian Myth and homocentric notions of wilderness management. The Hobbesian myth, although it was probably not Hobbes' intention, attempts or explanations of "primitive" behavior have been based on a translation of his postulates. The use of the term "myth" represents this transition between Hobbes' original postulates and their subsequent translation and usage. "Myth" implies underlying realities and
principles, true or false. Hobbes' postulates have, therefore, been mythically applied falsely to primal peoples and their life-ways, traditions, etc. The Hobbesian myth, then, is aligned with the collective madness and the imperial wilderness conceptions. This view postulates that the life of "primitives" is "nasty, brutish, short and solitary." Although this perspective has been disproved and shown to be unrepresentative of primal cultures (Lee and Devore 1968; Sahlins 1972), many continue unwittingly to accept it. They interpret wilderness totally in the imperial sense by projecting Hobbes' view over all primal cultures despite its affinity with the Genesis myth. It assumes that only the linear theory of history which the Judaic tradition developed, is legitimate. In effect, these scholars are taking the Biblical doctrine literally as an explanation for the human species' origin and relation to the earth. As a consequence, the implication is that only members of our modern cultures can appreciate and support the preservation of wilderness (cf. Nash 1982 and Tuan 1974).

It is, of course, erroneous to call wilderness early "man's" greatest evil. After all, it was in wilderness that humans evolved and learned, adapted and developed their physical and mental capacities. The wilderness nourished and selected for the evolution of humans; otherwise, how could the species have emerged dominant and survived? Wilderness served as early humans' greatest good, not greatest evil (Vest 1983A).

Even our modern conservation organizations are not free of imperial conceptions of wilderness. For example, the Wilderness Society has
published a map (see figure 1) which contrasts American wilderness between 1780 and 1980. The 1780 map depicts a tiny portion along the eastern seaboard as civilization while calling the vast remainder wilderness. The difficulty with this notion is its inconsistency with the definition of wilderness and human culture. The Wilderness Act of 1964 defines wilderness "as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." The interior depicted upon the conservationist's map was permanently inhabited by humans -- Native Americans. To say that it was all wilderness is to ignore these peoples' presence or to deny them human status.

The imperial wilderness tradition is, in summary, grounded in the ecologic fantasy of the *Genesis* myth. It denies biologic reality and divorces the human species from others of the natural world. This imperial conception was born from the "traumatic neurosis" of a culture under extreme stress. The delusions of this *meta-neurosis* have degraded into the fascist perspective of cultural narcissism. This narcissism rationalizes the immorality of wilderness and all those who appreciate the wild. Subsequently, the imperial attitude has been projected as true for all primal people. Primal cultures are erroneously perceived as living a hand to mouth existence. With the psychopathic annihilation of others -- both human and wild others -- this collective narcissism represents a *meta-psychosis*. The consequence is a *meta-madness* which is inherent to the imperial wilderness conception, and has deepened, spreading collective psychosis across the planet. Ultimately, as a
Figure 1 (courtesy of the Wilderness Society).
result, we are faced with a planetary madness which suicidally threatens all life on Earth!

B. PRIMARY WILDERNESS

The **primary** sense of wilderness is organically derived in ecologically mythic cultures. It is associated with sacred space and the spiritual traditions -- animism, animatism, naturism, etc. -- of primal peoples. The sacred places -- holy lands -- are wilderness. They form the setting for ritual and rites of passage, such as, the vision quest. Thus they are places of "Great Mysterious" where sacred ecological realities are ongoing and continually manifested to those who walk there in a sacred manner.

**WILDERNESS: THE WILL-OF-THE-LAND**

The primary wilderness tradition manifests the sacred and is born of wildness. It has been largely ignored and uninvestigated. In an article entitled "Nature Awe" (Vest 1983A), I discuss the Celtic peoples' relationship with wild nature. The Celts worshipped nature in sacred groves -- nemetons -- which were wilderness sanctuaries. These nemetons were far removed from habitations and were considered "a piece of heaven on earth" -- e.g., nemu, heaven and ton, place. This nature worship was widespread among early Indo-Europeans. Sacred groves were common among the early Greeks, Italics, Celts, Goths, Baltic-Slavic, and Finno-Ugric peoples before cultural disruption (Vest 1983B).

Today we can learn much from an illumination of the past. For many of us, our ancient Indo-European heritage includes an ancestral memory -- a primal mind -- of nature worship. These early Indo-Europeans
acknowledged a will-force compelling all nature — both among the animate and the inanimate. This will-force is in origin akin to the term wild. Roderick Nash (1982) tells us that "Etymologically, the term [wilderness] means 'wild-deor-ness,'" the place of wild beats. Nash argues that cognitive terms — wild and wildern — present an image of an alien environment to man which is outside of civilization's order. In this argument, Nash fails to develop a deeper etymological derivation for wilderness. Nash makes it clear that "the root seems to have been 'will' with a descriptive meaning of self-willed, willful, or uncontrollable. From 'willed' came the adjective 'wild' used to convey the idea of being lost, unruly, disordered, or confused."

Recognizing "will" or "willed" as the root for wild, Nash focuses upon the Old English term "deor" (animal) stating that it "was prefixed with wild to denote creatures not under the control of man." While this may be correct for selected wild derivatives — wilder and wildern — it fails to deal with the "ness" suffix. "Ness" is likewise a term derived from Old Gothonic languages. Nash does explain in Wilderness and the American Mind that the "ness" suggests a quality "that produces a certain mood or feeling in a given individual and, as a consequence, may be assigned by that person to a specific place." Walter Skeat (1980) concurs with this definition, explaining that the term was preserved in place-names — for example, Tot-ness and Sheer-ness. We also see it preserved in Scotland — Inverness and Loch Ness — both of which are areas that came under Scandinavian or Viking influence. (cf. Vest 1983:B)

"Wilderness" then means "self-willed-land" or "self-willed-place"
and the middle syllable "der" possibly represents the preposition-article combination "of the". Consequently, in wild-ness, there is "will-of-the-land"; and in wildeor, there is "will-of-the-animal." A wild animal is a "self-willed animal" -- an undomesticated animal; similarly, wildland is "self-willed land". In both cases the will, willful, uncontrollable state or elements are maximized. This "willed" conception is itself in opposition with the controlled and ordered environment which is characteristic to the notion of civilization.

The primal cultures of northern Europe were not bent upon dominating and controlling all environments. Thus, the "will-of-the-land" conception -- wilderness -- demonstrates a recognition of land for itself.

THE BIBLICAL EXPERIENCE

While this critique has been particularly harsh upon the imperial traditions of the ancient mid-East, it should be recognized that present alongside Imperial conceptions of wilderness were Primary wilderness traditions. Foremost among these is the Biblical account of Moses and the burning bush. Moses retreats from his nobility in Egypt to the "soul-mood" -- solitude -- of the wilderness. Herein he is quickened with an insight into an underlying principle of truth. When he encounters the burning bush, he is consumed with the land speaking. Moreover, given Moses' background of the Aton religious tradition (cf. Freud 1939), Moses is acutely aware of the sun's role in the earth's life and lifeforms. Thus in the desert wilderness he receives the burning bush's insight, which is one of extended social interest and
ecologic commonweal. Moses sees that like himself, like the Egyptians and the Hebrews that the bush is stored solar radiation. Its life is the product of an ever-active, on-going creative life-force which is produced by the Earth-Sun logos. Consequently, he sees that bondage, slavery and control, are wrong in whatever form they take. Moreover, he sees that in his equality with the bush, so is there equality throughout nature and therefore, in culture. We are all the product of the Earth-Sun logos. Moses is, then, called to action; the people [Hebrews] must be set free.

Another such Biblical primary wilderness tradition is manifest in the book of Job. Job's doubts, inferiority and anxiety, are answered by the land, from the will-of-the-land which is most potently manifested in the wilderness. Whirlwind, thunder and other extended ecologic processes answer Job. They provide him with the security and well-being which foster and thrive with an extended social interest and ecologic commonweal. Thus Job comes to accept the will-of-the-land and act in unison with it. It is seen not for humans alone, but also "to satisfy the desolate and waste ground; and to cause the bud of tender herb to spring forth (Job)."

Likewise Jesus was consoled in the wilderness and it was therein where he found the sacred most potently manifest. Following this example, "In the fourth century A.D., the deserts of Egypt, Palestine, Arabia and Persia were peopled by a race of men who have left behind them a strange reputation. They were the first Christian hermits, who abandoned the cities of the pagan world to live in solitude (Merton
These "desert fathers" sought to defuse personal ego and commit themselves to the ecstasy of the will-of-the-land. Merton (1960:7-8) explains that "A life of solitude... enabled the old superficial self to be purged away and permitted the gradual emergence of the true, secret self in which the Believer and Christ were 'one Spirit.'" In this way they reconciled their striving with a purity of heart found in the wilderness.

A serious problem with the Christian Desert Fathers withdrawal into the wilderness is that they failed to aid their brothers to see the way. Thus their actions lacked extended social interest. Nevertheless, they had found that in wilderness solitude -- soul-mood -- one becomes in empathy with the will-of-the-land. Thus wilderness solitude is an at-one-ment with the will-of-the-land.

**NATIVE AMERICANS**

On returning to North America, we can now understand the primary wilderness conceptions of Chief Luther Standing Bear and other Native Americans. First, we must acknowledge the erroneousness of a "Discovery of America." This phrase implies invention of a "New World" on behalf of the Europeans. Such a statement is indeed imperialistic and denies the reality of a fully inhabited pre-Columbian continent. Historian Wilbur Jacobs (Vecsey & Venables 1980) notes that in 1492, there were probably 100 million Americans in the Western Hemisphere. At this same time Europe had a population of 75 million. With this population, the Americas can hardly be called uninhabited and the fact that Western Hemisphere populations exceeded those of Europe at the time of
contact demonstrates the blind human chauvinism of calling the vast interior of America all wilderness.

Furthermore, geographer Carl Sauer (1966) cites Spanish chronicler Las Casas, author of the Apologetica Historia, stating, "The people [Caribbean natives]... lived in order and peace, which was true and demographically significant. [Las Casas] continues, 'they were healthy and lived to a good age.'" Sauer also explains that both "The physical and cultural conditions were highly favorable." Certainly such conditions are not that of the "nasty, brutish and short" wilderness life which advocates of Hobbes postulate.

Native Americans had consciously developed many complex land-human relationships in order to assure a continuous and harmonious balance between their cultures and the wild. The writings of Carl Sauer clearly demonstrate the presence of sophisticated land use practices and other wild, wilderness or "will-of-the-land" classifications. Among these Native American land practices, there are four principal classifications: 1. habitation sites and transport trails; 2. agricultural lands; 3. managed wildlands; and 4. sacred precincts or wilderness sanctuaries. These classifications emphasize a primary human-land relationship and further discredit the imperial land-use conceptions.

1. Habitation Sites and Transport Trails: depending upon the bio-region and available food sources, Native Americans occupied sites both permanently and seasonally. Explorers of the Caribbean, Central and South America encountered many
native villages. Sauer (1966) explains: "The rain forest was not the nearly unbroken expanse of modern times, but held numerous Indian villages and cleared lands." These were permanently occupied villages. Demonstrating this point in North America, the French discovered permanently inhabited villages in New England. Sauer (1980) explains: "At Saco they [the French] found permanent homes, cultivated fields, and fine oak, beech, and elm trees of very open growth. 'The Indians live permanently here, and have a large cabin surrounded by palisades made of rather large trees ranged one by another to which they retire when their enemies come to make war against them. They cover their cabins with oak bark. This place is very pleasant and as agreeable as one may see anywhere' They [the French] had come to a land of sedentary farmers, living in palisaded villages, surrounded by cultivated fields and park lands." In many cases, trails or Indian roads, linked villages together (Sauer 1971 & 1980). These native trade routes extended throughout the Western Hemisphere. The well known North American pueblo cultures of the southwest further demonstrate the extent of Native American habitation. Likewise, this permanent settlement pattern was repeated among the northwest coast peoples. Plains cultures were more seasonal in their occupation of a site. Still they regularly occupied certain places each year. Among most Native American cultures, there were well defined tribal territories. The
Dinetah or Navajoland which is defined by four sacred mountains in each cardinal direction is an example.

2. **Agricultural Lands**: agriculture was widely practiced throughout the Western Hemisphere. Sauer (1981) provides this detailed account:

   Indian agriculture in most parts of the New World is not an antiquarian matter. The aboriginal cultivators found and bred a series of crops for almost every climate in which agriculture is now practiced in this hemisphere. For the most part, the geographic limits of agriculture have not been greatly advanced by the coming of the white man. In many places we have not passed the limits of Indian farming at all.

   Sauer qualifies this statement by citing the exceptions of Pampas, and we should add the Great Plains. But the geographic extension of agriculture in these zones is not because of climatic reasons. Continuing Sauer's account, we note:

   Since primitive agriculture was dependent solely on the labor of men and women working with planting stick, foot plow, or hoe, the most serious barriers to primitive cultivation were found in heavy soils and cover of sod. In the utilization of broken terrain and forest land, on the other hand, the aboriginal systems were highly effective.

   In general, it may be said that the plant domesticators of the New World far exceeded in range and efficiency the crops that were available to Europeans at the time of the discovery of the New World.

   The ancient Indian plant breeders had done their work well. In the genial climates, there was an excellent, high yielding plant for every need of food, drink, seasoning, or fiber. On the climatic extremes of cold and drought, there still were a remarkable number of plant inventions that stretched the limits of agriculture about as far as plant growth permitted. One needs only
to dip into the accounts of the early explorers and colonists, especially Spanish, to know the amazement with which the Europeans learned the quality and variety of crop plants of Indian husbandry.

Native methods of tillage were remarkably benign in their effects on the soil. Planting and cultivation did not give rise to furrows or even commonly to lineal rows. The 'hillin' of the plants tended to break the surface into a maximum number of small elevations and depressions that were favorable to arresting the movement of water down slopes. Hill cultivation (temporalis) was in effect a long term crop rotation of wild woody growth and crop plants.

While this agriculture was widespread across the Americas, it differed in respect to bio-regions. Permanent garden plots known as conucos were widespread throughout the Caribbean, Central and northern South America. These conucos were hilled mounds which were in a constant state of productivity. Converse to "Our notions of a harvest season when the whole crop is taken off the fields.... In the conucos something may be gathered on almost any day through the year.... Such multiple population of the tilled space makes possible the highest yields per unit of surface...[Sauer 1981]." In Mexico such garden plots were known as the Milpa and planted with the seeds of maize, squash, beans and other annuals. Pueblo cultures planted similar gardens known as temporales and these were dependent upon summer rains or irrigated fields. "In the Eastern Woodlands [of North America, native] farming was carried on from Florida to the St. Lawrence [Sauer 1971]."

Three staples, maize, beans and squash, were grown throughout
the region. Planted together, these crops served to protect the soil and aid each others development. Furthermore, the fields or plots were regularly rotated. Also of note is the incipient horticulture observed in the East. An abundance and quality of fruits -- grapes, plums, pawpaws and nut trees -- were observed throughout the extent of the Eastern Woodlands. Sauer (1971) discloses that these were clearly cultivated by Indian horticulturalists to produce superior yields and quality.

This remarkable agricultural record demonstrates a very satisfactory standard of living. While agriculture requires moderate plots of land, there remained vast intervening landscapes. Much of these areas were commonly used to supplement the Natives' diets through gathering, hunting and fishing.

3. Managed Wildlands: much of the Western Hemisphere was managed through the use of fire to produce favorable conditions for food collection. While the landscapes retained much of their "willfulness" through the continuance of wildlife, these lands were modified and cannot be construed as pure wilderness. For example, Savannas of large extent were recorded in the tropics of mesoamerica (Sauer 1966). These savannas were produced by repeated use of fire by the natives. With the decline of the native population, these savannas returned to tropical
forests. Similarly, the "Prairies and open woods in the humid east may be explained by long continued Indian practices of setting fires [Sauer 1971]." This use of fire increased forage and edge effect, thereby improving wildlife habitat. This effect in turn favored native hunting. Some areas were exclusively devoted to hunting. For example, in mesoamerica, Sauer (1966) cites the Spaniard Andagoya, "The chiefs had hunting tracts (cotos) to which they went in summer [the dry season] to hunt deer. Fire was set on the windward side and since the plants (yerba) grew tall the fire was great. Indians were placed in a file at a position where the fire would come to a stop. The deer, massed in their flight and blinded by the smoke, were thus driven by fire to the place where Indians were waiting with their dart throwers and stone points so that few creatures escaped." In another use of fire to modify wildlands, Sauer (1971) explains the practice of burning the south Texas Plains for the production of Cactus fruits — tunas. These tunas were a summer food staple for the natives. In this process, the South Texas Plains were extended greatly and maintained.

Clearly, then, much of America consisted of managed wildlands. Fire was repeatedly used upon these lands in order to promote open savannas, plains and park lands. Such lands were recognized to be more productive for wildlife and some
incipient food crops. The natives had obviously altered these landscapes to suit their cultural needs. Thus, they may not be wilderness in the full sense inherent to the "will-of-the-land" concept — primary wilderness. To the imperial Europeans, however, these unfamiliar landscapes might produce the feeling of a "howling" wilderness.

4. Sacred Precincts or Wilderness Sanctuaries: Native Americans have for thousands of years venerated wild places as sacred and given mythic accounts for such holy places. Christopher Vecsey (1980) explains that "it is not necessarily the concept of nature which Indians love, but specific locations and particular aspects of their environment." Thus, the Indian world was filled with special spots where the power for life was concentrated. Forbidding all alteration and modification of such sacred locales, the Indians assured the continued wildness of these lands. Furthermore, Native Americans developed appropriate rites and rituals designed to communicate with the land. Such action served to renew Indian sacred traditions and ecological beliefs while reaffirming a human-wilderness ecological interrelationship.

Demonstrating Native American wilderness sanctuaries are sacred geographic provinces which are associated with the "will-of-the-land" — wilderness — conception. Sacred mountains and their surrounding precincts fulfill these
wilderness conceptions. For example, among the Plains Indian cultures, sacred mountains are centers of the world or points of union between heaven and earth. The Black Hills are such a place for the Lakota peoples. Their allies, the Cheyenne, also venerate these sacred wildlands (Neihardt 1932 & Hoebbel 1978). Generally among these tribes, the mountains are associated with mythic origin and vision quest rites. Similarly, the Blackfeet venerate much of the northern rockies geographic province. The Shoshoni recognize in the Grand Tetons, a sacred mountain spirit and dare not point a finger in their direction (Hultkrantz 1979). Southwestern Native Americans share this view of "in-dwelling" spirit. Among the Hopi, Kachinas — spiritual intermediaries — dwell in the San Francisco Peaks wilderness sanctuary. Likewise, the neighboring Athapascan speaking tribes, Navajo and Apache, venerate sacred mountains. In each case, sacred mountain precincts exist for each cardinal direction. In relatively recent times, the Navajo discovered the Rainbow Bridge region and developed a complex mythology for it. It thus became a wilderness sanctuary. Hultkrantz (1979) contends that the high cultures of mesoamerica also revered sacred wildlands. Among the Incas, such sites were venerated in connection with the cult of the earth goddess, who in Peru is called Pachamama. These sites were known as huacas. Several tribes including the Paruha and the Jivaro practiced a deep reverence
for volcanic peaks in Chile. When they passed by the high mountains, they hushed and did so quietly so as not to arouse the anger of the mountains. Another Andean tribe, the Karstan, believed the mountain spirits to be deceased medicine men. Hultkrantz (1979) also suggests that the Mayan peoples held a common belief in mountain gods. The Aztecs also recognized the sacred quality of wild nature. They believed in spirits which dwelled outside the populated areas, particularly on mountains. These mountain patron deities were known as Haloque, and they survived through the Christian era to modern times. The Yurok Indians of Northern California have wilderness sanctuaries for "medicine-training" and meditation. They contend that "not only the sites themselves must be protected, but the entire aural, visual and social (i.e., private solitude) context of the sites needs protection as well, if the efficacy of the sites is to be preserved [Nabokov 1980]."

Another deeply ecological oriented sacred wilderness scheme among Native Americans is found amid the inland Eskimos. These people exist largely upon Caribou. Professor Brown (1982; cf. Speck 1935) explains that the inland Eskimos envision a Caribou deity who is the guardian or keeper of the Caribou peoples. This Caribou deity resides on a sacred mountain and presides over them. No human person may dare go
to this sacred mountain because such a visit might disturb the Caribou Boss and the Caribou peoples. This sacred Caribou mountain, therefore, becomes something of a regenerative game preserve where the Caribou are allowed to live and reproduce undisturbed by humans. It is, then, a wildlife sanctuary which can only be visited by the shaman's free soul. These peoples are demonstrating a deeply inherent wisdom by allowing the Caribou an unmolested space in which to reproduce. Obviously, this is valuable in the utility of preserving the inland Eskimos' food source, but there is a deeper spiritual value in allowing these other animals a sense of solitude—freedom from human contact.

Sacred wilderness sanctuaries were also common around rock or stone monoliths. Among the Lakota, some rocks are recognized as holy and called Inyan. Examples are Standing Rock in South Dakota and Devil's Tower in Wyoming. Many tribes likewise venerated river valleys and surrounding precincts. In such cases, a central feature such as Kootenai falls in northwest Montana became the focus, but the surrounding lands were the wilderness sanctuary.
CONCLUSION

The modern response to wilderness is deeply infused with a spiritual response. The 1964 Wilderness Act uses ideal, romantic and poetic language in defining wilderness. Henry Thoreau and John Muir both give wilderness philosophy a religious expression. They both recognize the will-of-the-land and seek to extend the social interest of ecologic commonweal into an at-one-ment with it. In their wilderness philosophy, there is a re-emergence of an innate spirituality which is cognate to the ancient wisdom. Thus, Thoreau and Muir represent in their philosophy of wildness, an expression of deeper levels of consciousness which parallel both the primary traditions of the ancient world and the social interest psychology of Alfred Adler. This extended social interest -- kinship ethics -- or ecologic commonweal is the wild mind, primal mind. Consequently, common to both the primal and the contemporary conception of wilderness is a primary sense of religion. Primal cultures revered and honored the "in-dwelling spirit," the "will-of-the-land." The contemporary wilderness characteristic solitude expresses this relationship in its deepest etymological derivation. In origin and meaning the term solitude reduces to "soul" and "mood" -- "soul-mood." It thus represents the sacred and the spiritual manifestations of the "will-of-the-land" -- wilderness.

Among Native Americans, there are conscious designations of wildland for itself and for the manifestation of the sacred. Indians visit these places in order to worship and experience "Great Mysterious." This practice serves to keep them in contact with the
mythic primeval origins of the "will." Furthermore, ritual contact with
the sacred and the wild provided Native Americans with a firm sense of
ecologic reality and a extended social interest. These are all factors
which contribute to the maintenance of mental health.

The sacrality of place -- the awe, veneration and worship of nature
-- among primal peoples demonstrates a non-teleological moral
perspective. It is a kinship morality, based upon respect and concern
for others. This kinship morality is fundamentally based upon an
extended social interest which includes the ecologic commonweal. These
peoples celebrated their kinship with nature through ritual, rite and
ceremony. They internalized this kinship through their mythologies.
And they re-affirmed kinship through the obligation of seeking
communications -- rapport and empathy -- with wild others. The effect
was an environmental ethic which integrated the sacred -- Great
Mysterious -- with human culture. The practical result was
psychological balance and well being.

The appearance of imperial Europeans disrupted these primal
cultures and spread a meta-maddness across the Western Hemisphere.
Imperial Europeans brought with them a rationalized morality which
postulates utility for the sake of self. This self-interest is
fundamentally neurotic. In this perspective, the wild -- nature -- is
seen as a resource for the "chosen" human. It is thus decidedly
teleological or utilitarian. It is an ethic which is promoted and
rationalized on the basis of the Hobbesian concepts of articial
competition and savagery. It ignores the more realistic notion of
mutual aid and social interest which have fostered our human speciation and collective mental well-being (Leakey & Lewin 1977, Kropotkin 1925 and Adler 1956). Furthermore, it is grounded upon a collective cultural dysfunctionalism — a cycle of meta-madness which today threatens the life of the living earth with complete annihilation.

True to the primary tradition, however, modern wilderness areas continue the sacred-religious tradition of "Nature Awe." Such sacred "wild" lands have nurtured our psyche from time immemorial. They have actualized our species in fulfilling our obligation of conscious rapport and empathy with the Earth. As Rolling Thunder (1974) suggested, there is a connection between mental health and our relationship to the land. The presence of wilderness in the primal world view demonstrates that people can and have lived well without disrupting the earth's ecological processes. In the modern world view, the presence of wilderness is a healthy balance and essential for our psychological well being. Our collective mental survival is dependent upon it and the ecologic commonweal. Still in the deepest reality, wilderness is essential for itself.
FOOTNOTES

1The domestication of animals, their close confinement with humans, breeds many deadly diseases which were particularly devastating to a less medically knowledgeable populace such as that of the ancient mid-East. Recently, the Associated Press (Missoulian, Feb. 18, 1984:2) reported in an article entitled "Pets are a Health Hazard" the findings of USDA Veterinarian William T. Hubbert. Hubbert lists many old familiar diseases of domestication which include: "toxoplasmosis and plague-like tularemia from cats, rabies and plague from cats and dogs, tapeworm cysts from dogs, parasites from birds and frogs ... salmonella infection from turtles." Although this list is designed to manifest the contemporary health hazards of pets, these diseases are commonly associated with the early domestication of animals. We can be sure that as animals became domesticated their natural immune systems broke down making them disease breeding ground. The Biblical myth of Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 19) speaks of the wickedness of these places. These cities are in evidence heavily infected with diseases — syphilis is particularly prominent. Syphilis is a disease which leads to extreme mental imbalances before death, thereby accentuating meta-madness.

We can deduce parallels to this infection pattern to our modern encounters with swine flu, etc. One particular case in point is the contemporary herpes epidemic. Pregnant women infected with herpes when giving birth risk an extremely high likelihood of producing a mentally retarded child. Considering this fact, it is deductible that similar disease circumstances generated like consequences in the ancient mid-East. Subsequent, mental retardation and imbalance as produced by diseases like herpes and syphilis would ultimately infect entire populations such as in the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. Consequently, the collective imbalance of disease induced agents results in meta-madness behavior.
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