

not so much the encyclopaedic philosopher whose *Logic* and *Political Economy* became standard Victorian textbooks, or even the Utilitarian who remained true to Bentham's inclusion of sentient animals within the sphere of morals and legislation, but the lesser-known mountain climber, 'botaniser', and 'lover of Nature' who indignantly protested the Royal Horticultural Society's contest for the two best herbaria collected in each county in England as an event that would make 1864 the last year that many already-rare species would exist. It was this same Mill who . . . as autobiographer, recorded for posterity the classic case study of a sensitive person trained to operate as an analytic thinking-machine who 'died' and was then 'reborn' through rediscovering the capacity for feeling, intuition, imagination, the enjoyment of poetry and natural beauty, the ability to cry and to contemplate – without losing the capacity for rational analysis or practical action.¹⁹

Much green writing would implicitly approve of such a 'rebirth' – one which launches us out of an intoxication with language and, especially, theory into a fully embodied participation in the world outside ourselves.

Arne Naess and 'Deep Ecology'

Much of what Rodman wrote resonates with the views of 'deep ecologists'. Deep ecology originated with Arne Naess's 1973 paper 'The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement',²⁰ in which he distinguishes between two types of response to ecological problems. The first, 'shallow' response deals with environmental problems such as pollution and resource depletion as isolated issues which have no wider significance, and has as its objective 'the health and affluence of people in the developed countries'.²¹ It is therefore anthropocentric and is concerned with the health of the natural world only insofar as it affects our own well-being.

In contrast, the 'deep' approach advocated by Naess sees 'environmental problems' as symptoms of something much more profound – a disturbance in the entire 'biospherical net' of relations of which humans are a part. Nature is not something that can be bracketed off from human life as a separate realm with its own problems. As Alan Drengson notes, 'For Naess, free nature is critical to cultural flourishing, community health, and personal Self-realization'.²² Like Rodman, Naess rejects the Cartesian – and today widely accepted – view of the person as a largely autonomous being defined mainly by the ability to think, and suggests that we go

beyond such assumptions, asking deep questions about ourselves, the character of society and the natural world. In Naess's own words:

The essence of deep ecology – as compared with the science of ecology, and with what I call the shallow ecological movement – is to ask deeper questions. The adjective 'deep' stresses that we ask why and how, where others do not. For instance, ecology as a science does not ask what kind of society would be the best for maintaining a particular ecosystem – that is considered a question for value theory, for politics, for ethics. As long as ecologists keep narrowly to their science, they do not ask such questions. What we need today is a tremendous expansion of ecological thinking . . . deep ecology, then, involves a shift from science to wisdom.²³

Naess's own life was a testament to his belief that we are part of a wider 'biospherical net'. An accomplished mountain climber, even in childhood he felt a strong connection to the Norwegian landscape; and until his death at the age of 96, he still enjoyed spending time in the stone hut he built in the mountains. He was also strongly engaged in social issues and actions, once chaining himself together with other protesters to prevent the construction of a hydroelectric dam on the Alta River. There was a marked continuity and coherence between his philosophical views and the way he lived; and, in keeping with this emphasis on the relation between philosophy and lived experience, Naess was critical of the direction taken by academic philosophy and cultural theory, suggesting that 'the turn of philosophy in this century towards language rather than cosmos, towards logic rather than experience . . . is a turn into a vast blind alley'.²⁴ He was equally critical of postmodernism, which he regarded simply as 'the latest philosophical fad'.²⁵ In contrast to such approaches, which often seem to have only the most tenuous relationship with lived realities, the questions that Naess addresses are quite down to earth, although not always easy to answer:

We need to ask question like 'Why do we think that economic growth and high levels of consumption are so important?' The conventional answer would be to point to the economic consequences of not having economic growth. But in deep ecology, we ask whether the present society fulfils basic human needs like love and security and access to nature, and in so doing, we question our society's underlying assumptions.²⁶

Just as Rodman saw the destructive domestication of wild nature as inseparable from the taming of human life, so Naess rejected the

commonly accepted assumptions that the 'environment' is more or less separate from each of us, and that we are autonomous, egoic individuals dominated by self-concern. Instead, Naess embraces 'Self-realisation!' – that is, a broadening and deepening of the self as we identify with other life-forms and with other features of the natural world. Naess believes that if we realise our own nature as fully as possible, we will quite naturally be concerned with the welfare of the 'biospherical net' of which we are part, recognising other creatures' right to flourish and develop in their own way – a recognition that involves both empathy and intelligence, as the title of his book *Life's Philosophy: Reason and Feeling in a Deeper World* implies.²⁷ Following on from this, if we achieve a degree of Self-realisation, we will naturally engage in 'beautiful actions', rather than performing these out of a sense of duty or obligation ('dutiful' actions). Unlike 'shallow' approaches, then, deep ecology does not simply take for granted the sort of self that happens to exist but identifies industrialist forms of selfhood as part of the problem, suggesting that we need to reawaken ourselves to extended forms of subjectivity which can reach out to include the ecosphere.

In keeping with his respect for diversity, as exemplified by the attitudes of his intellectual forebears Gandhi and Spinoza, Naess is remarkably undogmatic, believing that each person will develop their own understandings. While he was widely recognised as a leading philosopher, and was clear about his own philosophy (which he refers to as 'Ecosophy T'), he does not regard this as everybody's truth, preferring to recommend some general principles which can be accepted widely. Naess's approach is therefore more *inclusive* than most critical theories, drawing on points of commonality with others rather than finding reasons to reject them, and embracing thinking *and* feeling rather than leaning on one or the other in a dualistic fashion. In keeping with this, the 'deep ecology movement' is not a direct reflection of Naess's personal philosophy but has been developed by him and others such as George Sessions and Bill Devall to include generally compatible views. The basic principles of deep ecology have been summarised most recently in Naess's book *Life's Philosophy* as follows:

1. All living beings have intrinsic value.
2. The richness and diversity of life has intrinsic value.
3. Except to satisfy vital needs, humankind does not have the right to reduce this diversity and this richness.

Green Critical Theorists

4. It would be better for human beings if there were fewer of them, and much better for other living creatures.
5. Today the extent and nature of human interference in the various ecosystems is not sustainable, and the lack of sustainability is rising.
6. Decisive improvement requires considerable change: social, economic, technological and ideological.
7. An ideological change would essentially entail seeking a better quality of life rather than a raised standard of living.
8. Those who accept the aforementioned points are responsible for trying to contribute directly or indirectly to the realisation of the necessary changes.²⁸

These basic principles, which constitute the 'deep ecology platform', aim to incorporate the wisdom Naess found in a broad range of sources, including Buddhism, Taoism, ecological science, Ghandi's teachings on nonviolence, and the philosophy of Spinoza. The platform is not intended as a set of environmental commandments which are unchallengeable, but rather as a vehicle for bringing together people from different backgrounds, nationalities and religious preferences so that they can jointly work towards a healthier and less destructive way of living. For example, what constitutes a 'vital' need (number 3) will vary from culture to culture, so that hunting might be essential to survival in one society, but not in the industrialised world. Similarly, there will also be a good deal of diversity in the particular contributions to change that each of us are able to make, depending on our circumstances. Generally, then, the deep ecology platform is not intended prescriptively but rather as a guide and an invitation to enhance the welfare of all members of the biosphere, including humans.

Ecofeminism

Ecofeminists see links between the patriarchal domination of women and the patriarchal domination of the natural world, and so explore the common cultural factors in these forms of domination. This general insight has given rise to a large variety of ecofeminisms, of which I will outline some of the more prominent ones. Evidence for linkages between male exploitation of women and nature is not difficult to find. In the sixteenth century, Francis Bacon, who was both a leading populariser of the new scientific approach and Lord