

ECOPHILOSOPHY III

George Sessions

Philosophy

Sierra College

Rocklin, California 95677 USA

April, 1981

Interest in ecophilosophical issues (so-called environmental ethics, ecological consciousness and ecological resistance, and the deep ecology movement) has taken a quantum jump forward in the last several years. ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS journal has now become a regular sounding board and outlet for the latest thinking in ecophilosophy. INQUIRY regularly publishes important scholarly ecophilosophy papers. If the Ecophilosophy Newsletter is still to perform a function, it may be to provide a more chatty informal commentary on recent developments in ecophilosophy, and to try to draw together some of the latest developments in a highly amorphous and diverse area. I would like to express my thanks to Ed Abbey, Bill Devall, Arne Naess, Gary Snyder, Richard "Red" Watson, and many others who have provided suggestions and encouragement for the newsletter. In this issue, I would like to focus on international developments in ecophilosophical theorizing, groups, and conferences.

ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS journal (hereafter referred to as EEJ) is now in its third year of publication. The editor, Eugene Hargrove, has gone out of his way to insure that a very broad spectrum of approaches has been represented. Although this has occasionally resulted in papers of only marginal relevance to contemporary ecophilosophical theorizing, nevertheless the overall quality of the journal is excellent. With the publication of Alan Drengson's "Shifting Paradigms" (V2N3, 1980), the issue of a major social paradigm shift and the existence of deep ecology was introduced to the pages of the journal. Baird Callicott's "Animal Liberation" (V2N4, 1980) is also an important, forceful paper which extends John Rodman's critique of the animal liberation movement. In the most recent issue (V3N1, 1981), the leading animal liberation theorist, Tom Regan, argues for an ecosystem ethic in "The Nature and Possibility of an Environmental Ethic". The notes section of EEJ does a good job of listing recent books and anthologies in ecophilosophy, up-coming conferences, and academic ecophilosophy programs leading to the M.A. Gene Hargrove has done an excellent job and it is good to know that he will continue as editor through the recent change in ownership and transfer of the journal to the University of Georgia. For a subscription, send \$15 to EEJ c/o Philosophy Dept. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NMex 87131.

INQUIRY, an interdisciplinary journal of philosophy and the social sciences, has Arne Naess as its founding and consulting editor. Naess first described the shallow and the deep ecology movements in a journal article in 1973. Those doing research in ecophilosophy should check the back issues of INQUIRY from about 1970 to the present. In addition to his ground-breaking work in ecophilosophy, Naess has also published important work to overcome the positivist "value free" orientation of modern social science; see e.g., "Notes on the Methodology of Normative Systems," METHODOLOGY & SCIENCE, V10N1, 1977 (Haarlem, Netherlands), and Naess, "Comments on Feyerabend" in INQUIRY.

THIS NEWSLETTER MAY BE FREELY REPRODUCED AND DISTRIBUTED.

INQUIRY is published by Universitetsforlaget, P.O. Box 2959, Tøyen, Oslo 6, Norway - P.O. Box 258, Irvington-on-Hudson, New York 10553, USA. Individual subscriptions are \$16/yr. Another good source of ecophilosophy papers over the last decade has been the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW (environmental editor Joe Meeker). Meeker is also head of the New Natural Philosophy graduate program of International College, and director of the Strong Center (2355 Hearst Ave., Berkeley, CA 94709). The Strong Center recently sponsored a series of radio broadcasts in the Bay Area of interviews with environmental thinkers such as Garrett Hardin, Paul Shepard, David Brower, Lynn White, John Lilly, etc. Write Meeker for commercial copies of these tapes and for his newsletter "Minding the Earth".

Another ecophilosophical journal is ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW edited by John Opie. Subscriptions are \$11/yr from ER, College Hall, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA 15219. PAVE is an environmental newsletter edited by Gene Bammel, West Virginia University, Dept of Forestry, 325 Percival Hall, Morgantown, W. VA 26506.

The Wilderness Psychology Group consists of professional psychologists, Wilderness "managers" and others. The newsletter is edited by Lance Olsen, Dept of Psych, College of Great Falls, Great Falls, Montana 59405 and is available for \$8/yr.

The anthology of papers from the 1980 Univ. of Denver conference on THE HUMANITIES AND ECOLOGICAL CONSCIOUSNESS has now been published: J. Donald Hughes and Robert Schultz (eds) ECOLOGICAL CONSCIOUSNESS, 1981. For a copy send \$16.75 plus postage to University Press of America, Customer Service Dept, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, Maryland 20801.

A national scholarly John Muir conference was held in Nov 1980 at the University of the Pacific. About 50 Muir scholars and others were present and, as it turns out, about five biographies on Muir are in progress or ready for publication. One is being written by Frederick Turner (author of BEYOND GEOGRAPHY); Michael Cohen, English, S. Utah State Univ. has a biography near completion which brings out Muir's Taoist orientation. Bill Devall read his paper "John Muir as Deep Ecologist" which is to be published by ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW. Univ. of the Pacific now has perhaps the largest collection of the Muir papers and, as a result of the conference, publishes a John Muir newsletter. For a subscription, send \$6 to Muir Newsletter, Holt-Atherton Pacific Center for Western Studies, Univ. of Pacific, Stockton, CA 95211 USA. There has been a continuing battle to keep the national parks from turning into resorts under the onslaught of "industrial tourism" and the "recreational demands" of the urban mentality. In a book now being widely read and discussed among park and wilderness administrators, Joseph Sax (MOUNTAINS WITHOUT HANDRAILS, Univ of Michigan Press, 1980) argues that the founders of the national park and wilderness idea, Thoreau, Muir and others, saw the parks and wilderness as places for spiritual regeneration and ecological consciousness raising as well as sanctuaries for other species and undisturbed ecosystems. Sax claims that Americans should defer to this vision and resist further commercialization and development of the parks. There is a particularly upsetting description of the rather cynical and vulgar attempt on the part of the Forest Service to "manage" people visiting campgrounds and wilderness areas (pp. 98-101). All of this is a far cry from the vision of deep ecology and of Raymond Dasmann's description of "ecosystem people" who have always lived in the equivalent of a wilderness national park.

Michael Zimmerman, who has written a number of important papers on Heidegger's rejection of technological society and his ecophilosophical concerns, has just received a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to write a monograph on Heidegger's deep ecology orientation.

The rapidly emerging intellectual-social movement variously known as the New Age-Coevolution-Aquarian Conspiracy deserves the attention of deep ecology theorists (for a description of this movement, see Marilyn Ferguson, *THE AQUARIAN CONSPIRACY*, 1980). While proclaiming a major social paradigm shift, and referring to the spirituality of Teilhard de Chardin and the Gaia hypothesis (the earth as organism), nevertheless their view of the planet seems extremely exploitive and destructive of ecosystems. Harold Gilliam, who writes the environmental column for the *SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER-CHRONICLE*, seems dazzled by this movement and by ideas for "reindustrialization" while also writing sympathetically of the more deep-ecology oriented works of Theodore Roszak, especially *PERSON/PLANET*, 1978. California governor Jerry Brown also seems to be split between the New Age orientation of his Stanford Research Institute advisers and the deep ecology of Gary Snyder. Bill Devall has submitted a critique of New Age thinking to *EEJ* and my review of Bonifazi, *THE SOUL OF THE WORLD* is also a critique of the anthropocentrism of Teilhard and New Age thinking (to appear in an upcoming issue of *EEJ*).

A wilderness preservation group calling itself *EARTH FIRST* sent out its first announcement in Nov. 1980. Its steering committee composed largely of ex-staff members of reform environmental organizations, seems inspired by Ed Abbey's *Monkey Wrench Gang*, and plans to take more direct action along the lines of *Greenpeace*. For membership and a newsletter, send \$10 to Susan Morgan, PO Box 536, Breckenridge, Colorado 80424.

The philosopher of science, Henryk Skolimowski, has established *ECO-PHILOSOPHY Centres* in both the United States and the United Kingdom. Skolimowski held an ecophilosophy conference at Dartington Hall, Totnes, England in July 1980. He is also holding another conference this summer in England, and is planning a major international conference possibly in London for the summer of 1983. *Alternative Futures* will be publishing his book *ECOPHILOSOPHY* this year. Write him c/o 21 Oak Village, London N.W. 5 and/or 1002 Granger, Ann Arbor, Michigan USA 48104.

The journalist, Roland de Miller (204, rue de Vaugirard, 75015 Paris France), has been compiling ecophilosophic bibliographies and publishing manuscripts. He plans to translate my bibliographic essay "Shallow and Deep Ecology" (in Hughes and Schultz, *ECOLOGICAL CONSCIOUSNESS*) as, "Environnementalisme superficiel et écologisme radical = panorama de la littérature philosophique anglo-américaine" and publish it as a manuscript this spring. There is work going on in German universities in deep ecology at this time. Norway has been a hot bed of ecophilosophical theorizing and activity since the early 1970's centering around Arne Naess at the University of Oslo and Sigmund Kvaloy at the Oslo School of Architecture. For a discussion of deep ecology theorizing in Japan, see James Whitehill's paper "Ecological Consciousness and Japanese Perspectives" in Hughes & Schultz, *ECOLOGICAL CONSCIOUSNESS*.

In Canada, the main deep ecology theorizing is occurring at the University of Victoria with Alan Drengson and William Leiss and at York University in Ontario with John Livingston and Neil Evernden. For information on the deep ecology plan of study, write Livingston or Evernden c/o York Univ. Faculty of Environmental Studies, 4700 Keele St, Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3J2R2. Livingston's new book was just published (*THE FALLACY OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION*, McClelland & Stewart Ltd. 1981) and he arrives at many of the same conclusions as Ehrenfeld in *THE ARROGANCE*

OF HUMANISM (Ehrenfeld's book is now out in an Oxford/Galaxy paperback with a new preface 1981). Everndon wrote a very valuable paper on ecological inter-penetration ("Beyond Ecology: Self, Place, and the Pathetic Fallacy," NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Dec 1978). Recently, Everndon has expanded these ideas into a book which provides a phenomenological approach to deep ecology; this should prove to be a milestone for deep ecology theorizing and understanding (OUT OF PLACE: ENVIRONMENTALISM IN TRANSITION, being considered by Univ. of Toronto Press).

Buddhist groups around the world are showing an interest in deep ecology, specifically to my knowledge, in California, Hawaii, New York, Poland, and Australia. The Buddhist Peace Fellowship Newsletter (P.O. Box 805, Makawao, Hawaii 96768) carried a discussion of deep ecology in its May 1980 edition. John Seed, Bodhi Farm, The Channon, NSW 2480 Australia, is distributing deep ecology manuscripts. Robert Aitken recently read a paper entitled "Gandhi, Dōgen and Deep Ecology" at the East-West Religions in Encounter conference at the Univ. of Hawaii, June 1980. It was published in ZERO, Vol. IV, 1980. While modern Buddhists are again becoming aware of the necessity of expanding one's sense of identification beyond humans to the non-human world, the California eco-poet Gary Snyder has been developing deep ecology from a Taoist/Zen Buddhist/American Indian perspective for many years. The depth of Snyder's position becomes apparent in his most recent publication, THE REAL WORK: Interviews and Talks, 1964-79, New Directions, 1980.

In addition to the United States and Norway, the other major hotbed of ecophilosophical theorizing and social activism has been Australia. A major political force in Australia is the Green Alliance, Box 158, P.O. Paddington, Sydney, N.S.W. 2021 Australia. One can join and receive the newsletter by sending A\$5 (US\$5.60) to them.

Some of the fruits of Australian ecophilosophizing by professional philosophers occurs in the anthology, ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY, edited by Don Mannison, Michael McRobbie, and Richard Routley, 1980. This anthology may be ordered from the Philosophy Department, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra, 2600 ACT, Australia (A\$6.70; US\$8.50).

According to the introduction to this anthology, ecophilosophy got its start in Australia as the result of Val and Richard Routley. Routley read a paper "IS There a Need for a New, an Environmental, Ethic?" to the XVth World Congress in Philosophy at Varna, Bulgaria in 1973 (published in the proceedings, Vol. I). Also "around 1973 (the Routleys) began to privately circulate intellectually provocative papers discussing what they still see as the need for a radical extension of the standardly accepted human domain of our various meta-ethics ... These privately circulated papers, not surprisingly, generated philosophical discussion and comment throughout the Australian philosophical community. Equally unsurprising is the fact that their views were widely misunderstood, oftentimes by those who took themselves to be in agreement." Adding to the fuel of controversy was Australian John Passmore's MAN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR NATURE (1974) which "provided a historical matrix in which the debates could be conducted." Australian Peter Singer's ANIMAL LIBERATION (1975) could probably date the beginnings of the animal liberation movement. "By the end of 1975 Australian philosophy was a 'hotbed' of argument about environmental matters." A national conference on environmental ethics, organized by Mannison, was held at the University of Queensland in 1977. "Another conference was held in 1978 at the Australian National University and was organized by McRobbie and R. Routley. This anthology is made up of the papers given at these conferences.

It should be noted that two Australian philosophers who have commented on an ecological interpretation of Spinoza's system are E.M. Curley ("Man and Nature in Spinoza" in J. Wetlesen, SPINOZA'S PHILOSOPHY OF MAN, 1978) and Genevieve Lloyd (Spinoza's Environmental Ethics" in INQUIRY, Vol 23, No 3, 1980).

The Australian anthology is dominated by two long papers by the Routleys -- "Human Chauvinism and Environmental Ethics" (HCEE, pp. 96-189) and "Social Theories, Self Management and Environmental Problems" (SSE, pp. 217-332). HCEE developed out of the 1973 Varna paper and has been substantially revised and expanded several times. Routley's influence has extended to North American ecophilosophizing; HCEE was read at the Univ. of Indiana, Univ. of Victoria, B.C. and Notre Dame in 1974 (see the Notre Dame Univ. Press environmental anthology, Goodpaster & Sayre (eds) ETHICS AND PROBLEMS OF THE 21st CENTURY, 1979). I will comment on the Routley papers.

The first sections of HCEE consist of an excellent critique of human chauvinism or anthropocentrism. Beginning with section 4, there is a critique of John Rodman's influential and important analysis of environmentalism and his ecological sensibility and resistance position. (Rodman, Liberation of Nature?" INQUIRY, 1977; "Theory and Practice in the Environmental Movement" THE SEARCH FOR VALUES IN A CHANGING WORLD, 1978). My critique of Rodman, which I am now amending, appears in ECOPHILOSOPHY II, 1979.

There is general agreement that Resource Conservation and Development is radically anthropocentric and thus untenable (HCEE p. 135). The problems come with Rodman's characterization of Wilderness Preservation and Nature Moralism. Rodman sees Wilderness Preservationists as concerned primarily with preserving high quality "scenery", esthetics, valuable for religious mystical human experiences. If this were true then taken at only this level, this would be merely another form of human chauvinism, hence shallow ecology. Routley agrees and argues that wilderness should be saved for its intrinsic value which is "the main reason for not unduly interfering with it" -- a non-anthropocentric reason (p. 138). Rodman is apparently unaware that Thoreau and Muir do take this non-anthropocentric stance (see Bill Devall, "John Muir as Deep Ecologist").

Rodman's description of Nature Moralism takes in a wide sweep of positions, as Routley notes, from extended utilitarianism to the assignment of rights to non-humans (p. 139ff). Rodman originally intended this to be a critique of animal liberation and Christopher Stone's legal rights, but recently he has made it even more sweeping by including Naess' formulation of deep ecology; "the world of the Nature Moralism is characterized by an apparent egalitarianism". Routley rightly calls attention to the "wide sweep" of what he calls the Moral Extensions view; intrinsic value (or "rights") is not distributed uniformly to all entities by animal liberationists and others, whereas on the deep ecology formulation of biocentric egalitarianism, it is. This is the crucial point over which both Rodman and Routley mistake what Naess is up to. Naess' position is not a Moral Extensions view; it is not "an extension of conventional Western ethics" (Routley, p. 139). By recognizing equal intrinsic value in all entities, one has strained conventional ethical theory past the breaking point. Biocentric egalitarianism is essentially a rejection of human chauvinistic ethical theory and the criteria used to ascribe rights and value; it is a reductio-ad-absurdum of conventional ethics. Biocentric egalitarianism is essentially a statement of non-anthropocentrism. Naess' original formulation lends itself to misunderstanding in that he speaks of the equal right of all things to live and blossom into their own unique forms of self-realization. Naess makes it clear ("Self-realization in Mixed Communities of Humans, Bears, Sheep, and Wolves," INQUIRY, Vol. 22, 1979) that he is not proposing a "rights" theory in the sense of contemporary ethical theory, but is using the word 'right' in a

metaphorical or everyday sense. Rodman himself seemed to endorse this non-technical use of "rights" when he claimed ("Liberation of Nature?" p. 109) that "to affirm that 'natural objects' have 'rights' is symbolically to affirm that ALL NATURAL ENTITIES (INCLUDING HUMANS) HAVE INTRINSIC WORTH SIMPLY BY VIRTUE OF BEING, AND BEING WHAT THEY ARE." This again is an affirmation of non-anthropocentrism. Why Rodman changed his position is not totally clear.

In a very real sense, then, the search for an environmental ethics, in the conventional modern sense (which Routley wants to endorse, pp. 145, 181) seems wrong-headed and fruitless. Both Curley and Lloyd go astray in their criticism of Spinoza's "environmental ethics" on this point. They argue that although Spinoza's metaphysics is non-anthropocentric, the ethics is anthropocentric. In his comments on Lloyd's paper ("Environmental Ethics and Spinoza's Ethics," INQUIRY, Vol. 23, No. 3, 1980) Naess no doubt shocked some Spinoza scholars and environmental ethicists as well by pointing out that Spinoza does not have an ethical system in the conventional sense: "The opinion that (Spinoza) is one of the greatest opponents of moralism that ever lived seems not altogether unreasonable." And he further asks, "Do we need to shift to moralizing in order to find a satisfactory metaphysics of environmentalism?"

The search then, as I understand it, is not for an environmental ethics, but for ecological consciousness. This ecological consciousness can be facilitated by a non-anthropocentric metaphysical view of the world such as Spinoza's, but the consciousness and the ways of life which flow from it are the essential thing. Ecological consciousness is the result of a psychological expansion of the narrowly encapsulated sense of self as isolated ego, through identification with all humans (species chauvinism), to finally an awareness of identification and interpenetration of self with ecosystem and biosphere. Spinoza, like some Eastern and primitive societies, provides us with a metaphysics in which the development of this expansion of self to Self is embedded. To the extent to which humans have dignity and are to be revered, the biosphere has dignity and is to be revered as aspects of God (this is the theme of Roszak's PERSON/PLANET). Lloyd puts the point well: Spinoza's pantheistic metaphysics of interrelatedness "gives metaphysical content (to the idea) of perceiving the world as my body. But it is a matter of transcending a distorted perception of our true position in nature ..." (p. 308). Routley rejects Leopold's "land ethic" as a version of Moral Extensions. I find it more charitable to read Leopold in terms of a psychological expansion of self into the ecosystem; a statement of non-anthropocentrism even though it is couched in moral language (Routley, pp. 110, 177).

As Aldous Huxley points out (PERENNIAL PHILOSOPHY, p. 1) "In studying the Perennial Philosophy we can begin either at the bottom, with practice and morality; or at the top, with a consideration of metaphysical truths; or, finally, in the middle, where mind and matter ... have their meeting place in human psychology." Spinoza goes from metaphysics to psychology. Rodman disavows metaphysics and begins with psychology; a phenomenology of the ecological self or consciousness. Both approaches are legitimate although the phenomenological approach runs the risk of anthropocentrism. Rodman does a good job of laying out ecological consciousness although Routley criticizes Rodman's concern with self as anthropocentric. Other criticisms Routley makes of Rodman I find unfounded (the microcosm-macrocosm idea). Routley feels the need to go beyond Rodman and deep ecology because he thinks "an environmental ethic can be as tough, practical, rational and secular as prevailing Western ethics" (p. 178). I find this neither desirable nor necessary, and perhaps not possible. When Routley provides a psychological grounding for anarchism as the true ecological community (SSE) he is right on the money.

A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON ECOPHILOSOPHY IN THE 1980's.
Bill Devall, Dept of Sociology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA 95521

In April 1980, politicians, pundits, scholars, and leaders of environmental organizations were celebrating Earthday X, the tenth anniversary of the "environmental decade". One year later, with Ronald Reagan in the White House and James Watt as Secretary of Interior there is a pervasive sense of malaise among those who worked so diligently for reform environmentalism. Reagan and Watt call for "balance" between "environment" and "economic growth" after only ten years of reform environmentalism. Ecology, ecosystem, sustainable yields of renewable resources, and clean air and clean water are now, in the Newspeak of the Reagan years, declared non-problems, non-words.

Even with the strenuous attempts to reform the political system through NEPA, the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Acts, establishment of a few new national parks and designated wilderness areas, there was much lost ground during the 1970's; many forests were clearcut, many species became extinct, much land was converted to monocultures of plants designed and tended by humans for human marketplaces. In general, the urban-industrial "artificial environment" rolled grandly along.

Now, every piece of reform environmental legislation passed at State and Federal levels in America during the 60's and 70's is under attack by an arrogant administration and a President who declares that "trees cause pollution" and "once you've seen one Redwood tree, you've seen them all."

All the members of Reagan's cabinet are Christians, and James Watt, a member of the Assembly of God, has explicitly stated the Christian position that it is morally wrong to "leave the back forty unplanted". Man-domination of nature is proclaimed as the official doctrine of the State. The major corporations from Exxon to IBM are now the saviors of the "economy".

But the Age of Ecology will not go away just because ecology is banned in Washington, D.C. The desperation of those who urge "produce, produce, produce" and "get America moving again" is apparent even to the proverbial man in the street. The anomalies are more and more glaring. The more the political hype, the less the substance of the argument for continued rapid growth in the Gross National Product and the human population. The paradoxes are more jarring. The greater the failures of the technological fix, the more desperate many people cling to technological optimism. The more the preachers talk of anthropocentric power-tripping over nature, the quicker the ground is shifting under them.

New paradigms are emerging. Perhaps the best strategy for intellectuals is to explore the contradictions of the contemporary dominant paradigm, the anomalous trends in contemporary societies and the shifts in behavior which already indicate an end to the arrogant ideology of a totally man-dominated Earth. John Rodman, the perceptive political scientist, suggests such a strategy for intellectuals at the conclusion of his article on paradigm shifting in political science (see his article in the special issue of AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST, Vol 24, No 1, Sept 1980 devoted to Ecology and the Social Sciences: An Emerging Paradigm).

Rodman concludes "Just as the real revolutions (e.g., the Industrial Revolution as a contrast to the French Revolution) are made up of small, apparently 'incremental' changes that eventually bring a qualitatively new pattern into being and into consciousness, so the new paradigm is more apt to be discovered than to be legislated. Let me give the last word to a writer whom I have used as a convenient foil (William Ophuls, ECOLOGY AND THE POLITICS OF SCARCITY, 1977) — 'To a very large extent the transition will evolve, instead of being created by theorizing and social planning ... The answers that emerge will then be ratified by theory.'"

Urban intellectuals, especially those in academia, however, have a special responsibility to help legitimate, through intellectual justification, the transition to a deep ecology paradigm. Urban chauvinist intellectuals, as Theodore Roszak brillinantly states in the epilogue of PERSON/PLANET (1978), have for the past three hundred years shaped the "modern mind". They now have responsibility to help in the "creative disintegration" of modernity. "What urban intellectuals must now do is to impose upon themselves a planetary sense of consciousness that bind their loyalty to the living variety of the planet. In that act of renunciation, they may not only make their peace with the planet; they may also discover the true and essential city that now lies suffocating beneath the dead weight of megalopolis".

In the remainder of this newsletter essay, I will review some of the major themes by social scientists in the emerging deep ecology paradigm and rival paradigms.

The most important and vital work by social scientists on paradigm shifting to an ecological paradigm has been done by William Catton, Jr. and Riley Dunlap, both in the sociology department at Washington State University, USA. I have mentioned the special issue of AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST edited by Riley Dunlap. Dunlap and Catton's article entitled "New Ecological Paradigm for Post-Exuberant Sociology" contrasts what they call the "Human Exemptionalist Paradigm" and the "New Ecological Paradigm". Comparison of major assumptions of the dominant Western worldview, sociology's version of the "Human Exemptionalist Paradigm" and the NEP are seen in Table 1 reproduced below. Other articles in this special issue of ABS discuss ecological paradigms for political science (John Rodman), economics (Hermann Daly), anthropology (Donald Hardesty) and geography (Daniel Luten).

A significant gap is the lack of articles in this anthology, or in other recent anthologies, dealing with an ecological paradigm for psychology. Major writers from ASne Naess, Theodore Roszak, Jacob Needleman, to Gary Snyder discuss the importance of cultivating what I label "Ecological Consciousness" (see Devall, "Ecological Consciousness and Ecological Resisting: Guidelines for Comprehension and Research," paper prepared for Pacific Sociological Meetings, Portland, Oregon, March 1981). But very few psychologists seem interested in moving away from the human exemptionalist paradigm in their own theorizing. Lance Olsen, editor of the Wilderness Psychology Newsletter wrote to leaders of the American Psychological Association asking for consideration of the relevance of psychology to the destruction of the natural world and for a stand by professional psychologists on further ecodestruction. He was stonewalled. The exchange of correspondence is a fascinating footnote to the tragic blindness of many academic intellectuals to ecological and ecophilosophical concerns (see Dec 1980 issue of Wilerness Psychology Newsletter).

Certainly the most important book published during the last year by a social scientist on issues of ecology and human societies is William Catton, Jr.'s *OVERSHOOT: THE ECOLOGICAL BASIS OF REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE* (Univ. of Illinois Press, 1980). Catton argues that present strategies of "economic growth" are based upon stealing from the past ("fossil acreage" in the form of coal and other fossil fuels) and from the future (losing ground, the soil of "Turtle Island" as Gary Snyder would say). Catton says "because this book is meant to overcome our habit of mistaking techniques that evade limits for techniques that raise them, it is, in a sense, a book about how to read the news perceptively in revolutionary times. This cannot be done without certain unfamiliar but increasingly indispensable concepts. 'Carrying capacity' is one of them."

Catton does not speak of an "environmental crisis" but of a "predicament" — "because I refer to conditions that are not of recent origin and will not soon abate." The "predicament" is outlined briefly. "Human beings, in two million years of cultural evolution, have several times succeeded in taking over additional portions of the earth's total life-supporting capacity at the expense of other creatures. Each time, human population has increased. But man has now learned to rely on a technology that augments human carrying capacity in a necessarily temporary way — as temporary as the extension of life by eating the seeds needed to grow next year's food. Human population, organized into industrial societies and blind to the temporariness of carrying capacity supplements based on exhaustible resource dependence, responded by increasing more exuberantly than ever, even though this meant overshooting the number our planet could permanently support. Something akin to bankruptcy was the inevitable sequel."

Human population has overshoot the carrying capacity of a finite earth. The myth of limitlessness, of technological optimism that "unlimited" energy is just around the corner (as in the belief in fusion breeder nuclear reactors) and the myth of cargoism (the gods will provide) will only exaggerate the crash of human population and the general "misery" of which Malthus talked. Catton asserts "In today's world it is imperative that all of us learn the following core principle: human society is inextricably part of a global biotic community, and in that community human dominance has had and is having self-destructive consequences."

Catton does not develop an "environmental ethics" nor does he mention "ecological consciousness" but he does suggest, by implication, that any environmental ethics must fit the "ecological realism" of our predicament if that ethics is to be relevant for the "post-exuberant age". Table 2, reproduced below, summarizes the various positions which different people take in response to our predicament. Ronald Reagan, James Watt and associates clearly demonstrate "ostrichism" every time they open their mouths.

Humans have been too successful as a tool making species in colonizing ecological niches at the expense of other species. Humans became what Catton calls Homo colossus for a brief interlude. "Our most urgent task is to develop policies designed not to prolong that dominance, but to insure that the successor to Homo colossus will be, after all, Homo sapiens. Developing such policies must be so enormously difficult that it is not easy even to accept the urgency of the task. But the longer we delay beginning, the more numerous and colossal we become — thereby trapping ourselves all the more irredeemably in the fatal practice of stealing from our future."

In my estimation, Catton has written the prologue for paradigm shifting to deep ecology (or foundational ecology) for the 1980's. The cutting edge of thinking about appropriate social organization for the "postindustrial" or "post-exuberant" age, as found in the writings of Val and Richard Routley ("Social Theories, Self-Management, and Environmental Problems" —see above), Raymond Dasmann, Gary Snyder, and Murray Bookchin (TOWARDS AN ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY, 1981), is toward the "future primitive", a theory of social anarchism. The Routleys draw upon the nineteenth century work of Kropotkin, Bakunin, and on the religion and social organization of Native Americans and Australian aborigines. Gary Snyder descends in consciousness (in his new book THE GREAT CLOD — still in manuscript and unfinished although a chapter has appeared in CO-EVOLUTION QUARTERLY,) to the neolithic villages of 6000 B.C. China. Mankind has lost its way in the "rise" to civilization, lost its way through meddling, through error and lack of understanding, through hubris instead of modesty. But the paradoxical message which Snyder finds in Ch'an Buddhism energizes our contemporary work: "The Perfect Way is without difficulty: strive hard!"

In his 1969 essay "Four Changes" Snyder was both perceptive and prophetic of the paradoxes in attempting to "reform" the present political system to "handle" so-called "environmental concerns". He saw the need for a utopian vision of an alternative society. Murray Bookchin carries the warning more urgently and desperately in his recent book and in his "Open Letter to the Ecology Movement" (RAIN magazine, April, 1980). This warning seems to have been ignored by most intellectuals interested in "environmental ethics" and by the leaders of the Sierra Club and other so-called "environmental organizations". One paragraph will summarize his statement but readers are encouraged to get a copy of the whole letter (from COMMENT, PO Box 158, Burlington, Vermont 05402 USA):

"It is necessary, I believe, for everyone in the ecology movement to make a crucial decision; will the eighties retain the visionary concept of an ecological future based on a libertarian (anarchist) commitment to decentralization, alternative technology and a libertarian practice based on affinity groups, direct democracy, and direct action? Or will the decade be marked by a dismal retreat into ideological obscurantism and a "mainstream politics" that acquires "power" and "effectiveness" by following the very "stream" it should seek to divert? Will it pursue fictitious "mass constituencies" by imitating the very forms of mass manipulation, mass media, mass culture it is committed to oppose? These two directions cannot be reconciled. Our use of "media", mobilizations, and actions must appeal to mind and to spirit, not to conditioned reflexes and shock tactics that leave no room for reason and humanity. In any case, the choice must be made now before the ecology movement becomes institutionalized into a mere appendage of the very system whose structure and methods it professes to oppose. It must be made consciously and decisively — or the century itself, not only the decade, will be lost to us forever."

This warning for eco-activists is also a warning for academic intellectuals who want to "fix the system" by the use of more and more technology, more centralized authority, and more man-domination of nature. Thus deep ecology diverges sharply from the "New Age" paradigm publicized by social scientists at the Stanford Research Institute (Robert Swartz and James Ogilvy) and technologists such as James Lovelock (GAIA: A NEW LOOK AT LIFE ON EARTH, 1980). This "New Age" paradigm only extends the Technological Optimism fallacy just as Ian Barbour's new book (TECHNOLOGY, ENVIRONMENT AND HUMAN VALUES, 1980) only extends and propagates the "Christian stewardship" man-dominant management paradigm. (Space limitations prevent the inclusion of my "The New Age Paradigm: A Review and Comment" available from me upon request). Barbour's work in particular calls for "social justice" which, from his perspective,

is "as fundamental as ecological reform". Barbour completely misses the implications of our predicament as outlined by Catton in *OVERSHOOT*. Barbour seems unable to face squarely the facts of ecological realism and the full implications of "interpenetration" of humans and the environment (Humans and Nature is the ultimate false dichotomy) as outlined in Aldo Leopold's "land ethic". To overcome this illusory dichotomy is the essence of ecological consciousness.

Deep ecology might be summarized as a descent into consciousness, into the soil of the earth (see L. Edwin Folsom's article on "Gary Snyder's Descent to Turtle Island: Searching for Fossil Love," in *WESTERN AMERICAN LITERATURE*, Vol. 15, Summer, 1980, pp. 103-21). It is based on experiencing the Earth and evoking the gods. If, as Roszak claims, Christians (and especially Protestants) "desacralized the Earth" and thus left it only as "natural resources" to be manipulated for ever increasing human populations using "scientific management" (see chapter 4, "The Sin of Idolatry", *WHERE THE WASTELAND ENDS*), and if we are in the twilight of an era, waiting for the gods to re-emerge, as Heidegger argues, the best strategy for urban intellectuals is to give up the pretensions of the mandarin class, descend to the soil, plant seeds of consciousness, explore the anomalies, participate in "creative dis-integration" of the exuberant ideology and the dominant institutions of political power, and prepare the pathless path for Being. In Heidegger's phrase "let beings be!". This should never be a shallow slogan but an evocative call to serene desperation. Most men, as Thoreau wrote, lead lives of "quiet desperation". We are always desperate but not quiet in this work. To quote again from the Ch'an Buddhist, to be serenely desperate is to be found while lost in wilderness. "The Perfect Way is without difficulty: strive hard!"

TABLE 1
A Comparison of Major Assumptions in the Dominant Western Worldview, Sociology's Human Exemptionalism Paradigm, and the Proposed New Ecological Paradigm

	Dominant Western Worldview (DWW)	Human Exemptionalism Paradigm (HEP)	New Ecological Paradigm (NEP)
Assumptions about the nature of human beings:	DWW ₁ People are fundamentally different from all other creatures on Earth, over which they have dominion.	HEP ₁ Humans have a cultural heritage in addition to (and distinct from) their genetic inheritance, and thus are quite unlike all other animal species.	NEP ₁ While humans have exceptional characteristics (culture, technology, etc.), they remain one among many species that are interdependently involved in the global ecosystem.
Assumptions about social causation:	DWW ₂ People are masters of their destiny; they can choose their goals and learn to do whatever is necessary to achieve them.	HEP ₂ Social and cultural factors (including technology) are the major determinants of human affairs.	NEP ₂ Human affairs are influenced not only by social and cultural factors, but also by intricate linkages of cause, effect, and feedback in the web of nature; thus purposive human actions have many unintended consequences.
Assumptions about the context of human society:	DWW ₃ The world is vast, and thus provides unlimited opportunities for humans.	HEP ₃ Social and cultural environments are the crucial context for human affairs, and the biophysical environment is largely irrelevant.	NEP ₃ Humans live in and are dependent upon a finite biophysical environment which imposes potent physical and biological restraints on human affairs.
Assumptions about constraints on human society:	DWW ₄ The history of humanity is one of progress; for every problem there is a solution, and thus progress need never cease.	HEP ₄ Culture is cumulative; thus technological and social progress can continue indefinitely, making all social problems ultimately soluble.	NEP ₄ Although the inventiveness of humans and the powers derived therefrom may seem for a while to extend carrying capacity limits, ecological laws cannot be repealed.

Eventually Had Already Come Yesterday

TABLE 2. Analysis of Several Modes of Adaptation to Ecologically Inexorable Change

New Ecological Understandings			
ADAPTATIONS	CIRCUMSTANCE:	CONSEQUENCE:	NAMES
	The Age of Exuberance is over, population has already overshot carrying capacity, and prodigal <i>Homo sapiens</i> has drawn down the world's savings deposits.	All forms of human organization and behavior that are based on the assumption of limitlessness must change to forms that accord with finite limits.	
I. Some people recognize that the New World is old and that major change must follow.	= circumstance accepted	+ consequence accepted	= Realism
II. Some people have faith that technological progress will stave off major institutional change.	= circumstance accepted	+ consequence disregarded	= Cargoism
III. Some people have faith that family planning, recycling centers, and anti-pollution laws will keep the New World new.	= circumstance disregarded	+ consequence partially accepted	= Cosmeticism
IV. Some people do not believe that the New World's newness once did, or that its oldness now does, have any significance.	= circumstance disregarded	+ consequence disregarded	= Cynicism
V. Some people insist that the assumption of limitlessness was and still is valid.	= circumstance denied	+ consequence denied	= Ostrichism

70

From W.R. Catton, *OVERSHOOT*, 1980.

Professor Arne Naess of the Institute for Philosophy, University of Oslo, Norway has sent the following information on ECOROPA for inclusion with this issue of the newsletter.

Note on some European ecophilosophical trends

It is difficult to keep track of ecophilosophical happenings around the world. In what follows some trends are mentioned which in most respects give expression to 'deep ecology' even when the term is not used.

Ecoropa is the name of an association which is involved in many campaigns today. It presents itself as follows:

The Ecoropa association involves a social philosophy and concentrates on changing social and political life. Dominant attitudes towards nature are explained and interpreted on the basis of a critique of the technocratic, economic growth society.

ECOROPA

Action Ecologique Européenne
Europäische Ökologische Aktion
European Ecological Action

107, rue de la Course - 33000 BORDEAUX

Siège Social :
Centre Européen de la Culture
122 rue de Lausanne
1211 GENEVE (Suisse)

ECOPHILOSOPHY III
who are we ? PAGE (13)

2

As our Western Society is moving into Post-Industrial Age - which we either have to be a r or must prepare - most people still do not realize the seriousness of the problems that confront us, nor do they seem to identify them as but inevitable symptoms of over-development . The Ecological Movement is alone in facing this ever more evident fact and is attempting to work out policies that will assure a transition to a stable post-industrial society .

● Ecoropa, founded in France in 1976, is a non-profit making association established in accordance with the Swiss Civil Code . Amongst its members are leading figures in the ecological movement from fifteen European countries .

Its main goals are the following :

- to facilitate the flow of important information between militant groups in Europe,
- to establish what must be the basic features of an ecological society in which free and responsible men and women can live in harmony with each other and satisfy their basic biological and social needs without destroying their natural environment (see article 2 of our statutes)
- to emphasize the 'European' aspect of the ecological issues which local groups are attempting to cope with
- to promote lifestyles and means of production that are based on the use of renewable resources and preserve our human heritage
- to advocate political forms that encourage liberty and responsibility rather than curb them

● Jointly with the whole planet and with future generations , Ecoropa tries to be a platform where action and study may fertilize each other, - where pluri-regional and pluri-cultural working groups refuse fatal endings and prepare the 'tools' of a society where life would be worth living .

Obviously these goals should be achieved at a world level but the founders of Ecoropa regard it as expedient, at least for the time being, to limit their action to Europe .

● Members are people actively involved in the ecological movement who are willing to contribute some time and money to the work of Ecoropa .

o o o o o

The Co-ordinating Committee of Ecoropa

President	: Denis de Rougemont	Geneva
Vice-Presidents	: Edward Goldsmith Manfred Siebker	Cornwall Brussels
Treasurer	: Orio Giarini	Trieste / Geneva
General Secretary	: Edouard Kressmann	Aquitania

Other Committee members :

Carl Amery, Bavaria - Bernard Charbonneau, Béarn - Wouter van Dieren, Holland - Mario Gaviria, Navarra - Theo Ginsburg, Zürich - Sigmund Kvaløy, Oslo - Brice Lakrde, Paris - Serge Moscovici, Paris - Jean-Marie Pelt, Lorraine .

Patrons

Charles Birch - Henri Brugmans - A. Buzzati-Traverso - René Dubos - René Dumont - Jacques Ellul - Georg Kahn-Ackermann - Aurelio Peccei - Georg Picht . . .



Eco(logica-eu)ropa issued in 1979 a manifest and a
^{great}
'Declaration for a Green Europe' which have been of ~~green~~
~~usefulness~~
~~fulness~~ in mobilizing opinion. Some excerpts:

The need for new goals.

For several decades, the pattern of life in Western Europe has been shaped by the ideas and assumptions of the traditional parties: conservative, liberal, socialist and communist. Despite the differences of their political standpoints, all four parties believe in continual economic growth and technological progress. All of them see life as dominated by production and consumption and differ only about who shall receive the rewards.

Millions of Europeans have come to the conclusion that such an approach is obsolete. They see the current political disputes as largely irrelevant — even as smokescreens which conceal the real issues from the electorate and sometimes from the politicians themselves. Hence the emergence of the Green Movement in Europe.

Deficiencies of the Growth Society.

Industrial growth, as we know it, involves the destruction of natural systems, the waste of resources and the pollution of the environment. It destroys human relations and aggravates social violence. It is a threat to future generations and its continuance relies on the exploitation of the Third World.

Industrial growth is based on the belief that technological innovation can provide panaceas for all our problems. But such technologies too often create new and more serious problems of their own. Not only is the growth society characterised by unemployment and inflation, it is also marked by increasing mental and physical ill-health, rising crime rates, and other symptoms of social disorder. Clearly material progress does not necessarily entail progress in human welfare.

Bureaucracy

Power now rests in the hands of a bureaucracy which has come to regulate the details of our daily lives in terms of its own goals of increased material consumption and technological efficiency. To survive, it demands ever higher rates of economic growth allied to ever higher rates of taxation. Always intolerant of dissent, such a centralised state moves inexorably towards a totalitarian system in which basic constitutional rights, such as those of free speech and freedom of association, are gradually eroded. To a greater or lesser degree, the freedom of the individual is now being seriously undermined throughout Europe.

Contemporary industrial society has created a new class of poor: those for whom work is meaningless; those who have been forced out of business by economies of scale; those who have contracted diseases of industrial origin; those whose families have been broken up by the mobility demanded of them; those who are lonely and isolated in the anonymity of big cities...

The Future is in Our Hands

If we continue to look towards traditional political societies for a solution, the situation is unlikely to improve. But millions of people are now concerned, many of them are attempting to alert public opinion and to stimulate responsible action by politicians. This movement constitutes a new political dimension. It believes that radical changes in existing priorities and values are required, we are to break out of the present impasse. The key-notes of this ecological perspective are:

- ☐ That respect for the balance of nature is fundamental in a stable society.
- ☐ That individuals and groups should practise self-reliance rather than surrendering control of their lives to 'experts'.
- ☐ That communities, whether cities or factories or schools or hospitals should be of human size.
- ☐ That the divisive segregation of society according to age, sex, class, health and intelligence, must be replaced by a new spirit of co-operation.
- ☐ That nothing should be done at a national level which can be done at regional, local or family level.
- ☐ That conservation of energy and resources are now of paramount importance.
- ☐ That dangerous technologies which are surplus to requirements should be banned; the nuclear power programme must be halted and existing reactors phased out.

Ecological Manifesto for a Different Europe

Manfred SIEBKER (Brussels) with contributions from **Wouter VANDIEREN** (Edam), **Jacques ELLUL** (Paris), **Edouard KRESSMANN** (Bordeaux), **Sigmund KVALØY** (Oslo), **Jaroslav LANGER** (Bonn) and **Roland VOGT** (Berlin) *

The ideological spectres of the last few centuries still haunt Europe. Worse, these economaniac spectres have become a reality and living reality has become a spectre.

If we look at what has been achieved and what is to be expected if we continue along the present road, we see that our society has not become the safe, healthy and peaceful community we once expected. On the contrary, it is losing meaning, quality and satisfaction. In important aspects the achievements of progress turn out to be as destructive as its failures.

More and more citizens of Europe share a conviction that the present road will lead deeper into unemployment and inflation, energy dilemmas, the exhaustion of depletable resources of the environment, the spread of radioactivity and genetic deterioration, the disappearance of free space, quiet and serenity, the extinction of plants and animal life, a global arms race and a fierce conflict between North and South. All these symptoms are signals of a crisis of civilization.

The widespread belief that these evils are accidental and can be made to disappear through the application of more science and technology or through more legal integration is an illusion, as is the belief in the feasibility and desirability of further economic growth and increased industrial production. After 200 years of industrial expansion, modern society has come to the crossroads. Continuing along the old path would push spiritual erosion beyond hope and lead to unprecedented global destruction.

This, however, is not an unavoidable fate. Change is possible, but only if the reality of this crisis of civilization is finally acknowledged by large segments of decision makers active in the political and economic fields. Eventually this will mean new politicians and new entrepreneurs who are well integrated into the grass-roots. An essential condition for both is that people should have increased consciousness and self-confidence.

These are the priorities of change as we see them:

1) Overcoming Technocracy

At the basis of all different crisis phenomena there is an attitude of expansion, domination and exploitation. It has set man against man, man against nature, the State against the individual, employer against employee. It has separated people from their roots, their relatives and their fellow-citizens. It has led to materialism, centralization of power, bureaucracy and gigantism. All this is stimulated by the industrial approach, which has infiltrated media and government policies. It prevails even in the functioning of political parties.

The common denominator of all this is: **Technocracy**, i. e. the submission of Man and of the whole Life System to the exigencies of the organizational and technical instruments of society which have become a system in itself, independent from human needs. It is domination usurped by the servants.

The technocratic expansionist system, both in its Eastern and its Western variants, is suffocating. Its crises stem from the very nature of the system and cannot be overcome by the same forces as those which generated it. Centralized power and institutionalized interests effectively block social, spiritual and political innovation to such an extent that politicians are becoming, in varying degrees, allies of technocracy rather than representatives of the people. The controlling forces of the Industrial Growth Society act as a filter which accepts only politicians of this type.

More and more people of all ages, backgrounds and educational levels are seeking ways and means to change this situation and their own lives. They already number many millions in Europe, but are confronted with the faceless complex of technocratic power, which tries to paralyse their initiatives, hope and faith. They are beginning, however, to join forces across the borders of nation states, classes and group interests. A new spirit is emerging.

2) Community of Communities

Democracy means that it is the people which holds political power. Centralized power is its negation. Unless absolutely essential, power should not be delegated to anonymous government agencies or other centralizing organizations, but should remain within social and economic communities of human proportions. The dominational structures of our states have shown themselves to be unfit for real integration: witness the stalemate European situation compared with the high popular hopes of unification of twenty years ago. The United Europe – and each of its member countries – must become a community of organic communities which on all levels and fields of human activity will have to replace the established power hierarchies. Reliance on the might of the Big Powers will have to be replaced by self-confidence, especially since even the superpowers have turned out to be superpowers only in destructiveness.

Nation states are patently incapable of solving many basic problems, at either global or local level. We should therefore aim at the federation of autonomous regions, each self-organized in a participatory and anticipatory democracy.

3) Participatory and Anticipatory Democracy

Complex structures necessitate participation. If we do not wish to have a uniform monocultural society or an a-cultural society in uniform, we need full participation. This means emancipation – emancipation not only in terms of rights but also in terms of responsibility. It means redefining politics by creating alternatives (or at least supplements) to the present party system in order to avoid the dilemma presented by the choice between immobility and totalitarianism. Free creative associations of active non-conformists should be encouraged, not repressed. People must be shown that they can influence things themselves and in their lifetime, that the future can be actively anticipated. An anticipatory democracy involves citizens already in the preparation stage of programmes and policies, not only in project decision or project implementation stages. Today they are not even involved in these.

Self-reliant local communities are the logical answer to the violence of centralized power. Protection against environmental disintegration, concentrational megatechnologies, alienating urbanization and superhighways can only be effective if decision-making, for issues beyond interpersonal affairs, is placed in the hands of federated local communities of people who want to express their own needs and themselves determine their particular way of life in peace. This means that citizens should have a right to and full anticipatory access to pertinent information. It requires social innovation to enable individuals and groups to control technology instead of becoming irresponsible parts of the technocratic machine.

4) Energy for the People

The engine of technocracy runs on an increasing energy throughput. The basic energy question does not so much concern resources and capital as whether the supply of more and more energy has led and will lead to a happier and more viable society. There is much evidence to suggest that this is not the case. The technocratic outlook for the future shows an ever closer web linking centralized (predominantly nuclear) energy systems with mili-

tary power and police control. "Managing" the crises of this system is becoming a goal in itself: above all it justifies structures of domination in societies which are theoretically democratic. The great loser is the average citizen, who pays with his autonomy and freedom of selffulfilment, who is pushed into escapist or even extremist postures as a reaction to non-participation and anxiety. More energy conversion will inevitably lead not only to more environmental destruction, but to more social, political and military crises also. A radical change is needed, replacing technocratic-by ecological structures and goals, which would stop the energy race, help to meet real needs and bring democracy a decisive step nearer to realization.

5) Meaningful Work for All

The motor of a sane society is meaningful work for people, from childhood onwards. The individual should be confronted directly and completely by material and social challenges, not just by a meaningless fraction of them. In present societies and in particular in the commercial economy, good human relations and harmony between people and the rest of nature are being increasingly destroyed and replaced by exploitative unilateral and narrow-minded relations. Decisions on whether and how to work, what to produce and how much income is provided, are for the overwhelming majority of individuals taken far away from them. People find themselves controlled by anonymous forces, be it as workers, as consumers or as inhabitants of environmentally affected areas. But there are no constraints other than those generated by the expansionists and exploitative system itself which could legitimize this hierarchy of alienation. In a healthy society work opportunities, resources and income are distributed according to social and ecological usefulness, not according to power and blackmailing potential.

If meaningful work is lacking, then people are also uncreative in their leisure time. This increases consumption dependency as well as causing a waste of environmental and human resources.

Meaningful work cannot be artificially created but depends on demand. Most employment openings proposed by the dominating elites are fictitious, parasitic or downright destructive: cases in point are throwaway goods, pollution/antipollution combinations and armaments. The right to work remains a demagogic slogan if it does not mean the right to engage in a meaningful activity according to one's talents and inclinations. This, however, means that work and the fulfilment of basic material need should not remain as strongly linked as they are today. The satisfaction of basic material needs should become decommercialized. It could be taken over by a public service duty at local level. Meaningful employment in general requires highly decentralized structures of production and decision-making. No central state agency, no centralized, large corporation or large hierarchically organized labour union can achieve this objective.

6) A Deprofessionalized Society

Under the spell of specialization pushed to the extreme by technocracy, society has become excessively professionalized if not downright expertocratic. People's ability to think and decide for themselves, to create, to organize their own lives, to plan their homes, to care for their children and their aged, to cure their diseases, has largely disappeared. Such functions have been more or less forcefully delegated to experts. This has led to a society of disabled beings, dependent on professionals who themselves depend on the technocratic machine.

The deprofessionalizing of our society can, however, only occur if experts acquire general knowledge and, even more important, if they re-integrate the grass-roots and learn to communicate on the human scale again. This process has silently begun all over the world, but at the same time state technocracy and industrialism are becoming worse and more powerful. It should become a matter of public policy to dismantle institutional castles.

7) Education for a Communitarian Society

To demand that education be improved is a futile objective as long as the educators and their political masters are themselves not appropriately educated. It takes training to think along ecological lines, to work in institutions of appropriate scale and to foster community self-reliance. Present educational systems seem to be hypnotized by the religion, or rather the superstition, of technological progress. Even though some change is visible, it is constantly menaced by the old forces. Contraction of the mind to narrow specialization on the one hand and to mass consumption on the other is still the rule. Instead, education for cooperation, self-determination and a creative mind should become a recognized societal goal. In other words: education not as adaption to exploitative interests and as an adjustment to the expected development of technology, but for the evolution of the spirit and the unfolding of talent in a co-operative culture. This new permanent education would also provide the flexibility in knowledge and skill necessary for adapting to the fast-changing demands of society and individuals themselves. The guaranteed satisfaction of basic material needs would greatly facilitate a self-adjusting, unbureaucratic training system.*)

*) See last paragraph of Point 5)

8) A Society which can Afford Health

Our life expectancy is decreasing, not only in the sense of our trust in the future, but in the brutal statistical sense also. Since the infant mortality rate has been brought under control, male mortality has ceased to fall and is even increasing again; female mortality tends to follow the same pattern, now that birth and abortion risks are no longer diminishing. The causes of poorer health have a common denominator in the disturbance of the ecological balance, as evidenced by pollution of the air, water and food, the excessive use of drugs, the weakening of self-healing forces by symptom treatment, unnatural life and working conditions, mental stress, alienation from meaningful relationships, drug addiction and socialization neuroses.

Our present society cannot afford to be healthy. Firstly, the escalation in the cost of medical treatment and insurance schemes is becoming intolerable. It cannot be stopped as long as public health deteriorates, individual responsibility is discouraged and the economic potential of physical and psychic misery is as recklessly exploited as any natural resource. Secondly, the forces which destroy health and a healthy environment are the same which propagate the industrialist system and cannot therefore be separated. Thirdly, the citizens of a healthy and sane society could not be so easily manipulated and blackmailed into patterns of behaviour which reinforce their own political and economic dependency.

Health, therefore, is a highly political issue. Self-reliance within the context of autonomous federated communities, the decommercialization of the satisfaction of basic needs and citizens' anticipative participation in public decision making mark, as in the case of employment, energy and education, the way towards the necessary change. Only an ecological society can afford to be healthy, and only a sane society will quite naturally behave in an ecologically appropriate manner.

9) In dubio pro vita: a Legal System Enhancing Life

The condition of a society is reflected in its legal system. In the course of their submission to the dictate of power and monetary profit, of productivist success rather than human goals, the occidental societies have decisively changed the character of their legal system:

- in having been reduced to an organization tool of the power structure, the legal system has ceased to be the practical translation into general norms of values consciously accepted by society as a whole;
- in having become an institutionalization of the power establishment, it has ceased to be a system of relationship between groups and individuals which provide compensation in favour of the weakest;

- in having become a means of political control by the State, it has ceased to be a permanently renewed creation fed by the activities and customs of the grass-roots.

Consequences of this mutation have been: abusive property laws and an increasing avalanche of legal and administrative texts, accompanied by an even greater avalanche of crime, general irresponsibility and perversion of the very sense of justice.

Thus, the "in dubio pro reo" principle of Roman law was once adopted to protect individuals against the abuse of power by abstract state justice; today it is often used to deny the protection of the helpless against the powerful structures which promote mega-technological violence in the form of nuclear or chemical industrial complexes or unsafe pharmaceutical products. When the benefit of the doubt favours the development of deadly menaces and when the accused organizations control most holders of formal expertise, illegal counter-action appears legitimate. This misdevelopment, which leads to societal chaos, must stop.

The legal system has to acknowledge as overruling principle the benefit of the doubt in favour of Life. "In dubio pro vita" must predominate over "in dubio pro reo". Order irrespective of ecological laws and laws irrespective of the order necessary for a viable system are counterproductive caricatures of law and order. No rational legal approach can be based on the hope that everything will turn out for the best, rather its very raison d'être is to prepare for the worst. Law must face reality.

10) New Life to the Political Landscape

Political parties still base their existence upon polarizations of nineteenth century talents: of the exploited against the exploiter or of the established order against upcoming competitors for power. Exploitation is still omnipresent, admittedly, but there are new poor in our countries: the victims of pollution, noise and the loneliness of urban deserts, those who suffer from meaningless jobs, from the manufacture of what are ultimately useless products and from the performance of nonsensical paperwork, those who see the web of their social relations destroyed by the violence of gigantism and commercialism, the victims of diseases which are part of the price of industrial expansion, such as cancer, the rate of which has increased tenfold in one century. But political parties do not recognize them. The political scene of Europe is therefore like a frozen lake, where the winds of change do not cause any waves. Political parties have largely become rigid hierarchical systems that function for their own sake, monopolizing the political scene in resistance to the spirit of democratic constitutions and the dynamics of a highly diversified culture.

A rigid political system is no method of overcoming creatively our crisis of civilisation; it cannot even guarantee the survival of its people and of the basis of all: living nature. We need politicians who are capable of breaking the ice, who listen to the winds of change and who understand that viable politics now and in the coming age cannot be based on socialist or liberalist or conservative ideologies, but only on ecological principles.

11) Solidarity of Europe and the Third World

Even the contention that there is a fundamental conflict of interest between the industrialized countries and the Third World appears quite different in the light of ecological insight. There are, no doubt, great threats to world peace; catastrophes of hunger and desperate moves are inevitable if industrial expansionism persists in the North and if this irresponsible development model continues to be imitated by the South. After having suffered the trauma of colonialist exploitation and now under the spell of neo-colonialist strategies, the Third World and in particular the majority of its elite are at present firmly engaged in a murderous ratrace which nobody can win. One way to end this fixation would be for Europe to embrace the idea of non-dominational, symbiotic partnership between people as well as between mankind and nature. A change in attitude and goal-setting in the Third World would thus be decisively enhanced.

In the struggle for dignity, self-reliance and civil rights and in the struggle for the co-evolution of all forms of life on our planet there can only be allies among those who have understood the new face of reality, in East and West, North and South.

This does not mean that everybody must wait until the others become reasonable. Of course, if economic expansion and exploitation of nature remain the main societal goals, no country or region can pursue its proper course: worldwide interdependence is bound to increase further, the propagation of instabilities within the international politico-economic system to become faster. This results from a willfully close coupling of local and regional economic systems. A Europe directing itself resolutely towards an ecological democracy would, on the contrary, become less and less dependent from the rest of the world, less influenced but with more beneficial influence. Hardware exchange would decrease to the benefit of soft ware exchange, the transfer of information and knowledge being liberated from narrow economic power interests. A Europe with an ecological orientation can dare to be a forerunner towards a new international order. It even has the moral obligation to do so.

12) Security and Peace

Security is the number one preoccupation of our society. It has three aspects: individual security, social security and security against aggression from the outside. The instrumental, symptom-oriented approach so typical of the North has not only proven unable to solve these societal problems (or any other) but has actually amplified them.

Thus, individual security is jeopardized by the disintegration of family and group coherence, by generalized opportunism and by the erosion of ethical principles – in other words by the effects of an economaniac society.

Secondly, social security is sought through anonymous, bureaucratic institutions. This erodes the sense of responsibility and the community spirit. It thus increases dependency as well as the public burden and enhances threat to the viability of the system as a whole. A one-side "generation contract", however, between the irresponsibles of the present and the future slaves of the past is not feasible. But if the breakdown of social security institutions is not intercepted by the rise of new, stable ecological structures, social chaos may ensue.

Thirdly, it is absurd to search for security against aggression from the outside through instruments of mass destruction, that is of terror and revenge, rather than through the spirited purposefulness of real communities to defend their integrity. In the international menace system of the nuclear age, security is not producible with military means at all. The military and armament complexes of our time share the destiny of all institutions which issue from aiming at absolute security (apart from the fact that also lust for profit and power are involved). They eventually produce the contrary of what they pretend to look for. Their product are in fact insecurity, constraints and the bondage of human learnability to a vicious circle. In the best case this leads to the disintegration of the institutions themselves, based on wrong ends and means; in the worst case it causes the annihilation of man and nature.

No balance of terror can be trusted in the long run. Fear engenders fear and may at any time trigger off an irrational attack in rational disguise. The arms development has led humanity to a point at which it must, for the sake of sheer survival, detach political action from all violent principles.

The European Community, by historical accident constituted as a civilian formation, signifies in this situation a unique chance: to lead its population beyond nation-state narrow-mindedness and beyond thinking in the bondage of institutionalized violence, in that it demonstrates the possibilities to resolve inner and outer conflicts without violence.

The societal consequences of armament are as devastating as the environmental destruction caused by its industry. An ecological Europe would therefore dismantle its armament potential. A Civilian Power Europe based on regional, federated communities will have to make credible the means of self-maintenance developed

by modern peace research, and realize them in response to the deep-lying anxiety of defencelessness of those citizens who are still conditioned to nation-state concepts. Civilian Defence starts from the premise that all domination over people can only be exerted to the extent in which the people is ready to collaborate with those who want to gain or maintain domination. In a base-democratic and economically decentralized society, the occupation of its territory by alien or alienated forces does not automatically lead to submission. Pre-conditions for the faculty of a society for civilian defence are firstly the citizens' identification with the community they live in, and secondly, the previous practice of non-military forms of combat. The experience gained at present in the resistance to mega-technological aggression can be as instructive here as the historical examples of the workers' movement, of military putschs ward off by general strikes, of civilian defence during World War Two, of Gandhi's liberation movement, of the resistance of Czechoslovakia in 1968 in spite of no international solidarity and no democratic structures to begin with.

If meaning is to be restored to the terms "peace" and "defence" at all, this can only be done by an ecological society. The determined and well organized self-maintenance of transnationally federated communities against any aggressor, be he intranational or extranational, military or commercial, lies at the core of the answer. But change should go even further. The aims and means of societal liberation, of personal development and of the defence of freedom have to be of the same nature: a respect for Life.



If we want life instead of death, if we want living reality instead of spectres, it is not enough for us to throw off our more evident outer chains. We have to lose also our conditioned inner bondage, which includes our unecological arrogance towards "the rest of the

world". The pseudo-alternatives of the dominating elites, be they officially in power or in phony opposition, must no longer hypnotize us with their disintegrating, fragmented flat universe. Reality is a multi-dimensional unity of meaningful patterns of interrelation. In our present condition these patterns convey the message of sickness, but they turn out to be patterns of stupendous potential once the inner and outer chains are shaken off. The necessary alternative beyond revolution and reformism can then be created by the people itself. The ecological movement shows that this is more than a hope. Real change is proved to be possible. More: its time has come.

- Gandhi's

***) ECOROPA European Ecological Action**

Legal address:
Association ECOROPA
Rue de Lausanne 122
CH-1200 GENEVA
Switzerland

ECOROPA Executive Secretariat
Mr Eduard KRESSMANN
Rue de la Course 107
F-33000 BORDEAUX
France

The ideas and principles laid down in the ECOLOGICAL MANIFESTO are the result of discussions between concerned citizens of 11 European countries. The Manifesto is intended to be a framework of reference for the members and friends of the European network of ecological action. At the same time it is the basis of a

DECLARATION FOR A DIFFERENT EUROPE

which shall be published in leading European newspapers at the occasion of the first direct elections for a European Parliament. Citizens who wish to support this transpartisan action and might consider to sign the Declaration for a Different Europe should contact one of the following addresses:

Manfred SIEBKER, ECOROPA Information Point Brussels
Bd. du Souverain 209, B - 1160 Brussels

Nicholas HILDYARD, ECOROPA Information Point Cornwall
73 Molesworth Street, Wadebridge
Cornwall PL 27 7DS, U.K.

John CARROLL, ECOROPA Information Point Dublin
c/o ITGWU, Liberty Hall, Dublin 1, Ireland

Book Review

Snyder's Real Work

by Bill Devall

Gary Snyder, *THE REAL WORK: Interviews and Talks, 1964-1979*. New York: New Directions, 1980, paperback \$4.95

For the last 30 years Gary Snyder has been doing the real work of the environmental movement. He has been working at living, at cultivating his ecological consciousness and at teaching others to listen to the voices of wilderness.

Snyder is the most important voice of his generation on what he calls the "western slope"—California and the Pacific Northwest. He is a regional poet because the sense of place, which infuses his poetry, is a vital element in Snyder's philosophy. In this sense he continues the tradition of John Muir and Robinson Jeffers, authors who also traveled extensively in other places but whose most important work was regional, in California.

While Muir and Jeffers came to the Pacific shore and stopped, Snyder made the leap to Asia, especially to the old ways of Japan. His poems and talks are filled with Buddhism as well as with American Indian myths and tales.

For Snyder, poetry is not effete and academic, but part of living, part of bringing together wildness and the community of humans. His poems grow from his working, from walking on a fire line, from farming, from working on a trail crew.

THE REAL WORK is a collection of talks and interviews Snyder has given over the past 15 years. Some were published in small, obscure journals; some never before transcribed and published.

William McLean has done an admirable job selecting, editing and introducing this collection. The very process of giving talks and interviews is part of Snyder's method of bringing "the old ways" into modern living.

The reader can pick up this book and read any interview at random or read the whole book in one sitting, as I did. Again this is part of Snyder's method. There is no linear progression in his working. Whatever one is working on at that time, conversation or interview or chopping wood, is most important for that



time.

The interviews and talks range in topic from the craft of writing poetry, through to poetry and community, Snyder's theory of bioregional ethics, shamanism—which he calls "man's basic mind-science, empirical, pragmatic, international—to the uses of a university, meditation, and Buddhism. Snyder's Buddhism is part of his approach to "right livelihood," to the real work of living."

Everyone will find a favorite interview or talk in this collection. I especially liked "the zen of humanity," in which Snyder discusses why meditation is so fundamental to right work, and "tracking down the natural man" (conducted while Snyder was burning brush on his property in the Sierra foothills), in which he makes a significant sociological analysis of communities versus social networks.

Snyder is showing, it seems to me, that the radical perspective of ecology is very practical, personal, realistic and important. There is no elitism here, no big organizations and massive political mobilizations. This is one man, living and doing the real work.

As Snyder says, he was raised on hard work, in a blue collar family. And "the real work is what we really do. And what our lives are. And if we can live the work we have to do, knowing that we are real, and it's real, and that the world is real, then it becomes right. And that's the real work: to make the world as real as it is, and to find ourselves as real as we are within it."