

“WE CAN LICK THE UPPER CRUST” –
PIES AS POLITICAL PRANKS

Audrey (Vanderford) Watters
University of Oregon

And the bigger the fall, the bigger the joke. It would be better fun to throw a custard pie at a bishop than at a curate. – George Orwell

Never doubt that a small, committed group of people with pies can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has. – Subcommandante Tofutti

On February 4, 1998, Microsoft chairperson Bill Gates was in Brussels to meet with Belgian government officials and business people. As he climbed the steps to an office building, a group of activists known as the *Pâtisserie Brigade Internationale* pelted him with cream pies. Always on the heels of the corporate celebrity, the media were there to document the incident. Footage of Gates, his face smeared with the yellowy filling, graced both newspapers and television. This prank was the work of Belgian artist/writer Noël Godin. Many in Belgium were already familiar with Godin's pie-throwing antics, as he has performed similar stunts against European personalities for decades. With the Gates incident, pie-throwing was tossed into the spotlight worldwide. Though deliciously mischievous, Godin's actions are but a small "piece of the pie"; militant bakers everywhere have heeded a call to arms.

The “pie-in-the-face” prank has a lengthy history with manifestations in popular and folk culture. This essay explores the history of pie-throwing as a *political* prank, with particular attention to the recent spate of “pie-litical” incidents. Like most pranks, pies are acts of ritualized inversion and humiliation. This essay focuses on the carefully crafted symbolism in these political pranks, evident in both the enactment and in the subsequent narratives and documentation. Although the performance of a prank has an immediate but limited audience, I argue that the impact of a prank takes on further layers of symbolism and importance through the media and through activist networks.

Towards a (Disciplined) Theory of Pranks

A successful prank is a nuanced and well-crafted event, executed with strategic planning and with anticipated results. When combined with elements of parody and political wit, pranks can offer an entertaining act of social criticism. Pranks operate on, in, and through power

dynamics, inverting structures of status and convention. According to journalists V. Vale and Andrea Juno,

a prank connotes *fun, laughter, jest, satire, lampooning, making a fool of someone* -- all light-hearted activities. Thus do pranks camouflage the sting of deeper, more critical denotations, such as their direct challenge to all verbal and behavioral routines, and their undermining of the sovereign authority of words, language, visual images, and social conventions in general. Regardless of specific manifestation, a prank is always an evasion of reality. Pranks are the deadly enemy of reality. And "reality" -- its description and limitation -- has always been the supreme control trick used by a society to subdue the lust for freedom latent in its citizens.[\[1\]](#)

Pranks are dramatic folk traditions, comically subversive performances, radical street theater. Political pranks draw on a long history of satire and parody in both performance and literature. Jesters and fools have long used humor to question and ridicule authority; modern-day activists continue to find the practical joke a useful and amusing tactic.

Despite their prevalence, pranks are largely unexamined and certainly under-theorized by scholars. Perhaps the lack of academic writing on pranks stems from the need for a focused, contextual study on which to base one's analysis. After all, there are only a few occasions, such as April Fool's Day, when "ritualized" pranks can be readily observed "in the field"; at other times, pranks are nearly impossible to predict or observe. Ethnography therefore must focus on the aftermath rather than the event, relying on the story as well as the performance. Fortunately, political pie-throwers have delivered their prank with a narrative portion, providing a particularly palatable topic for analysis.

Other than juvenile and mean-spirited "How To" manuals, there is to my knowledge only one book devoted entirely to the aesthetics and artistry of pranks: *Pranks!* by V. Vale and Andrea Juno. Published in 1987 as part of the Re/Search series, this book contains interviews with many well-known pranksters and performance artists, including Yippie Abbie Hoffman, Earth First! co-founder Mike Roselle, and Dead Kennedys' lead singer Jello Biafra. In the book's introduction, Vale and Juno begin to formulate the transformative power and revolutionary significance of pranks, stating that "the best pranks research and probe the boundaries of the occupied territory known as 'society' in an attempt to redirect that society toward a vision of life grounded not in dreadful necessity but rather continual poetic renewal."[\[2\]](#) Although the book is an excellent anthology of pranksters' recollections, the editors' journalistic style relies solely on conversation, sometimes at the expense of analysis. What it lacks in theory however, *Pranks!* makes up for in riotous storytelling.

There have been a handful of academic investigations of pranks, and these generally fall into three categories: children's/teenage folklore, occupational folklore, and holiday/celebration customs. For example, Julia Woodbridge Oxreider posits that pranks played at girls' slumber

parties are quests for identity and peer relationships.^[3] As in most studies of logging culture, Barre Toelken considers practical jokes on the job as initiation rites for “greenhorns.”^[4] In *Wobblies, Pile Butts, and Other Heroes: Laborlore Explorations*, Archie Green takes a historical and etymological approach to workplace pranks, examining acts of sabotage as rituals of resistance. Pranks are perhaps most often mentioned in relation to celebrations (weddings and birthdays, for example) and to holidays (such as Halloween and April Fool’s Day). In a chapter from *Folklore Matters* entitled “April Fool and April Fish,” Alan Dundes suggests pranks are played on “individuals who are placed in some kind of new situation or status,” such as high school graduates or newlyweds.^[5]

Dundes’s chapter is one of the only attempts to theorize pranks at length, using Arnold Van Gennep’s “rites of passages” model. Dundes examines pranks as symbolic acts that indicate times of transition. Describing pranks as markers of change, he draws upon Van Gennep’s argument that all rites of passage share the same structural stages: separation, transition, and incorporation into the world.^[6] Applying this structure to pranks, Dundes suggests the duped individual is psychologically separated from others by not being “in” on the joke; then upon realization of the prank, the person becomes admitted into the group. Although political pranks do not necessarily serve to initiate their targets, the “rites of passage” model can still apply because pranks, like all political activism, push for some sort of societal transformation. One aspect of “rites of passage” not fully elaborated by Dundes, but certainly discussed by Van Gennep (and later developed by Victor Turner in *The Ritual Process*), is the inversion of hierarchies implicit in the transitional or “liminal” period. These elements of pranks – pranks as anti-hierarchical and pranks as transformative – are central to the utilization of pranks by activists.

Although this element of ritualized inversion is important in the performance of political pranks, my methods differ from Dundes’s in that I rely largely on performance and narrative theories. By drawing on both the performance and the narratives surrounding pranks, I hope to establish a dynamic framework through which the energy and anarchy of these acts can be explored, without losing the bodily, contextual, and political cues they provide.

Political performances – protests, street theater, “agit-prop” – have received increasing scholarly attention since the Sixties. In the past thirty years, theorists have begun to examine both the politics of performance and the performance of politics. Although pranks have not been the focus of any one work, some of these performance-oriented studies can inform an analysis of political pranks.

In his article “Fighting in the Streets: Dramaturgies of Popular Protest, 1968-1989,” theater studies scholar Baz Kershaw expands the analyses of performance theories to include protest. Kershaw posits that as reflective and reflexive acts, protests wield a symbolic potential for *real* transformation, a “radical liminality” that moves beyond subversion and resistance.^[7] In other words, political performances of dissent and resistance – whether protests, pranks, wildcat strikes, or riots – can potentially enact and constitute new visions of freedom.

Rhetorician Kevin DeLuca contends that the non-verbal – the body – can provide a powerful argumentative force. In his article “Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, ACT UP, and Queer Nation,” he shows that the physical acts and images of activism create a visual performance, a bodily rhetoric that extends beyond “reason” and “words.” DeLuca’s article addresses the discursive, material body in contemporary political performances. These activists’ mode of performance reflects their prioritization of lived, bodily experience over “rationality” and traditional political argumentation. The non-verbal and the body are important sites for the communication of pranksters’ messages, as evident in pie-tossing performances.

Political activism is about “doing” – protesting, teaching, organizing, monkeywrenching – but it is also about “talking” – chanting, negotiating, persuading, and perhaps most importantly telling stories. Narratives play a significant role in political activism, constructing and maintaining individual and community identities. Activists’ narratives are important vehicles to promote and legitimate a cause, to evaluate previous actions, to recruit new members, and to sustain those already in the movement. Narratives provide a forum for arbitrating and resolving ideology and strategy. Protest narratives are performances, but they are also *performative*, constituting political subjects, actors, and agents. “Speaking truth to power,” these narratives configure events in such a way to re-present the past with a radical telos.

As mentioned earlier, the logistics of pranks make their performance less available to researchers than their aftermath and discussion. Fortunately, the narratives surrounding pranks can be as revealing as the events themselves. As anthropologist Richard Bauman suggests, these are actually “two complementary parts of the same expressive tradition.”^[8] Indeed, the tale of a prank can be as important as the initial action. As the prank narratives are repeated in activist circles, they take on a greater, even legendary significance.

“The Pie is Cast” – The History of Pie-Throwing

From the pie-toss at the county fair to vaudeville, stage, and screen, shoving a pie in someone’s face has been a common act of slapstick and subversion. As Mack Sennett, founder of the Keystone Cops proudly declared, “A pie in the face, provided the recipient does not anticipate it, has no equal in slapstick comedy. It can reduce dignity to nothing in seconds.”^[9] Contemporary prankster activists combine this traditional custom with *political* targets – and innovative press releases. Pies are retributive pranks, punishing corporate criminals, corrupt government officials, and others who represent exploitation and oppression.

Pie-throwing became an expression of political discontent in the late Sixties and early Seventies with the Yippies. Aron Kay, known as “the Pieman,” tossed pies at numerous politicians and public figures, including anti-feminist Phyllis Schaffly, Watergate “plumber” G. Gordon Liddy, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and artist Andy Warhol. Kay retired in 1992 after pieing Randall Terry, head of the anti-abortion group “Operation Rescue.” Today he maintains a

website that contains photographs and descriptions of his “pie-litical” acts, as well as updates on those pie pranks “perpetrated” by others.

Political pie-throwing in Europe also had its origins in the Sixties. Noël Godin, the man responsible for pieing Bill Gates, was active in the student uprisings in Paris. “I was never cured of the fever of May 1968,” he admits.[\[10\]](#) He continues to subscribe to the situationist practice of *détournement*: the “theft” of pre-existing artistic productions and their integration into a new construction, one that serves a radical political agenda. According to the situationists, an anarchist group instrumental in the events of May ’68, *détournement* provides a disruption or fracture in the “spectacle” of modern capitalist representations. “There are a thousand forms of subversion,” says Godin, “all of them interesting. But few, in my opinion, can equal the convenience and immediacy of the cream pie.”[\[11\]](#)

In 1997, six months before the Gates pieing received worldwide attention, the Biotic Baking Brigade struck their first target: Charles Hurwitz, CEO of Maxxam Corporation – parent company of Pacific Lumber, responsible for the clearcutting of the Headwaters Redwood Forest. Since then the BBB have pied many public figures for a variety of causes, including anti-biotechnology, anti-global capitalism, and human and animal rights. Although most of the BBB pieings have occurred in the Bay Area, the Brigade now has “factions” throughout the country. They are adamant, however, that they are not a formal organization; they are “flan-archists.” As spokesperson Agent Apple notes,

The BBB is a movement rather than a group. We have no members, though there is an underground network of militant bakers who provide us with nothing but the best vegan and organic pies. The focus of the current pastry “uprising” is to hold corporate crooks and their lackeys in government and the non-profit sector accountable. Our track record shows that unlike them, we don't just promise pie in the sky, we deliver.[\[12\]](#)

Although their vision of peace, justice and biodiversity may seem far-fetched and “un-american” in a culture of profit and plunder, these activists see their pie-throwing in line with the venerable tradition of political pranking in this country. As Agent Apple asserts, “The BBB's pies are the Boston Tea Party of our modern day, sending a serious message softly to the corporate oligarchy.”[\[13\]](#)

Contemporary relations of global capitalism have necessitated a global response from political activists. Agent Apple notes, “As the Zapatistas have made clear, in a global economy, we all live in Chiapas. [Pie throwers] build on that connection: under neoliberalismo, we all can throw a pie in the face of economic fascism.”[\[14\]](#) In many ways, pies are a form of “visual esperanto,” an act that translates across languages and borders.[\[15\]](#) Pie-throwing has spread throughout the West; bands of “militant bakers” are at work in Canada, England, Holland, and Australia.

Listed in Table 1 are some of these groups' recent targets. Although not all these people are necessarily famous, they are *public* and more importantly, *symbolic* figures who embody the government and corporations. A pie thrown is, then, a direct attack upon a *body* of authority. Those targeted by the pranksters experience public humiliation, but the injury is to their pride, not their anatomy. While powerful institutions and their figureheads may desire the appearance of inviolability, pies prove that in fact, no one is untouchable.

Repercussions for political pie-throwing seem to vary according to the sense of humor of the individual targeted. Sometimes activists are able to "get away with it" since it is "all in jest." However, the three activists who pied San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown in 1998 were charged with felonies for conspiracy and assault. Dubbed "the Cherry Pie Three," they were convicted and sentenced to six months in prison. For their part, these pie-throwers claimed to have never intended to hurt anyone; nevertheless the prosecutors treated their act as a vicious attack on the mayor. In response, the activists attempted to undermine the state's definition of violence, insisting that while a pie is merely fruit, sugar, and flour, the real violent acts are the crimes perpetrated by corporations and the State: evicting poor people from their homes, police brutality, clearcutting, polluting, and so on.

In a communiqué, the BBB state, "Don't forget to write pie-loving letters to the editor, so the press gets a little perspective on what constitutes a 'violent act'." [\[16\]](#) Indeed, the mainstream media have tried to vilify the pie throwers, often accusing them of silliness and frivolity. As one columnist writes, "Why would you want slapstick laughs around homelessness, the raping of the environment or corporate greed? That isn't funny." [\[17\]](#) The pie-slingers insist these critics have missed the punchline.

"Speaking Pie to Power" – Post-Prank Discourse

As in almost all political actions, the press and their "telling" of the joke play a key role in the pie prank. Like other forms of political performance, pranks are directed at a specific "victim" or target, but also at a broader audience. According to folklorist Barre Toelken, pranks have several audiences: insiders who perform the trick, strangers who know little or nothing, and bystanders who are initiated, thereby becoming insiders themselves. Toelken points to the importance of these audiences as they strengthen the "esoteric sense of heightened participation in a special group." [\[18\]](#) In other words, the performance of the prank solidifies the insiders' identity and group cohesion. For some outsiders, the prank can inform, educate, or convince; for others, of course, the prank can only embarrass, repulse, or ridicule.

In many ways, the mainstream press acts as the "outsider" audience in the prank performance. In the Sixties, many activists realized that manipulating the media was a crucial – and amusing – part of the revolution. As the protesters at the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago chanted, "the whole world is watching!" "On behalf of the corporations which own them," writes Agent Apple of the BBB,

mainstream media outlets present a spectacle that bamboozles and

distracts its viewers. To state the obvious, it is extremely difficult to get a dissenting message through the mass media filters and into the hearts and minds of the public. If we hold a rally in demonstration-jaded San Francisco, the media usually won't cover it. If we write letters to the editor, they don't get printed. However, the visual of a pie in the face makes a sizable chink in the media armor through which we can then discuss the reasons why a figure deserved to be pied. It allows us to communicate our message to a greater extent than traditional means currently allow.[\[19\]](#)

Agent Lemon Meringue, one of the "Cherry Pie Three," echoes this, noting that protests and marches are so commonplace that in order "to catch people's attention, it's got to be something bigger and different. Which is the curse and the blessing of pie."[\[20\]](#) However, sometimes the protesters' actual message is lost beneath the media hoopla over the prank itself. Some have lamented that the press is more interested in ascertaining the pie's flavor than pursuing the rationale for the act. Even with a negative slant to the coverage, the image of the pie-in-the-face is impossible to completely reinterpret; this prank resonates as a subversive, yet comic act.

Despite the drawbacks, the media offers activists a vehicle for spreading the word to others outside their movement. It also gives them a platform to include additional dialogue, narrative, and interpretation with their initial prank performance. For example, when one pie-thrower was convicted of harassment, disorderly conduct, and criminal mischief and ordered to formally apologize to her target, she seized the opportunity to append her joke: "All I can say is I am sorry. I'm sorry I missed when I hurled that pastry projectile, an all-American apple pie, in your direction"[\[21\]](#) She insured that the last laugh would be hers – not the judicial system's.

Despite the media coverage of many protests and political pranks, most of the communication about these events still goes on "underground." At this grassroots, in-group level, much discussion goes on orally, as word about actions is spread amongst friends. Due to the subversive nature of their political beliefs and due to the illegality of some of their activities, the activists are generally secretive and wary of outsiders, especially during the planning stages of a prank. Nonetheless, after a prank, there is usually much discussion and analysis, both written and oral.

Manifestos and justifications for political actions, once only handwritten or typed on flyers or in 'zines, are now published on web pages and spread via email. The Internet provides a medium for widespread dissemination of political information, and a certain level of anonymity online facilitates subversive discourse. Just as the Zapatista rebels in Mexico have utilized the Internet to broadcast their message beyond Chiapas, the activists have taken advantage of these new networks of communication, helping spread the "tradition" of the pie-toss elsewhere. Indeed, much of the research for this essay was accumulated from A-INFOS News Service, an international anarchist listserv, where Aron Kay, the BBB, and others relate their activities and

post their communiqués. No matter what format they take, humor and social criticism continue in the activists' post-prank discourse.

For example, the communiqués frequently make a point of describing the types of pies, for the ingredients are chosen purposefully. By using organic and vegan ingredients, the protesters align themselves with Nature, and in opposition to corporations and capitalism. Organic tofu cream pie had special significance for the pieing of Monsanto CEO Robert Shapiro, as his corporation produces genetically-engineered soybeans. Apple pie also has particular resonance as it symbolizes traditional American ideals. It provides a political critique not only of the actions of the person targeted, but of what exactly these American ideals entail.

The pie-throwers' communiqués also utilize a specialized terminology that heightens the humor of their actions. For example, the Belgians invented terms like "entarteur" ("pie-thrower") and "gloupinesque" ("pie prank") to describe their antics. Many of the pie-tossers also use abbreviations and acronyms to label themselves. These include PIE (People Insurgent Everywhere) and TAART (Dutch for "pie"). One group, mimicking the Nobel-peace-prize medical organization, call themselves "Bakers without Borders."

The BBB has also adopted a "spy" lingo to describe themselves and their actions; there are secret agents, code-words, and undercover operations. Pie throwers include Agent Creamy-Genes and Subcommandante Tofutti. Most take names of well-known types of pie: Agent Cherry Rhubarb, Agent Pecan, Agent Key Lime. In "Operation: Double Fudge," pieings occurred simultaneously on the UC Davis and UC Berkeley campuses. The opening lines of one pie-litical experience narrative read:

Twas round midnight when I got my marching orders from the Biotic Baking Brigade (BBB), sent from the General HQ and secrets ovens located deep in the heart of Headwaters Forest. Maxxam CEO Charles Hurwitz was having a hush-hush. . . meeting the next day. My assignment was to penetrate the security surrounding the event, locate Hurwitz. . . and pie him.[\[22\]](#)

The rhetoric of espionage, although certainly tongue-in-cheek, reiterates the activists' need for secrecy; it also mimics the very authorities who do monitor and infiltrate radical political groups.

The pie-throwers' communiqués and press releases contain other types of prankish language. The authors frequently *détourne* famous quotations and well-known proverbs, incorporating words and phrases associated with baking and pie. These include:

- "let slip the pies of war"
- "another one bites the crust"
- "pies fly while you're having fun"
- "pie 'em all, and let God sort 'em out"

- “if the people pie, the leaders will swallow”
- “it’s a good day to pie”
- “it’s better to pie on our feet than live on our knees”
- “ask not for whom the pie throws – it throws for thee”

Agent Apple of the BBB is particularly fond of puns and word plays, often crying, "let justice be served," claiming that the rich will get their "just desserts" and "culinary comeuppance." Echoing the communiqués of the EZLN spokesperson Subcommandante Marcos, Agent Apple often signs his letters “from somewhere in the mountains of Northwestern California, I remain faithfully yours” (Marcos signs his “from the mountains of the Mexican Southeast”). This use of humorous language is an additional wordplay, one that draws on well-known revolutionary rhetoric to heighten the practical joke of pie-throwing. The use of humor in both narrative and performance make the BBB communiqués as much a joy to read as their pranks are a joy to watch.

Pie-throwing is an appealing type of prank for activists as it has these multiple layers of meaning. Pie-throwing is a symbolic gesture, a way to publicly humiliate powerful members of society. By utilizing pranks and pies, political activists are able to undermine hierarchy, mock authority, and capture the attention of the media and public-at-large. The visual image of the pie-in-the-face is a popular act of ridicule and a well-known symbol of irreverence – one that even disparaging press coverage cannot entirely undermine. The “global pastry uprising” has embarrassed many targets and perhaps more importantly, has drawn attention to a variety of issues. Although few people may witness the actual pieings, the audience is widened by the media and by the activist’s own communication networks. At this narrative level of the prank, the joke is reiterated and strengthened.

Humor can be a valuable political weapon. As Saul Alinsky asserted in his activist handbook *Rules for Radicals*, “ridicule is man’s most potent weapon. It is almost impossible to counterattack ridicule. Also it infuriates the opposition, who then react to your advantage.”^[23] Pie-throwers recognize this, noting that “while the issues we try to tackle are serious – clearcutting redwoods and the global economy – there’s something very valuable in getting people to laugh.”^[24] In the words of Agent Apple, “The technocrats who dominate industrial society may call us radical and unrealistic, but the dream of a bio-diverse future is one for which we will fight until the day we pie.”^[25]

TABLE 1. A Partial List of Recent “Pie-litical” Targets – Names, Location, and Dates

Name	Location	Date
Charles Hurwitz, Maxxam CEO	Humboldt County, CA	August 1997
Bill Gates, Microsoft chairman	Brussels, Belgium	February 1998
Milton Friedman, economist	San Francisco, CA	October 1998
Robert Shapiro, Monsanto CEO	San Francisco, CA	October 1998
Renato Ruggiero, World Trade Organization, Director	London, England	October 1998

Willie Brown, San Francisco mayor	San Francisco, CA	November 1998
Oscar de la Renta, fashion designer	Portland, OR	November 1998
Gordon Rousser, Dean, College of Natural Resources, UC Berkeley	Berkeley, CA	November 1998
Douglas Watson, Novartis CEO	Berkeley, CA	November 1998
Larry Vanderhoof, UC Davis Chancellor	Berkeley, CA	November 1998
Carl Pope, Sierra Club president	San Francisco, CA	November 1998
Frits Bolkestein, Dutch right-wing politician	Leiden, The Netherlands	December 1998
Sir Richard Evans, Chairman British Aerospace	London, England	December 1998
Jim Torrey, Eugene mayor	Eugene, OR	December 1998
Gerrit Zaim, Dutch Finance Minister	Leiden, The Netherlands	January 1999
John Pepper, Procter & Gamble, Chairman	Chicago, IL & Columbus, OH	February 1999
Kenneth T Derr, Chevron CEO	San Francisco, CA	March 1999
Neal First, geneticist, University of Wisconsin	North Hampton, NH	March 1999
Roger Landry, LaPresse, President	Montreal, Quebec	March 1999
Charles Raines, Sierra Club staff member	Eugene, OR	March 1999
Jesse "The Body" Ventura, Minnesota Governor	Minneapolis, MN	March 1999
Reverend Fred Phelps	San Francisco, CA	March 1999
Lord David Sainsbury	Swansea, Wales	March 1999
Russel DeValois, UC Berkeley professor and vivisector	Berkeley, CA	April 1999
Dennis Avery, "free market biotech advocate"	Grinnell, IA	April 1999
Carol Flynn, Minnesota State Senator	Minneapolis, MN	April 1999
Stephane Dion, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Montreal, Quebec	May 1999
Patrick More, co-founder of Greenpeace	Santa Cruz, CA	December 1999
Keith Campbell, geneticist and creator of Dolly, the cloned sheep	Brighton, England	January 2000
Joyce Groote, president of BIOTEC Canada	Montreal, Quebec	January 2000
Michel Camdessus, IMF Director	Bangkok, Thailand	February 2000
Chuck Foldenaur, president of US Atomics	Southern Australia	February 2000
Ann Widdecombe, British Shadow Home Secretary	Oxford, England	April 2000
Martina McClaughlin, Director of Bio-technology, UC Davis.	San Francisco, CA	April 2000
Dan Glickman, US Secretary of Agriculture	Washington DC	May 2000
Jean Chretien, Prime Minister of Canada	Montreal, Quebec	August 2000

Notes

[1] V. Vale and Andrea Juno, ed, *Pranks!* (San Francisco: Re/Search, 1987), 4.

[2] Vale and Juno, 5.

[3]

Julia Woodbridge Oxreider, "The Slumber Party: Transition into Adolescence," *Tennessee Folklore Society Bulletin* 43 (1977): 128-134.

[4]

Barre Toelken, *Dynamics of Folklore* (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1996), 146.

[5]

Alan Dundes, *Folklore Matters* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989), 104.

[6]

Arnold Van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (London: Routledge, 1960).

[7]

Baz Kershaw, "Fighting in the Streets: Dramaturgies of Popular Protest, 1968-1989," *New Theatre Quarterly* 13 (1997): 275.

[8]

Richard Bauman, *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) 35.

[9]

Diane MacIntyre, "Keystone: Kops, the King, and Just Desserts," 1996, <<http://www.mdle.com/ClassicFilms/FeaturedStar/keystone.htm>> (3 September 2000).

[10]

Robert Chalmers. "Let Them Eat Cake," *The Observer*, July 3, 1995, Life section, p. 10.

[11]

Chalmers, 10.

[12]

Al Decker, "BBB Pies Head of the Sierra Club," 15 November 1998, <a-infos@tao.ca> (16 November 1998).

[13]

Agit Prop, "Cherry Pie 3 Follow-up," 27 February 1999, <a-infos@tao.ca> (28 February 1999).

[14] Agent Apple, "The Global Pastry Uprising," *The Ecologist*, 29 (August-September, 1999): 298.

[15] *The Pie's the Limit: A Documentary on the Global Pastry Uprising*, Whispered Media collective, 28 min., 1999, videocassette.

[16]

Al Decker, "Letter from the BBB," 3 December 1999, <a-infos@tao.ca> (4 December 1999).

[17]

Al Decker, "Big Fat BBB New Years Greetings from Pie Throwers," 4 January 1999 <a-infos@tao.ca> (5 January 1999).

[18]

Toelken, 146.

[19]

Agent Apple, "The Global Pastry Uprising," 299.

[20]

Ana Maria Cox, "The Medium is the Meringue: Pie-Throwing Protesters Who Take Their Slapstick Seriously (Pie Throwing as Means of Protest)," *Mother Jones* 24 (March 1999): 42.

[21]

Tricia Schwennesen, "Activist Guilty in Pie Incident," *The Register Guard*, 24 February 2000, sec. D, p. 1.

[22] Al Decker, "In Defense of Apple Pie," 1998, <<http://www.bud.com/98/07/tkles/24.aldeck.pie/>> (28 May 1999).

[23] Saul Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), 128.

[24] Gregory Lewis, "Pie-pitch Recipe: Activism with Humor," *San Francisco Examiner*, 9 November 1998.

[25]
Biotic Baking Brigade, "Pastry Uprising against Genetix Continues in Montreal," 26 January 2000
<a-infos@tao.ca> (27 January 2000).