

# CHAPTER 5

## Conclusion

### 5.1 Revisiting Deep Ecology:

Deep ecology is an attempt to go beyond the realm of anthropocentric thought. Proponents of anthropocentrism attempt to distribute values in terms of human characteristics only and are alleged to be guilty of speciesism. Also, anthropocentrism suffers from human chauvinism. Deep ecology originates in repudiation of the traditional western advocacy of a human-centered philosophy. Naess particularly targets European and North American sort of environmentalism which he believes merely to be an extension of human-centrism in the name of preservation of nature. This sort of concern to protect nature is termed by Naess as shallow ecology. The meaning of “deep” ecology is explicated in consideration of its opposition to the “shallow” counterpart. The shallow-deep distinction structures the foundation of this ecocentric movement. The shallow ecology stands for an anthropocentric ethics. It is a set of normative system that seeks to guide human action. It does not inspire a change in the way people perceive the world around them.

Naess tries to formulate deep ecology as a philosophy that makes one see oneself as a part of nature rather than as an outsider. It is a radical way to make one understand one’s real place in the total scheme of things. A deep questioning makes one realise one’s place in nature. “Man in Nature” can be apprehended in Self-realization. Naess believes, the solution to the problems of the environmental crisis lies in identifying oneself with the whole system. Man is an integral part of the system, and

while protecting his own interests, man also protects the interest of the system. Conversely, with the whole system, it is to protect oneself. Naess prepares an action plan for this. He advocates various policies with George Sessions and others in his deep ecology principles that evolved in different phases of its development. For example, the sociopolitical agendas like radical reduction of world's population, abandonment of the goal of economic growth in the developed world as well as the conservation of biotic diversity, living in small, simple and self-reliant communities etc. are included in the platform principles. These policies seek to preserve and expand wilderness areas. But, these principles, it may be observed, gave rise to a kind of eco-fascism on the one hand, and on the other provide justification for Ram Chandra Guha's allegation that deep ecology is an elitist philosophy.

Concerns for nature, the unity of humans and nature, the interconnectedness of things or the presence of intrinsic values in nature are frequently interpreted by radical ecologists as lying within the province of metaphysics or ontology, rather than ethics. The mechanism of deep ecology rests on two layers of ethics and ontology. These two layers are so closely akin to each other that they are like the two sides of the same coin. The first layer brings forth the concept of "biocentric egalitarianism" that denies differential valuation of organisms. It speaks about "the equal right to live and blossom" of non-human nature ("The Shallow ..." 96). It has intrinsic value in contrast to instrumental value. In simple language, searching for intrinsic values of non-natural properties in nature assures the ethical layer of deep ecology. In other words, when it is said that nature must be respected because it has value in itself, then it hints at the ethical aspect of deep ecology.

In the first experience deep ecology appears to be a normative value system. The ethical foundation is the base of deep ecology's action plan. Particularly, one can see the occasional ethical precedence followed by its metaphysical outlook. Ethical importance takes precedence through the platform principles or common deep ecological views among its supporters. This is the position where one finds a basis for the enacting of the policies in individual, national and transnational levels. Thereby one finds a basis for acting in the practical field on the part of agencies, governments as well as civil societies. The eight-point Platform Principles are the most general view that supporters of Deep Ecology hold in common. Platform Principles suggest that nature must be respected because it is valuable in itself.

In a normal perspective, man is habituated in confining intrinsic value to him alone. All other things are seen as having only instrumental value. Value is used in relation to human needs only. Only human being has the sense of value. Evaluation is done from the perspectives of the human side. Human perspectives cannot be overcome in valuation. As such, ethics is being confined to the human world alone. Philosophy is all about human affairs. It is all about human versus humans where human is the end, and the "other" is taken merely as instrumental to human good. But there was a shift in this attitude as traced in Aldo Leopold's "land ethic": "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise" (*A Sand County* 240). The intrinsic value of natural creatures is not dependent on activities of valuation or self-defense or value-generation on their part. The premise that all value depends on valuers does not necessarily imply that the value of non-valuing objects depends upon the whims of the valuer. In defence of intrinsic value of nature, Nirmalya Narayan Chakraborty writes:

Of course, it must be admitted that there is no value without a valuer and, if only humans can be valuers, then nothing can have value in the absence of human. But the premise that all value depend on valuers does not necessarily imply that the value of non-valuing objects depends upon the value of the valuer. An act of valuing, of course depends on a valuer. But a valuer may find out value in an object which does not serve any purpose of the valuer. The valuer finds an object valuable just because the object has certain properties. And so the object is valuable to the valuer, not because it is useful to the valuer, but because it has certain properties. So, while the act of valuing depends on the valuer, the value of an object may not depend on the valuer. (Chakraborty 52-3)

Richard Routley brings forth the “Last Man Argument”<sup>1</sup> as a strategy of interpreting the attribution of value on the nonhuman nature for a satisfactory basis of environmental ethics. According to Routley, the European and North American ethics are based on the principle in which agents are permitted to act as they please provided that they do not harm others or do not harm themselves irreparably. Routley labelled this principle as anthropocentric which affirms that moral deliberation and choice involve only human interests and concerns.

The last man (or person) surviving the collapse of the world system lays about him, eliminating, as far as he can, every living thing, animal or plant (but painlessly if you like, as at the best abattoirs). What he does is quite permissible according to basic [human] chauvinism, but on environmental grounds what he does is wrong. (Routley 207–208).

Let it be assumed that the last living person, in the event of the collapse of the world following a catastrophe, has come to know that the planet where he is living can never regenerate. In such a circumstance, if he damages what is left on the planet like

---

<sup>1</sup> Routley, Richard. “Is There a Need for a New, an Environmental, Ethic?” *Proceedings of the Fifteenth World Congress of Philosophy* 1: 205–210. 1973. This argument is extensively formulated in 1980 by Routley, Richard, and Val Routley, as “Human Chauvinism and Environmental Ethics.” *Environmental Philosophy*, eds. D. S. Mannison, M. McRobbie, and R. Routley. Canberra: Australian National University.

mountains and gorges and atmosphere and oceans and insentient species like animals and microbes, how can one evaluate his act since there is no valuer in the living state? Microbes and insentient beings cannot apply value to things. Can the act of the last living man on the planet be considered as anything wrong, in the event of there being no possibility of coming up a future man altogether? Will there be anything called ‘intrinsic value’ or quality of life or aesthetic nature?

Because he is the last human survivor, there are no other human interests to be considered, and the “chauvinistic liberty principle” therefore provides no grounds for moral condemnation of his actions. Nevertheless, it is clear to an environmentally enlightened conscience that the actions of the last man are morally dreadful. One view suggests that these insentient forms existed long before rationality came into existence to value them by some agent. For example, Jamieson holds that the last man destroying whatever has left seems to be highly egocentric. One’s existence around something does not necessarily prove the good or bad of that thing. Naess leaves the question of valuer and tries to move to one’s ontological status irrespective of being an evaluator or evaluated. Here one can see a new door to view deep ecology under the light of Object Oriented Ontology (OOO) as pioneered by Graham Harman<sup>2</sup>. It is pertinent to mention that, object-oriented ontology allows one to think deep down things. Timothy Morton<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> In an attempt to rethink realism, Graham Harman his books: *Tool-Being*, *Guerilla Metaphysics*, *Prince of Networks* and *The Quadruple Object* developed the idea of object-oriented ontology. A thing has an irreducible dark side (Morton, Harman). If one turns over a coin, one can never see the other side of the coin. The reason is the other side of the coin will have to flip onto “this” side when one turns it over. As a result it produces another underside. Harman tries to formulate this irreducible darkness from subject–object relationships to object–object relationships. Therefore, the idea of the relationship between subject and object is shifted to a view of object’s relationship to object thereby concluding to subjectless object.

<sup>3</sup> Timothy Morton in his book *Ecology without Nature* rejects the concept of nature in consideration of the view of “Correlationism” that refers to the view that a thing can only exist in relation to human-mind. Correlationism is anthropocentrism in philosophical form. It has affinity with ecophilosophy so far as ontological status of a being is concerned.

maintains that unlike the environmental activists, OOO does not see Nature as an object of reverent admiration and views the concept of Nature as self-defeating in ecological philosophy.

Deep ecology speaks about one's spontaneous experience. It is a means of intuitively giving one the experience of connection with nature as a whole. It is the basis of one's identification with nature. The thesis of identification goes in proximity with a call for things in themselves. It seems that this process undermines the "otherness" of nature for which ecofeminism criticises deep ecology. Both deep ecology and OOO attempt to see the world in itself. Both have the objective of acknowledging things and their rights. But unlike OOO, deep ecology conceives of the "other" as something that can be encountered immediately. In this process, deep ecology encounters a confusion of mixing up the *being* of other with its *being known*. Thus deep ecology denies the autonomy of objects.

The second layer of deep ecology, therefore, rejects the man-in-environment image in favour of the relational, total field image. This part is of a metaphysical holism. The metaphysics behind deep ecology speaks about the biosphere which does not consist of discrete entities. Naess says that the biosphere is internally constituted by individuals that make up an ontologically unbroken whole. He believes that ultimately all life is one. One's awareness to see one's position on the planet makes one realise the relational nature. One can apprehend ontological interconnectedness through enlightenment or "self-realization". This self-realization consists in identification with "others", the nonhuman nature. Naess speaks about a stage of maturity when one becomes aware of vast perspectives that ultimately life is one. This is an insight into the

nature of things. The deep ecology supporters learn to live with an ungraded, non-evolutionary continuity between innovative human nature and adaptive non-human non-refined nature. They practice leading a life that can appreciate the relational nature of each entity and denies a boundary between human and nonhuman life forms. Naess's theses of 'identification' and 'self-realization' are based on the belief of the ultimate unity of all living beings. This belief is intended to have a normative function. Naess says that "if we harm the rest of Nature then we are harming ourselves. There are no boundaries and everything is interrelated" ("The World ..." 68). In the same tone, Fox says that we cannot make a firm ontological divide in reality between the human and the nonhuman realms.

Naess repeatedly emphasises on reconstructing the connection and relationship with the non-human natural world. In order to have a connection of this sort, one needs a higher level of awareness. When one gets back to a feeling of connectedness with the rest of the human and non-human entities, the process of identification starts developing. It is the process of reaching the positive intuition of joy. This is how an individual step into maturity and relational existence. In this manner, one can see the rejection of the man in the environmental image in favour of the relational, total field image.

Believing in some principles and executing the same belief in one's action is a key character of a practical philosopher. Deep ecology assumes a particular metaphysical understanding of the way in which humans and nature ought to interact. Deep ecology seeks to persuade us that there ought to be a *prima facie* disposition in favour of non-interference with nature by humans. Focusing on the practical relevance

of deep ecology, David E. Cooper writes, “Deep ecology is a set of practical environmental policies underpinned by a set of normative principles which in turn are supported by a scientifically informed but, ultimately philosophical, view of reality of humankind” (213). Naess may have offered amorphous ecological ideas in the different phases of his life but he is not an “armchair philosopher”. As inspired by some deep ecological principles based on his belief and experience, Naess offers a program of action for the same. Naess adds the qualifier “in principle” to emphasise a realistic egalitarianism for he believes that “any realistic praxis necessitates some killing, exploitation, and suppression” (“The Shallow...” 95). Naess considers this program of action as the outline of the part of his philosophy. As such Naess’s belief of “unity of all life forms” is transformed into some ethical guidelines. This can be understood from A. J. Ayer’s analysis of Naess’s deep ecology. Ayer in his “A Reply to Arne Naess” in response to Naess’ “Ayer on Metaphysics: A Critical Commentary by a Kind of Metaphysician,” writes:

....Naess supposes that the best way to induce people to see themselves in other living beings is to secure their assent to the metaphysical pronouncement that they are identical with them. There is indeed, the suggestion that they obtain more from this metaphysical pronouncement than a reinforcement of the moral percept. (41)

Deep Ecology is a critique of the existing human relationship with the natural environment with a vision for the future. As an ecological movement, deep ecology has its theoretical framework for biosphere preservation. By recognising the intrinsic worth of other living beings, one recognises the solidarity of all life forms. Theoretically, it is not an atomistic concept. Practically, the success of deep ecology rests on addressing the issues within the global framework. Therefore, as a movement deep ecology has to

work on its formulated principles incorporated with the conjunction of the other movements around the globe considering the cross-cultural criticisms of other traditions or cultures.

## **5.2 Iconic class of Naess:**

### **5.2.1 Coinage of the term “deep ecology”:**

“Deep Ecology” is a new phrase coined by Naess in the early seventies. This coining is found as an attempt to formulate the thesis of biocentrism or ecocentrism in contrast to the anthropocentric approach for treasuring all sorts of biological or cultural diversity. Since its first use, the meaning of the term is continuously being refined. In the words of Naess, “I coined the term deep and shallow ecology movement, but I do not, of course, try to monopolise those terms. And I only welcome some diversity of verbalization of basic attitudes and intuitions” (“Intuition...” 166). Deep ecology, as such, is not one unified movement. Even in the formulation of the deep ecology platform, Naess and Sessions have invited the supporters of deep ecology for necessary changes in the implementations of eight points depending on the opinions of priorities. In “the gravity of the situation”<sup>4</sup> of environmental crisis these priorities include, what is highly desirable, what should be done first, what is most urgent etc. The "Shallow and the Deep" paper is considered as one of the trend-changing papers in the history of environmental philosophy.

According to Warwick Fox, the phrase “deep ecology” of Naess reflects three senses of its use: the formal, popular and philosophical. The Deep Ecology Platform summarises the popular sense. The popular sense of deep ecology refers to his

---

<sup>4</sup> The very first chapter of Naess’s magnum opus *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, starts with this heading where it is presented that because of the growing environmental crisis, the situation is very grave.

dimension of the movement. This sense of deep ecology refers to the most general kinds of ecologically relevant views that are popularly shared by those who derive their views from philosophical or religious fundamentals. Naess' personal norm of Self-realization is central to the philosophical sense.

Naess' formal sense of the term deep ecology provides the structural understanding that linked the popular and philosophical senses of deep ecology. All writings of Naess are underpinned by asking deeper questions. In order to show the distinctive use of the phrase "deep ecology", Naess distinguishes among the everyday, technical, scientific and philosophical questions. He says that asking progressively deeper questions means asking strings of why and how questions. In other words, deep questioning lies in asking a deep string of questions. Persistent why- and how- string of questions lead to philosophy. The formal sense is the basis for understanding the philosophical sense, the sense that is considered as distinctive of deep ecology. According to Fox, "Naess holds that this deep questioning process ultimately reveals bedrock or end-of-the-line assumptions, which he refers to as *fundamentals*, and that deep ecological views are derived from such fundamentals while shallow ecological views are not" (*Towards A Transpersonal* 62). By coining the term deep ecology, Naess shows that "despite being inspired by the science of ecology, the deep ecology movement is not naturalistic but rather ecophilosophical in its approach" (Lie and Wickson web).

### **5.2.2 Introducing Ecological Self:**

Formulating the idea of ecological-Self is a novel concept in the history of environmental philosophy. According to Naess, nature is left out in the traditional

conception of the “maturity of self.” In traditional conception, self has been considered as developing from ego to social self and from there to the metaphysical self. Naess, therefore, introduced the concept of ecological self. Naess writes, “our home, our immediate environment, where we belong as children, and the identification with human living beings, are largely ignored. I, therefore, tentatively introduce perhaps for the first time ever, a concept of ecological self” (“Self-Realization...” 35).

This thesis of realising the ecological-Self is primarily a philosophical undertaking of Naess. This concept of self-realization occupies an important place in Naess’s deep ecology as well as in his personal ecosophy. According to Naess, human life is much more meaningful, rich, diverse and multifaceted when experienced in a wide, ecological sense. To realise one’s self is an expansive process as it entails ‘realisation’ of reality – the unifying whole. Naess in this context distinguishes between “self-realization” and “Self-realization”. Accordingly, “self-realization” results in a narrow, ego-centered sense of self, whereas “Self-realization” leads to a wide, expansive sense of self.

Environmental critic Peter Reed considers Naess’s sense of Self with the capital letter S as the Atman of Hindus that corresponds to the Absolute of western philosophy. Reed gives a simple exposition of Naess’s concept of Self-realization,

The small self does not see that it is a part of the Atman because the small self is too busy with its narrow self-interests-egotism. To get around this problem and realise itself, the small self is not expanded to encompass everything but rather diminished. When it has reduced its egotism to zero (though this is unlikely happen), it is realised that is, it experiences a ‘oneness in diversity’. Self-realization has so little to do with the individual

ego, in fact, that the true Self-realization of one individual is impossible without the Self-realization of all individual. (182)

Reed is of the view that it is not easy to distinguish between these two approaches to the Naessian interpretation of self. For Reed, it is an attempt to distinguish by “splitting hairs.” He compares this approach of Naess as distinguishing between human subject and the natural object. A deep ecologist tries to bridge the gap between ourselves, the human subject and the world, the natural object. According to Reed, this is the expanded meaning of self, an attempt to see “how we are the same instead of how we are different.” Naess prefers to use the expanded meaning of the term self while speaking of Self-realization. In realising one’s true self, one is intimately bound up with others. Increased self-realization, in other words, implies broadening and deepening of the self. The idea is that by identifying oneself with one’s environment, care for the environment naturally follows, without being forced externally. In this way, Naess suggests that we should shift our understanding of nature from anthropocentric to eco-centric.

But Naess is not ready to believe the view that self is caged in the body and is externally related. Naess does not say that self-realization leads to the cessation of the natural world. In contrast, by advocating a pluralist position, Naess advocates better coherence and coherence to the natural world in one’s Self-realization. In the widest sense, Naess’s view is that all things are internally related. This internal relation is not a subject matter of any transcendental experience, but an experience of this pragmatic or day to day world of experience. It is an experience of one’s daily normal life earned with one’s maturity. In the process attaining maturity, the normative ethical

vocabularies like non-violence, love, empathy, the solidarity of all life forms etc. occupy a place of prominence in his diverse writings.

### **5.2.3 Developing Total World-view:**

Naess may be inconsistent in articulating diverse things of deep ecology philosophy. But he consistently writes in favour of developing one's total world view. His "total view", a complete and unified view, consists of the interrelationship between all the domains or disciplines of philosophy. Naess believes that philosophy includes the most profound, the deepest and the most fundamental problems. "Naess continues the philosophic-mystical tradition of Spinoza and combines his world of nature experience with an effort to change the western, dualistic paradigm into a green worldview" (Elders 46). This total view includes social and individual thinking configuration. It is inclusive of cross-cultural analysis which is a part of the richness and diversity of the Earth's living systems. Naess believes that in formulating deep ecological thought he cannot get away from the importance of them at any moment. As such the problem of theorising deep ecology is considered as a problem of arranging one's previous experiences of all sorts with reference to logic, epistemology, ethics and ontology. In this process what is important is one's synthesising capacity, open-mindedness and a generous spirit of philosophising. It is an important condition for the articulation of one's ecosophy.

In terms of the formulation of his idea of "total view", one may raise the question to posit Naess in an iconic class since this idea is very much akin to the customary idea of "world-view". Philosophy is taken as a pursuit of constructing one's world-view. A philosophical enquiry is characterised by an attempt at continuous searching for a world-view. Naess' deep ecology has given an extensive importance on

developing one's total view. He tries to give a new standard of understanding of its importance for an all-comprehensive philosophy.

#### **5.2.4 Respect of plurality of thought:**

Deep ecology can be characterised by Naess' respect for a plurality of thought. Believing in pluralism implies the believing in a multiplicity of perspectives, ideas, thinking patterns, values etc. Allowing a diversity of perspectives does not necessarily imply that one is to sanction every perspective. According to Andrew Brennan, a critic of environmental philosophy, "The deep ecology platform surrenders the specificity of the original position in favour of breadth. This move recognises the implications of pluralism in ethical and political life" (Brennan 179). Rothenberg compares the platform principles of deep ecology with a tree. The conceptual roots from which the tree obtains its nourishment like various religious, aesthetic, and philosophies etc are soils and its branches reaching out into the world, enjoining various types of political action (Rothenberg 185–190).

Particularly, one can see Naess' support of moral pluralism which lacks a determinate structure. Moral pluralism implies operating with different conceptions of good. In deep ecology, there is the questioning of the ideal of pure objectivity. There is also questioning on the claims to absolute truths. Naess is not in favour of simplistic reductionism. Therefore, he believes that there cannot be any absolutists' position. There is incompleteness in attaining any conclusion. The principles of the deep ecology movement are themselves not fundamental. Naess recognises diversity among ultimate premises. They are grounded in a rich plurality of deeper religious or philosophical

principles. Though Naess is influenced by the eastern religions, he never tries to integrate the greatest number of “orienting generalisations”.

At the level of platform principles, the ultimate principles are combined with unity. In such situation, if any underlying philosophy is found to be inconsistent with the platform principles, that is considered as unacceptable as a workable ecosophy. There may not be scope for pluralism within an underlying religious or philosophical principle as it may be a monistic or rigorous principle. But there is diversity among the ultimate positions and depending on the situation, a pluralist sets the action to be performed. It can be said that “recognising pluralism of underlying premises is deep in the sense that it encourages us to think about the environmental and ethical situation from a number of perspectives. Those who agree on the need for specific action may arrive at that agreement by different routes” (Brennan 178). It is pertinent to mention that Naess’ philosophy is characterised by a liberal tendency as he suggests for the formulation of one’s own ecosophy depending on believed religious or cultural positions.

### **5.3 Contradictory stands of Naess:**

It is very cumbersome to categorise the Naessian development of deep ecology simply by an ethical or any definite position of a philosophical branch of thought. Naess has been inconsistent throughout his career in formulating a single philosophical position for the cluster of diverse ideas and liberal tendency towards all nationalities as well as other worldviews. Thus unifying Naess’s deep ecological position becomes a tough job for anyone who tries to sum up Naess by a conventional school of thought.

Here lies the importance of Naess where other views are given due position in devising his own position.

But diverse phases of its development invite criticism as well. For example, at the first stage of its development, Naess' characterization of deep ecology by seven points comprised of the eradication of poverty in the South. Naess believed that "anti-class posture" is important for preserving the general long-term health of the biosphere. But there was a drastic change in its re-articulation along with George Sessions in 1984. It needs to be mentioned that most of the criticism of deep ecology have come from the social justice school of environmentalism. In this connection, Sahotra Sarkar makes an important observation.

Unfortunately, deep ecology lost its social conscience during its transplantation to North America. An attribution of intrinsic value replaced the argument from a relational ontology for respect for the nonhuman world. The basic principles of deep ecology, as Naess and George Sessions elaborated them in 1984, make no mention of human poverty or inequality. (69)

In the translator's note of *Ecology Community and Lifestyle* Rothenberg states that deep ecological thinking processes without end. Deep Ecology is not a monolithic concept. It is an unorganised cluster of ideas. In comparison to other schools of environmental philosophy "deep ecology has not crystallised into a complete system" (Keller 210). The meaning of deep ecology has been revised a number of times. It is a movement of the continuous upward process. One can witness different stages of its development as well as revision of the meaning of words and suggested principles. Particularly, one can see the occasional ethical precedence followed by its metaphysical outlook. In this connection Freya Mathews opines,

It is not possible simply to explain deep ecology in a definitive way, partly on account of successive revisions of its meaning undertaken by its original exponents, and in part because unintended meanings have attached to it as it has permeated popular culture. This protean quality of deep ecology has in fact contributed to its popular appeal. However, any exposition must start with the formulation offered by Naess in the 1973 article. (218)

Deep ecology is not an explicit philosophical position. Naess is not in favour of making any claim of certainty. Need to be mentioned that Naess was an admirer of Pyrrho's scepticism in the early part of his philosophical career. Instead of insisting on certainty Naess prefers to inspire others in fitting into the place of deep philosophical questioning through handy illustration. He uses the classical Greek term "zetetic" to make his stand definite, which implies the position of a seeker of truth without claiming to have reached. There has been a cross-cultural liberal tendency in embracing diverse religious, cultural and ethnic views in the various phases of the development of deep ecology. For example, the platform principles, developed with a number of amendments suggest anyone to be liberal towards others' views in an attempt to solve the environmental crisis. David Zimmerman writes:

Although happy to explain his own views, he does not present them as truth to which others must conform. While convinced of the validity of the intuition that all life is interrelated and important, he does not pretend that he can *persuade* some to agree with him. Ultimately, one must see for oneself. A critic of dogmatism, he is willing to modify his views if their limitations become apparent to him. (Web)

His apron diagram reflects how one can steer up one's position in meeting the solution of ecological crisis without hampering one's religious or cultural background. Naess sees diversity in terms of one's background and other respect not as a problem but as an asset of deep ecological view.

Naess' position has been developed as a harsh critique of anthropocentrism. Bookchin, who is known for a polarised attack on Naess in an attempt to establish the school of social ecology, in some point merges with Naess' lenient position of interpreting the cause of the ecological crisis. Naess himself admits in one of his personal letters to Clark that he finds it acceptable to Bookchin's view that "the ecological problems which the ecological crisis raises are really social" ("A Dialogue..." 27). Similarly, Naess' persuasion of love and empathy to the fellow human beings in the process of maturity is indicative of ecofeminists' assertion on the treatment of women. Of course, the lenient position of Naess is a progressing part of compatible dialogues among the radical ecocentric schools.

#### **5.4 Convergences and inter-dialogues:**

The modus operandi of holding inter-dialogues among various reflections of environmentalism is not an easy task. The development of the ecocentric thought in the last few decades has emerged as a new potentiality in the overall history of thought. On the basis of their belief systems, the contributors of the schools of environmental philosophy offered their justifications of believing or disbelieving anthropocentric or ecocentric views. On the basis of their critiques of the dominant worldview and elaborations of the idea of ecological interconnectedness, they differ to a certain extent. Deep ecology's engagement and exchanges of ideas with the other thinkers of environmentalism has given a new era of enlightenment in the discussion of man's place in the universe. There is the least significance whether the reflection of "man in nature" or "man and nature" sustains at the end of the academic discourse. But these lately developed streams of thought have emerged as awakening human beings to see the nature and one's place in the new light.

The two apparently conflicting approaches of environmentalism, namely, social ecology and deep ecology have raised some important philosophical and political issues. Naess and Bookchin have concern for ecological destruction and they are looking for radical transformations. At the time Naess considers anthropocentric value system as the main reason of environmental crisis, Bookchin considers social inequalities and inter-human domination as the reason behind the present ecological crisis. In this line of thinking social ecology offers its interpretation. The main tenet of social ecology is to understand the relationship between nature and society. This relationship, social ecology believes, is a holistic unity in diversity. Social Ecology seeks to discover why this relationship has gone off-centered. According to Bookchin, social ecology views nature and society as emerging through an evolutionary unfolding toward increasing diversity, complexity, freedom, and consciousness by means of processes that foundationally involve interconnections, complementarities, and cooperation. He says that social ecology provides more than a critique of the split between humanity and nature; it also poses the need to heal them. He opposes all forms of social domination as well as the domination of the nonhuman world.

There are some important differences between social ecology and deep ecology in their ecophilosophical orientations. These two streams of environmentalism, according to Eckersley, “have given rise to different perspectives concerning humanity’s proper role in the evolutionary drama” (*Environmentalism* 148). Bookchin raises one of the most important questions regarding the mental set-up of humankind, the dominating tendency of second nature. He argues that human beings’ distinctive feature of reasoning gives them the ability to potentially understand natural processes and to form a non-hierarchical society. Only because the second-nature or man is

cultured by the capacity of reason, it can potentially organise society along ecological and rational lines.

Bookchin's claim of social hierarchy can in no way be overlooked in the process of domination, be it man by man or nature by man. One can never deny that solution of environmental crisis is in the hand of second nature only because the synthesis with first nature is a matter of rational evolution.

Deep ecology and social ecology are two distinct theoretical positions. Naess seeks for the equality of all, animate and inanimate alike, in the course of environmental holism and interconnections. Naess and most of the deep ecologists are of the view that interconnections are psychologically based and the main issue is a rational analysis of how human society interferes with the intrinsic value of nature. On the other hand, Bookchin believes that interconnections are ecologically based and the main issue is about the rational analysis of the relationship between human society and nature. Social ecology has attracted political activists from a variety of movements like peace activists, feminists, and social thinkers of all orientations who have come to see the fundamentally anti-ecological nature of militarism, patriarchy, racism and other forms of social domination. The emergence of Green political movements has motivated a new search for sources of ecological wisdom. On the other hand, a wide spectrum of artists, philosophers, animal rights advocates and spiritual seekers have embraced deep ecology as a call for a stronger personal link to the natural world.

There are some important convergences between Deep Ecology and Social Ecology. Social ecology and deep ecology share a broad vision of the ecological society, highlighting the desirability of local governance and democratic decision

making. But Bookchin fails to acknowledge these convergences due to his over-focus on the deep ecologists' interpretation of spiritual transformation and invocations of mystical unity, that is, the ontological thesis of deep ecology. Social ecology and deep ecology are complementary ecophilosophies. These two thoughts of environmentalism are critical of scientism and a purely instrumental orientation towards the nonhuman world. Social Ecology is grounded in an ecological sensibility. This ecological sensibility rejects the instrumental posture toward nature. Bookchin's "organismic" philosophy says that subjectivity is present not just in humans but in all phenomena. This thought goes parallel with Naess's philosophy. According to Eckersley Social ecology and deep ecology, both are re-embed humans in the natural world. From the perspective of practical field social ecology and deep ecology, according to Eckersley, "support bioregionalism, small-scale decentralised communities, cultural and biological diversity and appropriate technology." (*Environmentalism* 147) Following Thoreau's Civil Disobedience concept, social ecology and deep ecology are of the basic agreement that, that government is best which governs not at all.

Clark has rightly said that Bookchin failed to acknowledge important convergences between social ecology and deep ecology. Most of the charges made by Bookchin are not directed at deep ecology's positive or constructive task of encouraging an attitude of ecocentric egalitarianism. Rather, Naess's egalitarianism is interpreted by Bookchin only to find out if there is anything wrong with it. Bookchin is very much offensive in attacking the deep ecology position. The intensity of his offensive attack is one of the main reasons for inviting a counter-attack on social ecology from diverse quarters. It does also help deep ecology to relatively weigh more theoretical edge over social ecology.

Eileen Crist opines that social ecology and deep ecology share a broad vision of the ecological society, highlighting the desirability of local governance and democratic decision making, small-scale economies of production and consumption, community spirit, lifestyles that respect cultural and natural diversity, ecological embeddedness, and care of nonhuman species both for the ways they enhance human life and for their intrinsic value (253-58). Brian Tokar says that “the deepening divisions between these approaches, with their very different theoretical assumptions and political styles, threatens to block the essential work of movement-building and the development of more lasting- alliances among people dedicated to saving the earth and creating more ecologically sound ways to live upon it” (31).

There is a close affinity between ecofeminism and deep ecology. Both these two schools of environmental activism have the concern for ecological destruction. They both seek radical transformation in thought and deed. These two schools of environmental thought are concerned with ecophilosophy and ecopolitics and two of the most philosophically and socially influential contrasting approaches. They are seen different only for their theoretical histories because feminism is the movement to end sexist oppression. The domination of female by male force is an age long historical fact. Ecofeminism tries to build a healthy and sustainable relationship with people as well as with the natural environment. It says that the in-depth relations of social hierarchies grounded by age-old patriarchal societies are the part of the ecological crisis. Ecofeminism tries to cognize one that there is a close affinity between women and nature. The mental and usual set up of subjugation of women and exploitation of the second nature are interlinked.

Ecofeminism slightly splits its stand from deep ecology by believing that every species within the biotic community is distinct from each other. It says that deep ecology's denying of "human-distinctiveness" does not guarantee the end of anthropocentrism and exploitation. It criticises deep ecology alleging that Naess and his followers fail to pay attention to inter-human oppression, domination and exploitation. Deep ecologists' notion of non-anthropocentrism is criticised as superficial. The notion of self-realization of Naess is disparaged as vague and masculinist. And it reasonably insists on respecting each of the distinct individuals of the biosphere.

Deep ecology tries to get rid of the mental set up of anthropocentrism. For this, it upholds some principles to establish biocentric egalitarian. It gives one freedom to develop one's own principle with any omission and commission with its own set of principles. It is professing the value of all species irrespective of its human use. It has become ecology for its concern to the biotic and abiotic components of the environment. Intrinsic value is to be respected. Loving nature means caring for the intrinsic value. The claims of deep ecology are considered as the urge of time considering the "gravity of the situation." One may say that in deep questioning there lies the primacy of human interest and as such it is another form of anthropocentrism or reform environmentalism. But Naess' deep assertion to the effect of claiming a "total field image" of man amounts to a metaphysical claim, and this is what places him in a unique status.

Ecofeminism, in one sense, is a direct challenge to deep ecological theorising. Most of the development of the latter part of the ecofeminist theories have cropped up as a reaction against the deep ecological theorizing, where there is the least consideration of issues raised by ecofeminism. But there can be said to exist no essential

disagreement between the two, provided anthropocentric legacies is overcome by the ecofeminists. Ecofeminism is nearing the anthropocentric discussion in its discussion on male-female distinction in connection with the treatment of nonhuman nature. Ecofeminism is wandering in and around the very nature of humanity itself, a humanity that no longer could afford to view itself as separate and distinct from the natural world. It is concerned with the suffering of women, history of oppression of women. With the domination of women, it tries to link up domination of nature by the same male oppressor. As such, it can be said that more than an environmental concern, ecofeminism is a feministic concern. One may allege that ecofeminism fails to get rid of the traditional barrier of concentrating on the discussion of anthropocentric thought. But the value of ecofeminism cannot be overruled for it reasonably exhibits the psyche of male domination and its connection with the domination of nature.

But the concern for the rest of the non-human being having mutual support and coexistence with them by accepting the intrinsic value of nature is the antecedent to anthropocentrism. Naess offers a holistic view by his relational thinking. Unlike the “real” of ecofeminist thought that is comprised of numerous, externally related components, Naess speaks about a vast relational field. This relational thinking covers the concern of feminine characters also. In comparison to ecofeminism, deep ecology, thus, has earned a better and well-deserved place in the history of environmental philosophy in dealing with the environmental issues in a unified form.

The environmental perception of Guha can be better understood with reference to his criticism of deep ecology. Guha criticises deep ecology as American ecological movement based on anthropocentrism and “pseudo-aestheticism”. But his criticism is

not an outright rejection of deep ecology. Instead, Guha acknowledges deep ecology's shift from aggressive anthropocentrism to biocentrism. Guha, however, favours for a more qualified view of deep ecology having concern for the poor people of the third world. In this connection, Debashis Guha prefers to label Ramachandra Guha's position as "qualified deep ecology" (138). According to Debashis Guha, these two forms of environmentalism are not opposed to each other in certain common agenda. He writes, "Deep ecology and Guha appear to be on a similar footing when they speak of exploitative technologies against both man and nature. Large-scale industrialisation, heavy mechanisation, capital-intensive plans and urbanisation are all opposed for exploiting both man and nature by the deep thinkers and Guha" (145). In short, Guha has no problem with deep ecology if it tends to address the concern of the third world poor people. Moreover, quoting a remark from the video "The Call of the Mountain," George Sessions says, "Vandana Shiva claims that deep ecology's insistence on the intrinsic value and protection of wild species and habitat is the only way to ensure a healthy life-style for the world's poor in the long run" ("Wildness..." 134). Thus it can be said, though the third world critics criticise deep ecology yet they believe that deep ecology has the potentiality of becoming a way of life if it seriously addresses the unaddressed important points as suggested by Guha.

### **5.5 Biocentrism Reasserted:**

If there is one word that underpins the whole range of radical opposition of the green movement to the present form of human behaviour throughout the world, it is probably "anthropocentrism" (Dobson 42). Naess severely attacks anthropocentrism considering it as the cause of present misbalanced ecological system. He believes that man and his belief system towards the rest of the planet is the prime reason of

environmental crisis. He gives suggestions at the same time to have a way out of the situation. For this, he publishes many articles even after 1973 appearance of the term deep ecology. His prime target is not to nullify other theoretical positions of environmental philosophy, rather establish his own ecosophy where other individuals can also have their own ecosophies. He does not use a critical lens to see Bookchin or other social ecologists' positions. Naess simply tries to carry on the legacy of his own as well as of those whom he admires till his death in 2009. One can see that in the post-Bookchin era the ideological rivalry between the supporters of Bookchin and Naess reached a considerable height. Although many supporters of deep ecology like Deval, Drengson, Sessions, Fox, Clark etc. gave replies to Bookchin's critiques, Naess kept on publishing papers converging his all writing towards interpreting the relation of deep ecology with other branches of human thought as well as clarifying his previous position.

Naess makes an exposition of the limitations of the anthropocentric valuing system as the basic point of referral. This exposition transcends the limit of deep ecology just as a body of philosophical theory. It ascends into a much broader implication. It is set on an objective of mass awakening with a deeper and sensible quest of one's place in the total scheme of things. Firstly it attributes intrinsic value to non-human nature and secondly, it adopts a relational ontology away from traditional ethics to explain the universe. Naess attempts to do this by a process of deep questioning. The challenge of deep ecology is to find a compatible station to meet this relational ontology with the intrinsic value of all.

A kind of upsurge of a consciousness can be seen targeting a man-centered philosophy for the sake of the planet or of the natural environment. Many ecocentric

theories have cropped up as a part of this agenda of targeting human-centrism. There is a legacy of the ecocentric theories starting with the philosophy of Leopold, Rolston to Naess. These theorists distribute values in terms of species-specific interests by accusing human species for the present environmental problems. They have uniformly tried to bring forth the limitation of the post-Kantian anthropocentric nature of ethics and showed its internal effect on the environment.

Deep ecology's address of the problem of environmental crisis consists in a criticism of anthropocentrism. There is a quarter which advocates that it is not possible to get rid of anthropocentrism. For instance, according to John Passmore, one is to look at the environment in a way that is not against the interest of one's own. Passmore replaces the biblical granting of "dominion over nature" by the "concept of stewardship" as the latter speaks about caring for the world against exploiting it. Though stewardship is not opposite to dominion, yet it is compatible with the belief in the intrinsic value of nature. At the same time, it is humans and humans alone who appreciate that something is valuable in itself. Like Passmore, the environmental ethicists of anthropocentric camp also argue that as we are human beings, all our thoughts are products of what we think as being humans. These thoughts aspire to the select ideas only which are believed to be for the betterment of human beings' own species.

There evolved a tendency to interpret deep ecology as an extended version of utilitarianism wherein an attempt to include the happiness of entire ecosphere the human species loses its focus. There is an allegation against deep ecology that it is belittling human species by positing it among the macrobiotics and biggies alike by not

recognising human-distinctiveness. But Naess is careful enough to acknowledge that “biospherical egalitarianism” is possible only “in principle”. In this connection, he distinguishes between an ideal and a practical situation. Deep ecology can be regarded as an ideal of high esteem, but given the impracticability of the ideal, it only turns out to be a utopia. Naess’ use of the term “in principle” is an acknowledgement of this impracticability. He admits, “any realistic praxis necessitates some killing, exploitation, and suppression” (“The Shallow...” 95).

A careful analysis of deep ecology reflects that Naess’ position is not a human beings’ self-defeating position, as sometimes it is alleged to be, since he tries to show the position of human beings along with that of the nonhuman beings. Naess’ intention is not to belittle the position of human species. He only explicates his strong conviction that age-old western belief of human superiority over the rest of the beings paves an easy path for exploitation of nature. Human identity is not abandoned in his crusade against anthropocentrism. This crusade is only an attempt to dethrone human beings from the highest position they used to occupy since long. Being against anthropocentrism is being opposed to human-centeredness, not humans per se. A reflection on the negative effects of human-centrism is only a plea for ecophilia from the part of the deep ecologists that calls for empathy for nonhuman nature. Naess appeals to move from egocentricity to eco-centricity. Egocentrism is a problem. Mary Midgley gives the reference of Joseph Butler’s view according to whom prioritizing the interest of human being is not bad, Quoting Butler, Mary Midgley says, “The trouble with human beings is not really that they love themselves too much; they ought to love themselves more. The trouble is, simply that they don’t love others enough” (103).

Naess' formulation of the idea of ecological-Self is a suggestion to move from egocentric position of human centrism to eco-centric position of deep ecology.

Anthropocentrism is viewed in diverse ways. The extreme version of anthropocentrism says that human being is the centre of the universe and thereby the only species of moral consideration. Non-human beings have no consciousness and they are only meant for human use. From the perspective of environmental ethics, this is essentially a narrow version of anthropocentrism. Deep ecology is justified in targeting this version of human centrism that is said to have prevalent in the western industrialised culture. Another version of anthropocentrism is found to have emerged only in the last century realising the need for preservation of nature for the benefit of human species. This is the broad version of anthropocentrism where there is a concern for nature. It speaks in favour of caring for nature as it is necessary for human existence. An outright rejection of this thesis is not feasible for an ecocentric theoretician. Deep ecology's overall target on anthropocentrism, one may say, loses some grip in this position. But idealistically, deep ecology is much deeper than the objective of preserving nature for human welfare only. It is only shallow ecology compared to Naess'.

The phrase "sustainable development," for example, comes under anthropocentrism. The very concept of sustainable development, an inter-disciplinary concept, has emerged out of numerous environmental movements. The World Commission on Environment and Development defines sustainable development as the "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." In this view, though nature is viewed from

the perspective of instrumental value for the benefit of human beings, yet there is an urge for developing a harmonious relation with other living beings. It aims at addressing a number of interrelated global issues, such as poverty, inequality, hunger, environmental degradation etc. A member of the camp of sustainable development may be free from many allegations made by social justice schools of environmentalism since an equity issue is the underlying principle of this camp. There is the difference between “equity issue” and “egalitarian issue” and Naess prefers the latter which he believes is absent in the “narrow interpretation of sustainable development”. Naess suggests going with the wider interpretation. He writes:

In a major victory for the global ecology movement, the World Commission for Environment and Development announced clearly that sustainable development unconditionally requires ecological sustainability. The consequences of this admission are far reaching because ecological sustainability requires significant economic, technological social, political, and cultural changes in most of all countries. Here I shall first dwell on a terminological consequence: The term developing country automatically implies “ecologically developed country.” (“Sustainability...” 295)

The background of sustainable development is, in fact, a moral thesis of qualitative and quantitative equilibrium. In this interpretation, the quantitative equilibrium implies sustainable economic progress for all. The Naessian recommendation of “quality of life” is inclusive of this qualitative equilibrium. The economics of sustainable development has a normative goal of meeting the need of the poor people of third world countries. This version of anthropocentrism offers a specific ethical criterion that the needs of the present are not to be satisfied at the expense of future needs. Sustainable development is positively penned down by Naess with suggestions of some terminological modifications. One can say, Naess makes an

attempt to shift to ecocentrism from an anthropocentric action plan. For example, Naess believes that there is ecological sustainability if and only if the richness and diversity of life-forms are sustained. In this connection, he plausibly seeks for a substitution of the term “development”. In his consideration, “a development is ecologically sustainable if and only if there is a long-term trend that ensures or that may justifiably be considered to ensure ecological sustainability” (298). Of course Naess does not clearly explain that his idea of moving towards ecological sustainability is a shift to deep ecological ideal.

One can say that deep ecology’s concept of the fulfilment of “vital needs” has a theoretical affinity with the idea of “meeting the present need” of the camp of sustainable development. Naess suggests “there is a sustainable development if and only if, it meets the vital needs of the present day human population without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own vital needs” (294). One can find a meeting ground of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism in the Naessian interpretation of ecological sustainability. In fact, anthropocentrism and biocentrism are two overlapping concepts. Even if this dichotomy is considered as a polarised view from any perspective, then also said polarisation melts down if the Naessian modification of the idea of sustainable development is taken into consideration. Or one can say that the Naessian ecological sustainability is a modified version of biocentrism.

Change in public policy is not sufficient to change the attitude and practices of people. Naess tries to change the attitude of human beings towards the natural environment. His ecocentric philosophy suggests one to think deeply where one can see oneself as the part of the ontological layer of ecological-Self. He calls on one’s desire to live in harmony with the nonhuman natural system where one is an inextricable part and

to live in symbiosis with the other species of this system. He also formulates platform principles as a part of one's action in day to day life as well as limitations and responsibilities to the human.

### **5.6 In Defense of Deep Ecology:**

The aim of Naess is “not a slight reform of our present society, but a *substantial reorientation of our whole civilisation*” (*Ecology* 45). This objective has made deep ecology “deep” since it demands a radical cultural shift in the way one views the world and one's place in it. In seeking a “substantial reorientation,” deep ecology stands in a radical end of a spectrum of environment-related worldview.

A joyful life is a part of mutual joyous existence. A mutual co-existence is all-embracing of happiness and sorrow, not exclusive of “others”, but inclusive of “mixed communities” of human and nonhuman life forms. For example, the conflict between wild animals and human beings has become a common phenomenon in all parts of the globe. Wild animals have frequently come out of their natural habitats to residential areas in search of foods. Crops and human lives have been lost as a result of the wild invasion. On the other hand, many such animals are being killed by the enraged villagers in countering the attack. Increasing human population and their rehabilitation have become a concern since it is causing the decrease of wilderness. This concern leads to ignoring the destructiveness of human activity in nature because protection of human lives always gets priorities. There stands a high demand of the introspection to see how human beings are to play their role in such situations. This introspection can motivate one to idealize a state of wilderness which is devoid of human intervention, a holistic belief that “in wildness is the preservation of the world.”

Deep ecology is a call for recognising the expanded-Self. An accidental fall of an injured rhinoceros in a marshy area in Kaziranga National Sanctuary that causes the animal a couple of days trapping before its painful death could bring a mass consciousness reminding one the Naessian experience of the agony of the flea. More than ethical sense, one can find the consciousness of oneness for this nonhuman being. Maybe one is not conscious of a wide ecological-Self, but one gets stuck to the suffering of those animals and starts identifying with the suffering as if they are one's own. It gives an organismic experience that if any part of the body is in a problem the whole body is in the problem. Deep ecology is rooted in this conviction of identification. This sort of belief can relieve the supporters of deep ecology that they are not in a utopian world.

The most significant allegation that deep ecology has to meet is that it is misanthropic. Bookchin and Guha have made this charge from different perspectives. Similarly, Watson charges deep ecology's non-anthropocentrism as anti-anthropocentrism. But after going through all the discussion, it is observed that deep ecology is neither anti-anthropocentric nor misanthropic. Therefore, at best, Naess' position can be said to be non-anthropocentric only. Failure of anthropocentrism is a prime motivation to move towards non-anthropocentrism. If deep ecology is to be characterised properly then it is in terms of ecocentrism. In search of the root cause of the environmental crisis, Naess concludes with a default cause in the anthropocentric behaviour of man. He does it in consideration of the limit of ethics in the writings of the most of the academics of western history. Nonhuman life forms don't possess human cognitive capacity. Naess' non-anthropocentric thesis rests on the conviction that all forms of life deserve moral consideration irrespective of cognitive capacity. In the

words of Naess, “in Protagoras’ statement about *homo mensura* nothing is said about what is measured. Man may be measure of all things in the sense that only a human being has a measuring rod, but what he measures he may find to be greater than himself and his survival” (“A Defense...” 125). The apparent ecological crisis demands one to review and recognise the differences between human and nonhuman life forms without placing first "above" the second as the first step of substantial reorientation.

Naess shows his concern to human beings with the interpretation of realistic egalitarianism. His ecocentrism does not undermine the status of human beings. His citation of numerous examples of going with an egalitarianism index in a realistic situation is to be addressed before making a straight allegation against deep ecology. Naess does not make a plain generalization regarding the position of human being as equal with nonhuman beings in the web of life. He simply shows his advocacy in valuing all life forms. It needs to be mentioned that Naess takes the support of biological preservationist Mysterud, nonviolent activist Gandhi as well as others to deal with a realistic situation.

The focus of Naess, unlike the social justice schools of environmentalism, is going beyond the periphery of the discussion of man’s world only. Neither of social ecology, ecofeminism and third world critics can outright disagree with the position that “environmental crisis is basically a man-made crisis.” The strength of deep ecology lies in this belief. Similarly, Naess and his supporters cannot outright disagree with the importance of addressing the problems of social justice for realizing a deep ecological consciousness. The supporters of environmental protection through social justice have succeeded in correlating these issues. As its strength lies in its dynamism as a

continuous process, instead of any attempt to eliminate anthropocentric thought from the human psyche, deep ecology needs to focus on the importance walking on a roadmap of anthropocentrism to ecocentrism, a tread that makes one realize that to be human is to be part of nature. At the same time, it should take a note to address the social issues in its suggestion to be matured for reaching an ecological consciousness which Naess believes capable of yielding positive intuition of joy. Addressing the issues of social justice schools of thought implies the acceptability of a modified-Naess. The liberal tendencies of Naess to respect others' belief and modification of platform principle suggest his good-will gesture to deal with social issues in living a deep ecological way of life.

A view can change the world. A new worldview means dealing with how humans experience their place in the world, a surrounding medium that sustains our being. Deep ecology wishes to immerse itself in nature where the value of the ecosystem takes precedence over individual existence. And deep ecology reasonably states that mankind needs substantial reorientation because all other approaches to protect the environment have proved to be failed. Mankind needs a reawakening of a *deep* approach to solve this *deep* problem, a shift from *green-talk* to *green-walk*.

\*\*\*

**Works cited:**

- Ayer, A. J. "A Reply to Arne Naess." *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy*. Ed. Nina Witoszek and Andrew Brennan. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 40-44. 1999. Print.
- Brennan, Andrew. "Comment: Pluralism and Deep Ecology." *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy*. Ed. Nina Witoszek and Andrew Brennan. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 175-179. 1999. Print.
- Chakraborty, N. N. *In Defense of Intrinsic Value of Nature*. Kolkata: New Age, 2004. Print.
- Clark, John P. "A Dialogue with Arne Naess on Social Ecology and Deep Ecology (1988-1997)!" *The Trumpeter*, Volume 26, Number 2. 20-39. 2010. Print.
- Crist, Eileen. "Social Ecology." *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics. and Philosophy*. Ed. J. Baird Callicott and Robert Frodeman. USA: Gale Cengage Learning, 253-258. 2009. Print.
- Dobson, A. *Green Political Thought*. London: Unwin Hyman. 1990. Print.
- Eckersley, Robyn. *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an Ecocentric Approach*, Albany, New York: State University of New York Press. 1992. Print.
- Elders, Fons, "Arne Naess, a Philosopher and a Mystic: A Commentary on the Dialogue between Alfred Ayer and Arne Naess." *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy*. Ed. Nina Witoszek and Andrew Brennan. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 45-49. 1999. Print.

Guha, D. "Ramchandra Guha and Vandana Shiva on Environment and Environmental Crises: A Critical Appreciation." *Environmental Ethics: Indian Perspectives*. Ed. D. N. Tiwari and A. Mishra. Varanasi: Dept. of Philosophy and Religion BHU, 133-52. 2012. Print.

Harman, Graham. *Tool-Being: Heidegger and the Metaphysics of Objects*. Chicago: Open Court. 2002. Print.

Keller. David R. "Deep Ecology." *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics. and Philosophy*. Eds. J. Baird Callicott and Robert Frodeman. USA: Gale Cengage Learning. 206-211. 2009. Print.

Keller. David R. "Deep Ecology." *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics. and Philosophy*. Ed. J. Baird Callicott and Robert Frodeman. USA: Gale Cengage Learning, 206-211. 2009. Print.

Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac*. New York: Ballantine Books. 1949. Print.

Lie, Svein Anders Noer and Fern Wickson. "The Relational Ontology of Deep Ecology: A dispositional alternative to intrinsic value?" URL: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295507788>

Mathews, Freya. "Deep ecology. *A companion to Environmental Philosophy*. Ed. Dale. Jamieson. UK: Blackwell Publishers, 218-232. 2001. Print.

Midgley, Mary. "The End of Anthropocentrism." *Philosophy and the Natural Environment*. Ed. Robin Attfield and Andrew Belsey. New York: Cambridge University Press, 103-112. 1994. Print.

- Morton, Timothy. *Ecology without Nature Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. London: Harvard University Press. 2007. Print.
- Naess, Arne. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-range Ecology Movement: A Summary." *Inquiry*, 16:1, 95 — 100. 1973. Print.
- . "The World of Concrete Contents." *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy and the Social Sciences*. 28: 417–428. 1985. Print.
- . "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World." *The Trumpeter* 4(3): 35–42. 1987. Print.
- . *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Trans. David Rothenberg, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989. Print.
- . "Intuition, Intrinsic Value and Deep Ecology." *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy*. Ed. Nina Witoszek and Andrew Brennan. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 166-170. 1999. Print.
- . "A Defense of Deep Ecology Movement." *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy*. Ed. Nina Witoszek and Andrew Brennan. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 121-126. 1999. Print.
- . "Sustainability! The Integral Part". *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess*. Ed. Alan Drengson and Bill Devall. Berkeley: Counterpoint, 293-301. 2008. Print.

- Passmore, John. *Man's Responsibility for Nature: Ecological Problems and Western Traditions*. London: Duckworth. 1974. Print
- Reed, Peter. "Man Apart: An Alternative to the Self-Realization Approach." *Philosophical Dialogues: Arne Naess and the Progress of Ecophilosophy*. Ed. Nina Witoszek and Andrew Brennan. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 181- 197. 1999. Print.
- Rothenberg, David. "A Platform of Deep Ecology." *The Environmentalist* 7(3): 185–190. 1987. Print.
- Routley, Richard. "Is There a Need for a New, an Environmental, Ethic?" *Proceedings of The Fifteenth World Congress of Philosophy* 1: 205–210. 1973. Print.
- Sessions, George. "Wildness, Cyborgs, and Our Ecological Future: Reassessing the Deep Ecology Movement." *Trumpeter*. Volume 22, Number 2. 121-182. 2006. Print.
- Sarkar, Sahotra. *Biodiversity and Environmental Philosophy: An Introduction*. UK: Cambridge University Press. 2005. Print.
- Tokar, Brian. "Exploring the New Ecologies: Social Ecology, Deep Ecology and the Future of Green Political Thought." *Alternatives*. Vol. 15 No. 4. 1988. Print.
- Zimmerman, David. "Arne Naess, Celebrant of Diversity." *Trumpeter*, Vol. 9. No. 2. 1992. URL:[trumpeter.athabascau.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/437/716](http://trumpeter.athabascau.ca/index.php/trumpet/article/view/437/716)