"Abolish the Monopolizing of the Earth"

Nature, Science, and the Environmental Politics of Transnational Anarchism

Adam Quinn

Introduction

"We have the temerity to declare that all have a right to bread, that there is bread enough for all, and that with this watchword of Bread for All the Revolution will triumph," Peter Kropotkin proclaimed in his 1892 anarchist-communist manifesto *The Conquest of Bread* (first published in French as *La conquête du pain*).[1] Kropotkin was a scientist as well as an anarchist whose revolutionary vision included providing horticultural education, increasing agricultural yields through both modern technology and agricultural science, and reclaiming communal systems of land ownership, all to ensure the possibility of an economic system where food would be a right. This revolutionary vision involved a reorientation of human relationships with the earth itself, as Kropotkin instructed, "Ask of the earth and she will give you bread, provided that you ask aright."[2]

This revolutionary demand for bread for all was echoed by radicals around the globe. Around a year later, Emma Goldman spoke to a demonstration of striking and unemployed workers in Union Square in New York City, adapting the demand for bread for all to her typically fiery oratory style. She urged direct action for "the starving man" to secure his "natural right" to bread: "Ask for work. If they do not give you work, ask for bread. If they do not give you work or bread, then take bread."[3]

Radical History Review
Issue 145 (January 2023) DOI 10.1215/01636545-10063606

Years later, revolutionary Ricardo Flores Magón had a large box of *Conquest of Bread* pamphlets (translated into Spanish) ready to mail throughout Mexico from the Los Angeles offices of his anarchist newspaper *Regeneracíon*.[4] While sending Kropotkin's revolutionary pamphlet to radicals in his home country, Flores Magón published his own works that elaborated on the ideas of bread and freedom. Before and throughout the Mexican Revolution, Flores Magón called for the "installation of a system that guarantees to all human beings bread, land, and liberty."[5] Concepts like bread, land, and liberty were all intrinsically connected—and all a part of nature—in these radicals' expression of anarchism. Uniting these concepts was an anarchist critique of capitalist domination and monopolization of nature, which anarchists saw as incompatible with human freedom and equality. As Elisée Reclus wrote of anarchists like himself, "They want to abolish the monopolizing of the earth and its products in order to distribute them to everyone. In this sense, the happiness they would have in guaranteeing to everyone the enjoyment of the fruits of the earth makes them enemies of property."[6]

From the 1870s to the 1920s, anarchism was the "principal ideology of global radicalism" until it was superseded by Communism, but its history was widely forgotten as many participants experienced political repression and dislocation from public consciousness.[7] Anarchism is perhaps best known for its historical role in the labor movement, from the Chicago anarchists who were executed in 1887 for their involvement in the fight for the eight-hour day, to the militant anarchists of the 1910s who faced repression for their wartime radicalism. In recent decades, scholars have recovered this history of anarchism and shown its role not only in labor and anti-capitalist movements, but also in anti-colonialist, anti-racist, and women's emancipation movements.[8] This article builds on this work to underscore anarchism's relationship with environmental politics. Anarchists used the natural world to articulate their revolutionary visions, in turn influencing environmental movements more broadly. To Kropotkin, Flores Magón, Goldman, and countless other anarchists, "anarchism" did not just mean the destruction of the state and capitalism but the construction of a new political-economic-natural system informed by nature itself.

To examine anarchism's environmental politics, this article will analyze the work of several thinkers whose writings were widely published, translated, and discussed in the global anarchist press. It considers the European anarchist geographers Elisée Reclus and Peter Kropotkin (who connected anarchist politics to natural sciences), the Indigenous Mexican anarchist organizer Ricardo Flores Magón (who advocated for militant action to secure revolutionary freedoms surrounding land and food), and the migrant anarchists Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman (who connected anarchism's environmental politics to the body politics of feminism and free sexuality). Considering these thinkers together reveals a multifaceted and diverse body of anarchist environmental politics that stressed rethinking

human-nature relationships as part of revolutionary, anti-capitalist projects. Anarchists looked to the earth as a guide to articulate "natural" rights to food, land, freedom, existence, and sexual liberty. Approaching anarchism from an environmental history orientation reveals how nature and science were central to anarchist politics, and this approach incorporates anarchism into the canon of the history of environmental movements.

A Factor of Evolution: Nature, Science, and Classical Anarchist Theory

Historians have long remarked on the importance of scientific authority during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including early environmental movements such as conservationism, which cited scientific authorities to lend legitimacy to its pursuit of more efficiently managed lands.[9] The same was true of anarchism; multiple early anarchist theorists came from natural science backgrounds, fostering the historically close ties between anarchism and environmental politics. Peter Kropotkin and Elisée Reclus used geography and biology to articulate and justify their anarchist politics. The works of Kropotkin and Reclus were widely translated and republished throughout the transnational anarchist press, and anarchists repeatedly used the lenses of nature and science to criticize capitalism and articulate their utopian alternatives.

The significance of Reclus's work to the history of environmental thought is perhaps best illustrated by his connections to George Perkins Marsh, whom biographers, historians, and the US National Park Service have labeled the "prophet of conservation," a "pioneer of conservation," and the "founding father" of conservation and environmental movements.[10] In 1864, Marsh published *Man and Nature; or, Physical Geography as Modified by Human Action*. As the environmental historian William Cronon later described, in *Man and Nature* Marsh combined "the role of a historian with that of a prophet," using world history to show how great empires over the course of centuries disappeared due to their abuse of the natural environment, and how the United States could suffer the same fate.[11]

In 1878, in an updated edition of *Man and Nature*, Marsh included a new preface that ended with a call to read the work of Elisée Reclus. Marsh wrote that Reclus's "admirable work" *La Terre* covered a similar topic but was concerned with the "conservative and restorative, rather than destructive, effects of human industry."[12] Marsh described Reclus's interventions as "aiming at a much higher and wider scope" while complementing his own *Man and Nature*. That Marsh recommended Reclus's work is unsurprising; the two corresponded for years and developed their ideas about human-environmental interactions in tandem with each other. Unmentioned in Marsh's recommendation is the perhaps more surprising fact that Reclus advocated social revolution and would soon become a prominent figure in the global anarchist movement. Such a fact would have likely confused readers, who might have been especially astounded that an anarchist offered a

"restorative, rather than destructive" vision considering the otherwise destructive image of anarchists as bomb throwers in late nineteenth-century popular culture.

Like many of his anarchist contemporaries, Reclus was not motivated by destruction but by an ideology that drew from nature and science in articulating its vision of a stateless, egalitarian society. Reclus rose to prominence in the 1860s as an internationally recognized geographer, prompting George Perkins Marsh to recommend Reclus's *La Terre* in 1869. *La Terre* (subtitled "Descriptions of the Life of the Globe") was an expansive two-volume work that synthesized broad scientific knowledge about the Earth, from its initial formation and the spread of land masses to volcanoes and glaciers. The conclusion of *La Terre* seems to be what Marsh referred to as optimistic, and it expressed some key ideas of Reclus's (and anarchism's) environmental politics. First, it optimistically presented modern views of nature, history, and existence as enabling global unity to progress toward a better society. Reclus argued that being aware of natural history allows humanity to become connected with "all the beings who have lived before him," just as civilization "connected all the nations of the earth in one common humanity."[13] To Reclus, nature was both a mother figure for humanity and an example for revolutionaries. Nature, according to Reclus, "brings about changes of the grandest character without even the knowledge of the beings that she nourishes. . . . Some revolution which appears to us to have been produced by a mighty cataclysm, has perhaps taken thousands of years to accomplish."[14] This quote can also be read as pointing to a slow buildup toward a social revolution based on modern knowledge of history and science. Reclus's later work would make this more explicit.

In his 1869 *History of a Brook*, Reclus clarified his environmental politics while describing the complexities of river ecology through nature writing. Reclus narrated how a stream connects to other bodies of water, allows flora and fauna to flourish, and allows humanity to survive and progress. The book used nature metaphors, especially of streams and rivers, to meditate on the interconnectedness of nature, history, time, and politics. In *History of a Brook*, Reclus also set up a common motif seen in later anarchist works: nature as liberating and uniting.[15] He described Earth as an educator that reminded humans of the values of harmony and freedom. Technology, too, was liberatory to Reclus, as water-powered mills eventually enabled workers to enjoy more free time, even as there remained more to do to achieve a more just and equal world. Reclus described the river of a modern, industrial city as overly polluted and imprisoned by stone canals, but he also argued that scientific studies of nature could inform the construction of more sustainable, arterial urban waterways. *History of a Brook* concluded by comparing society itself to flowing water, where groups of people mingle and eventually merge like multiple streams into a river. It explained that "just as all the waters of the same basin eventually merge into a single river . . . human currents will join together."[16] In this united humanity, Reclus believed that different peoples "will learn to associate in

a free federation" where a merged humanity would recognize each other as siblings and look toward common ideals of freedom and justice.[17] This utopian vision was expressed not as a revolutionary polemic but as a natural process, as organic as the flow of water in a brook.

Reclus's later geographical works focused more on human cultures and their interactions with the natural world, as in his multivolume *The Earth and Its Inhabitants* (1878–91), *New Universal Geography* (1876–94), and *Man and the Earth* (1905). These writings were highly influential in the field of geography. *New Universal Geography* was considered an authoritative work in the field for some time, and *Man and the Earth* was considered foundational to human geography. The latter, though an exhaustive 3,500-page scholarly tome, was especially political. In its human-nature history of the world, *Man and the Earth* found "three orders of facts that are revealed . . . [by] social geography, and which remain so constant . . . that we might label them laws."[18] These three laws were "the class struggle, the quest for equilibrium, and the sovereign decision of the individual."[19] To Reclus, the "observation of the Earth" itself revealed that free individuals should live in harmony with the environment and with each other to achieve progress.[20]

Throughout his works, Reclus was relatively early for a Western scientist in articulating common tenets among environmentalists. Even in his early writings from the 1860s and 1870s, Reclus expressed opposition to clear-cutting forestry, criticized industrial exploitation of nature, and called for an ecological rather than industrial relationship with nature to foster mutually beneficial biodiversity.[21] He also believed, and helped publicize, Indigenous points of view on native ecology, such as Maori critiques of European flora and fauna disrupting New Zealand ecosystems.[22] His opposition to domination also encompassed an advocacy for peaceful and fair treatment of nonhuman animals. In addition to advocating ethical vegetarianism in line with his views of domination, Reclus made a moral philosophical argument for extending solidarity and equality to nonhuman animals.[23]

Much of Reclus's proto-environmentalist worldview was rooted in a communalist ethos that was highly suspect of private property and private forms of land stewardship. For example, *Concerning the Awareness of Nature in Modern Society* (1866) expanded on Reclus's concerns over the monopolization of nature. In it, Reclus critiqued how speculators "who appreciate natural beauty as much as money-changers evaluate an ingot of gold" bought up places of natural beauty. In one eloquent example, he brought up entrepreneurs who "lease waterfalls, surround them with wooden fences to prevent non paying travellers from enjoying . . . [and] transform into solid ecus [coins] the light which dances in the shattered droplets."[24] He also raised that private property tended to make factory owners, farmers, and others put profit first and ignore the broader environmental impacts of their industry. The industrialist, Reclus wrote, could "not care less if, by exploiting his mine or his factory in the open country, the atmosphere is blackened

by coal-smoke and polluted by foul fumes."[25] In place of this system, Reclus called for a greater balance between human utility and natural beauty, both through political change and scientific advancement.

Reclus's views on politics and the environment were deeply informed by science. While critical of technocratic abuses of science by elites to more efficiently manage workers or exercise autocratic state power, Reclus saw science as necessary for revolutionary change.[26] The interconnections between Reclus's scientific and political thought are best summed up in an 1880 address commonly republished in the radical press, "Evolution, Revolution, and the Anarchist Ideal." Reclus articulated the interconnectedness of scientific and political progress and a dialectical relationship between evolution and revolution as he proclaimed:

> All advancements are interdependent, and in proportion to our knowledge and power, we desire them all—social and political progress, moral and material progress, and progress in science, art, and industry. . . . Evolution and revolution are two successive aspects of the same phenomenon, evolution preceding revolution, and revolution preceding a new evolution, which is in turn the mother of future revolutions.[27]

This address expressed many of the same ideas Reclus communicated earlier in his geographical work, such as how modern scientific knowledge could inform a long revolution. But here he was more specific about the "future revolutions" he had in mind. Reclus portrayed radicals as "united revolutionary evolutionists" whose knowledge would enable them to move toward "both peaceful and violent transformations that we already call 'social revolution,'" entailing the "destruction of the despotic power of persons and things, and of individual monopoly over the products of collective labor."[28] To achieve this revolution, Reclus laid out a vision that emphasized the role of radical labor unions and communes. He stressed the importance of labor strikes (including general strikes) and communitarian associations that sought to implement the "scientific practice of mutual aid" and adapt to their surroundings.[29]

Reclus's interest in the scientific practice of mutual aid was informed by his friend and fellow anarchist, geographer Peter Kropotkin. Kropotkin's most influential work on science and politics was *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. Kropotkin's work on *Mutual Aid* began in the 1880s as a refutation of social Darwinism's emphasis on an individualistic and competitive "war of each against all" as "*the* law of life."[30] Having traveled in Eastern Siberia and Northern Manchuria in his youth, Kropotkin noted that he failed to observe the "bitter struggle for the means of existence, *among animals belonging to the same species*, which was considered by most Darwinists (though not always Darwin himself), as . . . the main factor of evolution."[31] Kropotkin framed his argument as reclaiming "true Darwinism" by recovering the role of

sociability, interdependence, and mutual aid in the survival of species, which were observable in most species when studied in their natural habitats rather than in isolation in labs. Notably, the role of animal observations in Kropotkin's ideas underscores how nature had agency in the authorship of Kropotkin's ideas. This is in line with environmental historians' idea of "multispecies co-authorship," which sees knowledge as created by both humans and non-human animals.[32] By cooperating for the survival of groups, animals unintentionally had agency in shaping anarchist thought, which otherwise would have had to contend with, rather than draw influence from, the natural world.

What began as a nature-based refutation of thinkers who saw animals and humans as inherently competitive among their own species became a broader treatise on human history and politics. Kropotkin concluded the work with a call for "man" to be guided in his actions "not merely by love, which is always personal, or at the best tribal, but by the perception of his oneness with each human being." Kropotkin continued with an ethical and social vision that he saw as necessary to the "evolution" of the human race itself:

> In the practice of mutual aid, which we can retrace to the earliest beginnings of evolution, we thus find the positive and undoubted origin of our ethical conceptions; and we can affirm that in the ethical progress of man, mutual support—not mutual struggle—has had the leading part. In its wide extension, even at the present time, we also see the best guarantee of a still loftier evolution of our race.[33]

Kropotkin linked evolution in nature to evolution in human politics. In Kropotkin's final book, *Modern Science and Anarchy* (published in multiple editions in the early 1910s), he built on this to argue "that our conception of Anarchy represents a necessary consequence of the great general wakening of the natural sciences which took place during the nineteenth century."[34] As he elaborated, this was not his own unique or new intervention into the natural sciences of anarchism; rather the "development of the anarchist idea went hand in hand with the advances of the natural sciences" dating back to mid-nineteenth-century thinkers like Godwin and Proudhon.[35]

The works of Kropotkin and Reclus were published in many languages across the globe, and many anarchists across cultures similarly used science and nature to articulate visions of radical equality. For example, in his 1904 utopian fiction "New Year's Dream," the Chinese anarchist Cai Yuanpei seemed influenced by Reclus and Kropotkin in both his narrative and his utopian vision. Cai wrote about a fictional, globe-trotting man with the generic name Zhongguo Yimin ("Chinese national") who explored the world. Zhungguo's travels resembled those of Kropotkin, first venturing throughout Europe and the United States before making his way back to

Manchuria through Siberia. Upon returning to China, Zhongguo spoke on how self-interest among nations and households was preventing humans from pursuing more beneficial relationships with nature, and wrote that humanity cannot overcome "plague, food [scarcity], flood, or drought" because "the world is fragmented into many nations, each of them caring only about its own advantage."[36] The end of the short story returns to the same theme, as decades later Zhungguo's "aspirations had come to pass" as cooperative nations eventually dissolved their boundaries and, "in a common effort to overcome nature and to take control over the climate and the seasons, also [made] plans to conquer the atmosphere and colonize space."[37]

In addition to being read across cultures, since their fields involved traveling to produce knowledge, Kropotkin and Reclus were informed by a wide variety of experiences in different cultures and environments. Kropotkin's early geographical expeditions took him to Siberia and Manchuria, which was centered in *Mutual Aid.* Reclus's geographical and political thought alike were influenced by world travels early in his life. His experiences in Ireland led him to oppose colonialism and economic inequality, then his experiences in mid-nineteenth-century Louisiana working as a tutor made him more viscerally opposed to both slavery and capitalism.

Though situated in colonialist traditions and fields of study themselves, the two thinkers critiqued colonialist perspectives of their contemporaries. Reclus, in trying to justify his anarchism, mentioned that he could "cite diverse tribal peoples called 'savages,' who even in our own day live in perfect social harmony, needing neither rulers nor laws, prisons nor police."[38] He also criticized "simple and naïve stories" and "hasty observations" of early explorers and colonists, saying that evidence showed that formerly disdained tribes should "undeniably be ranked very highly among men who are closest to the ideal of mutual aid and brotherly love."[39] He also called his own European society "only half-civilized because it is far from benefiting everyone."[40] Similarly, in *Mutual Aid*, Kropotkin pushed back against Hobbesian views of "primitive" people living in a "state of perpetual warfare," and instead argued that cooperation, aid for the weakest community members, and complicated systems of social organization could be found among a number of Indigenous peoples detailed throughout the book.[41] It is worth noting that Kropotkin arguably replicated colonialist terminology of "stages of civilization" and "savage" (the latter he was critical of but still used) even as he attempted to show how many often-disparaged societies were more advanced than Europeans gave them credit for.[42] But perhaps most notably, by emphatically advocating for communal land ownership, the two anarchists were at direct odds with colonialist frameworks that relied on private property.

In terms of Kropotkin's political vision, like Reclus he sought a working-class revolution and advocated for communes that adapted to, and were self-sufficient within, their local ecologies. Both thinkers articulated visions of common land ownership and stewardship, stressing the ability of people to creatively manage their own

lands using local knowledge.[43] And, of course, both were deeply critical of capitalism, calling for more communitarian and less exploitative ways of organizing production. Both figures advocated for direct action by workers to bring about this change.

Kropotkin and Reclus articulated some of anarchism's core environmental and political principles in a way that would resonate with radicals across the globe. They emphasized communal approaches to land, labor, and politics as key components of a revolutionary vision of the future. They also emphasized how domination of both humans and nature was unnatural and anti-ecological, while cooperation was more observable in nature. They did so with the backing of scientific authority, as anarchist newspapers across the globe republished their scientific work to lend credence to their ideology. Radicals outside of Europe would adopt many of these ideas while also bringing their own environments and cultures to anarchism.

Land and Freedom: Nature and Indigenous Anarchisms

In the Americas, Indigenous radical movements brought their own ideas of nature and politics to the transnational radical movements of the turn of the century. The example of early twentieth-century Indigenous Mexicans who migrated between the United States and Mexico shows how Indigenous movements intersected with and transformed anarchism. As the historian Devra Anne Weber argues in an article about the anarchist- and Indigenous-influenced Partido Liberal Mexicano (PLM), Indigenous Mexicans on both sides of the US–Mexico border made up a substantial but understudied portion of the radical Left. Analyzing their history helps decenter the United States and Europe and reenvision a more geographically diverse Left that involved transnational "circularities of struggle."[44] The writings of the Mexican anarchist leader Ricardo Flores Magón helped guide the direction of the PLM. Examining Flores Magón's work elucidates commonalities between Indigenous and anarchist environmental thought, such as an ethos that emphasized free and equal access to food, communal management of land, and militant resistance to privatization and colonization.

Flores Magón was involved in organizing revolts throughout the US–Mexico borderlands and publishing anarchist periodicals, including *Regeneración*, the de facto organ of the PLM. Like many Mexican radicals of his time, Flores Magón was influenced by Indigenous thought and practice. Some of these influences are most clearly seen through his family background. His Mazatec father, Teodoro Flores, for example, taught him about the importance of communal land ownership (including communal ownership and stewardship of water, woodlands, and pastures) from a young age.[45] Both Teodoro Flores and Ricardo Flores Magón's mestiza mother, Margarita Magón, also had a history of fighting in anti-colonial resistance movements. Teodoro fought as a teenager against American invaders in 1846, and the couple first met when fighting against French colonial forces in the 1860s.[46] For

their own survival and livelihood, Flores Magón's family relied on a system of mutual aid in their local community, rooted in Mazatec traditions, that was threatened by dictatorship and capitalism in Flores Magón's lifetime.[47] When Indigenous Tomochitecos in Chihuahua rose up against land privatization and central authority, the historian Justin Akers Chacón writes, Flores Magón (then a college student and radical activist) began to see his politics as part of a longer tradition of Indigenous resistance.[48]

Influenced by his family, culture, and broader regional history, Flores Magón brought Indigenous thought and organizing tactics from the US–Mexico borderlands to anarchism in a transnational circularity of anarchist political and environmental thinking. Whereas common ownership of land and free access to food was one long-term goal within Kropotkin's and Reclus's science-focused political visions, to Flores Magón these were more immediate concerns that his direct actions and writings focused on.

Flores Magón often advanced these ideas through storytelling, using literal and metaphorical nonhuman agency to underscore the inequalities, failures, and absurdities of an industrial capitalism that denied land, freedom, and food, which should have been natural rights. A common motif in his work was that Man insulted Nature through his capitalist relationships to land and food. For example, one of Flores Magón's stories from 1916 was told from the perspective of a sentient *torta de pan* that was indignant about the hunger of those who hopelessly longed to eat it as they looked at the bakery's selection. The torta de pan thought that Man "dishonored the Earth" since impoverished people could not simply eat it "with the naturalness with which a mule bites a bundle of straw it finds in its path."[49]

In another story, Flores Magón similarly assigned agency and sentience to gold and iron. After being deposited together in a stream's crevasse, the gold told the iron to get away from it, claiming to be superior. Gold boasted of being "the splendid metal that glows" on the monarch's crown, on soldiers' medals, on the necks of wealthy women, and in the pockets of wealthy men.[50] It even claimed to be the owner of the world and the god of humans. Iron laughed at these assertions, mocking the idea of there being greatness in gold adorning the "forehead or the tyrant" or the "chest of the professional assassin" while it was not even able to be used as a nail to repair an old shoe. Iron instead pointed out its own utility in human life and the progress of the working class, from making a good harvest possible to being used to build hammers, hoes, machines, railroads, and even rifles in a proletarian uprising. Flores Magón used this story of natural elements to critique intertwined hierarchies of humanity and nature; humans assigned so much cultural and exchange value to gold that it became central to stratification and oppression, while iron's underrated use value formed both the core of human progress and underscored the potential for revolutionary action. In a following issue of *Regeneración* two months later, Flores Magón again wrote from the perspective of iron.

This time, unmined iron heard footsteps approaching and decried the uncertainty of not knowing if it would become a prison gate serving tyrants, a life-giving tool, or a weapon for liberation.

Flores Magón also drew anarchism, Indigeneity, and nature together in his more polemical writing. In a 1911 article in *Regeneración*, he praised how "Indians" throughout Mexico until recently "lived in communal villages" where "mutual aid was the rule" and there were no "judges, mayors, jailers."[51] In these villages, Flores Magón wrote, "everyone had the right to land, to the water to irrigate it, to the forests for firewood, and to the wood from the forests for the construction of small houses."[52] Work, too, was communal, as plows and oxen were shared, each family worked on both their own plots and common lands for community harvests, and communities worked together to build homes. The majority of the Mexican population was mestizo and had lived in these more communal systems in recent history until their land was stolen by "financial bandits," Flores Magón argued. Therefore, he believed, Mexican people were well suited for anarchist communism "because they've practiced it . . . for many centuries."[53] The PLM more broadly also sought to restore Indigenous communal land ownership. In its 1906 program, the party called for oppressors to "return . . . goods to their original origin" including to "indigenous tribes" and also said there would be enough land to be distributed "among all the citizens who request it" after the dictatorship was overthrown.[54]

Through his fables and polemics and his involvement with the PLM, Flores Magón simultaneously reoriented how to conceptualize nature; used capitalism's relationship to natural elements to critique monarchy, militarism, and economic inequality; and subtly called for militant action. These interconnected environmental politics of rethinking nature, critiquing industrial capitalism's relationship to nature, and calling for drastic action echo throughout later movements around radical environmentalism and Indigenous radicalism. Reading Indigenous and Mexican anarchism as part of the transnational genealogy of these later movements helps contextualize, expand, and diversify our historical understandings of environmentalisms.

Studying Indigenous and Mexican anarchism also provides a more complete picture of the politics of anarchism globally in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Mexican anarchists were embedded in the transnational production of radical praxis. Radicals debated the Mexican uprisings in the French anarchist newspaper *Les temps nouveaux*. The PLM's efforts to expropriate land from landlords in league with militaristic figures like "General Zapata" stirred controversy among European anarchists such as Jean Grave, who were divided on whether they should draw inspiration from Mexican radicals or view their politics as incompatible with anarchism. Some European anarchists, more concerned with industry than land ownership, also wondered if taking back land would do anything to change

working conditions like wages and working hours. The publishers of *Regeneración* as well as Kropotkin sent firm responses. Kropotkin criticized the narrow visions of revolution that some Europeans had in mind and highlighted the historical efficacy of peasant revolts and the importance of land, even if they did not fit the European ideal of revolution. Jean Grave apologized to the Mexican revolutionaries for questioning them, after a lengthy debate published over the course of eleven months in the newspaper.[55]

In March 1918, Flores Magón was arrested and imprisoned for violating the Espionage Act for antiwar speech. Nature reappeared in Flores Magón's prison writings and letters as he began to articulate deeply personal and frustrated critiques of the carceral environment. While imprisoned, Flores Magón wrote about how prison not only harmed his body and mind but also violently disrupted his connection to nature. In a letter, he wrote, "Every detail of prison life hurts my feelings: the walls, erected to prevent my communion with brothers in ideals, with my fellow-beings, with Nature."[56] Flores Magón experienced a material struggle over the incarcerated human body in the prison environment, forcibly separated from the outside world. Flores Magón died in 1922 in Leavenworth Penitentiary after a prolonged battle with prison administrators over his living conditions, illness, and access to medical care.

Flores Magón is just one part of a much broader tradition of Indigenous and anarchist politics joining together. Historians have described him as deeply influenced by European anarchist thinkers like Kropotkin (and vice versa) and fusing anarchist ideas with "widespread popular aspirations" of Indigenous communities seeking local autonomy, land ownership, and cooperative self-governance.[57] In Mexico, the Popular Indigenous Council of Oaxaca "Ricardo Flores Magón" (CIPO-RFM) was founded in 1997 and named for Flores Magón due to shared interests in common land ownership and environmental protection following the "basic principles [of] reciprocal aid, solidarity, non-violent direct action, autonomy and self-government as the way to freedom."[58] More recently, leaders of CIPO-RFM decried the intersection of colonialism, capitalism, climate change, and the COVID-19 pandemic in their communities as they struggled to buy and sell food and faced increased risks of disease. They called for mutual aid while organizing through *tequio* (communal work) and street demonstrations.[59]

Others, perhaps less directly influenced by Flores Magón, have similarly drawn anarchist and Indigenous political aspirations together while also problematizing the colonial relationship of white anarchists to Indigenous anarchists. Klee Benally argued that in classical anarchists' (including Kropotkin's) "distillation" of Indigeneity they "separated out our matriarchy, our queerness, and that which made us whole, so what would they have to offer except a vague essentialization?"[60] Benally also emphasized the role of nature in Indigenous anarchism and anticolonialism more broadly, writing:

> Indigenous Anarchists are an ungovernable force of Nature. We maintain that no law can be above nature. That is to say, how power is balanced and how we organize ourselves socially is an order that flows from and with Nahasdzáán (Mother Earth). This is what we are accountable and what we hold ourselves responsible to. Our affinity is with the mountains, the wind, rivers, trees, and other beings, we will never be patriots to any political social order.[61]

Benally's work should be understood as part of a larger Indigenous anarchist milieu that includes the Indigenous Anarchist Federation and more localized projects like "infoshops" (self-managed spaces with radical publications and community events). For example, Brandon Benallie (Navajo/Hopi) and Radmilla Cody (Navajo/Black) started an infoshop in the Navajo Nation in 2017 following both Indigenous politics and anarchist praxis (including mutual aid). They framed anarchism as originally influenced by Indigeneity.[62] The continuing linkages between Indigenous, anarchist, and environmental politics underscore how the genealogy of environmentalism should account for both.

Mother Earth: Anarchism, Nature, and the Body

As Indigenous anarchists in the US–Mexico borderlands struggled for land and freedom, urban immigrant anarchists in the northern United States adapted their transnational, nature-based ideology to address concerns surrounding sexual freedoms. Many anarchists saw the body, and by extension sexuality, as simply part of nature. They therefore viewed restrictions on sex as a violation of the natural order. Anarchism's sex radicalism, including struggles over obscenity laws, homosexuality, and contraception, were deeply intertwined with its environmental politics. Anarchists played a key role in early movements around these issues and were often willing to face spectacle-generating imprisonment for violating obscenity laws. The writings of two anarchist romantic partners and radical coconspirators, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, and others in their milieu, such as Max Baginski, are especially useful for understanding anarchist sex politics. These anarchists were particularly influential in the American anarchist movement (including among fellow European migrants), but like that of Flores Magón, their work was read transnationally (and they read Flores Magón—who was often discussed and published in Goldman's *Mother Earth*). Although figures like Goldman have been studied widely, the historian Rachel Hui-Chi Hsu argues that scholars have tended to "understate the role that anarchist frameworks played in shaping [Goldman's] sex radicalism."[63] Nature was essential to the anarchist frameworks that shaped Goldman's and others' late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sex radicalism.

Emma Goldman and Max Baginski's anarchist journal was aptly titled *Mother Earth*. In its first issue in 1906, Goldman and Baginski explained the title in a statement that encompassed their scientific, natural, and moral worldview. They began

by explaining their historical outlook, in which the Earth was one of a "myriad of stars floating in infinite space," on which "Man issued from the womb of Mother Earth" and owed her his life. This was contrasted with a capitalist-colonialist-Christian worldview in which "to gain for himself a seat in Heaven, man devastated the Earth," and priests allowed capitalists to take "possession of it." In the United States in particular, Mother Earth invited Europeans with hospitable arms before being "fenced in" as the "privileged few . . . monopolize[d] every material and mental resource." In addition to material inequality, the monopoly over mental resources included power over what was publishable and respectable, and Goldman and Baginski also call out the anti-obscenity crusader Anthony Comstock in the piece. In response to these inequalities, Goldman and Baginski portrayed Mother Earth as having agency in creating a more equal world where she would belong to all. *Mother Earth* drew environmental thinking together with anarchist politics, including not just anti-capitalism but also an opposition to the religious moral systems behind obscenity laws.[64]

Goldman, Berkman, and other anarchists used the idea of a morally indifferent, natural body to defend open and free discussions of sexuality, free love, and birth control. For example, during Emma Goldman's 1916 obscenity trial for her lecturing on these topics, the anarchist Leonard Abbott wrote in *Mother Earth* that Goldman's "lecture was no more 'indecent' than nature itself is 'indecent.'"[65] Goldman used the idea of natural bodily desires to argue in favor of free love and against taboos on sex outside of marriage, asking, "Can there be anything more outrageous than the idea that a healthy, grown woman, full of life and passion, must deny nature's demand . . . [and] abstain from the depth and glory of sex experience until a 'good' man comes along to take her unto himself as a wife?"[66] As Flores Magón had argued for a natural right to land and food, so too did Goldman and her compatriots argue for natural rights to sexuality.

Nature and science played a central role in anarchism's encounters with eugenics and neo-Malthusianism, from Kropotkin's scientific critiques to Goldman's anti-capitalist birth control advocacy. In a 1912 address to the First International Eugenics Congress in London, reprinted in *Mother Earth*, Kropotkin laid out a detailed critique of the science and social contexts of eugenics. First, he critiqued how hasty politicians were in implementing eugenicist policies even though "foundations" of the science still had to be "worked out." Then he questioned how determinations were made of who was unfit and worthy of forced sterilization, pointing out that incarceration and food scarcity were social causes of problems relating to poverty, intellectual development, and criminality, and that sterilization would commit one of the greatest crimes rather than promote a solution. Instead, he provocatively asked if the unfit in society should be considered those "who produce degenerates in the slums, or those who produce degenerates in palaces."[67] Instead of sterilization, he offered an alternative for improving "social hygiene" focused on

the abolition of capitalist property relations, sexual abuse, and unequitable urban planning, declaring: "Destroy the slums, build healthy dwellings, abolish that promiscuity between children and full-grown people, and be not afraid . . . of 'making Socialism' . . . and you will have improved the germ plasm of the next generation much more than you might have done by any amount of sterilization."[68]

In addition to being skeptical of the science and social implications of eugenics, Kropotkin was also a vehement critic of neo-Malthusianism, the idea that human population growth tended to exceed food supply and should be controlled to avoid environmental and social degradation. He often took issue with Thomas Malthus and neo-Malthusians throughout his social and scientific work. Where neo-Malthusians argued that there was a limited food supply and therefore population growth needed to be curtailed, Kropotkin and other anarchists instead argued that with improved agricultural yields there would be no need to limit birth rates.[69] Kropotkin, who was read in American social reform circles, received pushback from birth control advocates such as Benzion Liber. In an article titled "Kropotkin and Malthus" in a 1920 issue of the *Birth Control Review*, Liber criticized Kropotkin's views in favor of neo-Malthusian ones, which he saw as compatible with class struggle. Highlighting anarchism's and eugenics' shared (if sometimes opposed) uses of scientific authority, Liber also posed the question, "If we agree that the scientific regulation of production, as so warmly recommended by Kropotkin, is needful at times . . . may we not say the same thing about the scientific regulation of the number of children, or should this be left to hazard?"[70]

Emma Goldman, in her advocacy of birth control access, praised Malthus (a popular figure in the birth control movement) as a thinker but adapted his ideas to an anti-capitalist framework that emphasized personal freedom and economic change rather than population control. Like many eugenicists and birth control advocates, Goldman argued that allowing working-class women to better control their own reproduction would allow for better quality of life. But in underscoring the "social aspects of birth control," Goldman pointed to facets like women's dignity and freedom, challenging neo-Malthusian and eugenicist emphases on population control and eliminating undesirables from being born.[71] Goldman would have disagreed with eugenicists who employed neo-Malthusian and social Darwinist ideas to advocate for the forcible, ableist, and racist elimination of groups of people. Instead, she argued for increased personal liberties—and against capitalism.

Goldman and Kropotkin agreed that it was capitalism, not population growth, that limited people's access to food and threatened the environments that humans depended on for life. While she spoke in generally positive terms of Malthus, Goldman argued that if he were alive in 1916 he would agree that the problem was not that "the earth is lacking in fertility and richness to supply the need" of humanity, but that "the earth is monopolized in the hands of the few to the exclusion of the many."[72] In this critique of those who located problems exclusively in

population growth, Goldman echoed Reclus's earlier call to abolish the monopolization of the Earth, making anarchism's alternative ecological ethos a part of her case for birth control access and autonomy in fertility. As a result of these discourses, both Goldman and Kropotkin were later cited by Murray Bookchin as an influence on his staunchly anti-Malthusian social ecology, which challenged neo-Malthusian theories that were still prominent in the environmental movement over half a century later.[73] Despite some differences within the movement on issues like neo-Malthusianism, natural science clearly motivated anarchists' criticisms of limitations on birth control, just as it motivated their broader environmental politics.

Anarchists' critical, nature-informed views of dominant views of sexuality were also connected to their early defense of homosexuality. Before he was involved with *Mother Earth* alongside Goldman, Alexander Berkman was imprisoned from 1892 to 1906 for attempting to assassinate the strike-breaking industrialist Henry Clay Frick. Living in a prison environment that only allowed for same-sex relationships, and informed by his anarchist views of nature and morality, Berkman began writing about the same-sex relationships in prison with an openness that was unusual for the time. Through his *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist*, which was published by Mother Earth Publishing Association in 1912 and became popular even outside of the anarchist movement, Berkman became one of the most prominent early voices speaking on homosexuality in the United States. As the historian Terence Kissack remarked, Berkman's *Prison Memoirs* "contains one of the most sustained considerations of same-sex relations of any of the published works produced by the turn-of-the-century anarchists [and] is one of the most important political texts dealing with homosexuality to have been written by an American before the 1950s."[74] Berkman initially viewed same-sex relationships in prison with revulsion, particularly when they involved making one person inferior to another. However, over time, he came to publicly criticize taboos over homosexuality, personally embrace homosexuality in practice in his own life, and frame same-sex relationships as a refuge from the brutality of prison environments.

Like Flores Magón's prison writings, Berkman's *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist* juxtaposed the "hated walls of gray" of the prison cell with the "unrestricted sunshine and air and life" beyond. He yearned to be free of prison, find freedom in the woods and mountains, and, after "drinking sustenance and strength from the universal mother" of nature, would cry out for freedom for the "buried and disinherited."[75] Like nature outside, Berkman drew sustenance and strength from "love's dungeon flower" inside, as same-sex love temporarily relieved him and others from their socially and environmentally harsh lives in prison.[76] Berkman built on anarchist sex radicals' nature-based embrace of free love and birth control to advocate for same-sex relationships, openly praising the beauty and liberation he experienced through same-sex relationships in public writings in spite of censorious critics and officials.

As with the scientific and Indigenous anarchist ideas, US–based anarchist ideas on sex and nature were translated and circulated across the globe as part of transnational circularities of struggle. For example, Hsu argues that Emma Goldman not only radicalized sexology and used radical sex politics to attract people to anarchism but was also "pioneering in exporting the idea of free love to East Asia."[77] Hsu describes how Japanese and Chinese translators, even when they were anarchists themselves, typically prioritized Goldman's work on free love when translating and publishing for East Asian audiences. Similar to how anarchism's perspectives on science and land would later resonate with other movements despite the ideology moving to the margins, Hsu concludes that audiences in America and East Asia "found inspiration in Goldman's sex radicalism, but it did not turn them into anarchists."[78] Anarchism's previously overlooked environmental politics therefore help explain the genealogies of environmentalism and of movements surrounding reproductive rights and sexual liberties.

Conclusion

In the final chapter of Berkman's *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist*, he recalled a conversation with "Philo" (probably Baginski) that revitalized him. Shortly after Berkman's release from prison in 1906, Philo was trying to cheer up Berkman after he skipped a speaking tour stop in Cleveland because of his suicidal depression. Echoing Reclus's water metaphors and vision of a slow revolution from almost half a century earlier, Philo described how anarchism was once only "a little mountain spring, around which clustered a few thirsty travelers in the dreariness of the capitalist desert," but it had "since broadened and spread as a strong current that covers a wide area and forces its way even into the very ocean of life."[79] Philo explained that "the philosophy of Anarchism is beginning to pervade every phase of human endeavor," introducing its values in science, art, and social movements.[80] Even if Berkman and other anarchists' efforts did not lead to the direct, revolutionary change they hoped for, anarchism's ideas and influence could be seen throughout new political thought and movements. As Philo put it, "The seeds sown" by anarchists were "beginning to bear fruit."[81]

Examining anarchism's environmental politics is helpful for thinking through several historical and political issues. First, as Philo suggested, the ideological seeds sown by anarchists helped inform other movements. Historians have argued that modern radical and mainstream environmentalists of the 1970s and beyond "sprouted from the same seed" as Progressive Era conservationism.[82] We can see that these movements sprouted from many seeds, including those sown by earlier anarchists as well as those sown by the Indigenous communities, communal societies, and nonhuman nature that early anarchists interpreted. Examining these varied seeds, and the more diverse fruits they bore, allows us to tell more complete stories.

These stories are important because they underscore contingency—possibilities from the past that we can still learn from for the future. Historians and activists have criticized some radical environmentalists of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries for their sometimes reactionary "ecocentrist" worldviews that have placed nature above humans ethically, leading some to controversially advocate for population control, eugenics, and anti-immigrant positions. In their prioritization of the nonhuman world, ecocentrists in the 1970s "ignored debates about inequity and social justice that marked the same period."[83] More recently, other ecocentrist groups such as Deep Green Resistance have been criticized by scholars and activists for "green transmisogyny" and transphobia.[84] Notably, environmental historians have criticized some of these ecocentric radical environmentalists for taking hostile actions against the rural working class and Indigenous groups and for emphasizing neo-Malthusian theories that framed overpopulation (especially of non-white people) as responsible for ecological damage.[85] In contrast, the anarchists discussed here were often workers, migrants, and/or Indigenous themselves who argued against the domination of humans and nature alike, advocated for social justice (including increased sexual rights), and challenged their contemporaries who rooted ecological problems in population growth rather than capitalism. Rather than ignoring debates about social justice in favor of defending nature, anarchists viewed social justice as central to their environmental worldview.

These stark contrasts also suggest a fruitful area of future research: What changed for radical environmental politics between early twentieth-century anarchism and late twentieth-century radical environmentalism? What happened in the preceding decades that, by the 1980s, despite objections from "social ecologist" anarchists like Murray Bookchin, "deep green" ecocentrist anarchists like Edward Abbey controversially advocated against immigration, technology, and racial equality?[86] These questions are worth closer consideration as scholars and activists examine and challenge the deep historical divides between social justice movements and many environmentalist groups.

These stories of anarchist environmental politics also contribute to studies of working-class environmentalisms. Historians have portrayed transnational scientific knowledge exchange as central to the political and environmental ideas of government agencies and middle-class reformers in the Progressive Era, including conservationism.[87] In contrast, histories of working-class environmentalisms in the period have acknowledged the outsized presence of radical immigrants but have tended to frame their environmental politics as stemming locally from toxic workplaces and urban pollution, rather than from a similar transnational exchange of ideas about nature.[88] The varied roots of anarchism underscore how migrant and Indigenous radicals alike brought transnational traditions and politics—*including* environmental politics—to the anarchist movement. Through word of mouth, newspapers, and

letters, anarchism's environmental politics spread across nations and helped inform global anti-capitalist and anti-colonialist movements. This history can inform activists who continue to face local environmental inequalities that are situated in global economic and environmental systems—with resistance movements that likewise bridge the local and global.

Historians and activists alike still grapple with the relationships between humans and nature, human and nonhuman domination, science and politics, and environmental stewardship and labor. Of particular recent interest is connecting environmentalism to social justice, including labor, feminist, anti-racist, prison abolitionist, and anti-colonialist movements. Because of anarchism's focus on abolishing both human and nonhuman forms of exploitation and domination, the history of anarchist politics may help bridge the historiographical gap between these movements by underscoring an early example of radical environmental politics that also centered human justice.

By continuing to study, find inspiration in, and critique the movements of the past, we can make sure our own environmental movements are adapted to the societies and ecosystems around us. We are living through an era of extreme environmental inequalities and catastrophes, marked by deeply unequal experiences in issues like "natural" disasters, pollution, climate change, disease, and urban environmental change. While it is tempting to categorize this era as the Anthropocene—a period marked by the predominant role played by human activity in shaping the environment—some have argued that *Capitalocene* might be a more precise label.[89] Emphasizing capital, rather than humans in general, underscores how not all humans contribute equally to environmental degradation and exploitation, but rather a few humans with disproportionate power in the global capitalist system dominate the environment. Systemic issues under capitalism—like the drive for endless, short-term profit and the power (or monopoly) capitalists have over nature—fuel environmental problems and exacerbate their effects. To adequately address the root of these problems, then, requires imagining alternatives to capitalism and a future after the Capitalocene, including alternative ways of relating to nature.

Over a century ago, while living through industrial capitalism, many radicals did just that. Anarchists recognized the outsized role of humans in shaping (and degrading) the environment in their times, and they also saw the possibilities of more harmonious relationships between humanity and nature. Informed by their lived experiences under industrial capitalism, anarchists saw the monopolization of the Earth as a common thread in the domination of humans and nature alike. At the core of industrial capitalism was a flawed system that placed ownership of labor and nature in the hands of a few who put profit first. The seeds the anarchists sowed to imagine alternatives to this system may still germinate a century later in the Capitalocene.

Adam Quinn is a PhD candidate in history at the University of Oregon, where he studies social movements and environmental history. His dissertation explores the role of workers, nature, and environmental justice in the history of the computer industry. He has also researched other American and transnational social movements, including anarchism and the prison abolition movement, in articles published by the Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press, *Radical History Review*, and *Radical Americas*.

Notes

1. Kropotkin, *The Conquest of Bread*.
2. Kropotkin, *The Conquest of Bread*.
3. Hippolyte Havel, "Biographical Sketch," in Goldman, *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 25.
4. Owen, "The Death of Ricardo Flores Magón."
5. Junta Organizadora del Partido Liberal Mexicano,"Manifesto to the Workers of the World," 134.
6. Reclus, "Evolution, Revolution, and the Anarchist Ideal," 144.
7. Zimmer, *Immigrants against the State*, 11.
8. See Guglielmo, *Living the Revolution*; Anderson, *The Age of Globalization*; and Anderson, *The Nation on No Map*.
9. Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency*.
10. "George Perkins Marsh," Rockefeller National Historical Park (US National Park Service), https://www.nps.gov/mabi/learn/historyculture/gpmarsh2.htm (accessed November 28, 2021); Cronon, preface, xiii.
11. Cronon, preface, xiii.
12. Marsh, *The Earth as Modified by Human Action*, viii.
13. Reclus, *Earth*, 665.
14. Reclus, *Earth*, 665–66.
15. This has also been translated as *Story of a Brook*. *Histoire* is translated as either "story" or "history," and both terms arguably describe the work.
16. Reclus, *Histoire d'un ruisseau*, 317.
17. Reclus, *Histoire d'un ruisseau*, 317.
18. For further discussion of *Man and the Earth*, see Clark and Martin, "The Anarchist Geographer," 15.
19. Clark and Martin, "The Anarchist Geographer," 15.
20. Reclus, *L'homme et La Terre*, iv.
21. Clark and Martin, "The Dialectic of Nature and Culture," 29.
22. Reclus, *The Ocean, Atmosphere, and Life*, 519.
23. Clark and Martin, "The Dialectic of Nature and Culture," 31–32.
24. Reclus, "Concerning the Awareness of Nature in Modern Society," 31.
25. Reclus, "Concerning the Awareness of Nature in Modern Society," 32.
26. Clark and Martin, "The Critique of Domination," 88.
27. Reclus, "Evolution, Revolution, and the Anarchist Ideal," 150.
28. Reclus, "Evolution, Revolution, and the Anarchist Ideal," 154.
29. Reclus, "Evolution, Revolution, and the Anarchist Ideal," 154.
30. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid*, xv.
31. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid*, vii.
32. See Domańska, "Animal History." While Domańska was specifically referring to how nonhuman animals have agency in creating knowledge of the past, this seems especially true for knowledge such as Kropotkin's studies of bees and ants.

33. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid*, 300.
34. Kropotkin, *Modern Science and Anarchy*, 98.
35. Kropotkin, *Modern Science and Anarchy*, 101.
36. Cai, "New Year's Dream (1904)," 199. Years later, Cai, like several other Chinese anarchists, became involved with the nationalist movement, so his narrative in "New Year's Dream," which presents a sequence of strong nation building, international cooperation, and eventual dissolution of nations to overcome both human and environmental problems, is especially interesting to read as part of the genealogy of his later politics.
37. Cai, "New Year's Dream," 212.
38. Reclus, "Anarchy," 127.
39. Reclus, "Progress," 213.
40. Reclus, "Progress," 227.
41. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid*, 76–115.
42. For an example of Kropotkin critiquing the categories of "savage" and "civilized," criticizing the "'moral' European" and the European claim to superior civilization, and discussing how each category's knowledge of the other was limited by cultural and experiential barriers, see *Mutual Aid*, 105.
43. Although stewardship was more central in Reclus's work, Kropotkin also wrote that "village communities alone, working in common, could master the wild forests, the sinking marshes, and the endless steppes" (*Mutual Aid*, 129).
44. Weber, "Wobblies of the Partido Liberal Mexicano," 188.
45. Poole, "Ricardo Flores Magón," 5; Akers Chacón, *Radicals in the Barrio*, 157.
46. Akers Chacón, *Radicals in the Barrio*, 157.
47. Paredes and Ahuehuete, "The Indigenous Roots of Magonismo."
48. Akers Chacón, *Radicals in the Barrio*, 189.
49. Ricardo Flores Magón, "La torta de pan 1."
50. Ricardo Flores Magón, "El hierro y el oro 1."
51. Ricardo Flores Magón, "El Pueblo Mexicano es Apto Para el Comunismo."
52. Ricardo Flores Magón, "El Pueblo Mexicano es Apto Para el Comunismo."
53. Ricardo Flores Magón, "El Pueblo Mexicano es Apto Para el Comunismo."
54. Junta Organizadora del Partido Liberal Mexicano, "Programa del Partido."
55. Enrique Flores Magón et al., "A Debate on the Mexican Revolution in *Temps Nouveaux*."
56. Avrich, "Prison Letters of Ricardo Flores Magón to Lilly Sarnoff," 384–85.
57. England, "Magonismo."
58. CIPO-RFM, "Our Story," https://www.nodo50.org/cipo/ourstory.htm (accessed November 26, 2021).
59. Magónista Women's Commission, "A Letter of Resistance."
60. Benally, "Unknowable."
61. Benally, "Unknowable."
62. Nowell, "In the Navajo Nation."
63. Hsu also cautions scholars against overstating the "singularity" of Goldman's ideas and instead suggests seeing them as interconnected with her contemporaries. While I have attempted to highlight others in Goldman's milieu here, Hsu's point is worth emphasizing considering my focus on Goldman and Berkman. As various forms of environmentalism competed and influenced one another, so did different forms of sex radicalism.

64. Goldman and Baginski, "Mother Earth."
65. Abbott, "Reflections on Emma Goldman's Trial."
66. Goldman, "Marriage and Love."
67. Kropotkin, "The Sterilization of the Unfit."
68. Kropotkin, "The Sterilization of the Unfit."
69. Sonn, "'Your Body Is Yours,'" 420.
70. Benzion, "Kropotkin and Malthus," 13.
71. Goldman, "The Social Aspects of Birth Control."
72. Goldman, "The Social Aspects of Birth Control."
73. Bookchin, "Social Ecology versus Deep Ecology."
74. Kissack, *Free Comrades*,102.
75. Berkman, *Prison Memoirs*, 258.
76. Berkman, *Prison Memoirs*, 170.
77. Hsu, "Propagating Sex Radicalism," 38.
78. Hsu, "Propagating Sex Radicalism," 54.
79. Berkman, *Prison Memoirs*, 273.
80. Berkman, *Prison Memoirs*, 273.
81. Berkman, *Prison Memoirs*, 273.
82. Woodhouse, *Ecocentrists*, 284.
83. Woodhouse, *Ecocentrists*, 2. It is also worth stressing that, though broadly critical of radical environmentalists' positions on social issues, Woodhouse and other environmental historians reveal that at least some radical environmentalists have focused more on social justice. For example, one critique of radical environmentalists is that they have used direct action to disrupt Indigenous harvests of whales and seals, but some Indigenous people have been radical environmentalists themselves and employed similar direct action tactics to disrupt colonizers' exploitation of their resources.
84. Houlberg, "The End of Gender or Deep Green Transmisogyny?"
85. Woodhouse, *Ecocentrists*.
86. Krakoff, "Goodbye Abbey, Hello Intersectional Environmentalism."
87. Langston, *Forest Dreams, Forest Nightmares*; Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency*; Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*.
88. Andrews, *Killing for Coal*; Montrie, *Myth of Silent Spring*.
89. A few scholars seemed to independently begin using the term *Capitalocene* around 2009–12, beginning with Andreas Malm in a graduate seminar in 2009, then David Ruccio in a blog post in 2011, followed by Donna Haraway, Tony Weis, and Jason Moore in 2012. See Moore, "Anthropocene or Capitalocene?"

References

Abbott, Leonard D. "Reflections on Emma Goldman's Trial." *Mother Earth*, May 1916.

Akers Chacón, Justin. *Radicals in the Barrio: Magonistas, Socialists, Wobblies, and Communists in the Mexican-American Working Class*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2018.

Anderson, Benedict. *The Age of Globalization: Anarchists and the Anticolonial Imagination*. London: Verso, 2013.

Anderson, William C. *The Nation on No Map: Black Anarchism and Abolition*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2021.

Andrews, Thomas G. *Killing for Coal: America's Deadliest Labor War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Avrich, Paul. "Prison Letters of Ricardo Flores Magón to Lilly Sarnoff." *International Review of Social History* 22, no. 3 (1977): 379–422.

Benally, Klee. "Unknowable: Against an Indigenous Anarchist Theory." *Indigenous Action Media* (blog), June 2021. https://www.indigenousaction.org/unknowable-against-an-indigenous-anarchist-theory-zine/.

Benzion, Liber. "Kropotkin and Malthus." Edited by Margaret Sanger. *Birth Control Review* 4 (April 1920): 13.

Berkman, Alexander. *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist*. New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1912.

Bookchin, Murray. "Social Ecology versus Deep Ecology: A Challenge for the Ecology Movement." *Green Perspectives*, Summer 1987.

Cai, Yuanpei. "New Year's Dream (1904)." In *Hundred Days' Literature: Chinese Utopian Fiction at the End of Empire, 1902–1910*, by Lorenzo Andolfatto, 199–212. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Clark, John, and Camille Martin. "The Anarchist Geographer." In *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: Selected Writings of Elisée Reclus*, edited by John Clark and Camille Martin, 8–15. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2013.

Clark, John, and Camille Martin. "The Critique of Domination." In *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: Selected Writings of Elisée Reclus*, edited by John Clark and Camille Martin, 74–98. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2013.

Clark, John, and Camille Martin. "The Dialectic of Nature and Culture." In *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: Selected Writings of Elisée Reclus*, edited by John Clark and Camille Martin, 16–34. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2013.

Cronon, William. Preface to *George Perkins Marsh: Prophet of Conservation*, by David Lowenthal. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000.

Domańska, Ewa. "Animal History." *History and Theory* 56, no. 2 (2017): 267–87.

England, Shawn. "Magonismo, the Revolution, and the Anarchist Appropriation of an Imagined Mexican Indigenous Identity." In *In Defiance of Boundaries: Anarchism in Latin American History*, edited by Geoffroy de Laforcade and Kirwin Shaffer, 243–60. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2015.

Flores Magón, Enrique, Ricardo Flores Magón, Jean Grave, Peter Kropotkin, William C. Owen, and Michel Petit. "A Debate on the Mexican Revolution in *Temps Nouveaux*." Originally published 1912. Marxists.org. https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/kropotkin-peter/1912/a-debate.html.

Flores Magón, Ricardo. "El hierro y el oro 1." *Regeneración*, October 23, 1915.

Flores Magón, Ricardo. "El Pueblo Mexicano es Apto Para el Comunismo." *Regeneración*, September 2, 1911. Translated by CB. The Anarchist Library, September 2, 1911. https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/ricardo-flores-magon-the-mexican-people-are-suited-to-communism.

Flores Magón, Ricardo. "La torta de pan 1." *Regeneración*, January 22, 1916.

Goldman, Emma. *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1912.

Goldman, Emma. *Anarchism and Other Essays*. With biographic sketch by Hippolyte Havel. 3rd rev. ed. New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1917.

Goldman, Emma. "Marriage and Love." In *Anarchism and Other Essays*, 233–45. New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association, 1911.

Goldman, Emma. "The Social Aspects of Birth Control." *Mother Earth*, April 1916.

Goldman, Emma, and Max Baginski. "Mother Earth." *Mother Earth*, March 1906.

Guglielmo, Jennifer. *Living the Revolution: Italian Women's Resistance and Radicalism in New York City, 1880–1945*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Hays, Samuel P. *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890–1920*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1960.

Houlberg, Laura. "The End of Gender or Deep Green Transmisogyny?" In *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Environment*, edited by Sherilyn MacGregor, 473–86. London: Routledge, 2017.

Hsu, Rachel Hui-chi. "Propagating Sex Radicalism in the Progressive Era: Emma Goldman's Anarchist Solution." *Journal of Women's History* 30, no. 3 (2018): 38–63.

Junta Organizadora del Partido Liberal Mexicano. "Manifesto to the Workers of the World." In *Dreams of Freedom: A Ricardo Flores Magón Reader*, edited by Chaz Bufe and Mitchell Cowen Verter, 134–36. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2005.

Junta Organizadora del Partido Liberal Mexicano. "Programa del Partido Liberal Mexicano y Manifiesto a la Nación," 1906. http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Constitucion/CH6.pdf.

Kissack, Terence. *Free Comrades: Anarchism and Homosexuality in the United States, 1895–1917*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2008.

Krakoff, Sarah. "Goodbye Abbey, Hello Intersectional Environmentalism." *Environmental Law Prof Blog*, August 7, 2018. https://lawprofessors.typepad.com/environmental_law/2018/08/goodbye-abbey-hello-intersectional-environmentalism.html.

Kropotkin, Peter. *The Conquest of Bread*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906. Anarchy Archives, http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/kropotkin/conquest/toc.html.

Kropotkin, Peter. *Modern Science and Anarchy*. Edited by Iain McKay. Oakland: AK Press, 2018.

Kropotkin, Peter. *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. New York: McClure, Philips and Co., 1902.

Kropotkin, Peter. "The Sterilization of the Unfit." *Mother Earth*, December 1912.

Langston, Nancy. *Forest Dreams, Forest Nightmares: The Paradox of Old Growth in the Inland West*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1995.

Magónista Women's Commission. "A Letter of Resistance from the Magónista Women's Commission of the Popular Indigenous Council of Oaxaca." *It's Going Down*, May 7, 2021. https://web.archive.org/web/20210507013326/https://itsgoingdown.org/a-letter-of-resistance-ricardo-flores-magon-cipo-rfm/.

Marsh, George Perkins. *The Earth as Modified by Human Action: A Last Revision of "Man and Nature."* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Montrie, Chad. *The Myth of Silent Spring: Rethinking the Origins of American Environmentalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018.

Moore, Jason W. "Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, History, and the Crisis of Capitalism." In *Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, History, and the Crisis of Capitalism*, edited by Jason W. Moore, 1–11. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2016.

Nowell, Cecilia. "In the Navajo Nation, Anarchism Has Indigenous Roots." *The Nation*, September 25, 2020. https://www.thenation.com/article/activism/anarchism-navajo-aid/.

Owen, William C. "The Death of Ricardo Flores Magón." In *Sembrando Ideas.* Mexico, D. F.: Grupo Cultural "Ricardo Flores Magón," 1926. Originally published in *Freedom*, December 1922.

Paredes, Heriberto, and Taller Ahuehuete. "The Indigenous Roots of Magonismo: Ricardo Flores Magón and the Mazatec Cosmovision." Substack newsletter. *Ahuehuete.Org* (blog), November 17, 2021. https://ahuehuete.substack.com/p/ricardo-flores-magon-sierra-mazateca.

Poole, David. "Ricardo Flores Magón." In *Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution*, 5–6. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1977.

Reclus, Élisée. "Anarchy." In *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: Selected Writings of Elisée Reclus*, edited by John Clark and Camille Martin, 120–31. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2013. Previously published as "L'Anarchie" in *Les Temps nouveaux* 18 (May 25–June 1, 1895).

Reclus, Élisée. "Evolution, Revolution, and the Anarchist Ideal." In *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: Selected Writings of Elisée Reclus*, edited by John Clark and Camille Martin, 138–56. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2013. Previously published as *L'Évolution, la révolution et l'idéal anarchique*. Paris: Stock, 1898; Montréal: Lux Editions, 2004.

Reclus, Élisée. "Progress." In *Anarchy, Geography, Modernity: Selected Writings of Elisée Reclus*, edited by John Clark and Camille Martin, 208–33. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2013. Previously published as *L'Homme et la Terre*. Vol. 6. 501–41. Paris: Librairie Universelle, 1905–8.

Reclus, Élisée. *Earth: Phenomena of the Life of the Globe*. Vol. 2. London: Bickers and Son, 1876.

Reclus, Élisée. *Histoire d'un ruisseau*. Paris: J. Ketzel, 1882.

Reclus, Élisée. *L'Homme et la Terre*. Vol. 1. Paris: Librairie Universelle, 1905.

Reclus, Élisée. "Concerning the Awareness of Nature in Modern Society." In *Man and Nature*, translated by Jack Grancharoff, 13–34. Petersham: Jura Books, 1995. Previously published as "Du sentiment de la nature dans les societies modernes." *Revue des Deux Mondes* 63, May 15, 1866.

Reclus, Élisée. *The Ocean, Atmosphere, and Life: Being the Second Series of a Descriptive History of the Phenomena of the Life of the Globe*. Translated by B. B. Woodward and edited by Henry Woodward. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1873.

Rodgers, Daniel T. *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000.

Sonn, Richard. "'Your Body Is Yours': Anarchism, Birth Control, and Eugenics in Interwar France." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 14, no. 4 (2005): 415–32.

Weber, Devra Anne. "Wobblies of the Partido Liberal Mexicano: Reenvisioning Internationalist and Transnational Movements through Mexican Lenses." *Pacific Historical Review* 85, no. 2 (2016): 188–226.

Woodhouse, Keith Makoto. *The Ecocentrists: A History of Radical Environmentalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2018.

Zimmer, Kenyon. *Immigrants against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2015.