

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: The Formation of Deep Ecology

Human civilisation grew in the lap of nature. Nature thus provides the locus for everything that flourished over it. Or it may be understood in the way that that which provides the platform for birth and development of anything and everything is Nature. It is that which surrounds, inspires awe, and above all, provides the basic conditions and bare necessities for the birth and growth of life over it. Either with or without this realisation, human beings since the early days of civilisation developed some sort of respect, love and care for nature.

In the Vedic literature, there were references to revering the nonhuman world. Particularly in the *Rigveda*, one can find numerous references to the protection of nature on religious and aesthetic considerations. There is a number of hymns that enchant the adoration of nature-deities in many forms. The *Rigveda* states that there is only one Reality, the wise call it by various names like *Agni*, *Yama*, or sometimes *Matrisva* (Yadav 82-83). Similarly, *Atharvaveda* is said to be Veda of the masses for its more close relation with the common men and the environment where they live (Jena vi). Ancient people treated plants as their parents and siblings and considered cutting trees as sin and planting as charity. *Agni* is revered as the purifier of the environment and destroyer of the sins and evils of the earth. The Sun may be seen as the source of energy on the earth, and the most benevolent deity of the cosmic family being eulogised in the Vedic hymns. The earth is addressed as mother number of times in the *Atharvaveda*. Vedic seers considered the earth as mother and the sun the soul of the universe. As the

children of the mother earth, living organisms have to live in coherence as the children of the family live in a society. That is why since ancient periods, Indians showed love and tolerance towards other animals, nurture and prayed plants as deities and stressed on preserving the nonhuman natural environment without disturbing them.

But the awareness for environmental protection in the face of the *realised* crisis that it faces is a new phenomenon. In fact, the two, viz. the traditional love and care, compassion for nature, its personification on the one hand, and present-day conscious effort to protect and preserve nature are two different approaches. The former can be regarded as a spontaneous response of human beings toward their surroundings while the latter is a movement that grew up worldwide as an attempt at addressing the “crisis” that nature has been subjected to. Here, in this work, the latter, which is meant by “environmentalism” and its other synonyms that are in use, is the point of focus. Deep Ecology is one variant of this conscious human concern for protection and preservation of the environment.

The realisation that environment is degrading and it is causing concern to the planet as a whole, as well as to the human beings, is of very recent origin. In the last few decades, the world has experienced a lot of problems related to the environment. Pollutions of diverse sort stand synonymous with environmental degradation that causes a serious threat to the entire biosphere. For example, climate change, changes in physical surroundings, extinction of many species of plants and animals etc. are environmental related problems. Today the world is facing with serious environmental concerns both at the local as well as the global level. Certain visible symptoms of

degradation have hinted at the gradual shrinking of the life-span of the planet earth itself.

There are numerous reasons that may cause the loss of the balance of the natural environment. Among them, population explosion, growing industrialisation, deforestation and urbanisation, technological advancement, consumerism etc. are some prominent reasons. There seems to be general agreement among a wide variety of thinkers that the visible phenomena of environmental degradation are man-made. All these causes are rooted in the current mode of human lifestyle. The global environmental crisis is caused by the unprecedented rate of scientific and technological development. In other words, the disastrous consequences have been on the rising graph due to human beings' unlimited and unwanted intrusion and interference with the natural environment. However, it took man quite a long time to realize the crisis and its cause. Consequently, his concern for this and the initiative to protect nature came only during the last few years.

1.1 Ecology, Ecosystem, Environment:

The word "environment" is derived from an old French term, '*environner*', which means "to encircle." This term is taken in the sense of "nature" or "surroundings" or something that is given. It is used in the sense of the external conditions or surroundings that influence the life of individual organisms. In general, environment is the sum total of the physical and biological conditions within which an organism lives. It is the outer state that influences the growth and development of living organisms.

A sizable part of the overall environment is conducive to sustain life. It is called biosphere, the limits of which extend only up to a little above the earth. Sun is the natural source of energy to this biosphere. The organisms of various sorts interact among themselves and with their environment. This causes diverse changes in biosphere when the sun, the source of natural energy, plays a big role. For instance, solar energy is converted by plants into food energy which is consumed by animals directly or indirectly. This is called the ecosystem or the functioning system in the biosphere which is composed of a biotic environment and biotic communities.

The physical components of the planet like land, air, water, soil etc support and affect life in the biosphere. “In the biosphere, biotic and abiotic component are constantly acting, reacting and interacting with one another. This results in structural and functional changes in the biosphere” (Suresh 2-3). As there is difficulty in studying the biosphere as a whole, the constituents of the biosphere are studied by dividing into smaller parts like rivers, mountains, oceans, grasslands, forests etc. These are ecosystems. An ecosystem constitutes three main components of producer (e.g., plants), consumer (e.g., animals) and disposer (e.g., bacteria and fungi). An ecosystem is understood as a unit composed of a collection of diverse organisms together with its inorganic components like waters, minerals etc. Since all components of the biosphere are functionally interlinked for their conditions of existence, practical demarcation of the ecosystem is not possible.

The ecosystem is the whole interconnecting system of the science of ecology. Ecology studies about the “conditions of existence.” Ecology, according to deep ecologist Warwick Fox, “refers to the relationships between organisms and their

external conditions or surroundings that is, their environment” (8). It is a study of the interactions among organisms along with their environment. In the same way, ecology or the science of ecology is defined by Arne Naess, the father of deep ecology, as “an interdisciplinary scientific study of the living conditions of organisms, in interaction with each other and with the surroundings, organic as well as inorganic” (*Ecology* 36). Naess in his deep ecological vocabulary uses the terms “milieu” and “environment” interchangeably with the word “surrounding.” In ecology, there is a relationship between entities. This relation may be internal as well as external. For example, a bird and a mosquito are outside of each other but are inside the environment. When a bird eats a mosquito, Naess clarifies, it digs up in an external relation to that mosquito, but eating is an internal relation to its environment.

Ecofeminist philosopher Carolyn Merchant says that ecology as a science emerged in the late ninetieth century. “The science of ecology”, she holds, “looks at nonhuman nature, studying the numerous, complex interactions among its biotic components (air, water, soils, atoms, and molecules) and its biotic components (plants, animals, bacteria, and fungi)” (Merchant 8). The science of ecology, inherently a holistic discipline in terms of its role in biodiversity conservation, studies the interactions among these components. It is to be noted that the science of ecology can contribute to our normative considerations when devising environmental policy (Sarkar 108). The present work deals partly with use of the basic concepts from the science of ecology and tries to transcend it.

It is pertinent to mention that the word “environment” includes not just the natural environment, but also the *built* or *created* environment. Environment is a subset

of nature. The word 'nature' has a very deep root. It is originated from the Latin word "natura," meaning "to be born." If one seeks the etymological root of the word "nature," one can find that it is a Latin translation of its root "phyis" from "phyein" which means "to bring forth." In order to understand the word "environment" and "nature" separately, one can find that environment is understood only in the context of the immediate relationship that nature has with human beings. Moreover, nature is not within the control of human beings. But controlling the environment is within the periphery of human beings. However, this difference is not strictly maintained every time the word "nature" occurs in the present work. The word has been used interchangeably with the word "environment" also.

A natural ecosystem constitutes the living communities of plants and animals without the human impact of any kind. Created environment or man-modified ecosystem includes agricultural land and urban or industrial land patterns. It is not possible to have a completely natural or completely artificial environment in the present global scenario of domineering human interception. Again, one can speak about the "social environment" and "cultural environment" in any discussion on the environment. In other words, in the periphery of the term "environment" along with the totality of physical and biological elements, the cultural elements are also included which are continually interacting with each other in a natural systematisation. There continues an ecological balance or control among natural, man-built and the cultural or social environment. If there is a loss of this balance, environment degrades. Environmental degradation reflects a human attitude to separate themselves from the natural environment. This is a great concern of survival for the living community. In fact, it is a challenge for mankind to see the natural environment in its natural tone.

Naess believes that ecology as a science has some limitations. It does not ask questions related to value theory for maintaining a particular ecosystem. Naess, therefore says, “as long as ecologists keep narrowly to their science, they do not ask such questions. What we need today is a tremendous expansion of ecological thinking in what I call ecosophy” (Bodian 27). Keeping the word “ecology” or the prefix “eco” in their fields of thought, Naess and Fox introduce the phrases like “deep ecology”, “transpersonal ecology” respectively and consider themselves as “ecosopher” or “ecophilosopher” in the field of “ecosophy.” The accounts of ecophilosophy and the idea of deep ecology distinguish Naess’s position in discussions on environmental philosophy. However, before moving into the field of ecosophy or ecophilosophy, it is necessary to have a concrete idea of what environmental philosophy is.

1.2 Environmental Philosophy and Environmental Ethics:

It has already been observed that environment has become a concern for the philosopher, the ethicist and the scientist alike only in the recent past. In the last few decades, there have been a lot of discussions on global environmental related issues. Particularly the western world has witnessed a great number of environmental movements aimed at making people aware of the need of protecting the environment. Issues of climate change, global warming, expansion of greenhouse gases, acid rain, ozone depletion, nuclear accident & holocaust etc. came to limelight as threats to the existence of not only human beings but also to the entire biosphere and therefore to the existence of the planet earth. It has been shown by the scientist that as a result of the mass growth of industries during what is called “industrial revolution,” pollutions in terms of unregulated toxic emissions and wastes exerted a tremendous negative impact upon the environment. At the same time, setting up of more and more industries

required clearing of vast areas of land of its flora and fauna. People probably took a long time to realize the ill effects of destruction and degradation of nature. However late, humanity came to realize the importance of protecting nature before any further damage is done. The responsibility is shouldered by the philosopher and the ethicist to build up a different attitude toward nature – an attitude, a lifestyle of mutual coexistence and respect instead of an attitude of mastery over nonhuman nature.

Environmentalism is the environmental awareness that has arisen out of the necessity to counter the growing problems the globe is facing as a result of the unregulated exploitation of nature. Jamieson holds, “The term “environmentalism” was coined in 1923, to refer ...to the idea that human behaviour is largely a product of the social and physical conditions in which a person lives and develops” (6). Environmentalism in its broad sense is used to refer to Environmental Philosophy or a new branch of philosophy that has developed as a response to the rapid and irreversible deterioration of the life-sustaining capacity of the planet. It is the philosophical aspects of environmentalism, a stem of philosophy which is concerned with the natural environment and human beings’ position within it. It is found in diverse streams in the interpretation of different environmental philosophers. The challenge is to save the environment, to protect the planet, and thereby to look after oneself. Ted Honderich observes,

Environmental philosophy encompasses all philosophical reflection on the relations between human beings and the non-human environment. Since the discipline grew out of concerns with how humans ought to behave towards the natural world, it has been dominated by discussions of environmental ethics. In the face of this hegemony, some writers refer to ‘environmental

philosophy' rather than 'environmental ethics' in order to make the point that they are not primarily concerned with questions of applied ethics. (255)

There is a role for philosophy to play in responding to this current problem. Arne Naess, the founder of deep ecology movement, opines that what gives environmental study its urgency and focus from an ethical perspective, is the belief that mankind is in the threshold of a crisis which is more or less of its own making. But though this philosophical approach toward the environment is new, generated by the consciousness developed in the face of the crisis, it may be observed that even if there were no environmental problems, there would still be a place for reflecting on ethical evaluation of human behaviour toward the environment. Robyn Eckersley, an Australian writer on environmental politics, is of the view that "in the face of accelerated environmental degradation and species extinction, environmental philosophers are now asking: are we humans the only beings of value in the world? Does the world exist only for our benefit?" (*Environmentalism 2*). By wish or compulsion, the global think-tank is questioning if a human being is privileged over other creatures in leading a free life. It nurtures wisdom in the specific interest of the natural environment. Environmental philosophy says that plants, animals and other inanimate things are an integral part of the environment and as men live in the midst of all these things, the former have a "right" to be considered as part of the human way of life (Regan, Singer).

In the introductory note of the book *Eco- Phenomenology*, Charles S. Brown and Ted Toadvine say that environmental philosophy, the philosophical examination of the environment, is concerned with practical matters. The problem of environmental philosophy is to find "an effective voice" in the struggle with the apparent

environmental crisis. Environmental philosophy seeks to find a definite role of human beings for their sustainable presence along with the rest of the beings. They add,

If philosophy does have a contribution to make in today's practical decision making, this contribution will likely begin with steady and insightful clarification of our ethical and metaphysical assumptions about ourselves and the world around us. These basic assumptions about the relation between individual and society, human nature, the nature of nature, and the nature of Good underlie all of our current behaviour, both individually and culturally. (Brown and Toadvine x)

Environmental philosophy examines man's status in the universe along with rest of nonhuman world. The nonhuman world not only comprises the biotic communities, molecular or biggies, it also comprises the abiotic components of the world. Abiotic components include land, mountains, rivers, and landscapes. Thus, environmental philosophy studies diverse worldviews related to environment and man-environment interaction.

The ethical part of environmental philosophy examines how human beings should interact with the nonhuman world. Environmental ethics, a branch of environmental philosophy, studies the ethical relationship between human beings and the environment. Environmental ethics is also sometimes used synonymously with environmental philosophy, which considers extending the conventional boundaries of moral philosophy merely from human beings to the biospheric world where non-human beings are also a part. Defining environmental ethics Louis P. Pojman writes:

Environmental ethics is the fullest extension of objective ethics, extending the scope of moral thought beyond one's community and nation to include, not only all people everywhere, but also animals and the whole of nature,

the biosphere, both now and immanent future to include future generations. Global environmental ethics, through the logical extension of traditional ethics, is revolutionary in that, it calls on us to think and act in the ways we hardly imagined, subordinating our politics, economics, and technology to a holistic global understanding of how we function within the ecosphere. It calls for a new deeper moral consciousness. (Pojman vi)

This extension is merely not confined to theoretical ideals. It is a kind of eco-activism. According to Carolyn Merchant, “Environmental ethics are link between theory and practice. They translate thought into action, worldviews into movements” (Merchant 62). Environmental ethics seeks a new ethical theory that extends moral consideration beyond humans to include a variety of non-human entities. It is new in the sense of extending moral consideration to nonhuman beings. According to Arumugam, “strategies for applying moral philosophy to environmental issues and concepts are now being tested. ...the philosopher should be cautious if he proposes to place old wine in new bottles” (1). Regarding the objective of environmental ethics Arumugam says that, in the first place, environmental ethics questions the assumed moral superiority of human beings to members of other species on earth. In the second place, environmental ethics investigates the possibility of rational arguments for assigning intrinsic value to the natural environment and its nonhuman components.

There are two ethical dimensions of environmental issues in terms of the conservation. They are anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. The first one is the traditional and basically a western approach to dealing with the environment. However, a sceptical lens has been cast for viewing the traditional anthropocentric approach as responsible for the current environmental crisis. The second one is of recent origin and looks at the world from the point of view of the world itself. Environmentalism is a kind

of green activism, a call for a shift from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism (Oelschlaeger 135).

1.3 Anthropocentrism:

In philosophical discourses, both of the oriental and the occidental traditions, man occupies a unique position. Man is directly or indirectly the focal point of thinking of all disciplines. Man's role in the vast cosmos is momentous from diverse angles. Man's integrated development of the different dimension leads him to the highest position among all the species of the evolutionary process. The idea of human-centrism has been dominating across the global thought-scenario because of this all converging attention towards humankind. Human-centrism describes the tendency of human beings to regard themselves as the central and most significant entities in the universe. In the preface to *With Respect for Nature: Living as Part of the Natural World*, J. Claude Evans writes: "In most of the Western religious and philosophical tradition, the nonhuman world is thought to exist for the sake of human beings. This metaphysical and ethical position has come to be known as *anthropocentrism*. It is based on religious doctrine, on philosophical argument, and on scientific theory" (Evans viii). Ben A. Minteer, in the *Encyclopaedia of Environmental Ethics and Philosophy*, writes:

Philosophically, anthropocentrism may be understood in ethical, ontological, and epistemological terms. As an ethical view anthropocentrism refers to the explicitly stated or implied claim that only human beings have intrinsic value; all other natural beings and things have only instrumental value, and human interests thus always trump the interests of nonhumans and the environment. (58)

Anthropocentrism says that only human beings have intrinsic value, which makes them worthy of direct moral consideration and all other things have instrumental

value only. Traditional approaches kept moral considerations confined to humans only. Philosophical literature across various cultures of the yesteryears depict an apparent leaning towards an anthropocentric standpoint. This view considers man as the master of all living and nonliving beings and assesses reality through an exclusively human perspective. All other living and nonliving beings and things have value only because they come to use of the human species. This view is based partly on the natural egocentricity of homo-sapiens. Carolyn Merchant writes:

An egocentric ethics is grounded in the self. It is based on an individual ought focused on individual good. In its applied form, it involves the claim that what is good for individual will benefit society. The individual good is thus prior to the social good which follows from it as a necessary consequence. An egocentric ethic's orientation does not derive from selfishness or narcissism, but rather is based on a philosophy that treats individuals (or private corporations) as separate, but equal, social atoms. (Merchant 63)

According to Merchant, historically, egocentricity permits one to utilise nature as resources to enhance the lives of individuals as well as that of the others members of human-society. The anthropocentric attitude is further strengthened with the advancement of science and technology. Human beings' treading towards materialism and consumerism is taking nature as a means to satisfy ends.

Anthropocentrism can be found in two forms: strong anthropocentrism or the extreme version of anthropocentrism and Weak Anthropocentrism. One can find the diverse meaning of anthropocentrism overlapping and in mixed forms. Therefore, it is not often distinguished as strong and weak in the formal sense of the term. Strong Anthropocentrism limits intrinsic value solely to human beings "that carries a notion of

the injustice and unfairness involved in the instrumental use of the nonhuman world” (Dobson 42). Weak anthropocentrism, by contrast, allows the possibility of intrinsic value to be present in some animals and also in some other non-human things – but always to a very much lower degree than it is present in humans.

Traditional ethics always looks for ‘man to man’ relationship. For traditional ethics, one’s ethical responsibility is concerned with man. Utilitarianism, for example, says that one should be concerned with the happiness of the maximum number. According to this view, that action is right which brings happiness to the maximum numbers. This number in this sense is confined to human beings only limiting moral consideration to homo-sapiens. So, our action should be that which can give us happiness. Man always does such action which can please him. Therefore, man always tries to enjoy nature as a resource to be utilised. Man thinks that nature is made only for him to enjoy. The superiority of human beings over the rest of the life-forms is found, for example, in the religious expression of the first account of creation in *Genesis*. This view is sustained by the teaching of the holy writings that goes like:

God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. (Genesis 1:27) And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over fish of the sea, and over fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. (Genesis 1:28)

This sort of religious view teaches that God has given the nonhuman nature for the enjoyment of human beings only. It is our religious duty to know the secrets of nature. In the Western countries, this view that we should know the secrets of nature is mostly accepted. Therefore, one can say that the tendency of knowing nature has made

humankind understand deep down the components of the natural environment that resulted in the development of industries and technologies. Professor Lynn White Jr. (1907-1987), a historian from the University of California, is of the view that the orthodox Christian arrogance towards nature is the root cause of the environmental crisis. His lecture entitled "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis," delivered at the Washington meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on 26th December 1966, points out that the Industrial Revolution is a basic turning point in the ecological history of the earth since it was potentially rooted in the medieval Christian attitudes towards nature. According to White, the Judeo-Christian tradition carries a burden of responsibility for the environmental crisis due to its human-centeredness and its refusal to accept the idea that natural objects might be sacred. He writes, "God planned all of this explicitly for man's benefit and rule: no item in the physical creation had any purpose save to serve man's purposes. And, although man's body is made of clay, he is not simply part of nature: he is made in God's image. Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen" (White 1205).

As a human being we have certain limitations and to avoid such limitations we take help of science and technologies. In the history of western thought, "the environmental philosophy of domination has been defended for it is regarded as necessary to carry out the law of progress" (Miri 2-3). Moreover, the thesis of "dominion" is considered as the detrimental to the growth of an adequate all-inclusive environmental consciousness and spontaneous respect for nature. According to Merchant, "behaviours are guided by an underlying ethic. Religious beliefs ...establish powerful moods and motivations that translate into social behaviour" (Merchant 62).

Aristotle, for example, says that every being in nature has a purpose, function and it is good if it fulfils its natural function. According to him, Nature has made all things specifically for the sake of man. Aristotle regards the various life forms of the world in a hierarchic manner. He puts humans at the top of this hierarchy where the lower rungs of this ladder are for the sake of upper ones. Aristotle says, “Animals are provided for at a later stage too – that plants exist for their sake, and that the other animals exist for the sake of man... If then nature makes nothing without some end in view, nothing to no purpose, it must be that nature has made all of them for the sake of man” (79).

Rene Descartes considers humans beings as the lone entity on the planet with intrinsic value. The unique characteristics of human beings are their consciousness which is outside nature. Descartes says “unique in being in some way united with consciousness, the human person, conjoining mind and body would thus be set in total opposition to the nonhuman world it encounters” (Das 26). He believes that nonhuman animals are at par with machines which have no mind and therefore cannot suffer. Humans have minds and souls, they are different from animals. His famous dictum, “I think, therefore I exist” is suggestive of one’s existence for thinking capacity. In this way, the human superiority over the rest of the irrational nonhuman nature is established in the philosophy of the “Father of modern western philosophy”. The apparent dichotomy between human and nonhuman nature is one of the characteristics of Cartesian philosophy since it is predicated on the idea that humans are separate from nature and superior to it. In this respect, the natural world is just an object. Similarly, Francis Bacon is said to have promoted a view of nature as a machine. By believing in the utility as the end of knowledge, he gave importance to knowing and revealing the

secret of the world which he termed as “the inquisition of nature.” His primary focus was to enhance human ability in order to subdue the problems and necessities of the human race.

Again, the eighteenth-century German philosopher Immanuel Kant confines the realm of ethics to human beings only. Kant is known for his assertion on the intrinsic value of human beings. He demands that human beings, whether one’s own person or that of others, is never treated as a means, but only as an end. He is of the view that animals are not self-conscious and are there merely as a means to an end. Animals and the rest of nature can be treated as mere means because they are mere things. That end is a human being only. What makes the nonhuman natural environment as mere things is that they are not rational agents. Since animals are mere things, there is nothing like right or wrong in their instrumental use. Kant believes that one is justified in asking, ‘Why do animals exist?’ but not in asking, ‘Why do men exist?’ The latter is a meaningless question. His interpretation of dealing with nonhuman animals is human-centred which has an important bearing upon the formation of anthropocentric ethical codes. He writes,

If a man shoots his dog because the animal is no longer capable of service, he does not fail in his duty to the dog, for the dog cannot judge, but his act is inhuman and damages in himself that humanity which it is his duty to show towards mankind. If he is not to stifle his human feelings, he must practise kindness towards animals, for he who is cruel to animals becomes hard also in his dealings with men. We can judge the heart of a man by his treatment of animals. (Kant 240)

However, although for the *wrong reason*, he believes that cruelty towards non-human being is not to be encouraged. According to Kant, one has no immediate duties to animals. One's duties towards animals are indirect duties to humanity.

1.4 Ecocentrism, Radical Ecology:

A new approach has come into existence challenging the traditional human-centric attitude. And as a result, public concern for it has evolved in many corners giving birth to the ecology movement. It has drawn the attention of the enlightened circles to social aspects of ecological problems. The superiority of human beings to members of other species on earth is questioned and importance is laid on the possibility of assigning intrinsic value to the natural environment and its nonhuman contents. It has also challenged the previous views that only humans can be considered as moral beings. In this new approach "such things as species, habitats, ecosystem and even the earth's biosphere as a whole are part of the moral community. It is possible to have a direct moral obligation to *nature* that is independent of any obligations that we may have to ourselves, other people, or other individual natural organisms" (Miri 28). The anthropocentric view that only human species are thought to be the object of moral consideration is challenged in this approach. It is known as ecocentrism or biocentrism, an approach that looks upon all biotic species - humans as well as nonhumans - as the members of the biosphere enjoying equal status as earth's community of life.

Since 1970 this new approach towards the non-human world has come into existence with a challenge to traditional anthropocentrism. There came the ideas that all living species, humans as well as nonhumans, being members of the biotic community are integral and inevitable part of nature. Their survival in the biotic community is

completely interdependent. According to Gary Varner, an environmental critic, “Environmental philosophers, like environmental activists, have tended to assume that resolution of the environmental crisis will involve a paradigm shift in ethics, and much of the work in environmental ethics has been devoted to the question of which nonhuman entities have moral standing” (6).

This approach has come into existence in the form of Ecocentrism or non-anthropocentrism claiming the possibility of assigning intrinsic value to the natural environment and its non-human contents. Eco-centrism holds the view that one has to recognise the value in all species of organisms and of the ecosystems. Eco-centrism argues for the right of not just animals but also inanimate elements like an ecosystem. This view tries to see humans as belonging to, rather than owning, the biotic community. It makes the claim that everything is connected to everything else.

In environmental philosophy phrases like “deep ecology”, “social ecology” “liberation ecology” etc are used in everyday academic references. Ecocentrism is characterised by a diverse body of thought, ideas, values, and practices. Philosophers like Arne Naess, Warwick Fox etc. believe that the exact connotation of the word “ecology” is more comprehensive than the connotation of the term “environment.” “The appropriate qualifier (‘deep’, ‘liberation’, etc.) will explicitly indicate that there has been a shift from “ecology” as a science to “ecology” as a political ideology or movement” (Sarkar 109).

The objective of environmental ethics to extend moral standing to nonhuman beings is treated to be insufficient by radical ecology to resolve growing environmental crisis. Radical ecology, one of the broad streams of environmental philosophy, is

concerned with the socio-cultural roots of the socio-ecological crisis of the environment. Radical ecology believes that ethical extensionism is to some extent human-oriented since it considers human beings as the paradigm model of entities with moral standing. From the perspective of human beings, only ethical extensionism tries to extend towards the nonhuman beings considering the similar situation for moral decision making. Radical ecology, therefore, is not confined to the scope of ethics only. It calls for a systemic change to survive and to reverse the crisis in its possible extent. Radical ecology is based on action plan raising public consciousness and uses a critical lens to see the mainstream society and environmentalism. According to Merchant, radical ecology helps “to formulate answers to the dilemmas self in society, society in self, and self versus society ...Although it may fail to bring about revolutionary transformations, radicalism can still be effective in changing attitudes, raising consciousness, and promoting social change (14). She adds:

Radical ecology emerges from a sense of crisis in the industrialised world. It acts on a new perception that the domination of nature entails the domination of human beings along lines of race, class, and gender. Radical ecology confronts the illusion that people are free to exploit nature and to move in society at the expense of others, with a new consciousness of responsibilities to the rest of nature and to other humans. It seeks a new ethic of the nurture of nature and the nurture of people. It empowers people to make changes in the world consistent with a new social vision and a new ethic. (Merchant 1)

Distinguishing among the various streams of environmental ethics, Merchant brings forth the ideas of homocentric ethics and ecocentric ethics under radical ecology. According to her, a homocentric ethics is grounded on social good. It underlies those movements which are based on social justice issues. Social ecology and socialists’

ecofeminism, second and third world environmentalism etc. are related to social justice issues. Egocentric ethics which is anthropocentric in nature is not grounded on social justice but on capitalism and mechanistic worldview. In contrast to homocentric and egocentric ethics, ecocentric ethics is grounded in the cosmos and the whole ecosystem. This thinking guides the philosophy of cultural ecofeminism, spiritual ecology, and deep ecology (Merchant 62).

Zimmerman classifies three major branches of radical ecology, namely, deep ecology, social ecology, and ecofeminism. He adds, “Although initially attracted to deep ecology, I have learnt much from social ecology and ecofeminism. Hence my intention is to offer an equitable reading of all three branches of radical ecology” (*Contesting Earth's Future* 1). Jozef Keulartz notes down four broad currents within radical ecology that can be found in the work of nearly all environmental philosophers: Arne Naess’ *deep ecology*, Murray Bookchin’s *social ecology*, Ivan Illich’s *political ecology*, *ecofeminism*. (Keulartz 1) George Sessions in his edited book *Deep Ecology for 21st Century* addresses deep ecology’s relation to social ecology, ecofeminism, the New Age and the Greens as different streams new environmentalism (265).

Among these various streams of environmentalism deep ecology stands as a radical form environmentalism for which it occupies a unique place in the history of environmental philosophy. The present thesis deals with the deep ecology of Arne Naess.

1.5 Historic forebears of Deep Ecology:

Arne Naess (1912-2009), a Norwegian Professor of philosophy, coined the umbrella term, “Deep Ecology” as an alternative catchphrase for *eco-centrism* or

biocentrism. In 1973 the term “deep ecology” came to receive wide appreciation after Naess’ article, “The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary” published in *Inquiry*, Vol. 16:1, 95-100. In this paper, Naess criticised the civilisation of developed countries for its arrogance of human-centered instrumentalization of nonhuman nature. He first outlined the shallow-deep split to replace the destructive philosophy of modern industrial society by a new eco-philosophy or “ecosophy.” This was a reaction against traditional anthropocentric ideals. Deep ecology tries to reinstate a set of principles and work on values of the past that are now facing a sort of crisis. On the basis of ecological sensibility, deep ecology attempts at promoting natural diversity, autonomy, decentralization, symbiosis, biocentric egalitarianism and classlessness.

Deep ecology movement is said to have acquired inspiration from certain wilderness thinkers and has roots in wilderness places. There is a tendency among certain environmental historians (e.g. Zimmerman, Sessions) to credit the root of deep ecological worldview either in *A Sand County Almanac* (1949) of Aldo Leopold or *Silent Spring* (1962) of Rachel Carson. But the term “deep ecology” is inextricably associated with Naess and owes its prominence to him only. Therefore, the term would be used in the present work to represent Naess' view on ecology exclusively. In developing such a unitary worldview Naess also took inspiration from the philosophical positions of Buddhism, Spinoza, Thoreau, Leopold, Carson, Gandhi etc. Naess submissively pointed out that, each would need to find his personal and cultural pathways to this new wisdom which was at the core of many old, pre-modern spiritual traditions.

1.5.1 Buddhism:

The root of deep ecology is found in Buddhism. Gautama Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, was a great lover of the environment. He had love and respect for all living beings. There are a number of stories related to his love for the natural environment. The basic principle of Buddhist moral philosophy is Ahimsa or the principle of non-harming. Buddha believed that respect for life does not only refer to have love and respect for human beings but for every manifestation of life on the planet. Buddhism teaches one to show equal care and compassion for each and every creature in the universe. Buddha himself always abstained from the destruction of any life, even from causing harm to seed and plants; he also advised his disciples to do the same. The *Dhammapada* says, “All men tremble at punishment, all men fear death. Likening others to oneself, one should neither slay nor cause to slay” (Radhakrishnan 102).

Buddha believed forest to be the best place for practising Dhamma. In Buddhism, Dhamma suggests selflessness. Buddha inspired his disciples to live and practice meditation in the forest (wilderness) which has an important bearing on contemporary environmental philosophy. The underlying belief was that peace and undisturbed solitude would help the practitioner to concentrate on meditation. Buddha’s philosophy is all about ecological unity. In Buddhism, it is said that in the world we are all interdependent and that one should take a vow to work for the enlightenment of all. As such, there is no ‘I’ but rather an interconnected web of which ‘I’ am a part. Therefore, it can be said that “Transcending the human-centric (ego-bounded) perspective is one of the great strengths of Buddha’s interdependent or interconnected vision of all things within the natural-human-social matrix” (Bilimoria 5). Buddha suggests one to embrace all living things as a mother cares for her only son.

Naess' norms of Deep ecology, viz. Self-realization and Bio-centric egalitarianism say that if one harms nature, one is harming oneself. This view goes very near to that of Buddha's concept of *Dhamma*. "*Dhamma* and Deep Ecology call for the protection of natural areas and biodiversity for the sake of nature and other living beings for their own intrinsic value and worth. Naess believes that there is no boundary and everything is inter-related. The recognition of this intrinsic value and worth may well be bound up with the intrinsic value and worth of human beings as a species, including their humanity and spirituality" (Henning 81). All phenomena are understood basically in terms of the theory of dependent origination, the doctrine which refers to the interdependence and interaction among all existences. According to this doctrine, everything in the globe possesses the equal value. Because all living, as well as non-living things, have the Buddha-Nature, they are regarded as having equal dignity and intrinsic value. So Buddha always taught to approach every creature with the same empathy or loving heart. It is pertinent to mention that the Naessian ecological consciousness speaks about empathy towards nonhuman animals.

1.5.2 Spinoza (1632-1677):

Spinoza's philosophy is a pursuit for the right way of living. Spinoza feels that the meaning of life is needed in terms of its existence in Nature where man does not know his exact position. He embraces rational view in search of this. In this search for the rational view, religion has little place. He believes that one needs a re-conceptualizing philosophical way of life, not religion. Though Spinoza's philosophy centres round anthropocentrism, yet he develops a worldview based on naturalistic metaphysics. In this process, God is replaced by Nature. Spinoza's *Deus Sive Natura* (God and nature are same) forms a kind of pantheism showing metaphysical

interconnectedness between individuals and nature. Commenting on this position Naess writes, “The God of *Ethics* may be identified essentially with Nature-as-creative (natura naturans)—the creative aspect of a supreme whole with two aspects, the creative and the created –natura naturata” (“Spinoza and ...” 237).

But Spinoza neither wrote about the beauty of wild nature nor did he spoke about a deep sense of identification with animals. Yet an environmental philosopher can find certain inspiration from Spinoza’s writings. Spinoza uses the terms “Nature” (capital ‘N’) to mean “God” in the sense of unity which is intuitively conceived as perfect. It is not moral or utilitarian perfection. It is perfect in itself. Pantheism by default is present in Spinoza’s philosophy. According to Spinoza, a thing perseveres in its being “insofar as it is in itself” perseveres in its essence. Again, he uses the term “nature” (small letter n) to mean the “natural environment” in the sense of diversity. These are the thought (non-extension) and extension in his philosophy which have equal ontological status. These two are the complete aspects of one single reality without having one’s primacy over the other. Therefore, “there is no ontological priority given to God (Spirit), there is no transcendental realm which is ‘more real,’ or that has ‘more being.’ Since an assessment of Spinoza’s ontology requires the adoption of a particular view, it will be compared with other specific ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, and so on” (Quick 64).

Naess considers Spinoza as a great philosopher in the sense that Spinoza’s writings are constantly reinterpreted by thinkers of different generations. Particularly, Naess took inspiration from Spinoza’s *Ethics* which, he considers, teaches one to apply

in a concrete situation that one is a part of greater reality. Commenting on Spinoza's influence on shaping Naess' personality, Alan Drengson writes:

When in high school, he was given a copy of Spinoza's *Ethics* in the original Latin. He began reading it with great care and attention and continued to read and study it throughout his life. By the time he was ready to graduate from secondary education and move on to higher learning, he already felt a strong identification with Spinoza's *Ethics*. Also by this time, he had already decided he wanted to be philosopher. He deeply trusted Spinoza and felt that Spinoza's account of his worldview and life's philosophy had shown the way to deep inquiry and practical action that leads to community, friendship, and joy. (Drengson 6)

Fox maintains that in a letter to him, Naess said that Spinoza was his hero in system making (104). Following Spinoza, Naess said that we are united to the whole since there is ultimately only one *substance* and reality is a unity. Naess has modelled his normative system following Spinoza's geometric method from the book *Ethics*. Particularly, Naess believes in the intrinsic value of all components of nature. It speaks about biocentric equality. Naess' approach to ecophilosophy has been strongly influenced by Spinoza. Naess writes,

Among Spinoza's terms, none corresponds to the important term (process of) identification, by which humans attribute intrinsic or inherent value to every human being and to large sections of, or all, nonhuman beings. The structure of his system is that all beings take part in the power of God. Because of this equivalences joining power with other terms, the structure is compatible with the intrinsic value and the self-realization views. ("Spinoza and ..." 250)

For instance, the phrase "Self-preservation" as used by Spinoza in the sense of preserving one's being is used by Naess in the sense of self-realization. Spinoza

suggests people to try to preserve their beings. Spinoza says that human being is a part of nature. In Part III of his *Ethics*, “On the Origin and Nature of the Affects,” Spinoza writes that all finite modes including any human mind strive to “persevere in being”. According to Spinoza, it is an attempt to give an account of natural environment under which a man with his apparent distinctiveness is purely natural. But Naess prefers to use the phrase “Self-realization”. In his words, “The development of life forms, especially since the Cambrian period, shows an extreme degree of expansion of life space and a corresponding diversity of forms making use of different climatic and other conditions. There is no merely passive adaptation, no mere self-preservation in any narrow sense. Thus, the term self-expression, or -realization is better suited than self-preservation” (“Notes on the Methodology” 20).

1.5.3 Henry David Thoreau (1817–1862):

Henry David Thoreau, an anti-slavery activist and “the father of American nature writing” (Walls 107), is considered as one of the earliest critics of traditional human-centrism. He is basically known for his book *Walden*, an English classic that was published in 1854. It is a narrative of Thoreau’s own story of escaping from bondage to freedom. In this book he “moves from caustic criticism of American society to a lyrical intimacy with nature, teaching him, and us, how the spirit of the one can redeem us from the evils of the other” (Walls 107). One can see the criticism of industrial culture in his writings. This book is an account of his time spent in a small cabin on the shores of Walden. Walden was a name of the pond located in a peaceful landscape that was bought by his friend Ralph Waldo Emerson who authored the book *Nature* and was an advocate of transcendentalism.

Thoreau had a lot of influence from Emerson on shaping his philosophy of love for wilderness. He was basically known "as a satellite orbiting an Emersonian centre of gravity" (Oelschlaeger 133). Emerson writes, "The organic world, full of sights and sounds and smells was mere appearance, a visible promontory obscuring something more real than the phenomenal face of nature - namely, mind itself, and ultimately God, who unifies all seeming diversity into One" (Oelschlaeger 135).

Thoreau has a lot of contribution to the modern day environmental movement and "it is hard to imagine such a movement without the rhetorical fires of his words or the inspirational force of his actions" (Walls 106). But he was not so much appreciated during his life time. He tried to educate the learners of his natives about better ways to live with the land and river. He believed that "The universe is wider than our views of it" (Thoreau 309). He was a critic of modernity. He taught that one is to be cautious about the withering of all the trees of the neighbouring areas. It may bring forth evil days. In his words, "It is best to avoid the beginnings of evil" (Thoreau 64). One should strive to find out a solution to such situation. Therefore, he spoke in favour of the preservation of resources and their conservation. In this connection, it should be mentioned that Thoreau was never found to have involved in any environmental movement. According to him, the natural environment has the capacity to resist a man from evoking evil days. A human being has limitation. The natural environment cannot be remodelled like a clay model. Thoreau believed that nature has its own moral standing.

Naess is influenced by the American transcendentalism as developed by Thoreau in formulating his deep ecology philosophy. Naess advocates wilderness and known for

his criticism of modern consumerist nature of industrial culture. Following Thoreau, Naess believes that human beings and the natural environment where he lives grow together into an interlinked whole. Looking into it one can find one's place in the realm of things.

1.5.4 MK Gandhi (1869-1948):

Gandhi offers a world-affirming non-dualistic philosophy. He speaks about self which is not of narrow egocentric interest. The self which is to be realised is the supreme or universal Self, the Atman. Self-realization is not an "ego-trip". Gandhi believes in Advaita (non-duality). He believes in the essential unity of man and all that lives. He thereby speaks about the self-realization of nonhuman living beings. He believes in the success and failure of the spirituality of the whole world with the spirituality of just one man. The central thesis of his philosophy is nonviolence. It is a philosophy of activism. It recommends choosing select personal actions or attitude only which reduces the tendency of violence. One of his principles suggests fighting antagonisms, not antagonists. These principles may suggest an environmental activist work on the root cause of environmental degradation by changing the attitudes towards the nonhuman environment.

Naess is a great admirer of Gandhi. The concept of self-realization in Gandhi's philosophy has become the central spiritual principle of deep ecology. According to George Sessions, "Arne Naess is a recognised world authority on Gandhi's philosophy and has incorporated Gandhi into his personal ecological philosophy" ("Wildness... 134). In his article titled 'Self-realization', Naess writes that his idea of 'ecological self' is metaphysically influenced by Gandhi. Specifically, Naess was influenced by

Gandhi's vision of non-duality (Advaita). Naess directly applies the Gandhian vision of unity among all forms of life to his deep ecology movement, arguing that by identifying oneself with nature, one is naturally prompted to protect the environment. Naess writes, "As a student and admirer since 1930 of Gandhi's non-violent direct actions in bloody conflict, I am inevitably influenced by his metaphysics which to him personally furnished tremendously powerful motivation and which contributed to keeping him going until his death" ("Self-Realization..." 38).

The Gandhian vision of unity among all living beings inspires in formulating deep ecology principles. Naess particularly praises Gandhi's view of identification of oneself with the rest of nature. He cites some examples of Gandhian non-violent thought that support his concept of realisation of ecological or greater Self. Gandhi in his ashrams allowed the unhindered movement of snakes, scorpions, spiders etc. for which the European companions who lived with him were taken aback. What Naess wants to justify is that Self-realization in a wide sense can be practised. Naess further maintains, "Thus, Gandhi recognised a basic common right to live and blossom, to self-realization in a wide sense applicable to any being that can be said to have interests or needs. Gandhi made manifest the internal relation between self-realization, non-violence, and what has sometimes been called biospherical egalitarianism" (39).

1.5.5 Aldo Leopold (1887-1948):

Aldo Leopold, a wild-life ecologist, a forester, a conservationist and an environmental philosopher, "the rural sage" and "the patron saint of environmental ethics," is most widely known and appreciated for his description of the land ethic. He is best known for his posthumously published book *A Sand County Almanac* (1949) and

widely acknowledged as the father of wildlife conservation in America. His conviction is that some of the most profound aspects of human experiences are linked to a proper understanding and vivid perception of the natural world.

Leopold realised that there was no ethics in the three thousand years of recorded history of human evolution that deals with man's relation to land and to the animals and plants which grow upon it. Land is being treated as property and subject to disposal at one's wish. Therefore, the extension of ethics to land and to the animals and to the plants is not only an evolutionary possibility but also an ecological necessity. This extension enlarges the boundaries of the community that results in the inclusion of soils, waters, plants and animals. All these are collectively known as land. Leopold writes, "That land is a community is the basic concept of ecology, but that land is to be loved and respected is an extension of ethics. That, land yields a cultural harvest, is a fact long known but latterly often forgotten" (*A Sand County* viii).

Leopold believes that respect for one's fellow members and also respect for the community is implied by ethical codes. With his use of the words "loved" and "respected," the integration of science with a broader humanism becomes clear. He writes, "He who owns a veteran bur oak owns more than a tree. He owns a historical library and a reserved seat in the theatre of evolution" (*A Sand County* 30). According to Leopold, the extension of ethics, as studied by philosophers is actually a process of ecological evolution. Ecologically, an ethics is a limitation on freedom of action in the struggle for existence. Again, philosophically, ethics is a differentiation of social from anti-social conduct. These are two definitions of one thing. The thing has its origin in the tendency of the interdependent individuals or groups to evolve modes of

cooperation. Although Leopold could not have predicted the role he would play in the evolution of a conservation ethic, he understood the need for such an evolution.

Leopold has brought forth the community concept in the form of land. An individual is a member of a community. A community is a collection of interdependent parts. Leopold is of the opinion that the instincts of individual prompt him to compete for his place in community. The role of a conqueror, Leopold believes, is eventually self-defeating, for, it always turns out that he knows neither. The biotic community is so complex that its workings may never be fully understood. According to Leopold, most environmental mistakes are due not to some inherent baseness in human nature, but to ignorance. He writes:

The outstanding scientific discovery of the twentieth century is not television, or radio, but rather the complexity of the land organism. Only those who know the most about it can appreciate how little we know about it. The last word in ignorance is the man who says of an animal or plant, "What good is it?" If the land mechanism as a whole is good, then every part is good, whether we understand it or not. If the biota, in the course of eons, has built something we like but do not understand, then who but a fool would disregard seemingly useless parts? To keep every cog and wheel is the first precaution to intelligent tinkering. ("Other Essays..." 177)

But the ethics of the same individual prompt him to cooperate. The land ethics changes the role of an individual from a conqueror of the land-community to a plain member of it. The ecological interpretation of history shows that man is only a member of the biotic team. Most of the historical events actually are biotic interactions between human and land. Therefore, Leopold is of the view that the characteristics of land determined the facts quite as potently as the characteristics of the men who lived on it. Leopold writes, "...the plant succession steered the course of history; the pioneer

simply demonstrated, for good or ill, what successions inhered in the land. Is history taught in this spirit? It will be, once the concept of land as a community really penetrates our intellectual life” (*A Sand County* 207). The main contribution of Leopold was conservation philosophy. He primarily associated land health with land integrity. For preserving a particular piece of land’s health, Leopold believes, it is a necessary and sufficient condition to preserve its integrity. The Naessian interpretation of the meaning of “life” which is inclusive of landscapes and rivers goes parallel to this land ethics.

1.5.6 Rachel Carson (1907-1964):

Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* (1962) can be considered as one of the foundation stones of modern environmentalism. In this book, Carson raises a big question to whole mankind, the agent that has “silenced the voices of spring in countless towns in America” (Carson 31). It is not about the towns of America but a metaphor of the places on the globe as a whole. Carson is widely acclaimed for her role in bringing awareness in the field of environmental related matter. In this connection George Sessions’ view is a benchmark in the history of deep ecology. He writes:

Although Naess is often referred to as the “father” or “founder” of the deep ecology movement, this is misleading. Naess calls marine biologist Rachael Carson the founder of the movement. In his original 1973 deep ecology paper, he points out that “a vast number of people in all countries,” many of whom were field ecologists (both men and women) who identified with wild Nature, had spontaneously arrived at similar deep ecological attitudes and beliefs. (“Wildness...” 148)

Carson particularly mentions the growing application of agricultural chemicals as pesticides to control insects that took place after the Second World War. Her write-

ups in this book cite many factual and scientific examples of the use and abuse of synthetic chemicals of industry and agricultural usages. She writes,

In the less than two decades of their use, the synthetic pesticides have been so thoroughly distributed throughout the animate and inanimate world that they occur virtually everywhere. They have been recovered from most of the major river systems and even from streams of groundwater flowing unseen through the earth. Residues of these chemicals linger in soil to which they may have been applied a dozen years before. They have entered and lodged in the bodies of fish, birds, reptiles, and domestic and wild animals so universally that scientists carrying on animal experiments find it almost impossible to locate subjects free from such contamination. (Carson 31)

Carson tries to inspire the people worldwide to retrace their approach toward the natural world. In fact, she makes a plea in front of mankind to think of their activities from the point of view of health considerations of diverse life forms. Along with this Carson also addresses the moral considerability of nonhuman beings and urges humans for preserving wild nature. She expresses her grave anxiety about the hubris related to the inventions of man and about the historical incapacity of mankind to anticipate the possible cost of their actions in respect to environment. “Today we are concerned with a different kind of hazard that lurks in our environment—a hazard we ourselves have introduced into our world as our modern way of life has evolved” (Carson 168). She refers to the life-destroying potential of pesticide as “elixirs of death” which is inviting, as Fox sorts out, “a dying world, a world in which springtime might no longer bring forth new life, only a chilling silence” (4).

Thereby Carson shows her concern that if mankind continues its human-centric rat-race for speedy progress then a harmonious life of any locality with its surroundings will remain as “a fable for tomorrow.” She points out the destructive impact of human

civilisation and tries to justify the fact that the natural environment is unable to protect itself from human interference. Particularly Carson raises some questions related to some cardinal assumptions of mankind in its inclinations towards modernity. At the same time, she suggests the mankind to follow the road that is less travelled and destined to protect this planet in the name of development and modernity. In her words:

We stand now where two roads diverge. But unlike the roads in Robert Frost's familiar poem, they are not equally fair. The road we have long been travelling is deceptively easy, a smooth superhighway on which we progress with great speed, but at its end lies disaster. The other fork of the road—the one 'less travelled by'—offers our last, our only chance to reach a destination that assures the preservation of our earth. (Carson 240)

The attack on anthropocentrism, the arrow Naess uses throughout his life, is easily visible in Carson's writing. Carson cites the example human cruelty towards non-human life forms like birds, rabbits, domestic pets etc. She says that they are innocent. But human being "rewards them with a death that is not only sudden but horrible" (Carson 99). It shows Carson's concern for all of the life forms of human and non-human alike. Naess is highly inspired by Carson target on the human-centric behaviour of the western world "and her sense of wonder for nature inspired him to work on shifting to the quality of life values and a nature-oriented sensibility that finds joy in the world of diverse beings... This turned him to thinking about the accelerating negative impacts on nature by contemporary industrial civilisation and larger issues of ultimate aims and norms" (Devall and Drengson lxvi). Naess claims that even before the publication of Carson's *Silent Spring*, one can find the attitudes and opinions corresponding to deep ecological movement in many cultures. Naess believes that Carson's writing gives a new dimension in looking into the things. Naess believes that

his deep ecology movement is a very broad social phenomenon and it comprises all these three aspects. Naess finds that Carson gives man a different position treating it just as species among numerous species of this planet.

Naess posits man in the greater scheme of things and not simply in isolation. His deep ecology is, in fact, a holistic philosophy where man is not the controller of the rest of the beings but simply a part of all and diverse relational entities. According to Naess, “Rachel Carson's motivation in writing *The Silent Spring* was partly a feeling of deep humility. Humanity, 'a drop of the stream of life', should not thoughtlessly try to change this stream” (*Ecology* 64). It is to be mentioned here that deep ecology, which is a long ranged ecological movement has come as a stream of thought by criticising the counterpart of shallow ecology movement which is a temporary arrangement to meet the present ecological crisis.

The present work deals with the life and philosophy of Arne Naess. Naess was born at Slemndal, near Oslo, the capital of Norway on 27 January 1912. He graduated from the University of Oslo and received his PhD. from the same University. He was appointed to the chair of philosophy at the University of Oslo in which he worked for thirty years in his capacity. In the different phase of his life, he wrote on a diverse range of areas in a number of languages that include Norwegian, English, Danish, Swedish, German etc. His publications include books, monographs and articles on broad stream of areas. His magnum opus, *Ecology, community and Lifestyle*, translated into English by David Rothenberg, was published in 1989. Naess died on 12 January 2009. A biographical sketch of Naess, in connection with this study, entitled “Timeline of Naess” is included as Appendix of the thesis.

1.6 Problems and Objective of the Study:

Deep ecology, as contrasted by Naess with shallow ecology, stands for an approach that recognises intrinsic worth of nature. It stands in the opposite pole to anthropocentric or human-centric approach to Nature. As such, deep ecology does not look at or explain things from a human perspective but from the perspective of the ecology as a whole. The philosophy of deep ecology professes man-in-environment image instead of viewing man and environment as separate entities.

The problem before Naess is that his thesis of deep ecology has been criticized from different quarters. Particularly, the proponents who try to see environmental crisis as a conflict between man and environment instead of man-in-environment criticize the Naessian way of viewing the world. The main objective of this thesis is to see if deep ecology of Naess can be defended. Moreover, the proposed study aims at the evaluation and introduction of new perspective, if any, in environmental philosophy under the light of the Naessian deep ecology. In the course of the study, it is proposed to compare and contrast deep ecology with its critics to see if there is any converging point.

1.7 Methodology:

The present work makes a conceptual study of the present thread of environmentalism. This work is an attempt to conceptually overview the gravity and seriousness of the visible environmental crisis as well as to see the philosophical solution as enunciated by deep ecology. Deep ecology is a shift from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism developed in 1970's. This work is a critical study of deep ecology as formulated by Naess. In order to see if Naess can be defended, various methods have been adopted. The methods used are mainly critical through the conceptual study with

select schools of environmental philosophy. In other words, it is a descriptive study of select schools of thought in order to find out whether the Naessian version of deep ecology can effectively function on its theoretical formulation in meeting its stated environmental crisis.

1.8 Review of Literature:

The literature on the area of deep ecology in particular and environmental philosophy, in general, is fairly large. The present work has been restricted to review some select literature to trace some important core issues related to the deep ecology of Arne Naess.

The important source of the present work is Naess' magnum opus *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, published in 1989. This book is translated from the Norwegian version of *Økologi, Samfunn og Livsstil* into English by David Rothenberg. In the translator's preface, Rothenberg gives the clarifications of certain terms used in the Naessian deep ecological vocabulary which is helpful in outlining what deep ecology is all about. Naess terms the present environmental problem as "crisis" that needs to be immediately addressed. In this book, Naess' attempts to construct a worldview based on the basic principles of deep ecology. It is all about an attempt to move from ecology to ecosophy, an attempt of Naess to transcend the popular academic discipline, the science of ecology into *eco-sophia* or ecology of wisdom. In order to substantiate his attempt, Naess brings forth the disciplines of economics and ecopolitics within ecosophy. Thereby, Naess focuses on his personal philosophy, Ecosophy-T where his views on a sense of identification with nonhuman beings, the sense of oneness, realizing the wholeness, and Self-realization etc. occupy most of the

discussions. In contrast to shallow lifestyle, this book advocates living an “ecological lifestyle” which is a deep way of living.

George Sessions edited *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century* (1995) anthologizes the discussion of the nature of deep ecology by various theorists. Particularly, Naess’ deep questioning process, the platform principles, the human need for the process of identification with nonhuman life forms etc. are some common focuses of this volume. Naess’ personal philosophy, that is, Ecosophy-T, as well as his response to the criticism from Social Ecology, Ecofeminism etc. and misunderstandings of his position is also well furnished in this book. It also addresses the issues of deep ecology as a movement like its development from Thoreau, Muir, Carson, to Arne Naess as offered by various theorists. The discussion of wilderness and wild and its preservation get prominence in one part of this anthology. The book is ended with the Naessian optimistic note of the possibility of deep ecology in the twenty-second century.

Alan Drengson and Yuichi Inoue edited book *The Deep Ecology Movement: An Introductory Anthology* (1995) has anthologized select articles explicating Naess’ view of deep ecology. This book is basically set in support of the radical ecocentrism and Naessian position elaborating the views on Ecological Self, conservation and Self-Realization, platform principles etc. It also includes the important topic on the relationship between deep ecology and ecofeminism as well as urges the essentiality of rituals and council of all Beings. The editors of this volume claim that pieces of writing in this anthology “are not dull reading” but “are of fundamental human importance.”

Warwick Fox authored *Towards a Transpersonal Ecology Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism* (1995) is a comprehensive overview of the

development of deep ecology literature up to 1990s. This book gives a systematic exposition of the emergence of the environmental movement from Carson's *Silent Spring* to the formation of the deep ecology of Arne Naess. Fox explains the meanings and shortcomings of the label "deep ecology." He analyses the meaning in different senses and says that Naess' personal ecosophy and the identification thesis have unique bearings upon the entire deep ecology movement. Although set on the support of the Naessian thesis, Fox tries to show the problem with the label "deep ecology" and renames it as "transpersonal ecology."

Nina Witoszek and Andrew Brennan edited *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy* published in 1999, is a chronicle of inter-dialogues in environmental philosophy. Since the publication of Naess' paper on shallow-deep diversification in 1973, there have been lots of discussions on deep ecology both from its supporters and critics. There was a period when deep ecology was believed to have reached its matured stage. In the diverse period of time, the views of Naess have been mutated through dialogical disagreement and polemic. This book centres round on the work of Arne Naess and the attack and counter-attack of deep ecology. In other words, this book stands as exchanges of ideas and involvement of thinkers of diverse fields for the cause of philosophy and environment of the latter part of 20th century.

Harold Glasser and Alan Drengson edited *The Selected Works of Arne Naess* (2005) or *SWAN* is a comprehensive collection of ten volumes of Naess' life and works. The present work deals with the tenth volume of *SWAN*, namely, *Deep Ecology of Wisdom: Explorations in Unities of Nature and Cultures, Selected Papers*, which is

edited by Glasser and Drengson in cooperation of Naess himself. This volume, a volume of green philosophy, can be considered as a textbook of the Naessian deep ecology. The lengthy “*Series Editor’s Introduction*” by Harold Glasser is a concise version of deep ecology. It pens down the different aspects of Naess’ life that shapes his deep ecology in particular and other aspects of philosophy as a whole. *Deep Ecology of Wisdom*, the tenth volume is the compilation of articles that includes the papers on nature of deep ecology, deep ecology practices, Spinoza and Gandhi as the inspiration of deep ecology, the significance of place, gestalt ontology, total views, theoretical dimensions of deep ecology, the future of deep ecology etc.

Donald Alan Drengson and Bill Devall edited, *Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess* (2008) brings forth some important issues of the deep ecology of Naess. Particularly, his views on the importance of place for developing one’s own ecosophy, three great movements and the cause of paying more attention to ecology movement, ways of living a joyful life which is rooted in nonviolence and controlling one’s overconsumption nature etc. are quite a few highlights of this book based on “ecological wisdom.” This book also reflects on the construction of deep ecological “Methodology and Systems” which is influenced by the thesis of the wholeness of Spinoza and direct nonviolent action of Gandhi. Drengson and Devall also focus on the Naessian articulations on the views of sustainability and the importance of population reduction.

Specific philosophical discussions on deep ecology and other schools of environmentalism took place under the auspices of the journals like *Environmental Ethics*, *The Trumpeter*, *Hypatia* etc. Since 1979 the journal *Environmental Ethics*, edited by Eugene Hargrove, has been associated with publishing papers on

environmental philosophy. Many significant papers of Naess have been published in different issues of this journal. Other than the writings of Naess, this thesis deals with some important papers of different volumes of this journal. Special mention should be made on a few papers that have severely criticized deep ecology, for example, Ramachandra Guha's "Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique" (1989), Ariel Kay Salleh's "Deeper than Deep Ecology: The Ecological Feminist Connection" (1984), William C. French's "Against Biospherical Egalitarianism" (1995) etc. *The Trumpeter*, purely dedicated to the development of ecosophy, has a number of references in the present work quoting the deep ecology papers of Naess and other deep ecologists. Again, the academic journal *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* devoted an entire issue in 1991 under the editorship of Karen J Warren to a debate with the deep ecology standpoint. Many trends changing papers published in that issue have made explicit connections between feminism and deep ecology.

But the literatures on environmental philosophy in general and deep ecology, in particular, have not come into a definite position regarding the acceptability of the ecocentrism of Arne Naess. The present thesis enquires whether Naess can be defended. In order to do that it makes an exposition of the philosophy of deep ecology from the Naessian standpoint and the critical evaluation from other contemporary schools of environmental philosophy. The next chapter deals with the meaning and the proceeding of the development of deep ecology.

Works Cited:

- Aristotle. *The Politics*. Trans. TA Sinclair. England: Penguin Books. 1962. Print.
- Arumugam, E. *Principles of Environmental Ethics*. New Delhi: Sarup Book Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2008. Print.
- Bilimoria, Purushottam. "Buddha Fifth Century BCE". *Fifty Great Thinkers on the Environment*. Ed. Joy A. Palmer. 1-6. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Bodian, S. "Simple in Means, Rich in Ends: An Interview with Arne Naess." George Sessions. ed. *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century*. Boston and London: Shambhala, 1995. 26-36. Print.
- Brown, Charles S. and Ted Toadvine. "Eco-Phenomenology: An Introduction," *Eco-Phenomenology*. Albany: State University of New York. ix-xxi. 2003. Print.
- Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. London: Penguin Classics. 1962. Print.
- Callicott, J. Baird. "Buddha." *Fifty Great Thinkers on the Environment*. Ed. Joy A. Palmer. 1-6. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Das, Arpana Dhar. *Modern Environmental Ethics: A Critical Survey*. New Delhi: Kunal Books. 2013. Print.
- De Santis, Stefano. *Nature and Man: The Hindu Perspectives*. Varanasi: Sociocos and Dilip Kumar Publishers. 1995. Print.

Devall, Bill and Alan Drengson. "Preface." *The Selected Works of Arne Naess*, Volume X, Eds. Harold Glasser and Alan Drengson. lxxv-lxxxi. Netherland: Springer, 2005. Print.

Dobson, Andrew. *Green Political Thought*. London: Routledge. 2007. Print.

Drengson, Alan. "The Life and Work of Arne Naess: An Appreciative Overview." *Trumpeter*. Volume 21, Number 1, 2005, 5-47. Print.

Fox, Warwick. *Towards a Transpersonal Ecology Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism*. UK: A Resurgence Book. 1995. Print.

Eckersley, Robyn. *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an Ecocentric Approach*, Albany, New York: State University of New York Press. 1992. Print.

Evans. J. Claude. "Preface." *With Respect for Nature: Living as Part of the Natural World*. Albany: State University of New York. vii-xvii. 2005. Print.

Griemesjan, William. "Arne Naess, Norwegian Philosopher, Dies at 96." *The New York Times*. January 14, 2009. <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/15/world/europe/15naess.html> retrieved on 12-04-2017.

Hawtree, Christopher. "Arne Naess: Philosopher who invented the concept of 'deep ecology'." *Independent*. 6 May 2009. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/arne-naess-philosopher-who-invented-the-concept-of-deep-ecology-1680350.html> accessed on 12-04-2017

Henning, Daniel H. *A Manual for Buddhism and Deep Ecology*, Montana: Buddha Dharma Education Association. 2002. Print.

Honderich, Ted. (ed.) *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc. 2005. Print.

Jamieson, Dale. *Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2008. Print.

Jena, Niranjana. *Ecological Awareness Reflected in the Atharvaveda*. Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Prakashan. 2002.

Kant, Immanuel. "Duties to Animals and Spirits." *Lectures on Ethics*. Trans. Louis Infield. 239-241. New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row Publishers, 1963. Print.

Keulartz, Jozef. *Struggle for Nature: A Critique of Radical Ecology*. London: Routledge. 1998. Print.

Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1949. Print.

Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac with Other Essays on Conservation from Round River*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1966. Print.

Merchant, Carolyn. *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World*. New York: Routledge. 1992. Google Books. Web. 16 March. 2017. <http://books.google.com>

- Miri, Sujata. *Ethics and Environment: Theory and the Adi and Khasi Practice*.
Guwahati: Spectrum Publications, 2001. Print.
- Naess, Arne. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-range Ecology Movement: A
Summary." *Inquiry*, 16:1, 95 — 100. 1973. Print.
- . "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World." *The
Trumpeter* 4(3): 35–42. 1987. Print.
- . "Spinoza and the Deep Ecology Movement." Harold Glasser (ed.) *The
Selected Works of Arne Naess*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer Verlag. 2005. Print.
- Minteer, Ben A. "Anthropocentrism." *Encyclopedia Environmental Ethics and
Philosophy*. Vol. I. Eds. Callicott & Frodeman. York: Gale Cengage Learning,
58-62. 2009. Print.
- Miri, Sujata. *Ethics and Environment: Theory and the Adi and Khasi Practice*.
Guwahati: Spectrum Publications, 2001. Print.
- Oelschlaeger, Max. *The Idea of Wilderness*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
Print.
- Pojman. Louis P. *Global Environmental Ethics*. London: Mayfield Publishing
Company, 2000. Print.
- Quick, Tim. "In Praise of Naess's Pluralism." *Trumpeter*. Volume 22, Number 1. 52-68.
2006. Print.

Radhakrishnan, S. (tr.) *The Dhammapada*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. 1968.
Print.

Regan, Tom. *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1983. Print.

Sarkar, Sahotra. *Biodiversity and Environmental Philosophy: An Introduction*. UK:
Cambridge University Press. 2005. Print.

Sessions, George. "Deep Ecology and the New Age Movement." *Deep Ecology for 21st
Century*. Ed. George Sessions. USA: Shambhala. 290-310. 1995. Print.

---. "Wildness, Cyborgs, and Our Ecological Future: Reassessing the Deep
Ecology Movement." *Trumpeter*. Volume 22, Number 2. 121-182. 2006. Print.

Sessions, George. (Ed.) *Deep Ecology for 21st Century*. Ed. George Sessions. USA:
Shambhala, 1995. Print.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*. New
York: New York Review. 1975. Print.

Suresh, Gouri. *Environmental Studies and Ethics*. New Delhi: I K International. 2007.
Print.

Thoreau, Henry D. *Walden*. Jeffrey S. Cramer. (ed.). New Haven and London: Yale
University Press. 2004. Print.

Varner, Gary E. *In Nature's Interest? Interests, Animal Rights, and Environmental
Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1998. Print.

Walls, Laura Dassow. "Henry David Thoreau". *Fifty Great Thinkers on the Environment*. Ed. Joy A. Palmer. 106-112. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

White, Jr. Lynn. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science*. Vol. 155. No. 3767. 1203-1207. 1967. Print.

Yadav, D. N. "Elements of Deep Ecology in Buddhism." *Ecological Perspective in Buddhism*. Ed. K. C. Pandey. 231-240. New Delhi: Readworthy, 2008. Print.

Zimmerman, Michael E. *Contesting Earth's Future*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. Print.