



George Sessions
Philosophy Department
Sierra College
Rocklin, CA 95677

ECOPHILOSOPHY

Number 2
May 1979



It has been three years since the first and only issue of an "ecophilosophy newsletter" has appeared. Arne Naess of Norway has been interested in establishing a newsletter on a less informal basis but so far these plans have not materialized. The decade of the '70's has been a very fruitful one in defining and refining various ecophilosophical issues and positions. It is hoped that this issue will help clarify and disseminate the most recent thinking and identify those thinkers making a significant contribution to ecophilosophy as we move into the crucial decade of the '80's. Meanwhile the wholesale destruction of ecosystems, species, and habitat is accelerating at an even more incredible rate. The time is indeed short! We need dedicated clear-thinking emotionally-committed scholar/teachers to take a stand for person/planet.

* * * * *

THREE MAJOR EVENTS FOR ECOPHILOSOPHY stand out for recognition this year:

(1) the establishment of an Environmental Ethics journal under the auspices of the John Muir Institute for Environmental Studies and the University of New Mexico and edited by the philosopher, Eugene C. Hargrove. It is a quarterly and the first issue appeared Spring, 1979. This issue contained a piece by the well-known Whiteheadian, Charles Hartshorne, and an interesting paper by Holmes Rolston on differing meanings of "following Nature" (Rolston was the author of an influential paper "Is There an Ecological Ethics?" Ethics, Vol. 85, No 2, Jan 1975). A paper by Baird Callicott makes a contribution by examining Richard Routley's claim that "The dominant Western ethical tradition excludes

an environmental ethic in principle" but Callicott's paper bristles with logical formula. John Martin (the main reviewer for the journal) has contributed a paper which is even more studded with mathematical logic. No doubt the journal wishes to establish its academic credentials, but, this done, one hopes that the journal will strive to print papers which make a significant contribution to ecophilosophy, and not turn into a mere "in-house" intellectual plaything for professional philosophers who have found a "new field" and an outlet for their publishing requirements. The number of such journals abounds in all fields. However, the next issue promises an unpublished paper by Aldo Leopold, so perhaps there is hope. We wish the journal well. For a subscription (together perhaps with some comments concerning what function you think this journal should serve), send \$15 to Environmental Ethics, Department of Philosophy, Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131.

(2) the establishment of a graduate program in ecophilosophy during the fall of 1978 called THE NEW NATURAL PHILOSOPHY being offered by International College. The phrase "new natural philosophy" seems to have come from T. Roszak's Where the Wasteland Ends, Anchor Books, 1972, p. 241. This is a tutorial program in which students live in place and work with such ecophilosophers as John Cobb, Jr., at Claremont, Paul Shepard at Claremont, Gary Snyder of Kitkitdizze, Vine Deloria in Colorado, Dolores LaChapelle of Colorado who has recently written a book Earth Wisdom, Sigmund Kvaloy of the Ecophilosophy Group of the Ecopolitical Ring at the Univ. of Oslo, and the Spinozist Arne Naess of Oslo.

Joseph Meeker is the coordinator of the program and he was well-chosen for the position. Meeker recently developed an interdisciplinary program at Athabasca University (described in his paper "Ambidextrous Education or: How Universities can Come Unskewed and Learn to Live in the Wilderness" North American Review, Summer, 1975). Joe is the author of THE COMEDY OF SURVIVAL and has been environmental editor of the North American Review for 6 or 7 years. Many fine papers in ecophilosophy by Meeker, Shepard, Niel Everndon, and others have appeared in NAR.

In the April, 1979 newsletter of International College, it says that "Our brochure on the New Natural Philosophy was published last fall, and the response has been so enthusiastic that we have had to reprint it. It is available upon request. Somehow, a copy fell into the hands of a producer at Hanseatic TV (Hamburg, Germany), who wrote Dr. Meeker for further information on which to base a program for German television." For a brochure, write: International College, 1019 Gayley Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

(3) the final drafting of the paper "Streams of Environmentalism" by Bill Devall, Department of Sociology, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA 95521. Bill has worked very hard on this paper over the last several years and now has a paper ready, of monograph length, which makes an immense contribution to sorting out the different contemporary environmental movements. The main division Devall sees is between the shallow and the deep ecology movements, following the terminology of the Norwegian ecophilosopher, Arne Naess, in his paper

✓ "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements," Inquiry, Vol. 16, 1973, pp. 95-100.

Devall claims that "there are two great streams of environmentalism in the twentieth century. One stream ("shallow environmentalism") is reformist, attempting to control some of the worst of the air and water pollution and inefficient land use practices in industrialized nations and save a few of the remaining pieces of wildlands as 'designated wilderness areas.' The other stream ("deep ecology") supports many of the reformist goals but is revolutionary, seeking a new metaphysics, epistemology, cosmology and environmental ethics of person/planet." Devall sees these two major environmental movements as separated by an incommensurable paradigm gulf. The shallow movement seems essentially wedded to the modern social paradigm of the urban-industrial scientific/technocratic world view. He lists eight different movements within the shallow paradigm, including the (a) movement to establish urban parks and "designated wilderness" areas and national parks, (b) movement to develop "proper" land-use planning, (c) the Resource Conservation and Development position and the philosophy of "multiple use", (d) the "appropriate technology" movement, and (e) the "animal liberation" movement. In summary, Devall claims that the shallow movement is essentially anthropocentric.

"'Technique' for management, whether 'wilderness management' or 'wildlife management' or 'management of our human resources' is all in the name of efficiency. Nature is viewed as a collection of 'resources' for the use of Homo sapiens ... The dominant social paradigm can be saved, in terms of shallow environmentalism, if we develop institutional mechanisms for 'managing the commons' (Garrett Hardin), or if we define 'property rights' more clearly ... In short, shallow environmentalism legitimates the continued rape of planet earth and all its inhabitants while making token concessions to the demands and insights of ecology".

The "deep ecology" movement, on the other hand, "embodies, as its very essence, a radical critical analysis of the dominant social paradigm". It challenges the very concept of "progress," the idea of humans as separate from, or superior in any way, to the rest of Nature, the idea of non-human nature as "resources for humans", and the concept of man "managing" Nature. "In deep ecology, the 'wholeness' and integrity of person/Nature, together with the principle of what Arne Naess calls 'biocentric egalitarianism' are perhaps the key ideas ... Man is a 'plain citizen' of the biosphere, not its conqueror or manager (Aldo Leopold). There should be a "democracy of all God's creatures" (St. Francis). Man is a 'temporary and dependent mode of the whole of God/Nature' (Spinoza). Man should respect the evolutionary destinies of other life forms (Gary Snyder). The new way should 'let beings be' - that is, we should realize the intrinsic worth of other species, rather than as resources for man's increasing drive for more power (Heidegger). Man flows with the system of Nature rather than attempting to control it (Taoism). "

Devall also sees other strength and ideas for the deep ecology movement coming from the full implications of interrelatedness deriving from the science of ecology, and from the religions and life-styles of the American Indian and other primitive societies. He lists and elaborates upon twenty thesis statements of deep ecology, as well as

providing interesting case histories in the extended and full footnotes. As an invited paper for a special issue of the Natural Resources Journal on the topic "Whither Environmentalism?", the version to be published has required drastic cuts. Most of the critique of shallow environmentalism has been omitted together with large chunks of the deep ecology section. Devall was able to expand on certain themes of deep ecology in the version submitted to the journal, and while Bill still looks for a publisher for the "unexpurgated" version, copies can be obtained by writing him c/o Humboldt State University.

Bill Devall has been exceedingly productive academically this year. He has written a paper "Why Wilderness?" which provides a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the arguments proposed for protecting wilderness and another paper entitled "Naturalism and the New Paganism: The World as God". Copies can be obtained by writing him. In addition to his significant academic contribution to ecophilosophy (he has numerous other environmental papers and book reviews to his credit as well as serving as special editor for an issue of the Humboldt Journal of Social Relations Vol. 2, No 1, Fall/Winter, 1974 on the topic "Social Behavior and Natural Environments") Bill has put his deep ecology commitment into practice. He practices "living in place" with a very low-entropy, low consumption life style. For the last ten years, Bill has worked relentlessly with environmental organizations and individually to save the Siskiyou, redwoods, Humboldt Bay and the seacoast, and the entire North Coast area from further environmental degradation from the US Forest Service, the timbering companies, developers, and others. He was largely instrumental in setting up the Northcoast Environmental Center, a coalition of environmental groups (Sierra Club, Audubon, Friends of the Earth, Friends of the River, etc) and a model of its kind. Bill is a frequent contributor to Econews (Newsletter of the Northcoast Environmental Center) which can be received by joining for \$6/year. Write: NEC, 1091 H Street, Arcata, CA 95521.

* * * * *

A philosopher who also comes from a deep ecology orientation and who has been thoroughly immersed in environmental battles for many years is PETE GUNTER at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203. Some of Gunter's ecophilosophical papers include "The Big Thicket: A Case Study in Attitudes Toward Environment," in W.T. Blackstone, Philosophy & Environmental Crisis; "The Rural Southern Mentality & the Environmental Crisis," in Stephan White, Population & Environmental Crisis; "Wilderness Preservation: Some New Alternatives and an 'Old' Rationale," Phi Kappa Phi Journal, LVIII (1), Winter, 1978. For over a decade, Gunter fought for a Big Thicket State Park in Texas which is now a reality, although only a tiny portion of the original thicket was preserved. In this cause, he served as president of the Big Thicket Association and authored the book, The Big Thicket, Jenkins Publishing Co (dist by Viking PRESS) 1971. Currently, as a member of the Texas Coastal Zone Management Program's Citizens Advisory Committee, it would appear that Pete is taking on the whole state of Texas. "Now that (Gunter) has taken on unplanned growth as his new fight and come out in favor of imposing state limits on migration ..."

* Natural Resources Journal (Univ. of New Mexico School of Law) Special editor, Robert Mitchell of Resources for the Future, Vol. 19 No.3, Fall, 1979

this quote is from a powerfully written paper focusing on the phenomenal growth in Texas and featuring Gunter as the chief radical environmental spokesman in the state by Si Dunn entitled "Trapped in Texas: Will 1979's Wide Open Spaces Become 2020's Megalopolitan Mess?" in SCENE MAGAZINE, The Dallas Morning News, Feb 11, 1979. In recent correspondence, Pete reported that the article is "finding a surprisingly positive reception in Texas ... Could it be that even Texans have begun to figure out that the world is finite? Sounds almost un-American." He has also written a hard-hitting article "The Future of an Illusion" which appeared in The Texas Observer, Vol. 71, No. 7, April 13, 1979. As the metaphysical basis of his deep ecology stance, he has just edited with Jack Sibley, an anthology, Process Philosophy, with writings from Whitehead, Bergson, William James, and others, University Press of America, 1978.

* * * * *

ENVIRONMENTAL TYPOLOGIES have been attempted by theorists other than the "shallow-deep" classification first proposed by Arne Naess and elaborated upon by Bill Devall but they suffer from serious defects in that they tend not to capture the essentially incommensurable aspects of the competing paradigms. For example, Robert Cahn in his FOOTPRINTS ON THE PLANET: A Search for an Environmental Ethic splits environmentalists into the "enlightened egoists" and the "nature moralists" echoing the classical split between the utilitarian conservationist Gifford Pinchot and the religious/spiritual preservationism of John Muir, but his understanding of the issues tends to be vague.

A more serious typology has been proposed by the political philosopher, John Rodman, of Pitzer College and the Claremont Graduate School. In a proposed series of monographs beginning in 1976, entitled "Four Forms of Ecological Consciousness", Rodman intended to explicate, criticize, and integrate four historically developing forms of consciousness which he initially labeled (a) the economic ideology of Resource Conservation (and Development), (b) the moral/legal ideology of nonhuman rights and human obligations, (c) the religious/esthetic cult of Wilderness Preservation, and (d) Ecological Sensibility (Rodman, "Four Forms of Ecological Consciousness - Part I: Resource Conservation - Economics and After" (unpublished manuscript delivered at the American Political Science Association Meeting). More recently he has labeled these movements (a) Resource Conservation, (b) Wilderness Preservation, (c) Nature Moralism, and (d) Ecological Resistance (John Rodman, "Theory and Practice in the Environmental Movement" The Search for Absolute Values in a Changing World, The International Cultural Foundation, Inc., 1978). I think Rodman's classification has problems for reasons I will elaborate upon below.

The philosopher of science, Henryk Skolimowski, Humanities Division, University of Michigan, and associate editor of the British journal, The Ecologist, appears to recognize the competing nature of the radically different paradigms in contemporary environmentalism. See his "Eco-philosophy versus the Scientific World View" Ecologist Quarterly, Autumn, 1978, which is a very good critique of the old paradigm; his

✓ "Options for the Ecology Movement," The Ecologist, 7 (8) 1977; and his monograph, Ecological Humanism, Gryphon Press, 1977. Devall's elaboration of the "shallow" technocratic ecology movement vs. the "deep" spiritual ecology movement seems to capture the paradigmatic nature of contemporary environmentalism more than any other typology, hence I will make use of it in what follows.

* * * * *

SHALLOW ECOLOGY

From an ecophilosophical standpoint, the most interesting positions here are (a) Resource Conservation and Development, (b) the philosophy of Humanism, (c) future generations (of humans) arguments, (d) the animal rights or "animal liberation" movement. The chief weakness of these positions, from a deep ecology perspective, is that they are ultimately anthropocentric which contributes to their violation of what Arne Naess calls the principle of biospherical or ecological egalitarianism in principle. Also there is little awareness of the need for a religious/philosophical/social paradigm shift based upon a metaphysics consistent with the full implications of the ecological concept of interrelatedness (see Neil Everndon, "Beyond Ecology," NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Winter, 1978). They see no need to challenge the epistemology of the positivist/empiricist utilitarian model of the prevailing Western paradigm and seek spiritual paths which necessarily involve the resacrilization of Nature. Essential to the standard paradigm is an implicit belief in what the Yale philosopher, John Smith, calls a false theory of history ("Into the Secular Void," Commonweal, 16 March 1979); the philosophy of history developed by the "father of sociology", Auguste Comte. "Progress" is defined as the cultural development of man from the primitiveness of hunting/gathering superstitious religious man, through philosophy and metaphysics, to the scientific/technological society which is the zenith of human culture. While this value judgment undergirds and provides impetus towards the growth of the artificial environment, most other judgments of value and quality are infected with a pervasive relativism (for a critique of the havoc played by this sociological relativism in our current educational system, see Alston Chase, "Skipping Through College: Reflections on the Decline of Liberal Arts Education," Atlantic, Sept. 1978; John C. Sawhill, "The Unlettered University," Harper's, Vol. 258, No. 1545, Feb. 1979). But this value relativism (over and beyond the absolute and unassailable judgment of progress through growth and development) can easily be extrapolated to the industrial society as a whole, and certainly to the contemporary environmental decision-making process (see Devall, "Streams of Environmentalism").

* * * * *

A. Resource Conservation and Development. The two major contemporary spokesmen for this position have been the Australian philosopher, John Passmore, and the California biologist, Garrett Hardin.

John Passmore, in his influential book, Man's Responsibility for Nature (1974) provided a rather weak defense of the position, partly as a result of his somewhat superficial understanding of ecological principles and a lack of awareness of the depths and extent of contemporary environ-

mental degradation. Actually, his position and arguments served more to point out the enormous prejudices of the urban/industrial paradigm and the glaring inconsistencies of the Resource Conservation and Development paradigm. Val Routley wrote an extended critique of Passmore in "Critical Notice of Passmore's Man's Responsibility for Nature," Australasian Journal of Philosophy, Vol. 53, August, 1975, and I made some disconnected but pointed criticism of Passmore in several long footnotes to "Panpsychism vs. Modern Materialism: Some Implications for an Ecological Ethics," (unpublished manuscript of a paper read at the Claremont Rights of Non-Human Nature conference, 1974), and a more well-rounded critique in footnotes 7 & 8 of "Spinoza and Jeffers on Man In Nature," Inquiry, Vol. 20, No. 4, 1977.

In a more recent paper, "Attitudes Toward Nature," Royal Institute of Philosophy Lectures, Vol. 8, Macmillan, 1975, Passmore seems to have largely abandoned his former position and now claims that "we do need a 'new metaphysics' which is genuinely not anthropocentric ... The working out of such a metaphysics is, in my judgment, the most important task which lies ahead of philosophy". This new metaphysics will be accompanied by, ~~and hence a new ethics~~ a new ethics. "The emergence of new moral attitudes to nature is bound up, then, with the emergence of a more realistic philosophy of nature. This is the only adequate foundation for effective ecological concern." Passmore's "about-face" and these quotes are discussed in Richard & Val Routley's paper, "Nuclear Energy and Obligations to the Future," Inquiry, vol. 21, No 2, 1978, footnote 12.

* * * * *

This then leaves GARRETT HARDIN as the major theorist of modern Resource Conservation and Development with his analysis of the "tragedy of the commons" together with his solution to the tragedy -- MANAGING THE COMMONS. The step to "managing" the biosphere treated as a resource is the inevitable outcome of the Resource Conservation and Development line of thought. And Hardin has something for everyone -- everyone, that is, except the deep ecologist. As a smart ecologist, he knows that unchecked exploitation of ecosystems cannot continue, and so he calls for greater government intervention in the form of rules and regulations ("mutual coercion mutually agreed upon"). This tends to make the liberals happy and the conservatives unhappy. But he also claims that private property will be well-managed by its owners in their own self-interest and this might be a good solution to the problem. And he also calls for "lifeboat ethics" under which "underdeveloped" people will starve back to carrying capacity while we continue to use their resources on a capitalistic basis and remain affluent. The latter tends to make the conservatives happy and the liberals unhappy. Unfortunately, the history of environmental degradation of private holdings in this country is a long and sad one and, if anything, the record is getting worse. For as Aldo Leopold pointed out, without a land ethic, the profit incentive results in the destruction of the land. Hardin sounds radical to many people, but his theorizing is the most conservative ecophilosophical position in the field expressly designed to save the dominant social paradigm and value structure. The terse description by Naess of shallow ecology fits Hardin's position perfectly: "Fight against pollution and resource depletion. Central objective: the health and affluence of people in the developed countries."

Many intellectuals and policy makers in the industrial countries, wedded as they are to the dominant paradigm of the urban/industrial technocratic society, are rushing to embrace Hardin's position as the solution to our environmental ills. And this is true also of many professional philosophers who are now moving into eco-philosophical concerns. For example, Environmental Ethics reports that Donald Scherer and Thomas Attig, philosophy dept. Bowling Green State University, have received a \$50,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to develop a television script for PBS based upon the "tragedy of the commons".

Academic institutions are similarly wedded to the dominant social paradigm of technocratic Resource Conservation and Development for a variety of obvious and not-so-obvious reasons (again refer to the educational critiques by Chase and Sawhill mentioned above), and one fears that this ideology is the dominant one even in the environmental studies programs which were hastily thrown together and instituted at the beginning of the '70's and the "Age of Ecology". For recent papers which begin to broach these issues, see Brian Martin, "Academics & the Environment: A Critique of the Australian National University Center for Resource and Environmental Studies," The Ecologist, 7 (6) 1977; Livingston & Mason, "Ecological Crisis & the Autonomy of Science in Capitalist Society," Alternatives, 8 (1) Winter, 1978; Graham Carey & Peter Abbs, "Proposal for a New Ecological College," The Ecologist, 7 (2) 1977; and Devall, "Streams of Environmentalism" (long version). Theodore Roszak, in Person/Planet: The Creative Disintegration of Industrial Society, Doubleday, 1978, also points to the urban chauvinism of most intellectuals. And in Where the Wasteland Ends (section on "Ecology & the Uses of Mysticism") Roszak chides Ian McHarg who talks a non-anthropocentric line, and then takes a functionalist approach to pantheism and ecology. Roszak suggests that ecology could become the science of the whole person or "it could finish - at least in its professionally respectable version - as no more than a sophisticated systems approach to the conservation of natural resources. The question remains open: which will ecology be, the last of the old sciences or the first of the new?" (p. 371).

As Devall points out in "Streams of Environmentalism" many environmental organizations such as Sierra Club, Audobon, and Friends of the Earth had, as their founders and/or guiding lights, deep ecologists the likes of John Muir, Robinson Jeffers, and Aldo Leopold but, during the decades of the 60's and '70's, they have tended to drop back to the rhetoric of Resource Conservation and Development, and they have hired batteries of "experts" to counteract the arguments of the "experts" on the other side. Roszak (Where the Wasteland Ends) calls this the "strategy of countervailing expertise" and warns of its potential dangers in his chapter "Citadel of Expertise".

* * * * *

A sharp exchange occurred in Not Man Apart (newsletter of Friends of the Earth) this year between shallow and deep ecology precipitated by Bill Devall's review of Hardin & Baden, Managing the Commons (Aug/Sept 78).

One biology professor was so upset that anyone would criticize Hardin that he cancelled his membership. Another correspondent thought the "religious/esthetic" position was essentially the right one, but advised that the issues had to be fought out on the practical pragmatic level of Hardin & Resource Conservation. This person also pointed to William Ophul's Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity, Freeman, 1977, as another example of a pragmatic approach like Hardin's.

I joined the fray with a letter in the Jan or Feb 1979 issue of NMA which tried to point out that the two positions were separated by competing paradigms and thus, quite different assumptions. In a section which was editorially deleted, I pointed out that while Ophuls makes use of the concept of the "tragedy of the commons", nevertheless he "brilliantly argues that the present industrial/technocratic society cannot cope with the environmental crisis; "muddling through" will not do the trick. Thus, there will be no successful "managing of the commons" under the present system. In the end, Ophuls argues that nothing short of a complete religious/economic/political paradigm change will bring about an ecologically viable society. And referring to Thoreau, Gary Snyder, Callenbach, and Schumacher, Ophuls claims that the most pressing issue of our times is the development of a new ecological philosophy for modern society. Thus, Ophuls ultimately is in complete accord with Devall."

Just recently Hardin replied to my letter (NMA April, 1979). Apparently Hardin is not only a believer in what John Smith has labeled a "false theory of history" (see above), but he does not seem to have spent much time contemplating the possibility of a post-industrial society, for he argues that there is no alternative to managing nature under present existing economic systems. One imagines that a little analysis might be useful on his claim "Whenever we propose to use ('exploit') the goods of nature, they become human resources (even if we propose to do no more than regard them with wonder)". Despite his sloppy hasty replies to what he refers to as "nature mystics", one issue which he raises does deserve some serious attention; that is, the possibility of ambiguity attached to the concept of "managing" Nature - a concept which Hardin unabashedly concedes is essentially anthropocentric. This concept could profitably be subjected to careful analysis by a philosopher deeply immersed in the intricacies of the contemporary ecophilosophical and environmental scene. As a modest beginning:

(i) "Managing Nature" can be used in the sense in which John Passmore seemed to approve; that is, nature seen as one vast potential farm to be "managed" for man for his perceived benefit. Wild forests would be turned into tree farms, the oceans into fish breeding ponds, deserts would be turned into truck farms, there would be attempts to control the weather and hydrologic cycles in general, etc. etc. (see comments on Passmore in Sessions, "Spinoza & Jeffers," footnotes 7 & 8). Relatively small "designated wilderness areas", likewise managed by man, would be set aside in enclaves in an otherwise vast sea of urbanization, mechanized agri/business, and tree farms as we press forward toward what Roszak calls the "artificial environment" (Where the Wasteland Ends). And I don't see any strenuous objections to this vision of the future in Hardin's writings.

But despite the obvious repugnant "brave new world" aspects of all

this, there are serious ecological objections to this vision and direction (in which we are now headed) of which Hardin must surely be aware. As one ecologist put it "Nature is not only more complex than we think, but it is more complex than we can ever think" To this we can add Barry Commoner's third law of ecology "Nature Knows Best" (Closing Circle). And at the beginning of the environmental decade, two ecologists, Murdoch & Connell, in their paper "All About Ecology", issued a warning to the technological ecological approach to environment: "We submit that ecology as such probably cannot do what many people expect it to do; it cannot provide a set of 'rules' of the kind needed to manage the environment." If then this is Hardin's idea of "managing the commons (Nature)", his comment "I don't assume that we are competent in management; I merely assert that we had better become competent" clearly begs the issue.

(ii) there is another sense of "managing Nature" which needs to be distinguished. This might be characterized as "management" decisions consisting of deciding not to manage in the first sense. For example, the philosopher, John N. Phillips (also director of the Environmental Studies Program at St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301) presented the paper "On Environmental Ethics" at the APA meeting in San Francisco in 1978 which made such a proposal. Expanding upon ideas from Eugene Odum's Principles of Ecology, Phillips claimed that: "THE BIOSPHERE AS A WHOLE SHOULD BE ZONED, in order to protect it from the human impact. We must strictly confine the Urban-Industrial Zone, and the Production Zone (agriculture, grazing, fishing), enlarge the Compromise Zone, and drastically expand the PROTECTION ZONE, i.e., wilderness, wild rivers. Great expanses of seacoasts and estuaries must be included in the Protection Zone, along with forests and praries and

various habitat types. We must learn that the multiple-use Compromise Zone is no substitute, with its mining, lumbering, grazing, and re-creation in the national forests, for the scientific, aesthetic, and genetic-pool values of the Protection Zone. Such zoning, "if carried out in time, may be the only way to limit the destructive impact of our technological-industrial-agri-business complex on earth." Another writer who advocates huge tracts of wilderness or Protection Zone is Mulford Sibley in Nature and Civilization, Peacock, 1977

Phillips' proposal is very similar to that advocated by the deep ecologist, Paul Shepard in The Tender Carnivore and the Sacred Game (see the chapter, "The Choice: Industrial Agriculture or Techno-Cynegetics") Scribner's, 1973. But even this legalistic approach to zoning the environment as a form of "management" is, at best, a "temporary measure" until industrial society is "creatively dismantled" and Homo sapiens get their collective heads screwed on straight again.

The flip-flop from the shallow to the deep ecology paradigm essentially reverses the priority of natural to urban areas on the planet. Whereas shallow ecology sees small enclaves of "designated wilderness areas" and protected "wildlife refuges" in a sea of urbanism and "resource" extraction, deep ecology calls for a planet consisting primarily of free-flowing ecosystems, interspersed with small enclaves of civilization. The eco-poet, Gary Snyder, brings this vision out clearly in the eco-

logical broadside he coauthored with Alan Watts, Richard Brautigan, Stewart Brand, and others in 1969, "Four Changes": "What we envision is a planet on which the human population lives harmoniously and dynamically by employing various sophisticated and unobtrusive technologies in a world environment which is 'left natural'" (FOUR CHANGES was published and modified in Gary Snyder, TURTLE ISLAND, 1974). Ernest Callenbach projects assimilar vision in his Ecotopia as does Loren Eiseley in "The Last Magician" in Eiseley, The Invisible Pyramid, Scribner's, 1970. David Brower once conjured up the vision of an "Earth National Park" but a deep ecology "park" would not exist primarily for "recreation" or "esthetics" and it would be minus the management schemes of the Park Service - it would be a Protection Zone and "self-managing". If this is the sort of "management" vision Hardin has in mind, then he is to be applauded, and the practical visions, if not the paradigmatic commitments, of shallow and deep ecologists have indeed begun to coalesce.

The definitive refutation of the unreconstructed paradigm of Resource Conservation and Development occurs in John Rodman, "Four Forms of Ecological Conscience: Part ONE: Resource Conservation - Economics and After" (still unpublished).

* * * * *

B. HUMANISM as a philosophical orientation. As Western culture rejected main-line Christianity during the Renaissance and Enlightenment, a secular philosophy of Humanism, harkening back to the Athenian Greeks, arose to undergird the new dream of the urban-industrial technocratic vision of the artificial environment. Embodied in such philosophies as Comtean positivism and theory of history, John Dewey's instrumentalism, and Marxian socialism, this vision and value system grew perhaps even more virulently anthropocentric than Christianity. The first director of the U.S. Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot, made the most terse statement of this position (with the possible exception of Hardin): "There are just humans and resources".

Lately, "humanists" have been scrambling around for ecological credentials. For example, Victor-Ferkiss has a section on "ecological humanism" in his THE FUTURE OF TECHNOLOGICAL CIVILIZATION, and published a paper, "Ecological Humanism and Planetary Society" in THE HUMANIST, may/June, 1974. H. Skolimowski (discussed above) titled his monograph, ECOLOGICAL HUMANISM. And the philosopher, H.L. Parsons, in his recent book, MARX AND ENGELS ON ECOLOGY, tries to make a case that these thinkers had genuine ecological concerns. Parsons mostly succeeds in showing that they were thoroughly entrenched in the Resource Conservation and Development paradigm. Marx's metaphysics of secular atomistic materialism coupled with the Newtonian model of the Universe as a machine does not lend itself readily to a deep ecology perspective.

Dewey went to great pains, along the Comtean model, to eschew metaphysics in the traditional sense, but both he and Marx were clearly laying the foundations for the urban/industrial technocratic social paradigm and the further desacrilization of Nature. My paper "Spinoza

and Jeffers" also provides a running contrast between the systems of Spinoza and Dewey. Dewey's metaphysical hassles with George Santayana are referred to in footnote 34. For more on the Dewey-Santayana metaphysical dispute, see Manley Thompson, "Metaphysics" in Chisholm, Feigl, et. al., PHILOSOPHY, Prentice-Hall, 1964. Bertrand Russell's criticisms of the anthropocentrism of both Dewey and Marx are discussed in my paper, "Anthropocentrism and the Environmental Crisis".

Philosophers such as Dewey and Marx, by focusing almost exclusively on society and its political-economic problems, generally miss the significance of the ecological basis for society. As Roszak points out in Where the Wasteland Ends, "There are those who believe fervently that the good society may yet be built - if only our humanistic resolve is sufficiently strong. I disagree. Humanism is the finest flower of urban-industrial society; but the odor of alienation yet clings to it - and to all culture and public policy that springs from it" (p. xxiv).

The philosopher, Don Marietta, Jr. (Florida Atlantic University) has been working in the area of an ecological humanism. See his papers, "Humanism & Concern for Environment," RELIGIOUS HUMANISM, Vol. XII, No. 3, Summer, 1978; "Ecological Science & Environmental Ethics" (unpublished paper); and "Religious Models and Ecological Decision Making," in ZYGMON: JOURNAL OF RELIGION AND SCIENCE, Vol. 12, no 2, June, 1977. The Sept. 1977 issue of ZYGMON contains papers by H. Montefiore & D. Bryce Smith which argue that humanism leads to anthropocentrism and is unable to provide a basis for environmental concern. A recent book along this line is David Ehrenfeld, THE ARROGANCE OF HUMANISM, Oxford Univ Press, 1979.

The question is whether Humanism can reach a position of ecological egalitarianism in principle or whether this amounts to a contradiction in terms. Most legitimate humanistic concerns have been integrated into a more-or-less deep ecology paradigm by Ted Roszak in his Person/Planet.

* * * * *

C. Future Generations (of humans) Arguments. Those working in shallow ecophilosophy have often relied on these kinds of arguments, and there seems to be a recent resurgence of interest in them. The main problem with them, from a deep ecology perspective, is that, out of context, they are blatantly anthropocentric. David Brower, president of Friends of the Earth, has relied heavily on the "future generations argument" for years.

Environmental Ethics reports that the philosopher, Ernest Partridge, Weber State College, Ogden, Utah, was awarded a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship in environmental affairs to do a research project on our "duty to posterity". I understand that Partridge is now in the process of writing several books in this area. Partridge served as the Executive Director of the Environmental Education Council of Greater Milwaukee and has written several papers which seem to show more of a deep ecology orientation. For example, in his "The Lessons of Nature," Journal of Environmental Education, Vol 5, No 2, Winter, 1973, he talks about the

"intrinsic worth of wilderness" and refers to Muir, Audobon, Thoreau, Leopold, and Krutch.

Garrett Hardin occasionally argues from a future generations position and there is an interesting discussion of future generations arguments in Passmore. Perhaps the most powerful paper in this area is Richard & Val Routley's "Nuclear Energy and Obligations to the Future" (see p. 7). But the Routley's overall orientation seems to be that of anti-homo-centric deep ecology; see R. Routley, "Is There a Need for a New, an Environmental Ethic?" Proceedings of the Fifteenth World Congress of Philosophy, I (1973); "Against the Inevitability of Human Chauvinism" and "Human Chauvinism and Environmental Ethics" (unpublished manuscripts). According to J.J.C. Smart, the Routleys internalize their deep ecology principles by following a low-consumption contemplative lifestyle on the top of a mountain near the Bush miles from Australian National University.

The shallow ecology orientation of an exclusively "future generations" approach has been properly diagnosed by John Rodman at the close of his Resource Conservation and Development paper:

" 'the criterion of what is best for posterity' became perhaps the major criterion of normative judgment in the Conservationist outlook. Certainly it is with regard to this preoccupation with the good of posterity that the Conservationist movement has been most influential; the post-Conservation forms of ecological consciousness display all the marks of being children of Resource Conservation in this respect. Certainly it is the most powerful of the Conservationist appeals, for it appeals simultaneously to our egoism as individuals, Americans, and human beings and to our felt need for a loyalty to something 'beyond' immediate personal self-interest."

* * * * *

D. The "Animal Liberation" or "Animal Rights" Movement. The current version of the animal liberation movement among professional philosophers and others seems to have stemmed from the Australian philosopher, Peter Singer, and his paper "Animal Liberation" (NY Review of Books, Apr 5, 1973) which was a review of Godlovitch & Harris, ANIMALS, MEN & MORALS. Singer had the impetus of the Age of Ecology behind him, and the paper was soon expanded into a book by Singer, ANIMAL LIBERATION, Random House, 1975. Singer's movement was essentially a revival of concerns which clustered around the formation of the Humane Society and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (mostly domestic animals) such as vegetarianism, anti-vivisectionism, sport hunting, and now the inhumane treatment of feed-lot animals, factory hens, and the needless cruelty inflicted on animals in the name of science and product-testing. This entire movement had its beginnings within a humanistic paradigm, and it is correspondingly tainted with humanistic misunderstandings and biases, and so fails to escape anthropocentrism, as we shall see.

The issue of animal rights has become amazingly popular among professional philosophers in the last few years. Many look upon it as a radical departure from standard Western anthropocentric value systems and theories but, in its most developed and extreme form, it merely strains at the edges of the standard paradigm. The other major theorist in this field is the philosopher Tom Regan (North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N. Carolina) who co-edited with Singer, *ANIMAL RIGHTS & HUMAN OBLIGATIONS* (Prentice-Hall, 1976) and has also edited *MATTERS OF LIFE AND DEATH* (Random House, 1979) which contains papers on animal rights and environmental ethics. Regan has made available a "Select Bibliography on Animal Rights & Human Obligations" which has 36 book entries and over 70 paper entries, many of them since the early 70's. Mary Hunt & Mark Juergensmeyer have published *ANIMAL ETHICS: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY*, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1978. The most recent anthology was edited by R. Morris & M. Fox, *ON THE FIFTH DAY: ANIMAL RIGHTS AND HUMAN ETHICS*, Acropolis Books, 1978, copyright the Humane Society of the United States. An entire issue of *Ethics* (Vol. 88, No.2, Jan. 1978) was devoted to animal rights theorizing as is *Inquiry*, Vol. 22, Nos. 1-2, 1979.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute is hosting a major conference in May, 1979, entitled "The Moral Foundations of Public Policy: Ethics & Animals" with major ethical theorists participating including Larry Becker, Stephan Clark, Michael Fox, James Rachels, Jan Narveson, Tom Regan, and Peter Singer. A follow-up to the conference will be the formation of the Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals with the purpose of "improving communication among those interested in the philosophical examination of the moral status of non-human animals and the human treatment of other species." For more information, contact: Harlan B. Miller, Dept. of Philosophy & Religion, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061.

Since I don't know where else to put this, a group is forming calling itself the North American Rousseau Society. For more information write: Howard R. Cell, Dept. of Philosophy/Religion, Glassboro State College, Glassboro, N.J. 08028

* * * * *

In a recent paper, Tom Regan has split with Peter Singer over the issue of whether utilitarianism can provide an adequate basis for the moral treatment of animals and vegetarianism (Regan, "Utilitarianism & Vegetarianism" (unpublished paper) and now appears to be arguing a strict "rights" position (see also Regan, "Singer's Critique of the Market", forthcoming in *Analysis*).

While these "animal rights" theorists tend to be engaged in an "in-house" debate conducted essentially within the parameters of the standard humanistic paradigm, the most serious and damaging criticism of the entire animal liberation or animal rights movement has come from a theorist exploring deep ecology alternatives, namely John Rodman.

John Rodman's paper, "The Liberation of Nature?" INQUIRY, Vol. 20, Spring, 1977 stands as a superb example of critical and creative analysis and is probably the best paper he has written to date. Ostensively a critique of Peter Singer's ANIMAL LIBERATION and Christopher Stone's SHOULD TREES HAVE STANDING? (a "rights model" for Nature), a careful reading will show it to be a devastating critique of the entire shallow ecology orientation as irrevocably and unjustifiably anthropocentric. While no attempt will be made to analyze or summarize this complex subtle paper, a few points can be made.

Of Singer, Rodman says, "The weakness of this 'new testament of the animal rights movement' lies in the limitation of its horizon to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Utilitarian humane movement, its failure to live up to its own noble declaration that 'Philosophy ought to question the basic assumptions of the age', and its tendency to utilize the contemporary rhetoric of 'liberation' without fully comprehending what liberation might involve" (p. 86).

Stone hints at a panpsychistic metaphysics in which the whole Creation is linked through universal sentience and then proposes what he calls "thinking the unthinkable" -- extending legal rights to natural entities such as forests and rivers on the model of treating corporations as legal entities. Rodman criticizes both Singer and Stone:

"Singer proposes what he considers radical changes in order to diminish the suffering of domesticated animals (and arguments which he thinks lead to vegetarianism as the only acceptable moral stance), but he does not challenge domestication itself. Similarly, Stone is concerned to ward off the Walt Disney stage of 'development' but he seems to presuppose a continuation of the policy of confining and managing wilderness and wildlife in National Forests, National Parks, Wildlife Refuges, etc. (p 87) ... In the end, Singer achieves 'an expansion of our moral horizons' just far enough to include most animals ... The rest of nature is left in a state of thinghood, having no intrinsic worth ... Homocentrist rationalism has widened out into a kind of zoocentrist sentientism."

The problem with Singer and Stone and the whole animal rights movement is that they attempt to **EXTEND EXISTING HUMANISTIC ETHICAL AND LEGAL THEORY TO THE NON-HUMAN:**

"Stone and Singer follow a similar pattern: they pick a quality that is conceded to be normally possessed by humans; they make it the basis for the capacity for rights; then they find it writ large beyond the human pale. Singer picks sentience and stops with (most) animals. Stone picks consciousness as well as sentience and suggests that it may well be present in all natural 'objects' (panpsychism). Of course, **THERE IS A PECKING ORDER IN THIS MORAL BARNYARD** (humans always come out on top! *italics & comment mine, ed.*) (p. 93) ... In the process of extending rights to nonhumans conveys a double message. On the one hand, nonhumans are elevated to the human level by virtue of their sentience and/or consciousness; they now have (some) rights. On the other hand, non-humans are by the same process degraded to the status of inferior human beings, species-anomolies:

"imbeciles, the senile, 'human vegetables' ... Is this, then, the new enlightenment - to see non-human animals as imbeciles, wilderness as a human vegetable?" (p. 94).

In despair, Rodman asks: "Why do our 'new ethics' seem so old, and our exercises in exploring the 'unthinkable' so tame? Because the attempt to produce a 'new ethics' by the process of extension perpetuates the basic presuppositions of the conventional modern paradigm, however much it fiddles with the boundaries ... the progressive extension model of ethics, while holding out promise of transcending the homocentric perspective of modern culture, subtly fulfills and legitimizes the basic project of modernity - the total conquest of nature by man" (pp. 95-7). And further, Rodman asks, "whether contemporary philosophers accompany the advance of technological society the way missionaries once accompanied the march of conquistadors assimilating the conquered to the culture of the conquerors and ameliorating (making more 'humane') the harshness of the yoke, or whether they criticize the process of conquest in the interest of liberation" (p. 98).

The problem, as Rodman realizes, is with the whole anthropocentric humanistic urban/industrial social paradigm and value system. Why not REALLY THINK THE UNTHINKABLE which means challenging the whole paradigm?

(1) Against Singer, instead of trying to argue for the morality of vegetarianism, why not challenge the entire concept of domestication (along the lines proposed in Paul Shepard, THE TENDER CARNIVORE AND THE SACRED GAME)?

(2) Against Stone, why not challenge the whole idea of "designated wilderness areas and wildlife refuges to be managed, etc." and raise questions about the legitimacy of the very concept of PROPERTY (pp. 107-110)?

(3) Against Singer & Stone, why not stop trying artificially to extend existing anthropocentric ethical systems which treat other forms of life as sub-human? Instead "in this context, 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" (p. 109).

(4) And against Hardin, as well as Singer and Stone, Rodman points out, "From the standpoint of an ecology of humanity, it is curious how little appreciation there has been of the limitations of the moral/legal stage of consciousness. If an existing system of moral and legal coercion does not suffice, our tendency is to assume that the solution lies in more of the same, in 'greatly extending the laws and rules which already are beginning to govern our treatment of nature' in the tradition of 'mutual coercion mutually agreed upon' hallowed by the social contract myth ... What is 'unthinkable' (and therefore interesting to consider) is the alternate possibility that we may need to become less moralistic and less legalistic, or at least to become less fixated at the moral/legal stage of consciousness" (p. 103).

(5) And finally, Rodman refers to deep ecologist Paul Shepard's vision (THE TENDER CARNIVORE & THE SACRED GAME) as the ultimate version of "thinking the unthinkable": "Can we imagine an alternative world in which the situation is reversed, a world in which human population and economic sprawl are reduced to a point where people live again within city walls (boundaries, not frontiers), surrounded by free wilderness into which they can make their ritual journeys in quest of re-creation? A utopian vision? Perhaps, but while computerized projections of eco-catastrophe appear all around us, prophesying at least a crash of civilization as we know it, we may do well to consider the kind of civilization that would be worth living in if some of us survive" (p. 112).

* * * * *

The Oxford Spinoza scholar and moral theorist, Stuart Hampshire, once wrote a paper criticizing utilitarianism for its inherent anthropocentrism, and was subsequently criticised on grounds that utilitarianism allows moral consideration for those animals which feel pain. However, if Rodman's critique of utilitarianism and animal rights is sound, and I think it is, Hampshire need not have apologized, as I am sure he was well aware. Hampshire wrote:

"For a utilitarian, the moral standpoint, which is to govern all our actions, places men at the very centre of the universe, with their states of feeling as the source of all value in the world. If the species perished, to the last man, or if the last men became impassible and devoid of feeling, things would become cold and indifferent and neutral, from the moral point of view; whether this or that other unfeeling species survived or perished, plants, stars and galaxies, would then be of no consequence. Destruction of things is an evil only in so far as it is, or will be, felt as a loss by sentient beings; and the creation of things, and the preservation of species, are to be aimed at and commended only in so far as sentient beings are, or will be, emotionally and sentimentally interested in the things created and preserved.

This doctrine may reasonably be criticized in two contrary ways; first, as involving a kind of arrogance in the face of nature, an arrogance that is intelligible only if the doctrine is seen as a residue of the Christian account of this species' peculiar relation to the Creator. Without the Christian story it seems to entail a strangely arbitrary narrowing of moral interest. Is the destruction, for instance, of a species in nature to be avoided, as a great evil, only or principally because of the loss of pleasure that human beings may derive from the species? May the natural order be farmed by humans for their comfort and pleasure without any restriction other than the comfort and pleasure of future human beings?

...On the other hand, the doctrine that only our feelings are morally significant may be thought, on the contrary, to belittle man: for it makes morality, the system of rights, duties, and obligations, a kind of psychic engineering, which shows the way to induce desired or valued states of mind. This suggests, as a corollary, that men might be trained, moulded, even bred, with

a view to their experiencing the kinds of feeling that alone lend value to their morally neutral surroundings ... So the original sense of the sovereign importance of human beings, and of their feelings, has been converted by exxageration into its opposite; a sense that these original ends of action are, or soon may become, comparatively manageable problems in applied science" ("Morality & Pessimism" NY Review of Books, Vol 19, Jan. 1973, reprinted in Hampshire, PUBLIC & PRIVATE MORALITY, Cambridge University Press, 1978).

As an alternative to the serious deficiencies in utilitarianism and other conventional ethical systems, Hampshire argues for certain morally desirable "ways of life" together with absolute moral prohibitions based upon intuitive moral feelings (genetically based?) which are ultimate and not to be overridden by other considerations. Rodman, in his paper, occasionally seems to make a similar appeal.

* * * * *

The most recent issue of ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS (Vol 1, No. 2, 1979) just arrived with the lead paper by the philosopher, Richard Watson ("Self-Consciousness & the Rights of Nonhuman Animals and Nature"), who outlines, with meticulous academic style, the standard anthropocentric approach to these issues. It is inconceivable that professional philosophers writing in the animal rights vein will have anything useful or interesting to contribute at this point without explicitly addressing the criticism raised by Rodman and Hampshire.

In the notes section of the journal, there is an exciting announcement of a masters degree program in the philosophy of ecology offered by the University of Montana. "The program aims to integrate three ways of studying the environment: (1) the social-political-legal; (2) the scientific-technological; and (3) the ethical-metaphysical." Write: M.A. in the Philosophy of Ecology, Department of Philosophy, Univ. of Montana, Missoula, Montana 59812.

* * * * *

Perhaps the most innovative of the animal rights theorists is Tom Regan. Tom has just written a paper "On the Nature and Possibility of an Environmental Ethic" to appear in SOCIAL THEORY AND PRACTICE. He arrives at what he calls the Preservation Principle by which he means "a principle of non-destruction, non-interference and, generally, non-meddling. By characterizing this in terms of a principle, moreover, I mean to suggest that preservation (letting-be) be regarded as a moral imperative." Regan may be the theorist to "pied piper" the whole animal rights movement and the Humane Society over to a deep ecology perspective.

* * * * *

Deep ecology theorists are also writing specifically on man's relationship to other animals. Gary Snyder (in a paper presented at the Claremont Conference on the Rights of Non-Human Nature, reprinted as "The Yogin & the Philosopher", in Snyder, THE OLD WAYS, 1977) puts the issue like this:

"As the discriminating, self-centered awareness of civilized man has increasingly improved his material survival potential, it has correspondingly moved him farther and farther from a spontaneous feeling of being part of the natural world. It often takes, ironically, an analytical and rational presentation of man's interdependence with other life forms from the biological sciences to move modern people toward questioning their own role as major planetary exploiter. This brings us to the use of terms like "Rights of Non-Human Nature": or questions such as "do trees have standing?" From the standpoint of "all is one" the question need never arise."

In a recent conversation with Snyder, he discussed the origins of vegetarianism in both the West and the East. In the West it has been handed down from the Pythagoreans through various religious groups to the Humane Society and current animal rights theorists. The rationale is usually for spiritual and/or health reasons and is often associated, both East and West, with the principle of non-violence. That either human or non-human predation should be looked upon as a form of violence is, in all likelihood, a non-biological misreading of the situation (for a discussion of this, see "On Preying Together" in John Livingston's excellent book, ONE COSMIC INSTANT). In the East, Hinduism and later Buddhism arrived at a vegetarian position, and, as Snyder pointed out, Jainism is the world extreme in this regard. It's as if the "original sin" of mankind was to be destined to "violence" through predation. But Taoism, with its close identification with Nature, never prohibited meat-eating, and Zen and Tibetan Buddhism grappled with this problem and came down on the side of human omnivorousness. Most hunter/gatherers were of course omnivorous; dietary habits were largely regional, depending upon what the bioregion had to offer. For Taoism and Zen, as well as hunter/gatherers, predation and meat eating were largely a matter of "good manners", a matter of sacramentalizing the food chain through cultus and ritual.

* * * * *

Undoubtedly the most important book to discuss man's relationship with other animals is Paul Shepard's THINKING ANIMALS: ANIMALS & THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, Viking, 1978. Shepard argues that the very development of humans, and human intelligence, has depended, and still depends, upon their relationship to other animals. Wild animals provide a much better model than domesticated "goofies". Correspondingly, Shepard argues in an admittedly selfish, anthropocentric, way that we need large wild animals in their natural habitat to pattern ourselves after, and become fully human. But ultimately, this apparent anthropocentricity is only another way of expressing our absolute interrelatedness with the rest of Nature and its inhabitants.

For other papers written by deep ecologists on our relationships with other animals, see Arne Naess, "Self-Realization in Mixed Communities of Humans, Bears, Sheep and Wolves", and John Rodman, "Animal Justice", to appear in Inquiry, Vol. 22, Nos. 1 & 2, 1979. Other related books of interest include Donald R. Griffin, THE QUESTION OF ANIMAL AWARENESS: EVOLUTIONARY CONTINUITY OF MENTAL EXPERIENCE, Rockefeller UP, 1976; Mary Midgley, BEAST & MAN: THE ROOTS OF HUMAN NATURE, Cornell UP, 1978.

A deep ecology conference was held April 7-10, 1979, by Centrum at Fort Worden State Park, Port Townsend, Washington, entitled "The Power of Animals" and featured Gary Snyder, Paul Shepard, and Barry Lopez, author of OF WOLVES AND MEN.

* * * * *

DEEP ECOLOGY

"The ecological, or second thermodynamic revolution, will be the most all-encompassing revolution in the history of mankind. It involves questioning and altering almost all of our ethical, political, economic, sociological, psychological, and technological rules or systems" (G. Tyler Miller, REPLENISH THE EARTH: A PRIMER IN HUMAN ECOLOGY, Wadsworth, 1972, p. 152).

The most well-rounded contemporary discussion of deep ecology appears in Bill Devall "Streams of Environmentalism" (the long unpublished version as well as the revised version to appear in NATURAL RESOURCES JOURNAL). In what follows, I intend to elaborate somewhat on Devall's analysis, especially in the areas of recent work on Spinoza, and in philosophical anthropology and reinhabitation.

A. Christian Metaphysics, Ethics, and Ecology. The outstanding work here in deep ecology was the paper by the medieval historian and past president of the American Historical Association, Lynn White, Jr., "Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis," Science, Vol. 155, 1967, later reprinted in White, MACHINA EX DEO, MIT press, 1970, and innumerable ecology anthologies. White criticized main-line Christian anthropocentrism, showed how modern humanistic ideologies such as Marxism failed to emancipate themselves from Christian anthropocentrism (see Hampshire above), and further, how this orientation diverted theoretical science from its historic preoccupation with natural theology and spiritual discipline, to a technology designed to conquer and dominate Nature. Following the ecologist, Marston Bates (THE FOREST AND THE SEA, 1960), White proposed St. Francis as the patron saint of ecology. St. Francis was surely a remarkable heretic and extreme radical in the Christian tradition, propounding a neo-pagan animistic panpsychistic metaphysics together with a corresponding biocentric egalitarian ethic in the best deep ecology tradition.

White's paper caused an immense stir among Christian theologians and scientists. White justifiably credited himself with founding, with one stroke, the "theology of ecology". The dust caused by White's paper has not yet settled, although most critics, immersed in the contemporary social paradigm, have yet to comprehend the significance of his claims. There quickly emerged a theological split between White's deep ecology Franciscanism and the Dominican view put forth by the microbiologist, Rene Dubos, in which the good monks carefully tended and husbanded their gardens around the monastery walls. Extrapolated to the planet, we are back with the Resource Conservation and Development management position of Passmore and Hardin, hence shallow ecology. White and Dubos argue out

✓ their positions in I.G. Barbour, WESTERN MAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS, 1973. Incidentally, Dubos wrote a book review of Shepard's TENDER CARNIVORE AND THE SACRED GAME (from his shallow ecology perspective) in a back issue of Time magazine.

There has been an immense amount of material written about ecological ethics during this decade by theologians and others in the Christian tradition, but the Franciscan position is the only one of which I am aware which reaches a deep ecology position, and few Christians other than White seem to have embraced it. It would seem that the long pervasive history of anthropocentrism in the Christian tradition presents too high a hurdle for these thinkers to vault. In addition, perhaps most Christian theologians are thoroughly wedded to the urban/industrial technocratic paradigm.

✓ One can now subscribe to ECOLOGY & RELIGION by sending \$1 for a sample newsletter to Ministry of Ecology, 1250 Queens Road, Berkeley, Ca.

* * * * *

B. Whiteheadian Metaphysics & Anthropocentrism. The organic panpsychistic process metaphysics of Alfred North Whitehead has looked attractive to many thinkers in the West as an alternative to mechanistic atomistic materialism and as a basis for a deep ecology perspective. I am not sufficiently acquainted with Whitehead's position to know what he actually says about man's relation with the rest of Nature, but those thinkers who have, in recent years, attempted to give Whiteheadianism an explicit ecological interpretation (e.g., Charles Hartshorne, John Cobb, Jr., and the Australian biologist, Charles Birch) have ended up with an anthropocentric ethics.

/ At the 1974 Claremont conference on the Rights of Non-human Nature, Professors Birch, Hartshorne, and Cobb all read papers which argued, on the basis of differing degrees of sentience or consciousness in the continuum of the human to the inanimate, that moral value and worth ✓ should be correspondingly weighted and assigned.

In my Claremont paper in response to these theorists ("Panpsychism vs. Modern Materialism: Some Implications for an Ecological Ethics"), I argued against this Whiteheadian panpsychistic moral anthropocentrism on essentially the same grounds Rodman subsequently used to argue against the animal liberationists. "Hartshorne is now in a position (on the basis of his theory of degrees of sentience) to assign 'degrees of importance' to these differing kinds of entities. Humans, both individually and as a species ... are thus the most important entities. The degree of importance diminishes correspondingly as we move down the continuum to the least sentient processes ... (Hartshorne's version of panpsychism) which postulates varying degrees of consciousness and sentience throughout Nature merely underscores the ethical anthropocentricity to which the doctrine is prone."

"Cobb recommends that rights be ascribed to the higher forms of life on the basis of the extent and degree to which they are capable of having these valuable (conscious) experiences ... (My critique of Hartshorne &

Cobb) attempts to indicate the parallels between the choice of criteria and the ascription of value and rights of Hartshorne's panpsychistic system, and the more-or-less inevitable result of attempting to 'extend' existing humanistic ethical theory to the non-human sphere." In other words, even with the Whiteheadian process philosophy (which has perhaps been given a Christian anthropocentric twist), as John Rodman so nicely points out, "There is a pecking order in this moral barnyard". Although the Whiteheadian process metaphysics seems ecologically sound, attempts by contemporary Whiteheadians to develop an ecological ethic violate the principle of ecological egalitarianism, and so this movement should currently be seen, along with animal liberation, as a form of shallow ecology.

Incidentally, the Hartshorne-Cobb-Birch-Sessions papers at Claremont became the basis for a chapter on ecological ethics in a best-selling introductory philosophy text: James Christian, PHILOSOPHY, 2nd edition, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1977.

Based on a bibliography generously supplied by John Cobb, Jr. at Claremont, the most relevant writings of Whitehead are SCIENCE AND THE MODERN WORLD, Chs. 5 & 13; and MODES OF THOUGHT, Chs. 6 & 8. For Charles Hartshorne, see BEYOND HUMANISM AND THE LOGIC OF THEISM. For John Cobb, Jr., see IS IT TOO LATE?: A THEOLOGY OF ECOLOGY; Cobb, "Beyond Anthropocentrism" in Morris & Fox, ON THE FIFTH DAY; and Cobb, "The Population Explosion and the Rights of the Subhuman World" in Roeloffs, Crowley & Hardesty, ENVIRONMENT & SOCIETY; and "Christian Existence in a World of Limits", Environmental Ethics, Vol 1, No 2, 1979.

See also David Griffen, "Whitehead's Contributions to a Theology of Nature" Bucknell Review, Vol 20, 1972; D & G Slusser, TECHNOLOGY -- THE GOD THAT FAILED: The Environmental Catastrophe; K. Cauthen, CHRISTIAN BIOPOLITICS; H.H. Barnette, THE CHURCH & THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS.

* * * * *

C. Aldo Leopold. Leopold's "land ethic" has been enormously influential over the years on the American scene as a clear statement of a non-anthropocentric biospheric egalitarian position. Perhaps the most outstanding promoter of Leopold's position these days is Roderick Nash, professor of environmental history at UC Santa Barbara. Nash has been very active in environmental campaigns in the Santa Barbara area and has authored many books and articles in the ecophilosophy area. Nash has a good chapter on Leopold in his outstanding history of environmental attitudes in America, WILDERNESS AND THE AMERICAN MIND. Nash's chapter on the counterculture in the revised edition is one of the best summaries in print of the contemporary environmental scene. Nash has recently written "Do Rocks Have Rights?" (THE CENTER MAGAZINE, Vol 10, 1977) which attempts to put Leopold's ethic in a contemporary setting and to expand upon Leopold's rationale for the "land ethic" as a logical extension of our ethical horizons. In "Panpsychism vs. Modern Materialism", I tried to point out that this kind of rationale was weak: "Leopold was of the opinion that this ethical posture (the land ethic) could be arrived at merely by widening our sphere of sympathetic identification (Einstein & Schweitzer also seem to suggest this approach to widening our ethical horizons) ... but it is difficult to envision an adequate, or metaphysically appropriate, environmental ethic which does not begin by taking the natural system as ethically ultimate."

Rodman ("The Liberation of Nature") also criticizes this approach: "From the amnesiac perspective of modern culture, we then presume to be able to envisage the course of human evolution in terms of an ever-progressive widening of the sphere of moral concern from the individual ego to the family, to the clan, to the village, to the city, to the nation, to humanity, and thence to 'the lower animals', perhaps now to 'the land' and all its inhabitants, culminating in 'the rights of rocks'. The fact that this model is abstractly unhistorical ... does not seem to lessen its appeal. That appeal lies, I suggest, in the model's accidental association with the notion of Evolution ... in its bold simplicity and optimism, in its apparent avoidance of the various modern 'fallacies' that we fear to commit because we have not thought our way through or around them ..." (p. 96-7).

Leopold's attempt (and Nash's) to justify the land ethic upon an ever-widening extension of subjective feelings of moral consideration - an ultimate inclusive sense of moral community - is thus exceedingly shakey and perhaps a concession to the anti-metaphysical positivist Comtean tenor of the times. The new society has based itself squarely on "objective" pragmatic sense observation, makes no philosophical pre-suppositions, and has "progressed" beyond the infantile stage of religious or metaphysical theorizing.

Bertrand Russell once pointed out that "Philosophy has had from its earliest days two different objectives which were believed to be closely interrelated. On the one hand, it aimed at a theoretical understanding of the structure of the world; on the other hand, it tried to discover and inculcate the best possible way of life ... it was neither purely theoretical nor purely practical, but sought a theory of the universe upon which to base a practical ethic". And in implicit criticism of the so-called presuppositionless nature of the modern paradigm, Russell pointed out that "Contempt for philosophy, if developed to the point at which it becomes systematic, is itself a philosophy; it is the philosophy which, in America, is called 'instrumentalism.' I shall suggest that philosophy, if it is bad philosophy, may be dangerous, and therefore deserves that degree of negative respect which we accord to lightning and tigers" (UNPOPULAR ESSAYS, pp. 1, 23-4). And in keeping with Russell's remarks, Aldous Huxley pointed out that "The psychology of the Perennial Philosophy has its source in metaphysics and issues logically in a characteristic way of life and system of ethics" (PERENNIAL PHILOSOPHY, p. 1; see also my "Spinoza-Jeffers", footnotes 1 & 25).

If the Comtean positivist theory of historical progress is wrong, and I think it is, then we must drop back to a religious/metaphysical basis to ground our ethics (social and personal as well as environmental). As Stuart Hampshire described Spinoza's system, which is clearly part of the "perennial philosophy" tradition: "(Spinoza's) metaphysics and dependent theory of knowledge are designed to show man's place in nature as a thinking being. Spinoza always argued that, until this is understood, nothing can be said about the nature and possibility of human happiness and freedom. Ethics without metaphysics must be nonsense; we must first know what our potentialities are and what our situation is as parts of Nature" (SPINOZA, Penguin Books, 1951, p. 115).

The problem with Leopold's "land ethic" from this perspective is that it lacks a metaphysical/psychological basis or grounding. Similarly, the thrust of Rodman's and Hampshire's criticisms of "animal rights" and utilitarianism is that these ethical systems rest on unexamined or dangerously erroneous bases, and the underlying assumptions of these systems, and the whole modern philosophical/social paradigm for that matter, are largely going unchallenged by these theorists.

* * * * *

But now it appears that Leopold did have a metaphysical basis or vision for his land ethic. Roderick Nash alluded to the influence of Eastern religions on Leopold in WILDERNESS & THE AMERICAN MIND. More explicitly, a very early previously unpublished manuscript of Leopold's "Some Fundamentals of Conservation in the Southwest" (written in 1923) just appeared in ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS, Vol 1, No. 2, 1979. In this paper Leopold bases his environmental ethic upon a kind of Gaia hypothesis (that the universe is a totally interrelated living organism) which he came across while reading the Russian philosopher, P.D. Ouspensky. Leopold's biographer, Susan Flader, (in a companion commentary on this paper) speculates that some of Leopold's colleagues, worried about the soundness of the metaphysics and what effect this might have on his pragmatic audience, discouraged Leopold from publishing the paper. For more on Leopold and on the Gaia hypothesis (recently put forth by two ecologists), see Devall, "Streams of Environmentalism", and Gary Snyder, THE OLD WAYS.

* * * * *

D. Martin Heidegger's Critique of Western Philosophy and the Technological Domination of Nature. Martin Heidegger is perhaps the one major philosopher to overthrow the subjectivism of the modern Western philosophic tradition and provide a radical critique of the dominant Western philosophic enterprise as paving the way for the technological mentality and society. Heidegger's critique occurs mainly in his NIETZSCHE, Vol. II, and in the essays THE QUESTION CONCERNING TECHNOLOGY, trans. by William Lovitt, 1977.

The philosopher who has done the most to develop Heidegger's critique from an ecological perspective is Michael Zimmerman, Newcomb College, Tulane University. Long excerpts from Zimmerman's paper, "Technological Culture & the End of Philosophy" (first read at the APA meeting in Berkeley, 1976) appear in my "Spinoza-Jeffers" paper. Zimmerman's paper subsequently has been published in PHILOSOPHY & TECHNOLOGY (vol 2), 1979, along with Zimmerman's paper, "Heidegger & Marcuse: Technology as Ideology". Zimmerman contrasts Heidegger's religious/metaphysical stance not only with Marcuse, but with Dewey and with Marx in "A Comparison of Marx & Heidegger on the Technological Domination of Nature", Philosophy Today, 1979, and "Dewey, Heidegger & the Quest for Certainty" Southwest Journal of Philosophy, Vol 9, 1978. In the latter paper, he points out that "Dewey failed to see the ideological nature of technology, for he himself was caught up with the Enlightenment idea of Progress, which held that true freedom was possible by the growth of autonomous Reason. But Reason in our century is in fact identified with the calculative, manipulative vision of Nature (including man) as raw material, valuable only insofar as it contributes to more Power. Heidegger calls this way of interpreting the whole of being: Technology".

See also Zimmerman, "Heidegger on Nihilism and Technique," Man & World, Vol 18, 1975; "The Foundering of Being & Time," Philosophy Today, Summer, 1975. In his paper, "Beyond 'Humanism': Heidegger's Understanding of Technology" (Listening, Vol. 12, 1977), Zimmerman brings out the deep ecology orientation of Heidegger. Heidegger calls for a new way of thinking about Being and beings which goes beyond the technological mentality and power trip over nature which would "let beings be". "This would allow man to dwell within the world not as its master ... being able to let the beings of the world display themselves in all of their glory ... Heidegger agreed with many of the aims of the new (ecological) conscience, including its desire to halt the senseless pillaging of nature for profit. But he was more radical than most ecological thinkers, who continue to look upon man as the 'husbander' of nature, in the sense of having the 'right' to manipulate nature as long as he does not cause too much damage in the process. For this still fails to see that the most important threat of the technological view is not a physical one, but a spiritual one".

Hwa Yol Jung & Petee Jung have written some important papers on Heidegger's deep ecology orientation. In "To Save the Earth," (Philosophy Today, Vol. 8, 1975) they claim that Heidegger is the most radical anthropologist of the modern era (for more on the current upwelling of radical ecophilosophical anthropology, see below). The Jung's paper "Toward a New Humanism: The Politics of Civility in a 'No-Growth Society'" (Man & World, Vol. 9, 1976) is a very fine scholarly blending of Heideggerian-Buddhist deep ecology with a critique of Western technological society. Dolores LaChapelle of the New Natural Philosophy also draws upon Heidegger as the basis of her ecophilosophy.

Some of the main shortcomings I find in Heidegger is his failure to provide an explicit structural metaphysics of interrelatedness and process, and to rely instead on an almost totally "mystical" sense of "oneness". He admits that the 'new way of thinking about Being' has just begun. This lack of a specific model of "thinking" might also relate to his refusal or inability to distinguish theoretical science from technology (Dewey also refused to make this distinction); Heidegger holds that the scientific enterprise, from its Greek beginnings, has been inextricably bound up with the pragmatic attempt to control and dominate Nature. Spinoza attempts to rescue theoretical science as a spiritual path, as does Capra in TAO OF PHYSICS, and Needleman in A SENSE OF THE COSMOS.

Finally, Heidegger, I think, mistakes Nietzsche's intentions by attributing to him the final step in the subjective technological power-over-nature orientation. Nietzsche seems to have meant 'power' in the sense of 'spiritual power' (like Casteneda's Yaqui "man of power"). See "Spinoza-Jeffers" footnote 15 for a discussion of Heidegger's interpretation of Nietzsche. My colleague, Alaister Moles, who is finishing his PhD dissertation on Nietzsche at UC Davis, tells me that certain untranslated Nietzsche documents disclose a metaphysical/ethical system very similar to Spinoza's.

* * * * *

E. Eastern Philosophy/Religion & Deep Ecology. The metaphysics/epistemology/psychology of Eastern religions, especially Taoism and Zen Buddhism, have had considerable influence on the development of a deep ecology perspective. Thoreau and the transcendentalists were influenced by Eastern nature religions, as was John Muir, Aldo Leopold, and Robinson Jeffers. Bertrand Russell noted the radical opposition of man/nature views of East and West in THE PROBLEM OF CHINA, 1922. Lynn White, in "Historical Roots" claimed that "the beatniks, who are the basic revolutionaries of our time, show a sound instinct in their affinity for Zen Buddhism, which conceives of the man-nature relationship as very nearly the mirror image of the Christian view." The philosopher, F.S.C. Northrup, has explored Eastern themes since at least the first Hawaiian East-West Philosophers' Conference in 1939 (see Northrup's interesting paper, "Naturalistic Realism and Animate Compassion" in Morris & Fox, ON THE FIFTH DAY).

The impact of Eastern thinking on the West and man/nature views, has been most influential since the '50's with the writings of Alan Watts (a Christian theologian turned Buddhist); see especially PSYCHOTHERAPY EAST & WEST; NATURE, MAN & WOMAN; and THE BOOK. The very influential eco-poet, Gary Snyder (to be discussed below) developed a philosophy combining Zen Buddhism with Native American religion, lore and life styles. The radical social critic, Paul Goodman (GROWING UP ABSURD, "Can Technology Be Humane?") was heavily influenced by Taoism. One of the leading humanistic psychologists, Abraham Maslow, has an interesting chapter on "Taoistic Science and Controlling Science" in his THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SCIENCE, 1966. Other interesting chapters are "Value-Free Science?" and "The Desacralization of Science".

E.F. Schumacher, in *SMALL IS BEAUTIFUL*, bases his new scaled-down economics on a Western/Eastern metaphysical/spiritual basis (see his chapter on "Buddhist economics"). His religious/spiritual system is developed more fully in *A GUIDE TO THE PERPLEXED* (a take-off on Maimonides great spiritual work), and the posthumously published *GOOD WORK*, 1979. The well-known philosopher of comparative religion, Huston Smith, has written a book which is strikingly similar to Schumacher's *GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED* in its spiritual/metaphysical orientation: *FORGOTTEN TRUTH: The Primordial Tradition*, 1976. There is an interesting chapter in Smith's book, "Hope Yes; Progress No" in which he argues that "progress is an illusion; not only future progress but past progress as well ... If Western man were to see that this god is a false one ... the modern age would be over, for the notion is so much its cornerstone that were it to crumble, a new edifice would have to be built." Smith has also written "Tao Now: An Ecological Testament" in I.G. Barbour, *EARTH MIGHT BE FAIR*, 1972.

* * * * *

A very interesting paper by the molecular biologist, Gunther Stent at UC Berkeley ("An Ode to Objectivity", *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov. 1971) is discussed by the philosopher, Bernhard Murchland, in *THE NEW ICONOCLASM*, 1972, pp. 149-50. "Speaking of the breakdown of the covenant between man and nature, Stent expresses his belief that this 'presages the end of science, since there is little use in continuing to push the limits of our knowledge further and further if the results have less and less meaning for man's psyche.' Noting that in the 12th century the Chinese were technologically sophisticated enough to launch an Industrial Age but didn't, Stent goes on: 'I suspect that the Chinese knew all about the principle of objectivity when two millennia ago they reached the highest level of civilization, cultural as well as technological, seen until then on the face of the Earth. Once the Chinese had attained that pinnacle they weighed and found ... the principle of objectivity wanting. While the Dark Ages were settling on the West, China turned toward Taoism, a kind of animism in reverse that projects nature into man, rather than man into nature. This turnabout changed man's ancient quest from domination over to harmony with nature.' The question is: will modern Western man imitate the example of 12th century China? Will he strive to rebuild his sense of self as part of nature? Stent's honesty in facing such questions is refreshing."

* * * * *

Joseph Needham, the biochemist/embryologist turned historian of Eastern science and technology, has argued that we need a Taoist/Buddhist orientation for Western science; see his "History and Human Values; A Chinese Perspective for World Science and Technology", *Centennial Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1, Winter, 1976.

One of the most important books to discuss the relationship of modern quantum physics to Eastern metaphysical/spiritual traditions was written by the research physicist, Fritjof Capra (*THE TAO OF PHYSICS*). Western philosophy and science since Democritus have been searching for the ultimate discrete particles of matter - a metaphysics of individual entities and subject/object dualisms which no doubt has affected our views of humans and other discrete "objects" as not ultimately inter-related but actually in competition with each other and the rest of Nature. Capra cleverly shows how the modern "dematerialization of matter" into energy transformations finds a more appropriate metaphysical home in Eastern religions. His thumbnail sketches of the Eastern traditions are amazingly succinct and illuminating, and his overall argument is quite convincing without being forced.

IT HAS been said that "The most technologically advanced society in the world is now the site of a rebirth of spiritual practice". The philosopher, Jacob Needleman, at San Francisco State University, claims that "new teachings about man and his place in the cosmos are entering our culture from the Orient and the ancient worlds. These teachings from India, Tibet, China, and the Middle East; these ideas from the priests of Pharaonic Egypt and from the alchemists and mystics of antiquity now exist among us like the whisperings of another reality" (A SENSE OF THE COSMOS, p. 2). Needleman, together with Theodore Roszak, have provided us with the most responsible evaluations of the various metaphysical/spiritual movements in contemporary America; see Needleman, THE NEW RELIGIONS; Needleman & Lewis, ON THE WAY TO SELF-KNOWLEDGE; Needleman & Baker, UNDERSTANDING THE NEW RELIGIONS; Roszak, UNFINISHED ANIMAL: The Aquarian Frontier & the Evolution of Consciousness.

* * * * *

A group called Reminding is holding a national conference to invite philosophy back into our lives as spiritual guidance. This conference is entitled "Philosophy, Where Are You? and features such speakers as Norman Cousins, Jacob Needleman, Theodore Roszak, Huston Smith, Michael Scriven, Gregory Bateson, and the Spinozist, Paul Wienpahl. The dates are June 29-July 4, 1979. For more information, write: Reminding, 505 Tamalpais Avenue, Mill Valley, CA 94941

* * * * *

One of the most significant questions which has to be faced is whether or not religious orientations such as Taoism and/or Buddhism have had any actual effect on man's relationships with the rest of Nature. This issue also plagues those who praise the ecological harmonious ideals of Native American religions. Lynn White claimed that "Human ecology is deeply conditioned by beliefs about our nature and destiny -- that is, by religion. To Western eyes this is very evident in, say, India or Ceylon. It is equally true of ourselves and our medieval ancestors". The question is, of course, whether this claim can be adequately supported. For example, the geographer, Yi-Fu Tuan, in response to Lynn White's thesis, "Our Treatment of the Environment in Ideal and Actuality", American Scientist, Vol. 58, 1970, catalogs the immense deforestation and environmental damage which occurred in ancient China and notes the discrepancy between ideals and practice. It is one thing, of course, to note the fact of environmental degradation and it is another matter to provide the actual reasons why it occurred. Often those scholars who tend to take a thoroughly functional/pragmatic survival approach to man and history seem overly anxious to dismiss the significance of religious/philosophical man/nature orientations on the basis of historical events which, at this point, we have less than adequate information.

Gary Snyder has been researching a book for a number of years about traditional Asian ways of seeing nature which should help shed some light on this complex issue.

* * * * *

Other books of interest in this area are D.J. Kalupahana, BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHY: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS, U. of Hawaii, 1976, which attempts to separate early primitive Buddhism from later institutional developments. Francis Cook, HUA-YEN BUDDHISM, Pennsylvania UP, develops the basis of the Buddhist sense of interrelatedness and systems theory.

The philosopher, Paul Snyder, has written TOWARD ONE SCIENCE: The Convergence of Traditions (1978) which tries to combine Western and Eastern science. His chapter "Holism & Pluralism as Philosophies of Nature" has some interesting comparisons and diagrams relating Eastern & Western scientific progress, but, all in all, his attempt seems too minimal; one fears that he is too thoroughly wedded to the Western paradigm.

* * * * *

F. Spinoza and Deep Ecology. Interest in the Spinozistic metaphysical/psychological/ethical system as a basis for deep ecology has increased over the last few years. Part of this interest in Spinoza has resulted from the attention generated by the celebration of the tercentenary of his death in 1977. A number of academic philosophy journals have devoted a special issue to Spinoza, conferences have been held, and anthologies of papers dealing with various aspects of Spinozism have appeared. Although many of these papers deal in a narrow properly academic way with difficult points of interpretation of this complex system, other scholars tentatively explore the possibility of Spinozism as the basis for a contemporary Weltanschauung and "way of life".

Mandelbaum & Freeman, SPINOZA (1975) contains a number of good papers which discuss Spinoza's theory of mind/body identity, his conception of human power and freedom, and his ethical theory. Marjorie Grene, SPINOZA (1973) contains a number of classical essays together with two powerful papers by Stuart Hampshire ("Spinoza and the Idea of Freedom") and M. Wartofsky ("Action & Passion: Spinoza's Construction of a Scientific Psychology"). Shahan & Biro, SPINOZA (1978) contains good papers including an excellent historical piece by Richard Popkin ("Spinoza & La Peyrere") and a cosmological paper by D. Lachterman ("The Physics of Spinoza's Ethics").

Probably the best introduction to Spinoza's thought (apart from reading the ETHICS itself) is Stuart Hampshire's SPINOZA (1951). An excellent discussion of Spinoza's structural metaphysics of nature as a "system of individuals within individuals, of increasing power and complexity, each type of individual differentiated by its characteristic activity in self-maintenance" occurs on pp. 71-81. Over the last 25 years, Hampshire has increasingly strained the standard philosophic paradigm in his elegant interpretations of Spinoza as providing a scientific, metaphysical, spiritual path to enlightenment and freedom. One of his most explicit statements of this is his paper "Spinoza and the Idea of Freedom" (1960) in which he also compares Spinozistic psychology with Freud (there is now independent evidence of the Spinozistic basis of Freudian psychotherapy; see Hessing, "Freud's relation with Spinoza" in Hessing, SPECULUM SPINOZANUM, 1977). Another excellent paper by Hampshire is "A Kind of Materialism" in Hampshire, FREEDOM OF THE MIND, Princeton UP, 1971.

Recently, Hampshire has expanded his critique of contemporary ethical and political theory (begun in "Morality and Pessimism", see above, pp. 17-18), and his defense of a Spinozistic "way of life" in TWO THEORIES OF MORALITY, Oxford UP, 1977. He claims that "Aristotle's and Spinoza's moral philosophies, which are theories of practical reasoning and human improvement, seem to me the most credible and the most worth developing of all moral theories in the light of modern knowledge and of contemporary philosophy." Their theories differ in that "Aristotle states clearly that moral theory must be in accord with established opinions" whereas "by contrast, Spinoza in the Ethics claims to be showing the path to a necessary moral conversion which philosophical and moral theory introduce" (p. 1). "Spinoza's Ethics gives an account of a possible moral conversion which takes the form of an intellectual enlightenment acting on the emotions, which is not unlike a religious conversion ...

...Spinoza's doctrine makes morality, in the ordinary sense of the word a means to, and a by-product of, liberation from obsessions and from prejudice and an emotional enlightenment ... (pp. 64, 69). Hampshire ultimately chooses Spinoza's morality over Aristotle's. A discussion of Spinoza and ecology occurs on pages 90-95. Hampshire feels that Spinozism needs to be augmented with Kant's theory of aesthetic experience. While this possibility needs to be explored, nevertheless the notion of "aesthetic experience" seems much too shallow an orientation to express the full implications of a deep ecology perspective.

* * * * *

One of the most important contemporary deep ecology theorists, and the one who has done the most to interpret Spinozism as a form of biocentric egalitarianism and as a religious/scientific/spiritual path is ARNE NAESS of Oslo, Norway. Naess was a professor of philosophy at the University of Oslo from 1939 to 1970 at which time he resigned his position "in order to devote himself more fully to the urgent environmental problems facing man". He is the founder and consulting editor of the international journal, INQUIRY. Naess' most important book on Spinoza is FREEDOM, EMOTION AND SELF-SUBSISTENCE: The Structure of a Central Part of Spinoza's Ethics, Universitetsforlaget, 1975. A discussion of Spinoza's biocentric egalitarianism occurs on pp. 118-19. Naess has written two papers dealing specifically with Spinoza and the environment: "Spinoza and Ecology," Philosophia, Vol 1, No. 1, 1977 reprinted in Hessing, SBECULUM SPINOZANUM, 1978, and "Spinoza and Attitudes Toward Nature", Entretiens in Jerusalem, Sept 6-9, 1977, Intern. Inst. of Philosophy, SPINOZA-HIS THOUGHT AND WORK.

Naess has also written a full-length book, ECOLOGY, COMMUNITY AND LIFESTYLE: A Philosophical Approach, Oslo, 1977, seven chapters in length, which deals with all aspects of a deep ecology approach to the environmental crisis, from theoretical Spinozistic ecology, to ecological economics and ecopolitics. The last chapter is on the "unity of life" and elaborates his own version of deep ecology which he calls "Ecosophy T". No adequate translation of this exists in English, and certainly the deep ecology movement would be greatly enriched to have this in an English edition.

One very important paper by Naess, in addition to "The Shallow and the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movements," is "The Place of Joy in a World of Fact", North American Review, Vol. 258, No. 2, Summer, 1973, in which he explains some of the strengths of the Spinozistic psychology and its relationship to the environmental crisis. Another strength of the Spinozistic system is that it clearly breaks down that bugaboo of the contemporary paradigm: the "fact/value" distinction (for more on this, see my "Spinoza-Jeffers" footnote 42, and Naess, "The Place of Normative Ethics Within a Biological Framework", Breck & Yourgrau, BIOLOGY, HISTORY & NATURAL PHILOSOPHY).

Naess taught a course in deep ecology and ecopolitics at UC Santa Cruz, Winter term, 1979, and also called together a conference in March, 1979, hosted by the Spinoza scholar Paul Kashap, UC Santa Cruz, to discuss teaching Spinoza as deep ecology and as a "way of life". In attendance were Spinoza scholars Wallace Matson, UC Berkeley; Paul Wienpahl, UC Santa Barbara; Charles Jarrett, Rutgers University; Reiko Shimizu, Tokyo; Joe Meeker, New Natural Philosophy director, John Rodman, Claremont, and George Sessions. Graduate students can study Spinozism and deep ecology with Naess in Oslo as part of the New Natural Philosophy program.

* * * * *

The Norwegian philosopher, Jon Wetlesen, has just published *THE SAGE AND THE WAY: Studies in Spinoza's Ethics of Freedom*, which draws parallels between Spinoza's psychotherapeutic techniques and those of Mahayana Buddhism. Some of the most important collections of papers to come out of the Spinoza tercentenary are S. Hessing, *SPECULUM SPINOZANUM 1677-1977*, Routledge, 1978, and J. Wetlesen, *SPINOZA'S PHILOSOPHY OF MAN: Proceedings of the Scandinavian Spinoza Symposium 1977*, Universitetsforlaget & Columbia UP, 1978. In the Hessing collection, Wetlesen and H.G. Hubbeling have papers which argue Wetlesen's Buddhist and mystical interpretation of Spinoza. In the Wetlesen collection, Arne Naess has a paper "Through Spinoza to Mahayana Buddhism, or through M. Buddhism to Spinoza?" which provides a critique of Wetlesen's book.

In the Wetlesen volume, there is a paper by the Spinoza scholar, E.M. Curley, "Man and Nature in Spinoza" which criticizes the ecological interpretation of Spinoza I advanced in earlier papers. My reply to Curley can be gathered from "Spinoza-Jeffers" pp. 506-509, and explicitly in footnote 49.

A reasonably explicit statement of Spinoza's "ecological" sense of the natural system is his analogy of the circulation of the blood which occurs in Letter XXXII to Oldenburg. The ecological significance of this is discussed in E.E. Harris, *SALVATION FROM DESPAIR: A Reappraisal of Spinoza's Philosophy* (1973), pp. 65-69, and in PH Nidditch's good paper "Spinoza" in O'Conner, *A CRITICAL HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY* (1964), p. 191.

Interestingly enough, Schopenhauer, who was steeped in Eastern philosophy, was quick to pick up on Spinoza's anomalous attitude toward other animals: "Spinoza's contempt for animals, as mere things for our use, and declared by him to be without rights, is thoroughly Jewish, and in conjunction with pantheism is at the same time absurd and abominable" *WORLD AS WILL AND REPRESENTATION* (tr. E. Payne), Colorado, 1958 (II, p. 645), cited in S.R.L. Clark, *THE MORAL STATUS OF ANIMALS*, 1977, p. 19.

In "Spinoza-Jeffers" I discussed Einstein's relationship with Spinoza suggesting that "Einstein was to all appearances a Spinozist" (Footnote 35). More direct confirmation is now available in a letter written by Einstein in 1929 in which he refers to himself as a "disciple of Spinoza" (see Hoffmann & Dukas, *ALBERT EINSTEIN*, 1972, pp. 94-5). I also discussed the relationship of Spinoza and Bertrand Russell in footnote 37. This is being further confirmed in a PhD dissertation now being completed by Kenneth Blackwell, Archivist at the Bertrand Russell Archives at McMaster University, Ontario, on the subject "The Ethics of Spinoza and Russell".

An important paper by Henry Brann in the Hesse volume traces the roots of Spinoza's thought into the Jewish mystical Kabbalah tradition. See also the interesting remarks on Spinoza in Jacob Needleman, *A SENSE OF THE COSMOS*, pp. 75-6, and the similarities with Maimonides' spiritual directions on active vs. passive attention in Needleman, pp. 154-57.

Probably the most important breakthrough in Understanding Spinoza are the recent meticulous translations made of the entire Spinoza corpus by Paul Wienpahl at Santa Barbara (see Wienpahl's paper "On Translating Spinoza" in the Hesse volume). Wienpahl claims that he developed the strategy of "translating a Latin word wherever possible by an English word with a Latin root". The results are astounding. One discovers that " 'to be' should never be used as a copula, only as an active verb ... property-words become adverbs" (p. 496). Given this new translation, "you find that you can view your world as a kind of fluidity. The ocean is a suitable simile. There is BEING and the modes of being, constantly rising up from it, and just as constantly subsiding into it ... Perceived clearly and distinctly, God is Being."

"The great distinction between Spinoza and his immediate predecessors may be put this way: for him God is Being, not a Being" (pp. 509, 512). In other words, it is now clear that Spinoza, along with Heraclitus and Whitehead in the West, is a PROCESS PHILOSOPHER, although Hampshire, Matson, and others have said as much when they claimed that Spinoza's Substance was best understood as ENERGY.

Wienpahl has had difficulties finding a publisher for his new translations, although New York University Press is coming out with Wienpahl's THE RADICAL SPINOZA this summer in which all the retranslated propositions of the ETHICS are laid out in an appendix. Paul has been teaching Spinoza as a "way of life" for years at UC Santa Barbara and, by all accounts, his students love it and his Spinoza classes overflow with enthusiastic serious students. Paul has practiced Zen Buddhist meditation since 1959.

* * * * *

G. Robinson Jeffers: Metaphysical Ecopoet of the West. From his perch on the Hawk Tower on the Carmel coast of California, Robinson Jeffers hammered out a pantheistic ecophilosophy which he called "Inhumanism" as a counterpoint to the humanistic anthropocentrism of the modern urban/industrial paradigm which he saw as ultimately life-destroying and nay-saying. For an excellent contemporary critique of humanistic anthropocentrism by an ecologist, see David Ehrenfeld, THE ARROGANCE OF HUMANISM (1978). Jeffers saw through the illusions of civilization and "progress": As Squires points out "(Jeffers) deplores the extended civilization that trades spiritual power for material greatness. War, he thinks, helps to bring about this fat decadence, for the reason that it intimidates the one social value that Jeffers worships -- freedom ... To direct man toward a moral self by means of the wise, solemn lessons of Nature; that has been Jeffers' life work". Jeffers enraged critics not only for directly challenging the whole modern social paradigm and value structure, but also for indicting Roosevelt as well as Hitler and Stalin as responsible for the war (see James Shebl, IN THIS WILD WATER: The Suppressed Poems of Robinson Jeffers (1976); Robert Ian Scott, "Poet as Prophet: Jeffers' Unpublished Poems About World War II", North American Review, Spring, 1978; Scott, "Verse: Making the Nightmare Make Sense", Harper's, Feb. 1976).

Arthur Coffin (ROBINSON JEFFERS: POET OF INHUMANISM, 1971) called Jeffers "Spinoza's twentieth century evangelist" and I tried to develop this theme further in my "Spinoza and Jeffers on Man in Nature".

Those critics who most explicitly have called attention to the deep ecology orientation of Jeffers' poetry have been Robert Brophy, William Everson (Brother Antoninus), the biologist, Michael Flower, and Robert Ian Scott (Brophy, "Robinson Jeffers: Metaphysician of the West"; Everson, ROBINSON JEFFERS: FRAGMENTS OF AN OLDER FURY, 1968; Flower, "Seeking an Eco-centric Ethic Beyond Human Wants"; Scott, "The World as God"). The papers by Brophy, Flower, and Scott were presented at the Robinson Jeffers Festival at Southern Oregon State College in November, 1975, and, to my knowledge, are still unpublished. Everson made a powerful ecophilosophic Jeffers presentation to a packed Colosseum at UC Berkeley on Earth Day, 1970.

It no doubt underscores the pervasive religious/pantheistic orientation of Jeffers' poetry that Robert Brophy, now professor of English at Long Beach State University is an ex-Jesuit priest, and William Everson, another powerful expositor of Jeffers' poetry and a major poet in his own right, is an ex-Dominican brother.

After Jeffers' death in January 1962 at the age of 75, a Robinson Jeffers newsletter was initiated by his biographer, Melba Bennett. Robert Brophy took over the editorship in 1968. Subscriptions are \$4/year- Write: RJ Newsletter, Occidental College Library, 1600 Campus Rd, LA, Ca. 90041. A backfile is available for \$25.

* * * * *

H. Ecophilosophical Anthropology, Reinhabitation & Bioregionalism.

Contemporary philosophers have often dabbled in what they call "philosophical anthropology" but this has mostly been rather timid ethnocentric stuff largely confined to modern European thinkers. Meanwhile, professional academic anthropology, like all the social sciences, has approached its subject matter - "primitive societies" - with all of the "objectivity" of the standard philosophic-social industrial paradigm, i.e., the Comtean theory of history and progress. Hunting/gathering societies were seen as an "early" stage in the inevitable development of mankind to the scientific-technological stage; all societies were striving to gain dominion and power over Nature, and all social aspects of a society are seen as functioning from a narrowly pragmatic sense of survival. As Hobbes put it, before the advent of the social contract and the state, precivilized life for man was "poor, solitary, nasty, brutish, and short". Attempts to correct the modern systematic distortion of "primitive ways of life" are labeled, from this perspective, the "myth of the Noble Savage".

Years ago, D.H. Lawrence chided anthropologists for failing to understand Native American ways of life in a wonderfully written paper ("Pan in America", written in Taos in 1924 and first published in PHOENIX: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence (1936), reprinted in Forstner & Todd, THE EVERLASTING UNIVERSE, as "The Death of Pan"). Lawrence asked, "What can men who sit at home in their studies, and drink hot milk and have lamb's-wool slippers on their feet, and write anthropology, what can they possibly know about men, the men of Pan?"

In WHERE THE WASTELAND ENDS, Roszak criticizes the anthropologist, Alfred Kroeber, for his "single vision" approach to primitive societies on pp. 89, 213. Roszak points out, "Where people find their way in the world by magic, their technology evolves far more slowly than we are used to... in cultures that preserve a magical worldview no technique can ever be just a technique, or an artifact just an artifact. Everything must be ritualized." (p. 345). There is an discussion of the TEACHINGS OF DON JUAN on pp. 325-28.

And similarly, Jacob Needleman (A SENSE OF THE COSMOS), claims that "Even the American Indian approached nature through the mediation of a revealed tradition. The Indian learns from nature to the extent that he learns from his religion ... It is only modern anthropology which leads us to believe that spiritual tradition can arise out of a people's relationship to nature as an effect arises out of a cause. We are all so ready to believe that all men at all times were pragmatists like ourselves, and that every civilized form has the same raison d'etre as do most of our recent forms: namely physical safety and comfort or

psychological pleasure" (p. 79).

And certainly Carlos Casteneda's books on the young UCLA anthropologist and the Yaqui Indian Don Juan have brought to public consciousness the different worlds or paradigms of these two men.

* * * * *

The two most influential books by anthropologists to begin to break the spell of the modern Comtean paradigm approach to anthropology and primitive societies have been Stanley Diamond, IN SEARCH OF THE PRIMITIVE, and Marshall Sahlins, STONE AGE ECONOMICS. Diamond's introduction consists of a massive attack on the idea of civilization as progress (and implicitly the Comtean theory of history). The history of civilization, he argues, is the history of imperialism, and further, "the basic apology for imperialism remains the idea of progress". The notion of "progress" in primitive societies is a metaphor for spiritual transformation. Diamond also criticizes Plato's REPUBLIC as the "classical model of the Western state exhibiting in an early but perfect form all the characteristics and stigmata of civilization".

The University of Chicago economic ^{anthropologist} ecologist, Sahlins, in STONE AGE ECONOMICS, undercuts the myths and distortions heaped upon hunter/gatherers (and the idea of modern civilization as progress) by claiming that upper Paleolithic cultures were the "truly affluent societies". Another important collection of papers along this line is Irvin & DeVore, MAN THE HUNTER.

The historian, William Irwin Thompson, in AT THE EDGE OF HISTORY, provides interesting speculation based upon the film, THE HUNTERS, which portrays the way of life and a hunting expedition of the Kalihari bushmen. The primary bond and interaction of the four-man hunting group (Leader, Shauman, Clown, and Hunter) are extrapolated out, as history develops, into the major social institutions of modern industrial society, with a corresponding loss of closeness and integrity of these basic social functions.

* * * * *

The challenge to modern academic technologic/chauvinistic ^{ecology} anthropology has begun. The anthropologist, Donald Hardesty, Univ of ^{Nevada} Reno, has written ECOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY (1977). The anthropologist, Phillip Staniford, San Diego State University, is developing what he calls "transpersonal anthropology". Gary Snyder has contributed a piece to the new emerging ecoanthropology, "The Politics of Ethnopoetics" in THE OLD WAYS. The anthropologist, Stan Steiner, in THE VANISHING WHITE MAN (1976) discusses the movement on the part of some Native Americans to return to the old ways. His chapter "The Circle of Life" contrasts the "deep ecology" orientation of Native American religion and life styles with the "Shallow ecology" of conservation organizations.

A major non-functional reevaluation of Native American nature religions is underway, and books on this subject pour off the press at an amazing rate. One of the better ones is by the anthropologists, Dennis & Barbara Tedlock, TEACHINGS FROM THE AMERICAN EARTH: Indian Religion and Philosophy (1975). Vine Deloria is a Native American who writes in this area (see e.g., GOD IS RED). He is also a member of the New Natural Philosophy group.

The retort from standard paradigm anthropologists is that the Native Americans really weren't "ecologists" (Although they never bother to define how they are using this term). They point to cases of what they take to be environmental abuse by Native Americans, reminiscent of the instances of environmental abuse in ancient Asian cultures.

A recent interesting development in this debate is Calvin Martin's KEEPERS OF THE GAME: Indian-Animal Relationships and the Fur Trade (1978). As Devall points out ("Streams of Environmentalism"): "Martin has examined the question why Native Americans so readily gave up spiritual relations with animals and began ruthlessly hunting and trapping large numbers of mammals for the White traders who wanted to ship those furs to Europe ... Martin argues that before the arrival of white men, Indians and animals had a sacred bond ... humans could take the lives of animals, but only on a limited basis, and only after asking the spirit of the animal for permission. But Whites brought devastating diseases which ravaged many Indian tribes. The Indians thought the animals had broken the bond between human and beast and brought the diseases, so the Indians set about to get vengeance on the animals, to exterminate the beaver ...".

Martin, a member of the History Dept. at Rutgers, provides a closely-argued well-documented analysis, but his long epilogue "The Indian and Ecology" is disappointing. He fails to address the religious/spiritual issue until the last few pages and his conclusion shows little insight. He claims "The Indian's was a profoundly different cosmic vision when it came to interpreting Nature - a vision Western man would never adjust to. There can therefore be no salvation in the Indian's traditional conception of Nature for the troubled environmentalist. Some day, perhaps, he will realize that he must look to someone else other than the American Indian for realistic spiritual inspiration." Martin gives no reasons why modern man cannot return to such a view, and he suggests no other directions for "realistic spiritual inspiration". Martin's thesis also appears in "The War Between Indians and Animals" Natural History Magazine, June, 1978.

* * * * *

One of those who think people like Martin are wrong about modern people recapturing a sacramental sense of Nature is PAUL SHEPARD of Pitzer College and Claremont Graduate School. Paul is one of the most creative and original thinkers in the deep ecology movement. His TENDER CARNIVORE AND THE SACRED GAME (1973) stands as one of the finest blends of ecophilosophy and "radical" anthropology in print. Shepard has been thinking and writing about these issues for some time; see his MAN IN THE LANDSCAPE (1967) as well as THINKING ANIMALS (1978). He has edited, with Daniel McKinley, THE SUBVERSIVE SCIENCE: Essays Toward an Ecology of Man (1969), and ENVIRON/MENTAL: Essays on the Planet as a Home (1971). The first anthology contains Shepard's "Ecology and Man" which stands, with Gary Snyder's "Four Changes", and Lynn White's "Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis" as one of the pivotal papers for deep ecology at the beginning of the '70's. Some ecophilosopher needs to do a critical work on the development of Shepard's thought.

The psychologist, Tom Pinkston, teaches college courses in California built around Native American initiation rituals to help bring people to

a sense of self-identity and integration with Nature. For a copy of his book, A QUEST FOR VISION, send \$5.70 to Free Person Press, 455 Ridge Rd, Novato, CA 94947.

Another related book of interest is Ashley Montagu, LEARNING NON-AGGRESSION: The Experience of Non-Literate Societies (1978). Also see Robert Solomon, "Emotions and Anthropology", INQUIRY, Vol 21, No 2, 1978.

* * * * *

The new deep ecoanthropology would seem to lead directly into the ideas of "reinhabitation", "bioregionalism", and "future primitive". One of the thinkers who most naturally provides this bridge is the California eco-poet, GARY SNYDER. Snyder's poetry deals, in one way or another, with his blend of Native American religion and life style, Zen Buddhism, and ecophilosophy. Three of his most recent publications, EARTH HOUSEHOLD (1969), TURTLE ISLAND (1974) and THE OLD WAYS (1977), contain prose statements of his ecophilosophical position. THE OLD WAYS contains his paper "Re-inhabitation" given at the Reinhabitation conference held on San Juan Ridge, August, 1976. Snyder has just written HE WHO HUNTED BIRDS IN HIS FATHER'S VILLAGE: Dimensions of a Haidu Myth, Grey Fox Press, Bolinas, 1979. Bob Steuding has done a study of Snyder's poetry and ecophilosophy (GARY SNYDER, Twayne Publishers, 1976). Snyder appears to be trying to forge the new cultural basis for the emerging post-industrial reinhabitory society.

* * * * *

Besides Snyder, the other major theoretical figure in the deep ecology reinhabitory movement is the professional ecologist, Raymond F. DASMANN. In some ways, Dasmann's career and intellectual history parallels Aldo Leopold's. Dasmann received his PhD in zoology from UC Berkeley and then took a post as chairman of the Natural Resources dept. at Humboldt State College, CA. From there, he became director of environmental studies for the Conservation Foundation in Washington, D.C. He now serves as Senior Ecologist with the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) in Morges, Switzerland, and also teaches at UC Santa Cruz. He gave the XVI Horace Albright Conservation Lecture at UC Berkeley, April, 1976 on "The Threatened World of Nature".

Like Leopold, he has written major texts in "resource management": AFRICAN GAME RANCHING (1963) and ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION (4th ed, 1976). His best selling book, THE DESTRUCTION OF CALIFORNIA (1964) describes the rich flora and fauna of the alluvial central valleys of California and then proceeds to catalog the destruction of this biotic wealth by the European invaders. The book ends with one of the first pleas for a strategy of non-growth by "not planning for growth". Dasmann's many other ecological books include THE LAST HORIZON, A DIFFERENT KIND OF COUNTRY (a plea for diversity), PLANET IN PERIL (1972), ECOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (1973), and THE CONSERVATION ALTERNATIVE (1975).

It is in CONSERVATION ALTERNATIVE, as well as his paper "Conservation, Counter-culture, and Separate Realities" Environmental Conservation, Vol 1, No 2, Summer, 1974, that he discusses a change of

head and heart somewhat reminiscent of Leopold's conversion to a deep ecology perspective (see Susan Flader, THINKING LIKE A MOUNTAIN). Some of the influences that Dasmann mentions are books by Lewis Mumford, George Leonard, and Roszak's WHERE THE WASTELAND ENDS. He also mentions Taoism, Carlos Casteneda, and Alan Watts.

Now Dasmann writes papers on reinhabitation, bioregionalism and ecodevelopment with titles such as "National Parks, Nature Conservation and 'Future Primitive'" The Ecologist, Vol 6, No 5, 1976 (the idea of "future primitive" comes from a paper by Jerry Gorsline & Lynn HOUSE, "Future Primitive", Planet Drum, S.F., Issue 3, 1974: "We are in transition from one condition of symbiotic balance - the primitive - to another which we will call future primitive ... a condition having the attributes of a mature ecosystem: stable, diverse, in symbiotic balance again").

Dasmann makes a distinction between what he calls ecosystem people and biosphere people. "Ecosystem people live within a single ecosystem, or at most two or three adjacent and closely related ecosystems. They are dependent upon that ecosystem for their survival ... Biosphere people draw their support, not from the resources of any one ecosystem, but from the entire biosphere... Biosphere people can exert incredible pressure upon an ecosystem that they wish to exploit, and create great devastation - something that would be impossible or unthinkable for people who were dependent upon that particular ecosystem ... Biosphere people create national parks. Ecosystem people have always lived in the equivalent of a national park ... I propose that the future belongs to those who can regain, at a higher level, the old sense of balance and belonging between man and nature (ecosystem people)".

This then is also an ^sanswer to Hardin from a "deep ecology" ecologist. Hardin would have the "underdeveloped countries" remain "ecosystem people" while the industrialized countries would remain "biosphere people". This is unrealistic as a solution to the environmental crisis, says Dasmann; we are all going to have to become ecosphere people again with all that this entails in terms of change of attitudes and lifestyles. In his paper, "Toward a Dynamic Balance of Man and Nature", The Ecologist, Vol 6, No 1, January, 1976, Dasmann again reiterates his thesis, while arguing for decentralization and ecosystem local control. He also claims that "the first duty of a conservationist is to practice a conservation (low consumption, living-in-place) lifestyle".

Dasmann's paper "Reinhabiting California" (coauthored with Peter Berg of Planet Drum Foundation) first appeared in Not Man Apart, Mid-Sept., 1977 and subsequently was published in Peter Berg, REINHABITING A SEPARATE COUNTRY, Planet Drum Foundation, S.F., 1978. Reinhabitation is a process of relearning how to Live-in-place. A society which lives-in-place (ecosystem people) "keeps a balance with its region of support thru links between human lives, other living things, and the processes of the planet ... Reinhabitation means learning to live-in-place in an area that has been disrupted and injured through past exploitation. It involves becoming native to a place through becoming aware of the particular ecological relationships that operate within and around it. It means undertaking activities and evolving social behavior that will enrich the life of the place, restore its life-support systems, and establish an ecologically and socially sustainable pattern of existence within it ... It involves applying for membership in a biotic community and ceasing to be its exploiter."

"Reinhabitation involves developing a bioregional identity, something most North Americans have lost, or have never possessed ... Natural watersheds could receive prominent recognition as the frameworks within which communities are organized ... (Reinhabitory communities) could view themselves as centered on and responsible for the watershed."

Reinhabitation is now being practiced by groups in areas of northern California and the Pacific Northwest. The San Francisco group, called the Frisco Bay Mussel Group, has a pamphlet called "Living Here". There are also People's Forestry groups in California and Washington which provide labor-intensive alternatives to the USFS practices of spraying herbicides to remove underbrush, etc.

The IUCN of Switzerland, of which Dasmann is Senior Ecologist, has been holding conferences in Africa and the South Pacific on ecodevelopment and producing documents on ecodevelopment and ecological bioregional classifications of the world. Some of these include M.D.F. Udvardy, "A Classification of the Biogeographical Provinces of the World"; R. Dasmann, "Classification and Use of Protected Natural and Cultural Areas" together with a world-wide map of bioregions. For a copy of the paper "Ecoregions" write: Ecoregions, 86 Mount Vernon St, Boston, Mass 02108. Jimoh Omo-Fadaka of England has produced studies such as "A Framework for Ecodevelopment in South Pacific Island Countries". This work might be viewed as laying the groundwork for a post-industrial return to "ecosystem people" reinhabitation.

* * * * *

Planet Drum Foundation held a public symposium in April 1979 in San Francisco entitled "Listening to the Earth: The Bioregional Basis of Community Consciousness" and featured Dasmann as the keynote speaker talking on "Finding Our Way Back into the Northern California Bioregion". Other speakers and participants included Dr. Jack Forbes (Native American Studies, UC Davis), Peter Berg, Dr. Robert Curry (Dept of Geology, University of Montana), Roderick Nash, Linn House, Gary Snyder, Ernest Callenbach (author of *Ecotopia*), and Murray Bookchin (Director, Goddard College Institute for Social Ecology).

Incidentally, Bookchin is author of POST-SCARCITY ANARCHISM which contains his paper, "Ecology and Revolutionary Thought". Bookchin is again issuing his newsletter which can be obtained by sending \$5 to COMMENT, P.O. Box 371, Hoboken N.J. 07030.

One can become a member of Planet Drum Foundation by sending \$10 to the Planet Drum Foundation, Box 31251, San Francisco, CA 94131.

* * * * *

I. Ecological Sensibility and Ecological Resistance. John Rodman (Political Science, Pitzer College and the Claremont Graduate School, CA) is one of the most sophisticated and powerful critical analysts of the contemporary ecophilosophical movement.

Rodman was primarily responsible, along with John Cobb, Jr., and Paul Shepard, for planning and staging the RIGHTS OF NON-HUMAN NATURE conference, sponsored by the National Audubon Society, and held at Pitzer College, April 18-20, 1974. This conference provided stimulus for, and interaction among, such ecophilosophers as Rodman, Shepard, Cobb, Vine Deloria, Jr., Garrett Hardin, Charles Hartshorne, John Lilly, John Livingston, William Leiss, Joseph Meeker, Roderick Nash, and Gary Snyder. The development of the New Natural Philosophy program was, in part,

a natural outgrowth of this conference.

As mentioned above (p. 5), Rodman has been developing a four-fold historical typology of contemporary approaches to the environment, resulting in the emergence of what he calls "Ecological Sensibility" and "Ecological Resistance". The order of Rodman's recent writings largely parallel these types. Part One was an analysis and critique of Resource Conservation and Development. Part Two was an analysis and critique of "animal liberation" (the "moral/legal - nature's rights and human duties" approach, or what Rodman now calls for short, Nature Moralism, see pp. 13-17 above). Rodman's projected analysis and critique of what he calls the "religious/esthetic" approach of Wilderness Preservation has not been written, although the gist of his criticism can be gleaned from his later writings. The fourth form of environmental consciousness, and the position he now defends, is called Ecological Sensibility which leads to Ecological Resistance. A short description of Ecological Resistance appears at the close of "The Liberation of Nature?" and is developed more fully in his recent long unpublished monograph "Ecological Resistance: John Stuart Mill and the Case of the Kentish Orchid" (read at the American Political Science Association meeting, Sept. 1977). A short forceful presentation of this position, plus additional critiques of the other three forms, can be found in Rodman, "Theory and Practice in the Environmental Movement".

John Rodman has produced a carefully thought-out characterization of what he considers to be a viable and defensible contemporary form of ecological conscience. However, I find problems with it, some of which I will briefly sketch out below. No careful formal analysis of his position is intended, although such an analysis is needed and deserved. Rodman admits that his position is vague ("Theory and Practice", p. 55), but in addition to vagueness, I find it inconsistent in places, and dependent upon misrepresenting or misunderstanding positions which he rejects. Once these problems are cleared up, it would seem that the "shallow-deep" ecology distinction is adequate to characterize the contemporary ecophilosophical scene.

To begin with, Rodman's defense of his position is clearly anthropocentric. "My primary purpose is to clarify the kind of self we choose when we take up a particular posture towards the non-human environment. My secondary purpose is to suggest that the fourth of these alternatives may be the one most faithful to the integrity of experience" (T&P p. 46). In choosing the "kind of self" Rodman has in mind, this involves acts of "ecological resistance" in order to protect a "way of life" consistent with "this kind of self". This "ecological sensibility" assumes what Rodman calls a "theory of internal relations: the human personality discovers its structure through interaction with the nonhuman order ... (Ecological Resistance) is a ritual action whereby one aligns the self with the ultimate order of things."

Rodman tells us that "the central principle of Ecological Resistance is the conviction that diversity is natural, good, and threatened by the forces of monoculture". And coupled with this principle is the principle of what Rodman calls "metaphorical mirroring" which is based on the ancient idea that man is a microcosm of the macrocosm: "the different levels of experience - cosmos, polis, psyche - mirror one another" (T&P p. 53).

Further, we are told that "if there is a base model it is that of the ecosystem; but the characteristics of this model are not so much extracted from biology and then imposed upon polity and personality as they are perceived as a common Gestalt manifested in varying ways at different levels" (T&P p. 54). We are also told that "the image of humanity in Ecological Resistance is more holistic and participatory, 'Man' does not stand over against 'his environment' as manager, sight-seer, or dog-gooder; he is an integral part of the food chain ... a microcosm of the cosmos who

takes very personally the wounds inflicted on his/her androgynous body" (T&P p. 56).

Thus Rodman's position meets most of the conditions for deep ecology, except for the central principle of "biospheric egalitarianism", and except for the apparent lack of a religious/metaphysical framework for cosmic and biological unity.

In Rodman's treatment of the Nature Moralism position in "The Liberation of Nature?", his criticisms seemed to center around (a) the attempt to extend existing human ethical systems to the non-human, which resulted in (b) non-human entities receiving less moral consideration than humans. In "Theory and Practice", Rodman appears to shift his criticism in claiming that "the world of the Nature Moralism is characterized by an apparent egalitarianism" (p. 50). Does Rodman now see Naess' principle of biospheric egalitarianism (which is essentially a statement of non-anthropocentrism) as a form, or the form, of Nature Moralism? If this is the case, then a serious misunderstanding has occurred on Rodman's part, for Naess clearly points out that biospheric or ecological egalitarianism in principle is used as a metaphor for the "right" of non-human entities "to live and blossom" (or rather to attain their unique forms of self-realization); on this point, see Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep Ecology Movements" and "Spinoza and Ecology". Gary Snyder expresses egalitarianism (or non-anthropocentrism) with his claim that "Man should respect the evolutionary destinies of other life forms" (Four Changes). Rodman appeared to endorse this view in his earlier writings (see "Liberation of Nature?", pp. 94, 108). Why has Rodman apparently reversed his position? Does his anthropocentric concern with "self" logically preclude a non-anthropocentric concern for other life forms?

Rodman also claims that his version of "ecological sensibility" involves the position that "Ecological Resistance is not ideological action. Rather, action tends to precede theory, and theory emerges retrospectively as actors try to make their experience intelligible" (T&P p. 53). It seems somewhat inconsistent to me to hold this to be true, and then to put forth the amount of theory which he does to characterize his position, e.g., the "theory of internal relations"; aligning oneself with the "ultimate order of things"; the central principle of the goodness of diversity; and the ancient religious/metaphysical idea of man as a microcosm of the macrocosm, among others. One suspects that a good deal of the problem here is that Rodman has chosen John Stuart Mill as his prime example of ecological sensibility and ecological resistance, and, as Rodman points out ("Ecological Resistance" p. 46): "A suspicion of 'metaphysics', of any sort, both on grounds of its being pre-'scientific' and on grounds of its being a covert 'theology', was part of the Comtean legacy that fit in with Mill's inherited Benthamism". It would appear that the inconsistency occurs because, like Mill, Rodman wants to avoid any kind of religious metaphysics, and so like all good presuppositionless philosophy, Rodman ends up by trying to sneak it in the back door.

Mill seems like such a strange choice as an exemplar of contemporary ecological sensibility. His subjectivist "metaphysics" and epistemology is precisely of the sort which Heidegger indicted as leading to the technological society and the conquest of nature; e.g., Mill characterizes physical objects as "permanent possibilities of sensation". As one of the chief architects of utilitarianism, Mill is an excellent example of the sort of moral/legalism which Rodman objects to elsewhere. Under the influence of Comte from 1837 on, one wonders whether Mill ever really questioned the idea of civilization-as-progress, or positivism as the only valid form of knowledge. As a young man, Mill read Malthus which became the basis of his concern for controlling human population, and also perhaps the basis for his vision of the end-of-the-road of the optimistic liberal-Enlightenment program. As a result, he called for a steady state economy and a world which was not totally controlled by man. But mostly controlled?

Mill's positivism was somewhat tempered by reading the Romantic poets, and this became the basis of his (one?) act of Ecological Resistance, an intervention to keep the Kentish Orchid from being obliterated from overzealous botanists. Thus, Mill's act of resistance seemed to be based not on positivist knowledge but Romantic esthetics, which Rodman attacks in connection with Wilderness Preservation. Mill's combination of positivism and Romantic esthetics seems an unstable and unintegrated basis for an ecological sensibility. His lack of a religious/philosophical metaphysics of interrelatedness allowed him to vacillate in later life and write the notorious essay "Nature" which Rodman attempts to explain (and excuse) in "Ecological Resistance". In short, Mill seems more an example of Resource Conservation and Development coupled with certain anomalous unjustified acts of Ecological Resistance and hardly the paradigm case of modern ecological sensibility.

Rodman's lack of an overall ecological metaphysics, and his apparent antipathy toward a non-anthropocentric religious orientation toward Nature (echoing Mill?), may help explain his apparent problems in trying to classify John Muir. Rodman classifies Muir as the archetype for Wilderness Preservation, although he overlaps into Nature Moralism (T&P pp. 48-51). Rodman tells the story of Muir stopping Pinchot from killing a tarantula on the grounds that "The tarantula has as much right to be there as they did". Rodman reads this as an example of the "nature's rights and man's obligations" position, although, as mentioned above, this misunderstands the situation. It seems more plausible to see this as Muir's non-anthropocentric religious/metaphysical stance and, like Naess, the idea of a "right" is used symbolically (for more on Muir's non-anthropocentrism, see my "Spinoza and Jeffers" footnote 10).

In "Theory and Practice" Rodman attacks Muir and the "religious/esthetic" orientation of Sierra Club members for wanting to set aside choice areas of natural beauty (such as Yosemite and the Grand Canyon) while tending to neglect less spectacular areas. This may be valid contemporary criticism and it may well be that contemporary environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club, when proposing wilderness, are largely into "esthetics" and wilderness recreation (for more on this, see Devall "Streams of Environmentalism"). Devall has suggested that environmental groups are taking a Resource Conservation and Development position, but I don't think this was Muir's orientation. As Ray Dasman points out ("National Parks, Nature Conservation and 'Future Primitive'"): "Those who were responsible for the creation of the system of protected areas in the United States ... were attempting to establish buffers against the greed and rapacity of their fellow citizens. In the 1850's Thoreau had proclaimed the necessity for protecting at least some areas in which nature could remain intact against the destructive forces of civilization".

Finally, Rodman argues that his version of contemporary ecological sensibility requires that one fight for diversity in many areas other than the ecological; for example one should fight against racism, for feminism, etc. Rodman claims that Mill fits the bill here perfectly whereas Thoreau would be only a marginal case, and "John Muir, who ignored almost every social issue of his time ... would not qualify at all" (T&P p. 53). This is most curious. It would appear that Rodman has cut his category of modern ecological sensibility so narrowly that all of the great deep ecologists would not qualify, from the Taoist sage and St. Francis, to Thoreau, Muir, Leopold, Robinson Jeffers, Gary Snyder and Ed Abbey. This seems almost perverse. Perhaps one fights for piecemeal social reform mainly if one is satisfied that the existing social structure and paradigm is a satisfactory one; otherwise the cause of diversity can best be served by seeking a dismantling of the existing structure and working towards a vision of biosphere people, reinhabitation, and future primitive.

Many of Rodman's major planks (the principle of diversity and complexity, anti-class posture, preferred ways of life, and the Gestalt approach to experiencing

self-and-Nature) have already been proposed as the basis of contemporary ecological consciousness and deep ecology by Arne Naess ("The Shallow and the Deep Ecology Movements") although Naess ultimately bases this on a Spinozistic religious/metaphysical biospheric egalitarian (non-anthropocentric) underpinning.

* * * * *

One of the most important contemporary theorists of an Ecological Resistance position is EDWARD ABBEY who has lived in, and fought for, the Southwest (Utah, Arizona) for over 20 years, and who has become a sort of "hero" to the new generation of eco-activists. His most explicit statement of ecological resistance is THE MONKEY WRENCH GANG (1975). Other well-known books by Abbey are DESERT SOLITAIRE (1968) and THE JOURNEY HOME (1977). Almost all of his books are pervaded with the theme of ecological resistance; University of New Mexico has just rereleased some of his early novels in paperback such as FIRE ON THE MOUNTAIN and THE BRAVE COWBOY. Abbey wrote a master's thesis in philosophy on the morality of anarchism and tends to take an extremely individualistic stance. While he explicitly disclaims any metaphysical/spiritual approach to Nature, many passages in his writings tend to belie his "official" position. A good sketch of Abbey, and an up-to-date bibliography, appears in Peter Wild, PIONEER CONSERVATIONISTS OF WESTERN AMERICA (1979) along with sketches of John Muir, Leopold, Krutch, William O. Douglas, David Brower, and Garrett Hardin. Douglas Strong, THE CONSERVATIONISTS (1971) has a very good objective sketch of Muir, along with sketches of Powell, Leopold, and others.

* * * * *

Bob Hunter has been writing a series on ecological resistance in Greenpeace Chronicles which he calls "Endgame Ecology". The fifth piece in the series occurs in the April 1979 issue.

* * * * *

Last Announcements:

The first half of Devall's "Streams of Environmentalism" paper will appear in the fall 1979 issue of Humboldt Journal of Social Relations as "Reform Environmentalism"

The departments of Philosophy and History of the University of Denver will hold an international conference on 'the humanities and the problems of human ecology' on April 21-24, 1980. For more info write: Robert C. Schultz, Philosophy, Univ of Denver, University Park, Denver, Colorado 80208.

Attachment 1 is a critique of Roszak's PERSON/PLANET by Bill Devall which appeared in ECONEWS, Vol 9 No 3, March 1979

Attachment 2 is a syllabus of a deep ecology course I am teaching.

Attachment 3 is a syllabus of an interdisciplinary course which has been taught at Sierra College since 1973. It regularly draws 120 students/semester. We are now using Miller, LIVING IN THE ENVIRONMENT which is due out in a 2nd edition next year. We also require the students to read Callenbach's Ecotopia. I lecture early in the course to bring out the distinction between shallow/deep ecology and then return at the end to explore these issues further.

Book Review

Economics Northwest Environmental Center
Arcata, CA Vol 9 No. 3 March 1979

PERSON/PLANET by Theodore Roszak,
Anchor Press, 1978, \$10.95

by Bill Devall

In *PERSON/PLANET*, Roszak argues that the human potential movement and the environmental movement have intermingled destinies. But both personhood and environmentalism have special meanings for Roszak, the author of *MAKING OF A COUNTER CULTURE*.

Personhood is not just individualism as preached by capitalists; it is the process of the liberation of unique talents in each person, of seeking the limits of potential, of self-discovery.

Just as our liberal, hedonistic society turns individualism on its head, so does it turn "natural resources" into just "commodities." The dominant ideology in America says that nature must be developed, controlled, "made more productive."

We will not let nature be. We will not allow free expression of natural diversity or diversity of persons.

The common enemy of both person and nature is the bigness of things. According to Roszak, "The same inordinate scale of industrial enterprise that must grind people into statistical grist for the market place and the work force simultaneously shatters the biosphere in a thousand unforeseen ways. Nor does this happen (as some radical social critics would insist) because selfish, profiteering interests are at work. Sometimes that is so. But far more often the real culprit is the world industrial economy as a whole as it races toward global integration, whether under private or socialized auspices."

Rozsak introduces the Gaia Hypothesis, that the world as a whole is a living organism, with humans as one type of consciousness in this organism. The needs of the person and the needs of the planet are intermingled, and indeed, human consciousness may "direct" the planetary organism.

Rozsak criticizes "normal science," the reductionist science taught in most universities which disenchant the mystery of the planet. Ecology as a science may degenerate into just another technology trip-into environmental engineering. In the post-modern society, Rozsak argues, we must go beyond ecology as a reductionist science to ecology as a perspective on person in nature.

In his chapters on the failures of contemporary institutions, Rozsak makes some pointed criticisms of schooling and of modern cities. Rozsak teaches at Hay-

ward State University and he argues that students in universities in California have limited themselves. College students are sterile clones, he says, who in their narrow-minded, egoistic vision of the "good life" are rejecting the best parts of their education for vocationalism and conventionalism.

And he criticizes the intellectuals, including most college professors, for their urban chauvinism. Intellectuals, he argues, are the biggest Chamber of Commerce for the modern urban complex, for the imperialism of the cities.

Rozsak is in the stream of some of the most important thinking on environmentalism but he never fully reaches a statement of deep ecology.

He suggests that a neo-paganism might be an appropriate religion for post-moderns and quotes the remarkable statement by ecologists James Lovelock and Sidney Epton: "Let us make peace with Gaia on her own terms and return to peaceful co-existence with our fellow creatures."

Although Rozsak never explicitly says as much, the total impact of this book can be read as a warning to eco-activists.

For eco-activists, this book reminds us that the environmental movement is more important than many of us realize. In seeking access to center of po

power, eco-activists during the 1970s have phrased their appeals in the rhetoric of resources conservation and development.

They have spent enormous amounts of time and energy analyzing environmental impact statements and lobbying politicians. In the process, eco-activists have won legitimacy as just another constituency in the political shell game.

But environmentalism is not just a campaign against pollution or a campaign for coastal planning. Those tasks are very important, but there is a grave danger that eco-activists will become trivial, unless they live the revolutionary implications of deep ecology.

The environmental movement is not just the politics of regulating the military-industrial complex and "rational planning" for further economic "development." The environmental movement goes beyond ecology, beyond reformism, to revolution. Nothing less than revolution is necessary.

If the destinies of person and planet are intermingled, perhaps eco-activists should stop working to legitimate the military-industrial complex by attempting to reform its bad habits of pollution and waste, and instead engage joyfully in the creative disintegration of this garbage civilization.

PHILOSOPHY

Syllabus
Spring,
1979

40 Contemporary Philosophical Issues
"Rationality, Mysticism & Ecology"
Units: 3 Transfer: CSUC/UC
Prerequisite: None
Hours per week: 3 lecture/discussion
A special problems course designed to explore the contemporary conflicts arising out of the clash of Eastern mysticism, spiritual tradition and Nature-man harmony with the dominant rational scientific-technological man-over-Nature orientation of Western culture. Readings will include those by T. Roszak, Alan Watts, Gary Snyder, W.I. Thompson, and J. Needleman.
451901 Sessions M-2 TTh 12-115

Sierra College
Rocklin, Ca 95677

I. INTRODUCTION OF ISSUES

1. Ray Dassmann, "Conservation, Counter-Culture, and Separate Realities," Environmental Conservation, Vol I, No. 2, 1974 (Handout)
2. Bill Devall, "Streams of Environmentalism" (Handout)

II. Mini-course (Overview of Issues). All readings except Hardin, "Lifeboat Ethics" in Forstner & Todd, Everlasting Universe, Heath & Co., 1971.

a. Shallow Ecology

Paul Ehrlich, "Ecocatastrophe", Garrett Hardin, "Tragedy of the Commons", Garrett Hardin, "Living on a Lifeboat," (Handout)

b. Deep Ecology

Marston Bates, "Man's Place in Nature", Lynn White, "Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis", Paul Shepard, "Ecology & Man", D.H. Lawrence, "The Death of Pan".

III. Theodore Roszak. Where the Wasteland Ends (possibly skip chs. 8 & 9).

IV. Alan Watts. Psychotherapy East and West.

V. Gary Snyder, Turtle Island, & Gary Snyder, The Old Ways.

VI. Stan Steiner. The Vanishing White Man.

VII. Jacob Needleman. A Sense of the Cosmos.

VIII. George Sessions, "Spinoza & Jeffers on Man in Nature", Inquiry, Vol. 20, No. 4, 1977 (Handout)*

Recommended Reading: F. Capra, The Tao of Physics, R. Dasmann, Conservation Alternative, Ed Abbey, The Monkey Wrench Gang.

* Theodore Roszak, "Review of Needleman's A Sense of the Cosmos" "Diluting the Sacred Truths" Los Angeles Times, Nov. 23, 1975 (Handout)

MAN AND THE ENVIRONMENT
Interdisciplinary I Syllabus
Sierra College, Rocklin, Calif.
SPRING 1974

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Phone ext.</u>
Dr. David Beesley, History	WH-47	215/216
Mr. Roland Bergthold, Biology	SH-12a	226
Mr. Don Cospo, Sociology	WH-45	215/216
Mr. John Creelman, Economics	WH-41	215/216
Mr. Perry Edwards, Computer Science	WH-37	200/250
Mr. Vearl Gish, Agriculture	I-4	293/4/5
Dr. Kay Glowes, English	M-9	274/5
Dr. Bill Hotchkiss, English	M2a	265
Mr. Walter McCallum, Chemistry	SH-4a	246
Mr. Alfred McElroy, Physiology	SH-16a	228
Mr. Robert Ridley, Art	E-2a	283/4
Mr. Dale Scoggin, Chemistry	SH-4a	246
Mr. George Sessions, Philosophy (Coordinator, 1973-74)	C2a	268
Mr. Larry Night, Political Science	WH-41	215/216

TEXTS

1. Barry Commoner, <u>The Closing Circle.</u>	\$1.95
2. G. Tyler Miller, <u>Replenish the Earth.</u>	2.95
3- Raymond Dasmann, <u>The Destruction of Calif.</u>	1.50
4. Garrett DeBell (ed) <u>Environmental Handbook</u>	.95
5. Playboy eds. <u>Project Survival</u>	.95
Total cost	8.30

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS on 3-day reserve in the library for this course.

1. Ehrlich & Holdren (eds) Global Ecology
2. Ehrlich & Ehrlich. Population Resources & Environment. 2nd ed.
3. G. Hardin (ed) Population, Evolution, & Birth Control. 2nd ed.
4. E.P. Odum. Fundamentals of Ecology 3rd ed
- ✓ 5. Harte & Socolow (eds) Patient Earth
6. R. Falk. This Endangered Planet
7. K.W. Kapp. The Social Costs of Private Enterprise.
8. B. Weisberg. Beyond Repair
9. R. Nash. Wilderness & the American Mind
10. L. Marx. The Machine in the Garden.
11. J.W. Forrester. World Dynamics
12. Meadows & Meadows. The Limits to Growth.

Further titles on specific subjects are listed in the extensive bibliography in Miller, Replenish the Earth.

COURSE GRADE will be based on 3 objective examinations covering the assigned reading and the material presented in class. Extra credit will be given students who elect to write an in-depth paper on some specific environmental topic. See the appropriate instructor and course coordinator before beginning work on the paper.

Interdisciplinary I is an academic course which transfers to 4-year colleges either in Humanities, Social Science, Biological Science, or Physical Science.

INTERDISCIPLINARY I: Man and the Environment
 SPRING SCHEDULE: 33 class meetings WH-10 TTh 11-12:15

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC	REQUIRED READING	STAFF
I. MAN AND THE ENVIRONMENT				
1	Jan 29	COURSE INTRODUCTION: ASB Environ. Coord. Remarks	Fischer (pp 134ff) in DeBell	G. Sessions ASB Env. Coord.
	31	FILM: Multiply & Subdue the Earth. Col. 67 min	Norman (pp 11ff) in Playboy eds Commoner, Ch. 1 Miller, pp. iii-4	"
II. POPULATION DYNAMICS				
2	Feb 5	Lecture: Population Dynamics FILM: Population Ecology. Col-19 min	Ehrlich (pp 219ff) in DeBell Miller, Chs. 1-2	A. McElroy
3	7	Lecture: Population Dynamics		"
	14	FILM: Brazil: Gathering Millions. 45 min Discussion of film		D. Cosper
III CONCEPTS OF ECOLOGY				
4	19	Lecture: Thermodynamics & Environment	Miller, Ch. 3	D. Scoggin
	21	Lecture: The Ecosphere & Ecosystems	Miller, Ch. 4 Commoner, Ch 2	E. Riley
5	26	Lecture: Energy Flow & Biogeochemical Cycles		"
	28	Lecture: Diversity & Stability in Ecosystems FILM: Jungle Biome. Col 25 min	Miller, Ch. 5	R. Bergthold
6	Mar 5	Lecture: Ecological Succession, Food Chains FILM: Changing Forest. Col 25 min	Miller, pp 100-103	"
	7	Lecture: Case Study: The Redwoods Review of basic concepts of ecology	Dasmann, Chs 2-5	"
7	12	Examination #1 over areas II and III		

INTERDISCIPLINARY I
SPRING SCHEDULE
PAGE 2

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC	REQUIRED READING	STAFF
IV. MAN IN THE ECOSPHERE				
7	Mar 14	Lecture: Agriculture & the Environment		V. Gish
8	19	Lecture: Pesticides, Fertilizers & Soil Pollution FILM: Chain of Life. Col 30 min	Woodka (pp 76ff) in DeBell Commoner, Ch 5	"
	21	Lecture: World Hunger, Growing More Food & Water Pollution. FILM: Aging of Lakes. col 14 min	Miller, Ch 6 Commoner, Ch 6 Dugan (pp113ff) in Playboy eds.	"
9	26	Lecture: Air Pollution	Commoner, Ch 4 Dasmann, Ch 9	W. McCallum
	28	Lecture: Case Study--Chemistry of the Automobile	Cantor (pp 197ff) in DeBell	"
10	Apr 2	Lecture: Energy Crisis Case Study: Nuclear Power Plants	Commoner, Ch 3 DeBell (pp. 66ff) in DeBell	D. Scoggin
	4	Examination #2 over Area IV SPRING VACATION		
V. CAUSES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS				
11	16	Lecture: Population, Pollution & Affluence FILM: Population & Pollution. Col 17 min	Commoner, Chs 8-9, 11 Miller, pp. 117-133	J. Creelman
	18	Lecture: World Computer Models & Cybernetics	Miller, pp. 83-89 133-144	P. Edwards
12	23	Lecture: Science & the Limits of Technology	Commoner, Chs 7, 10 Marine (pp 205ff) in Playboy eds	G. Sessions

INTERDISCIPLINARY
SPRING SCHEDULE
PAGE 3

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC	REQUIRED READING	STAFF
12	Apr 25	Lecture: Philosophy, Religion & Ecology: The Lynn White Thesis	White (p. 12ff) in DeBell	G. Sessions
13	30	Lecture: Philosophy & Ecology: Primitive Views of Man and Nature. FILM: Home. Col 29 m	Eiseley (p. 27ff) in Playboy " 4 Changes (p. 323ff) in DeBell	
	May 2	Lecture: Literature of Ecology FILM: Mornings of Creation. Col 20 min	Commoner, pp. 46-48 Brower (p. 147ff) in DeBell	K. Giowes
14	7	Lecture: Literature of Ecology: Robinson Jeffers: Calif Nature Poet	Jeffers handout	B. Hotchkiss
	9	Lecture: Art and Nature		B. Ridley
15	14	Lecture: Economics & Environment	Breslaw (p. 102ff) in DeBell Commoner, Ch. 12	J. Creelman
	16	Lecture: Politics & Environment FILM: Interview with Garrett Hardin. Col 11 m	Miller, Ch. 8 Edey (p. 312ff) & Hardin (p. 31ff) in DeBell	L. Wight
16	21	Lecture: California Politics, Water & Land Use	Dasmann, Chs. 6-8, 10, 11	D. Beesley
	23	Discussion: Local Environmental Groups: R.U.R.A.L. & S.P.A.C.E.		L. Hilligas L. Fellows
17	28	Discussion: What We Must Do: The Short Run FILM: Men at Bay. Col. 26 min	Commoner, Ch. 13 Miller, Ch. 9 &	D. Cosper D. Beesley
	30	Discussion: What We Must Do: The Long Run	DeBell (p. 153ff) in DeBell	V. Gish L. Wight
18		Final Exam Week: Exam over areas V & VI		

INTERDISCIPLINARY I - Man and the Environment
Supplementary Reading (see page I of the syllabus)

I. MAN AND THE ENVIRONMENT

1. P. Ehrlich. The Population Bomb.

II. POPULATION DYNAMICS

1. P&A Ehrlich. Population, Resources & Environment. 2nd ed.
2. G. Hardin. Population, Evolution & Birth Control. 2nd ed.
3. G. Hardin. Voyage of the Spaceship Beagle.
4. Ehrlich & Holdren. Global Ecology
5. E.P. Odum. Fundamentals of Ecology. 3rd ed.

III. CONCEPTS OF ECOLOGY

1. P&A Ehrlich. Population, Resources & Environment. 2nd ed.
2. E.P. Odum. Fundamentals of Ecology. 3rd ed.
3. E. Kormondy. Ecology.
4. Ehrlich & Holdren. Global Ecology.

IV. MAN IN THE ECOSPHERE

1. P&A Ehrlich. Population, Resources & Environment. 2nd ed.
2. Hart & Socolow (eds) Patient Earth. A number of case studies
3. Ehrlich & Holdren. Global Ecology.

V. CAUSES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

A. World Computer Models

1. J. Forrester. World Dynamics
2. Meadows & Meadows et. al. The Limits to Growth.

B. Philosophy & Religion

1. F. Elder. Crisis in Eden.
2. I. Barbour. Earth Might be Fair
3. A. Leopold. Sand County Almanac. Ch. on "Land Ethic"
4. E. Laszlo. Intro. to Systems Philosophy. Ch. 14
5. R. Nash. Wilderness & the American Mind. Chs. 1, 5, 8, 11
6. R. Falk. This Endangered Planet. pp. 15-39

C. Literature & Ecology

1. L. Marx. The Machine in the Garden.
2. R. Nash. Wilderness & the American Mind.

D. Economics & Environment.

1. K.W. Kapp. The Social Costs of Private Enterprise.
2. B. Weisberg. Beyond Repair.
3. Ehrlich & Holdren. Global Ecology.

E. Politics & Environment

1. R. Falk. This Endangered Planet.
2. Ehrlich & Holdren. Global Ecology.

VI. WHAT WE MUST DO

1. Ehrlich & Holdren. How to Be a Survivor.
2. Ehrlich & Holdren. Global Ecology.

See also extensive bibliography listed by subject in Tyler Miller, Replenish the Earth