Through a Green Gaze:
Tentative Indicators of a Green 'Text'

Sally Harper and Wilhelm Johann Jordaan, University of Pretoria, South Africa

Abstract

This paper[1] seeks to re-claim for the idea 'green', something of the depth and range of its philosophical and ideological ideas at the time of its emergence and early formation from the 1960s to the 1990s, ideas which appear today to be largely unknown, forgotten or deliberately sidelined. It also seeks to provide for political, economic and environmental opinion-makers and decision-takers, a list of indicators by which to assess the green-ness of a 'text'. The paper is also useful for educators wishing to examine the philosophical foundations of their practice and the texts that they use in educational work.

Introduction to 'Seeing Green'

'Seeing green' as United Kingdom green politician Jonathon Porritt (1984) phrased it, has been around since the 1980s as a proposed solution to our growing environmental problems. Yet what has filtered through into the mass consciousness – or, from a more cynical point of view, what has been allowed to filter through into the consumer mass consciousness – is a rather impoverished version of it. For example, during the 2007 festive season, one popular women's magazine, in its 'Environment' section, carried an article entitled 'Dreaming of a Green Christmas – Gifts that Won't Leave a Large Eco-footprint'. Readers are advised to '... think of items that shout 'green' – recycled goods and those that won't end up in a landfill. Where possible, choose local products because imported goods have a larger carbon footprint' (Rassool & Warren-Brown, 2007:56). The article covers topics such as indigenous gardening, 'conscientious' (organically produced) wine drinking, environmental awareness-raising books, solar-powered radios and ornamental lights, organic body and skin-care products, and bike riding to reduce carbon emissions (56–57). It is true that all these topics are part of the green message, but what has been forgotten, or intentionally/unintentionally sidelined, or is simply unknown, is the radical, Western counter-cultural, and some would say, subversive, nature of their 'seeing green' context.

This paper seeks to reclaim for the idea 'green', something of the depth and range of its philosophical and ideological ideas at the time of its emergence and early formation from the 1960s to the 1990s. And, to provide for political, economic and environmental opinion-makers and decision-takers, as opposed to environmental and political philosophy scholars, a list of indicators by which to assess the green-ness of a 'text'. Here, 'text' is understood widely to mean not only printed texts, such as development policy recommendations or policy papers on

socio–economic issues, but also 'texts' such Al Gore's acclaimed film about climate change, *An Inconvenient Truth*.

Seeing green: More than reform environmentalism

Seeing green is not to be confused with that point of view called 'reform environmentalism' which is often encountered in conservative models of sustainable development.

Achterberg (1993:84) notes that in the literature:

> ... two visions of the nature and solution of environmental problems are traditionally distinguished. First, there is a 'superficial' or reformist vision ('environmentalism'). According to this vision, environmental problems are mainly management problems, soluble within the context of the dominant political and economic system, and without any rigorous change in our values and culture. Second, there is a profounder vision, aiming at more structural change ('ecologism': for example, 'deep ecology'), according to which a radical change in our attitude towards nature, and therefore also in our political and social system, is necessary ...

Seeing green rejects reform environmentalism, sometimes called anthropocentric[2] reformism, as insufficient to address the ecological crisis. Reform environmentalism:

> argues that the root of our environmental problems is neither anthropocentric attitudes about humanity's place in nature, nor the political-economic structures that embody those attitudes. Rather, air and water pollution, wasteful use of natural resources, and the like, stem from ignorance, greed, and shortsightedness. Such factors may be addressed by enacting legislation, changing public policy, increasing education, altering tax laws, returning 'public lands' to private ownership, emphasising moral obligations to future generations of humans, promoting wise 'stewardship' of nature, and otherwise encouraging more prudent use and more equitable allocation of natural resources. According to these reformists, while nature has value only as an instrument for human ends, those ends range from the food provided by plants and animals to the aesthetic pleasure provided by a beautiful wild landscape. (Zimmerman, 1993:viii)

The 'profounder vision' of which Achterberg speaks, can also be called 'seeing green'.

Seeing green's key ideas: A summary

Seeing green comprises so much more than simply eco-friendly consumerism, recycling, or energy consumption that seeks to reduce our eco-footprint while carrying on our lifestyles as usual. Its stories are about the pathological Western–cultural construction of what it is to be a human being, and of the Self/Other relationship – Self divided against self, against other human beings, against 'the female' as value system, against women, against nature, against animals. Seeing green proposes that our current, and increasingly global, ecological crisis is but one manifestation of this pathological Self/Other construction. It argues that there will be no

lasting solution until this pathological relationship is healed, in thought, word and in public as well as private deed; that is, in our cultural practices, and in our political and socio-economic institutional structures.

Seeing green comprises at least five key ideas, all related to a view of the Self/Other relationship different to that found in dominant Western cultural thought. It problematises firstly, whether 'the good life' really is global capitalist techno-industrialism, which seeks to bring as much as possible of humanity's and nature's activity within the economy and the market system, and which values instrumental efficiency, materialism and consumerism.

Then secondly, there is within seeing green, a strong current of feminist and ecological critique of what is argued to be a predominantly 'masculine', hierarchical, patriarchal, and atomist view of what it is to be a human being – a Self in which reason is divided against emotion, mind against body, the 'male' against the 'female', for example. Thus thirdly, on the green view, there must be both personal transformation towards the adoption of ecological/post-patriarchal values, and radical political and socio-economic changes, to achieve a green, or ecological society.

Crucial in this transformation is rejection of the dominant idea that human progress – 'development' – requires the conquest, mastery or exploitation of nature. It is this idea, seeing green argues, that legitimates the omnipresent instrumental ethic[3] towards the natural world. As key fourth idea, seeing green proposes an ethic for nature which 'crosses the species divide'. That is, in one way or another, it extends the sphere of ethical behaviour beyond human beings only, to include some or all of nature for its own sake, not merely for human-instrumental reasons. There is agreement that long-range, wide ecological sustainability matters not only economically, but morally.

Finally, a key idea of seeing green is the call to mission, as it were. Adherents of seeing green are required to try to implement the necessary changes in self and society, by living out their personal beliefs in the public sphere.

Seeing green's ideas form an entire alternative worldview

It cannot be claimed that a 'seeing green' world-view represents a 'spectacular synthesis' of ideas (Ferris, 1993). It comes in darker and lighter shades of green too. This diversity is to be expected, since seeing green draws its inspiration from so many different 'new social movements', political ideologies, philosophies and religions, many having their own internal variation as well. The more important of these are perhaps the animal liberation movement, the ecology movement, feminism and eco-feminism, the peace movement, the counter-cultural movement, and the New Left political movement, but with contributions also from some alternative Christian movements, and the human potential and alternative health movements, to name but some. It is thus no easy task to present seeing green's diversity and complexity, either compactly or simply.

Yet there is a coherence of key ideas that can be discerned, and which in their detail, comprise an entire and alternative worldview to that of the dominant Western social paradigm. The subversivity of seeing green, some would argue, is why mainstream Western thought has been so quick to assimilate its less dangerous ideas (e.g. reducing carbon emissions, recycling,

the polluter pays principle), while quietly sidelining its more unsettling ideas (e.g. there is more to life than capitalism as economic and socio-cultural system; we should respect nature's agenda too, not only our own).

All the customary elements of a world-view (Macnamara, 1980) can be found in seeing green – theories which address the major personal and social questions, such as 'What is True?' 'What can we know, and how can we know it?' (epistemology). 'What is real?' 'What is the nature of reality, of human and non-human nature?' (ontology/psychology). And, 'What is Good?' 'How should we live?' (morality and ethics). A world-view should also contain a political ideology, that is, an analysis of political reality, a picture of the Good Life, and a theory of political action or strategy to achieve it (Dobson, 2000:164). One can expect too, one or more 'grand' narratives that hold the whole world-view together, and legitimate its critique and visions.

It is possible, I suggest, to propose tentative[4] indicators of each of these aspects of a green world-view, and use them to assess the green-ness of any text. To do so, one can phrase each indicator listed in the next section, as a question. As example, the second indicator can be rephrased as 'Are the ideas of androcentrism, or anthropocentrism, or hierarchy, or patriarchy, critiqued in this text?' I present next an overview of 18 potential green indicators, before then explaining them in more detail.

Tentative Indicators of a Green World-view: An Overview

One would expect a green 'text' to contain most of the following world-view aspects and indicators:

Legitimating narratives
1. Ecology is seen as normative
2. The ideas of androcentrism, anthropocentrism, hierarchy, and patriarchy, are critiqued
3. Western capitalist techno-industrialism as definition of 'the good life', is challenged
4. Spirituality is recognised as necessary for personal and social transformation

Epistemology
5. Rationality/rationalism as sole way of knowing is questioned

Ontology/Psychology
6. A holistic, organismic, purposive, view of reality/nature is proposed
7. There is philosophical concern for a reconceptualised human being/nature relationship
8. There is philosophical concern for a reconceptualised Self

Ethics, with focus on an ethic for nature
9. There is an account of the ethical generally, which differs from standard (or 'masculine') western accounts

10. The ethic for nature is ecological sustainability, understood as long-range, and 'wide', and not as only human-instrumental environmental sustainability

Ideology: Real-world seeing green politics in an ecological society

Some views on social reform

11. Fundamental, ecologically-informed, post-patriarchal reformation of society's values and structures are proposed
12. Living in solidarity is advocated
13. Non-violence and radical peace are advocated

Some views on the natural environment

14. Long-range, wide, ecological sustainability is placed on a genuine par with, if not ahead of social or economic sustainability

Some views on the economy

15. The economy is ecologically reoriented
16. Animals are treated ethically

Some views on the political process

17. Grassroots ('direct') democracy is advocated
18. Living/enacting your personal moral beliefs in the public-political sphere is encouraged.

The Green Indicators Explained

In this section, I present green 'stories' on the indicators of each world-view aspect. 'Stories' because it is not possible to present one categorically correct version of a green viewpoint. But as in any elusively complex but beautiful melody, seeing green comprises major and minor themes, harmony and counterpoint. To keep the descriptions of the indicators reasonably short, I have not discussed the variations, even contradictions, which do occur within the stories. But the synthesis presented here does convey the major ideas of 'seeing green'.

Legitimating narratives

1. Is ecology seen as normative? In the mid-1960s, some saw the newly emerging natural science ecology as a 'subversive' science, its ideological status that of a resistance movement (Deep Ecologist Sessions, 1995:102), its social implications revolutionary. Social ecologist Bookchin (1965, in Bookchin, 1974:68) wrote of ecology's 'awesome message to humanity ... in a new social dimension'. He argued that ecology conveys both a critical message (what humanity is doing wrongly: broadly, seeking to dominate nature; disturbing its balance), and a reconstructive one (what humanity ought to be doing: broadly, re-harmonising itself with nature; preserving nature's richness, complexity, diversity). The imbalances humanity is producing in the natural world, for example, the current reversal of organic evolution from diverse complexity to increasing homogeneity, are caused by the imbalances which humanity has produced in

the social world, such as the 'appalling contradictions between town and country, state and community, industry and husbandry, mass manufacture and craftsmanship, centralism and regionalism, the bureaucratic scale and the human scale' (68).

To varying degrees, social ecologists, deep ecologists, and 'green' as a new social movement in the 1970s, all welcome natural science ecology as partly normative for their epistemological, ontological and ideological views. Particularly valued are qualities in nature such as self-organisation, self-reliance, egalitarianism, symbiosis (mutualism, interdependence, cooperation, toleration, partnership, harmony rather than conflict); diversity, and unity in diversity; complexity; stability (equilibrium, 'balance'); richness (abundance); and spontaneity. 'Ecology' is the value within which all issues in society are to be assessed, and from which personal and social values, and social structures and practices, should be derived.

2. Are the ideas of androcentrism, anthropocentrism, hierarchy and patriarchy critiqued? Feminists/eco-feminists contend that while androcentrism[5] is a supposedly gender-neutral understanding of being and living, it is actually a socially constructed 'masculine' or 'male'-values view. Its dualistic, hierarchical and dominating, or 'power-over' logic generates a Self divided against self, against human Other, and against nature as Other. They argue that it is therefore an even more fundamental conceptual framework than anthropocentrism within which to understand the green-suggested pathology of the human–human, and human–nature relationship. Non-anthropocentrism, perhaps most easily recognised through its acknowledgement of nature's value-for-itself, is a key marker of a green text. An anthropocentric text on the other hand, tends towards considering nature as a collection of resources-for-humans, whether these resources are understood as material or aesthetic.

Androcentrism also encompasses seeing green's powerful critique of the ideas of hierarchy,[6] and patriarchy,[7] as well as their cultural and social expressions as colonialism, nationalism, statism, parliamentarianism, militarism, classism, sexism, racism, tribalism, and authoritarian bureaucracy in human affairs. Pathological ideas of hierarchy and patriarchy, they argue, provide the justification of 'naturism' – any way of thinking about, or acting towards nonhuman nature 'that reflects a logic, values, or attitude of domination' (Warren, 1990:141).

The rhetoric employed in this legitimating narrative is that of liberation for all oppressed groups: liberation for women from patriarchy; liberation for animals from speciesism[8] or inegalitarianism; liberation for nature from human domination; liberation for ourselves from our dominator role, amongst other human beings, and in nature.

3. Is Western capitalist techno-industrialism as definition of 'the good life', challenged? Seeing green critiques visions of 'the good life' equated with the values of global western capitalist techno-industrialism. Its alternative visions include a reconceptualisation of what it is to be a better human being (indicator 8), a reconceptualised human-nature relationship that rejects anthropocentrism (indicator 7), and a different understanding of authentic development.

The ideology of 'progress' is critiqued. Social ecologist Bookchin rejects any understanding of progress that involves the idea of hierarchy: the domination of people, or the idea of dominating or controlling nature (Bookchin, 1993). Eco-feminist Shiva critiques the Enlightenment model

of progress as dependent on a 'masculine' model of what it is to be human. She criticises notions of progress that elevate 'modern scientific knowledge and economic development' to 'sanctity' (e.g. Shiva, 1988:xiv, in Hayward, 1995:3), or which include the idea of human transcendence of dependence on nature (Mies and Shiva, 1998:489). Deep ecologists critique that understanding of progress that equates development with economic growth, and equates a society with its economy (Sachs, in Sessions, 1995:429–431).

Under New Left and counter-cultural influence, as well as in terms of ecology normatively understood (indicator 1), seeing green problematises capitalism as cultural/socio-economic system, inter alia for:

(a) assuming universality of western economic concepts, such as 'development' understood as ever-increasing commodity production: economic growth becomes practically equated with moral desirability (idea from Mark Sagoff, in Botzler & Armstrong, 1998:517, footnote 5). In this assumed universal understanding, subsistence living is equated with 'poverty', and nature is assumed to be 'productive' only when generating goods and services for profit in the marketplace;

(b) encouraging increased production for consumerist wants rather than the satisfaction of vital needs;

(c) leading to increased poverty, and increased international economic inegalitarianism. In the Third World, advanced capitalism tends on the one hand to create 'new elites', while increasing the economic gap between haves/have-nots, between men and women, and between the North and South;

(d) being ecologically impossible to universalise on a global scale, without encouraging militarism to secure access to natural resources; and

(e) reducing cultural diversity through its homogenising nature.

It is also critiqued for its aggressive, competitive, expansive and greedy spirit, its ecological destruction, its 'commodification' and intensive media-marketing of almost every aspect of life, and its overvaluing of materialism and consumerism. Supposedly 'green' consumerism, which fails to query materialism (the pursuit of wealth understood as ever-higher standards of living) as value, does not escape critique either.

Alternative forms of development that do not reproduce patriarchal oppression of women, do not rest on materialism and consumerism as values but meet people's fundamental needs, value their dignity, recognise the role of spirituality in human development, protect cultural diversity, recognise ecological limits and protect nature's diversity, which are regionally appropriate, tend towards increased economic self-reliance, harness renewable energies and soft technologies, and maintain international peace, are all recommended. Two positive examples are the 'eco-development' model (Bartelmus, 1986:46), subsequently overshadowed by 'sustainable development', and Norwegian resource economist and peace activist Johann Galtung's work (Naess, 1989a:98–99). A negative example is Shiva's (1988, 1990) 'maldevelopment'.

So seeing green rejects the overvaluing of aggressive individualism, materialism and consumerism inherent in capitalism and industrialism. Its understandings of the good life and authentic development are characterised by radical egalitarianism. In the public sphere,

'solidarity' development politics deliver what is needed locally to combat poverty, hunger and sickness, not what promotes Western economism, and an ever-higher standard of living. In the personal sphere, the new understanding of the good life manifests itself, for example, as voluntary simplicity (Elgin, 1981). This does not mean a life of grim-lipped self-denial, but a rejection of materialism and consumerism as ends in themselves, an embracing of a lifestyle-of-enough, and also, a statement of visible solidarity with have-nots.

Seeing green's radical egalitarianism in resource sharing, and solidarity of lifestyle with have-nots, appears in sustainable development discourse too, but as a less radical 'equity' (Hayward, 1997:97). Poverty reduction assumes in sustainable development discourse, the same kind of legitimating narrative status which seeing green accords to a western counter-cultural critique, or to ecology as normative. But ecological economist Martinez-Alier (1987:xi), for example, takes the cynical view that poverty reduction as story is deliberately cultivated by Northern (and 'new' or emerging) elites in order to deflect too much probing into their own inegalitarian pursuit of resource-intensive, and ever higher standards of living. It is often noted that this standard of living, for example that of the USA, 'is not replicable in the rest of the world because it implies such a disproportionate use of the earth's resources' (Martinez-Alier, 1987:237).

Martinez-Alier points out that underlying the economic growth for poverty alleviation viewpoint is an ethical question not always clearly spelt out, particularly in the context of the developed world *vis à vis* the developing world. If continual economic growth is possible, then developed world countries currently enjoying the high standard of living aspired to by the rest of the world (southern African new elites included), are not called upon to introduce any fundamental change to their lifestyle – 'tinkering' perhaps, but not a fundamental reorganisation. By 'assuming miraculous technical change and economic growth in the future' (Martinez-Alier, 1987:236), it is argued that developing countries will eventually reach the same high standard of living as in the developed countries. There is thus no need to give up 'the last great conservative ideology' (15) of growth, or to become involved in the painful business of redistribution of wealth. But, if continued growth is not possible, if our energy reserves are indeed limited, and not capable of delivering the same high standard of living across all peoples and all countries, should the developed countries then not be sharing the available resources in an egalitarian way, starting right now? And, closer to home, what about Die Grünen philosopher and activist Rudolf Bahro's contention that the elites in developing countries should also be engaging in the same kind of egalitarian, distributionist thinking, rather than pursuing what he called the 'Mercedes culture', or '... our auto-culture, the "good life" of Washington, London, Paris and Frankfurt' (Bahro, 1984a, in Bahro, 1986:161–162)?

4. Is spirituality seen as motivation in personal and social transformation? Calls for spiritual renewal to end the 'religion' of economism, the philosophy of materialism, and the pathology of individualism common to both, are part of seeing green. Personal spiritual transformation is seen as essential in bringing about the new social transformation; spirituality is the practice needed 'to dismantle ... previous psychological structures and be socialised anew' (Bahro, 1983, in Bahro, 1986:90). The sources of seeing green's spirituality are religious, secular and diverse: alternative forms of Christianity such as that advocated by St Francis, or the Christian mystics;

Eastern lifeways such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism; Earth or goddess worship; animism, and naturalism (respect for evolutionary process) are some. Spirituality in the green world-view also expresses itself as a rejection of domination, as a commitment to living in authentic community with other human beings, and in a partnership ethic with nature. Spirituality is seen as the link between the reconceptualised human being, and an ecologically sustainable society.

Epistemology

5. Is rationality/rationalism as sole way of knowing critiqued or problematised? Seeing green problematises the primacy of reason and rationality as ways of knowing and acting, on various grounds: as divorced from the body as epistemological agent (i.e. the validity of feeling in knowing is denied; body as moral agent is denied); as abstract, and universal; as generating a dualistic ontology; as favouring the analytical above the holistic; the value-free above the value-laden; and devaluing particular and local knowledge. In a seeing green worldview, the validity of subjectivity, emotion, intuition, empathy, sensitivity, involvement, and value-recognition in knowing is acknowledged.

Particularly, and consistently, perhaps as heritage of the neo-Frankfurt School/counter-cultural critique, seeing green problematises that form of rationalism which legitimates a rational-efficient, instrumental use of the Other, whether people or nature. Instrumental reason, examples of which are economic rationality and rational self-interest, are critiqued for their ethically bankrupt use of the Other for own ends. Rational-instrumental, exploitative forms of science, and of technology, which demean and dehumanise the human being, which exploit nature, and which provide short-term, 'quick-fix' solutions to the ecological crisis rather than encouraging a review of fundamental values, including the predominantly anthropocentric human-nature relationship, is also part of the green epistemological critique.

In addition to rationalism (provided it is not instrumental-only rationalism), seeing green embraces alternative holistic, dialectical, both/and, process and standpoint epistemologies. The discursive influence of language in epistemological and ontological views is problematised: the Other, including nature, women, and animals, must also be liberated from oppressive epistemological and ontological constructions in our words.

Ontology/psychology

6. Is a holistic, organismic, purposive view of reality/nature proposed? Nature as a random phenomenon of separate, independent, human-usable parts is rejected (e.g. what has been called, the 'supermarket' view [deep ecologist Naess, 1989b, in Sessions, 1995:244]). Instead, there is a holistic view of reality conveyed in non-hierarchical, and non-mechanistic metaphors such as gestalts, systems or networks. Nature is seen as a single organism, or systems of organisms, or ecological gestalts. These are alive, manifest consciousness, subjectivity, or mind, have their own 'agenda' as it were, their own interests ('conatus'; 'nisus'), which are becoming, or self-development, or self-evolution towards greater complexity, diversity, self-reflexivity. They are also understood as possessing a capacity for self-organisation and self-direction ('autopoeisis') in achieving their 'agenda'. In early Die Grünen real-world political programmes for example, this self-organisation is primarily understood to manifest itself in a dynamic ecological balance

and stability, which should not be disturbed[9] (Die Grünen, ca. 1985:22). This ontological view (mind, nisus, conatus, self-organisation, in dynamic equilibrium) provides an objective basis (e.g. Bookchin, 1995, in Biehl, 1997:214) on which to ground a new human–nature relationship ethic (indicator 10).

7. Is there philosophical concern for a reconceptualised human being/nature relationship? Dominant Western understandings of the world assume a sharp human–nature divide. In green stories, a call for a critical review of this 'discontinuity problem' is central. In one eco-feminist view (Plumwood, 1991, in Warren, 1996:170), this must entail a simultaneous reconceptualisation of what it is to be a human being, and a reconceptualisation of Self, 'especially ... [the Self's] possibilities of relating to nature in other than instrumental ways'. These last two aspects are taken up in green indicators 8, and 10.

Green philosophers and ideologues call for a fresh start for a humanity which has failed to live up to its potentiality for symbiosis, and which has become 'warped' through the idea of hierarchy (Bookchin, 1990:258), or pathological Western individualism (Bahro, 1984b: 214–217). Eco-feminists critique the assumed human–nature divide as derived from an 'androcentric premise' on rationality, Self and Other. Instrumental rationalism underwrites 'human chauvinism', 'whereby things are valued only to the extent that they are useful to Man'. The androcentric premise comprises five key ideas:

(1) the creation of masculine and feminine archetypes, their polarisation, and the elevation of values defined as masculine (rational, competitive, dominating, calculating) above those defined as female (emotional, nurturing, caring, accommodating);

(2) the idea that 'masculine' Man is autonomous. 'This false sense of masculine autonomy underlies the alienation and anthropocentrism to which many environmentalists trace the modern crisis';

(3) a patriarchal association of women with nature seen as 'feminine';

(4) masculinity is to be measured by distance from the 'feminine', by autonomy, and by the amount of '*power over*' others; and

(5) the assumption that what is actually a 'masculine' model of experiences and values is gender-neutral and universal (Birkeland, 1993, in Gaard, 1993:24, 25, her italics).

In Die Grünen's real world political statements, there is a demand for a human being recreated on an ecological basis (Die Grünen, 1980:4).

8. Is there philosophical concern for a reconceptualised self? Essential in bringing about the possibility of relating to nature, and to other human beings, in a non-instrumental way, is a reconceptualised Self. The dominant Western view of what it is to be a fully developed, fully functioning human being – atomist, rationalist, autonomous, individualist and competitive, with an associated inimical, instrumental stance towards other people, women, nature and animals – is rejected as pathological.

The new Self in green stories, derived variously from metaphysical understandings of reality, to emphatic naturalism and normative understandings of ecology, is fully liberated, reintegrated,

symbiotically connected, embodied. The role of spirituality, metaphysical or secular, in bringing about 'inward' transformation towards seeing green (changed personal and social values, and related social-structural change) is explicitly recognised.

Because the new human being is conceptualised as capable of mature, self-responsible, and ethical behaviour, there must be complete liberation, complete freedom. Freedom is ideally understood as self-chosen, self-directed, spontaneous, creative activity, within human-scale communities that are in harmony with each other, and with their natural environment. Liberation from the one-dimensional view of the human being as *Homo economicus,*[10] from humans' entrapment within techno-industrialism, freedom for women from all expressions of patriarchal oppression, and freedom for nature from human domination, are all included in the green vision.

In the reconceptualised human being, and in the reconceptualised ecological society, 'masculine' values are rebalanced – not replaced! – by 'feminine' values, also sometimes called 'post-patriarchal' values, or the 'feminine principle'. This latter concept, easy to understand intuitively but elusive to articulate, is described variously as comprising the 'soft' values, such as partnership, caring, compassion, non-violence, nurturing, non-defensiveness, accommodation, a welcoming of interdependence; 'intimate communion with the natural world' (Spretnak, 1990:14) and the desire to conserve it; or the recognition of diversity as asset, not threat; the abandonment of reductionism, duality and linearity; the rejection of the alienation and subjugation of women and nature (Shiva, 1990:190).

The separated spheres of the modern human being (*Homo economicus*) are reintegrated: city and country, passion and rationality, mental and physical activity, work and play, mind and body. Green epistemology acknowledges the 'embodiedness' of knowledge: feeling is readmitted into knowing; in green ethics, the body is readmitted as moral agent, for example, in what we count as food. On the green view, education, work, health practice, recreation, and political praxis, should all be oriented toward addressing and promoting the development of the whole person, not merely *Homo economicus*.

In the reintegrated person, there is also a relational rather than atomist sense of Self – a 'self-in-relation'. We acknowledge our connection to, and develop our sense of community with not only other human beings, but with all living beings. The reconceptualised human being is part of nature, not separate from it, not transcendent over it. There are calls for harmony with nature, based on a recognition of a 'necessary interdependence of all beings', rather than the predominant Western cultural value of human opposition to, struggle with, mastery and subjugation of nature (Hayward, 1995:31, 59). Our non-instrumental connectedness includes the usually underplayed or completely eliminated emotional values of identification, empathy, compassion, and care.

Ethics, with focus on an ethic for nature

A key premise in green stories of morality is that often unexamined, but dichotomising epistemological and ontological assumptions underpin our Self/Other ethic. Seeing green proposes a new, different account of the ethical (indicator 9), and tends towards a same ethic for both humans and non-humans. A new consciousness, informed by alternative views of the human/nature relationship (indicator 7), what it is to be a better human being (indicator 8), and

the recognition that nature has its own interests (indicator 6), which are independent of their usefulness to human beings, provide the motivation for a new nature ethic (indicator 10). For lack of a word or short phrase capable of encompassing all the nuances and variations within the various versions of a seeing green nature ethic, I call it an empathetic, caring, respectful partnership ethic, one which also recognises nature's value-for-itself. However it is described, it distinguishes itself from reform environmentalism in that it is not merely an anthropocentric-instrumental ethic (however enlightened) that views nature as resources for human beings.

9. Is there an account of the ethical generally, which differs from standard (or 'masculine') Western accounts? Seeing green rejects mainstream Western dichotomising epistemological and ontological assumptions, which underpin and justify instrumental rationalism towards the Other. The usually unquestioned assumption of morality based on a rights concept is used, but problematised, because it is based on an individualistic, competitive view of what it is to be a human being. Traditional western accounts of morality are widened to reinstate those aspects of morality that have been devalued in accounts of moral behaviour, particularly emotion and the role that the human capacity for empathy, identification, and care, for example, should play in morality. Instead of only the abstract, and the universal, context is readmitted – the personal, the particular, the process/history which preceded the actual ethical decision needing to be made. Preservation of sense of place – an emotional, not merely rational-instrumental connection with the land – is thus also recognised as a moral concern. The body is readmitted as moral agent, for example, in what we eat and wear. The seeing green partnership ethic includes the valuing of cultural diversity, and recognition of future generations' needs, as moral concerns. Sometimes 'future generations' appears to mean future non-human generations too, for their own sake, not merely for humans' sake.

10. Is the proposed ethic for nature, ecological sustainability, understood as 'wide', and long-range? The scope of seeing green's ethic for nature is extended beyond human interests only. 'Wide' means that nature's value-for-itself (based on its purposivity and autopoeisis), and not only its value as economic and aesthetic resources-for-humans, is recognised. Human treatment of wild and commercially farmed animals is firmly brought within the sphere of moral philosophy and ethical practice (indicator 16). It is thus a wider understanding than the natural resource management ethic of mainstream versions of environmental sustainability encountered within sustainable development models (Jacobs, 1995).

Still, the philosophical scope of the seeing green nature ethic varies widely, to include ecological sustainability for some or all of nature, whether animate, inanimate, individual, species, ecosystem or ecosystemic process. This ecological sustainability is to be achieved philosophically through ethical approaches such as assigning legal standing to sue, thus rights, to some of nonhuman nature; 'biospherical egalitarianism' which means empathetically respecting every life form's equal or same right as your own to 'live and blossom'; actively employing human creativity to restore and maintain biological evolution towards mutuality, diversity, and increasing subjectivity; or practising an ethic of care. One seeing green real world approach has

been to advocate policies and programmes which express a non–violent, partnership ethic with nature which protects the life basis for all living beings (indicator 14 as indicative example).

'Long-range' in seeing green really does mean, long-range, and not the customary short-term rational-economical view, or the vague phrase 'future generations' (which on closer examination usually turns out to mean, just one generation), which tend to occur in political or business-as-usual documents. One long-range view sometimes given, is 'the lifetime of the grandchildren of our grandchildren' (Naess, 1992, in Sessions, 1995:463), i.e. a seven-generation view.

Alternative forms of political, economic, and social organisation are proposed to provide the supportive context for the reconceptualised Self, the reconceptualised human-nature relationship, and the new partnership ethic for nature.

Ideology: Real-world politics in an ecological society: Some views on social reform

11. Is a fundamental, ecologically informed, post-patriarchal reformation of society's values and structures proposed? Decentralisation and human-scale are key green social values. Their ideological context is opposition to all forms of hierarchy, domination and coercion. Local autonomy (self-determination, self-management, self-reliance), and direct democracy are further key values in green, post-hierarchical forms of political and socio-economic organisation. Instead of the power-over mentality of patriarchy, hierarchy, militarism and bureaucracy, seeing green advocates participatory, non-aggressive, non-competitive, non-hierarchical and egalitarian forms of organisation and decision-making.

The decentralised, human-scale community (not to be confused with the local authority) is the basic political, social, economic and ethical unit of the transformed society. It is well-rounded, in that it has psychologically and spatially reintegrated the separated areas of our lives. It is also ecologically appropriate, and integrated with its physical surroundings. The eco-community is seen as the supportive physical, social, economic and psychological context for the reconceptualised human being, the reconceptualised Self, and the ideal way to combine ecological sustainability, solidarity in living, and personal self-realisation.

In the more radical anarchist-utopian influenced green stories on ecological/post-patriarchal social reformation, statism, parliamentarianism, and the capitalist market economy are rejected altogether, in favour of radical forms of decentralised political and economic self-management such as communitarianism. Human-scale eco-communities/communes control their own political, social and economic affairs. Their boundaries are determined by natural features and biomes, rather than history and nationalism.

12. Is living in solidarity advocated? The value of solidarity is derived inter alia, from symbiosis (interconnectedness and interdependence) in ecology normatively understood, as well as from Gandhian principles such as *advaita* (radical ontological non-duality), *ahimsa* (non-violence), and *aparigraha* (non-possession).

Today, 'living in solidarity' is roughly translated in mainstream development models as 'social responsibility', or 'social justice'. In green stories, the solidarity concept is richer. Identification with the Other means that one espouses 'solidarity politics', that is, living in genuine

community, partnership, cooperation, gentleness and non–possessiveness with other human beings. Nature is included in green solidarity politics: 'How can we be non–violent to nature unless the principle of non–violence becomes central to the ethos of human culture?' (Gandhi in Swaminathan, 1990:xiii).

Above all else, living in solidarity – 'partnership' – requires a rebalancing of 'masculine' and patriarchal values with 'feminine' qualities and values in our personal and social-structural spheres (indicator 11). In a sense, living in solidarity also requires reclaiming our own estranged, or denied other half (indicator 8).

More specifically, living in solidarity also includes:

(a) sustained attention to women's full emancipation; reducing/eliminating their oppression and exploitation (for example, eliminating domestic violence against women; equalising their education, work, and recreation opportunities; ensuring that they are in control of their own fertility; and promoting non-patriarchal gender roles in society, because 'male'-defined gender roles for women have been '... part of *the means* of domination and subordination in patriarchy' (Davion, 1994:292, her italics). As examples, both men and women are to be involved in house-caring, and child-rearing; there must also be a revision of socio-economic structures to support such non-patriarchal sex and gender roles;

(b) the valuing of cultural diversity;

(c) social inclusion – ecology's egalitarianism translates into ideas such as 'a social ecosystem': secure social services, a basic, but sufficient income for all (the green 'Social Wage' idea is discussed again at indicator 15), and the social inclusion, and rights protection, of the marginalised (prisoners, social-welfare cases, the elderly, the disabled, the mentally ill as some examples);

(d) holistic health care, which addresses the whole body-mind person, delivered as close to home as possible, and emphasising transparency, self-determination and self-responsibility in the healing process. Health care must also address those social-structural factors which are detrimental to health, such as techno-industrialism's poisoning of air, soil, water, and food, high noise levels, stress engendered through automated work processes, and the cooptation of the medical industry by profit-seeking companies;

(e) spatial reintegration to match our psychological reintegration. Human habitat spatial planning should seek to reintegrate the areas of our lives artificially segregated by techno-industrialism: living space, place of work, recreation, education, and shopping for example. Spatial planning should seek to restore feelings of solidarity, and human scale, in daily living, rather than concentrating people in mega-cities; to provide and protect green spaces; and to preserve architectural and other expressions of the aesthetic in humanly scaled cities. Citizens must be given genuine participation opportunities in urban planning;

(f) integral education designed to develop the whole person, to support self-realisation, to produce people imbued with the post-patriarchal values needed in a new ecological society, and not just to ensure a person's economic usefulness to society. Holistic education also seeks to reintegrate learning and living. Genuine participation in the

political process is also seen as part of a person's well-rounded education. Finally, living in solidarity, means living in solidarity with future generations as well.

13. Are non-violence and radical peace advocated? The most fundamental expression of living in solidarity is the active practice of non-violence and peace. Deep ecologist Naess considered peace to be one of the three criteria[11] of a truly green society (Naess, 1993:219). Peace is understood radically, not merely as absence of war, but as an end to power-over thought and action:

(a) no militarism, as this is a symptom of aggressive, dominating, competitive, possessive relations with others, particularly when used to ensure access to natural resources and markets. No militarism includes radical disarmament, and the conversion of death-dealing industries to life-affirming production.

(b) there should be no inherent violence in society's structures, for example, no intentional or unintentional, formal or informal abuse of any section of the population, as in disproportionate health risks for the poor, women or children from eco-hazards, or the holding of people longer than the legal period in detention without being charged before a magistrate, because of administrative delays in the judicial system.

(c) there should be no physical violence; no hate speech or behaviour in either the public or private spheres.

(d) on the green view, radical peace includes ethical trade practices, particularly in relation to natural resources.

Some views on the natural environment

14. Do policies and programmes place long-range, wide, ecological sustainability on a genuine par with, if not ahead of social or economic sustainability? In real-world green politics, philosophical concerns about long-range, wide ecological sustainability translate into policies and programmes that recognise the planet's ecological limits as the ultimate 'bottom line' for all endeavours of the current generation, as well as of future generations.

To assure ecological sustainability, 'stronger' rather than 'weaker' environmental sustainability policies should be pursued. In trying to decide whether or not a text tends towards stronger (more green) or weaker environmental sustainability, it is helpful to ask of it three questions: 'What is to be sustained?' 'For whom?' and 'For how long?' In texts tending towards weaker versions of environmental sustainability, the answers are likely to favour short-term human interests. (Look carefully for example, at biodiversity protection programmes – is their ultimate aim to preserve biodiversity for its own sake, or for its as-yet unknown benefits for humanity?).

Other sub-indicators of green policies and programmes would be calls to stabilise, then reduce the human population growth rate; to reduce non-vital intervention into natural processes, or at the least, to apply the precautionary principle; to set aside large areas of pristine or near-pristine nature from human techno-industrial progress to ensure richness, biodiversity and habitat conservation; and to adopt the principle of reciprocity in agriculture.[12]

Green policies on energy carry traces of their genesis within the radical social critique of early ecological economics thinkers (Martinez-Alier, 1987). There should be egalitarianism in the sharing of energy resources, and local direct democracy in their management. There are calls to reduce consumption of non-renewable resources, and to consume renewable resources only within their regenerative capacity. There must be increased reliance on renewable energy, the increased use of energy-saving, people- and nature-friendly transport systems (mass public transport and cycle paths in urban areas, within a spatial planning approach to human habitat which has reintegrated, for example, the severed areas of work, living, play and shopping), and comprehensive national rail networks; increased public spending on research into alternative energy sources such as solar, wind and bio-gas. On the whole, seeing green rejects nuclear energy, because it endangers the environment (the 'safe' waste disposal means currently employed essentially pass the problem to future generations), and threatens base democracy.

Environmental education must be provided both in schools and in continuing adult education, and should be aimed at revealing and changing the dominant Western techno-industrial consciousness, not only raising environmental awareness and knowledge. Above all, the economy must be ecologically reoriented.

Some views on the economy

15. Is the economy ecologically reoriented? Green stories on an ecological re-orientation of the economy should be understood within the alternative stories of the human-nature relationship (indicator 7), what it is to be a better human being (indicator 8), an alternative conception of 'the good life' and alternative models of development (indicator 3), and the conviction that ecological sustainability (indicator 10) is the ultimate 'bottom line' of any human economic endeavour. This latter is in contradistinction to those models of sustainable development which assume that a simultaneous 'triple bottom line' – economic, social and environmental sustainability – is possible. In real-world development politics though, it is often so that the economic and social are given primacy above the environmental.

An ecologically oriented economy specifically recognises ecological limits. Natural resource accounting has been introduced to keep track of the economy's mix of human, social, and renewable and non-renewable environmental capital. In 'stronger' versions of environmental sustainability for example, little or no substitution of one form of capital by another is permissible. However, in 'weaker' forms, there is no regard for the exact mix of capitals, because the one is considered substitutable for the other. Indicators of development, such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), have been 'greened' to reflect natural resource consumption and degradation. Waste generation, pollution, and wastefulness in production, consumption, and disposal are reduced or eliminated. At the least, the 'polluter pays' principle is applied.

Some other markers of an ecologically oriented economy are that: (a) It prioritises life-affirming economic activities, rather than, for example, munitions or nuclear energy production. (b) It would favour community-based rather than industrial production, and base-democratic rather than hierarchical management: what should be produced, where, and how (particularly the use of technology) should be determined and controlled by those involved. (c) Production should also be for needs, not for exchange and profit, be ecologically appropriate,

and intended for local use. This latter aspect can be traced in green consumerism today as the concept of reducing 'food miles' travelled. (d) Production processes favour eco-friendly and non-demeaning technologies rather than instrumental technology, and provide creative activity, not meaningless labour. Unavoidably tedious but necessary jobs are shared. (e) Misleading encouragement to materialism and consumerism is critiqued. (f) There is a demand for fair trade practice, both in the home and export markets. (g) The economy must also deliver social justice, protecting the marginalised and the weak, for example, through a basic social income for all. Namibia's NGO-initiated Basic Income Grant pilot scheme is a good example of this green viewpoint.

16. Are animals treated ethically? the philosophical ultimate premises which bring animal wellbeing into accounts of the ethical vary from ontological conceptions of human-nonhuman continuity, to arguments from sentience (Singer, 1973), rights (Regan, 1983), and the feasibility of legal standing for natural objects (Stone, 1974). Common though, is a call for radical changes to scientific and economic structures and practices, as well as personal practices, which negatively affect animal wellbeing. Some more, and less, radical demands are to eliminate completely, or almost completely, animal experimentation, including vivisection, and product-testing on animals; to dissolve, or radically reform, commercial animal production; to stop commercial culling, sport hunting, trapping of wildlife, and related trade, and to stop the confinement and use of animals for entertainment. Animal torture is forbidden in law and strictly enforceable. There are calls for complete or partial moral vegetarianism,[13] both as personal ethical practice and public economic boycott of industrialised animal production methods.

Some views on the political process
17. Is grassroots ('direct') democracy advocated? In green stories, 'grassroots' democracy means direct democracy, and not the Western liberal model of indirect or representative democracy. Green direct democracy stories are to be understood within an anarchist political critique of hierarchy, the feminist critique of patriarchy, and the normativity of the assumed absence of hierarchy in ecology.

Decentralised decision-making and human-scale functioning in the political, socio-economic and environmental spheres are seen as the necessary counter to the kind of hierarchy, bureaucracy, and technocracy particularly prevalent in industrialised/industrialising societies, which disempower ordinary citizens. There are radical demands for self-determination (self-choice), self-direction, self-management, self-responsibility. Such free, unfettered, creative not enforced, choice-from-below, is understood to contribute to the anarchist/humanist vision of the fully functioning human being. It also represents, in feminist critique, liberation from patriarchal, power-over relationships, and liberation from the patriarchal viewpoint that the personal is not political – in the feminist critique, the personal is political.

Direct democracy's most radical expression is face-to-face democracy in eco-communitarian living. In less radical understandings, direct democracy means authentic citizen participation in the political process. Such active and responsible participation in the political process is held to be an essential part of an individual's holistic development. This requires society's

management to be de-professionalised, simplified and made transparent, so that power can be returned to ordinary citizens, where it belongs. Understandings of citizenship are far wider than merely voting once in a while; citizens' initiatives and public referenda are part of citizenship too. Mainstream notions of 'participatory democracy' and 'public participation' represent rather watered-down expressions of even seeing green's less-radical understandings of direct democracy.

Genuine democracy respects fundamental rights, understood widely as having not only political, but also ecological, economic, cultural, and religious dimensions, and including the rights of minorities. Government is fully accountable to parliament, and parliament is fully accountable to its citizens. Democratic governance makes public information transparently available, and free of party-political interest, to enable genuine citizen participation. At the same time, it respects the privacy of its citizens' personal data, and guards against uncontrolled use of techno-surveillance.

Direct citizen action is considered in seeing green as an essential element of both the public democratic process and self-realisation. Direct action may range from mild social influence actions (letters, petitions, demonstrations, marches, street theatre for example), to economic boycott, or forming 'neighbourhood assemblies' with moral if not legal power, to influence local management by the local authority, or outright civil disobedience. All direct action should however, to be 'green', be non-violent in nature.

18. Is living out/enacting your personal moral beliefs in the public-political sphere encouraged? Adherents of seeing green are urged to undertake 'Self-work', understood variously as clarifying for yourself what your ultimate premises on questions such as 'What is True? Real? Good?' actually are, and attempting at least to formulate them into a reflected-upon worldview. To be green, this worldview should include room for non-instrumental relationships with the Other, including nature. Some eco-feminists would argue that ridding ourselves of 'patriarchal programming', and refusing to play 'patriarchal games' should be part of our Self-work too (Birkeland, 1993, in Gaard, 1993:20, 54).

In seeing green, personal lifestyle choices flowing from a reviewed world-view represent not only a quest for self-realisation, or inward transformation, but a political demand for social-structural change too. Hence the green support for direct democracy and direct action to achieve such change. Some writers within deep ecology and ecofeminism have formulated philosophical-political platforms (Naess, 1986, in Sessions, 1995:68, and Birkeland, 1993, in Gaard, 1993:20 respectively) to guide political action based on the new ecological/ non-patriarchal consciousness.

Conclusion

What can we learn from these tentative indicators of a green world-view? We can firstly reflect on our own world-views – perhaps formulate them consciously for the first time, and so be able to compare them with the version of a green world-view presented in this paper (other versions are possible, given seeing green's immense richness).

As importantly, we can learn, using these green indicators, to assess the credentials of 'texts' that claim to be green. The distinction drawn at the start of this paper – that seeing green is so much more than the mainstream reformist environmentalism described there, cannot be overemphasised. The crucial difference between the two approaches is that where reform environmentalism requires some not-too-arduous adjustments to our business-as-usual, and lifestyle-as-usual (with legislation and tax-breaks/penalties to help us along), seeing green uncomfortably demands that we review our most fundamental values, including our predominantly anthropocentric human-nature relationship, and strive to make the required changes in ourselves, and in our society. And to say that we are trying to do that, publicly. Green consumerism is simply not enough to deal with the ecological crisis.

Now that the ideas with which this paper began – recycling, carbon-footprint reduction, bike riding, and solar-powered goods – have been replaced in their green worldview context, do they really 'shout green'? Or, judging by the tentative indicators of green presented in this paper, are they mere whispers of what 'green' is about?

Notes on the Contributors

Wilhelm Jordaan is a retired academic from Pretoria. Since his retirement in 2000 he occupies the position of professor extraordinarius, Department of Psychology, University of Pretoria and is also associated with the Department of Industrial Psychology and People Management at the University of Johannesburg. His main fields of interest are interdisciplinary studies and the nature of quantitative and qualitative theory building in the human sciences. E-mail: jordaanw@netactive.co.za

Sally Harper, *The Namibian,* Windhoek, Namibia. Sally Harper specialises in information management, and has also worked in the field of environmental impact assessment and management. Her interests have always been, and still are, philosophy, cosmology, history, nature, and how people relate to it. Her PhD, recently completed at the University of Pretoria, happily allowed the further pursuit of all these interests simultaneously. E-mail: sally@namibian.com.na

Endnotes

1   This paper is based on a doctoral thesis (Harper, 2008). The paper's title 'Through a Green Gaze' is derived from an idea in McLaughlin (2003).

2   Anthropocentrism is a '... stance that limits moral standing to human beings, confines the scope of morality and moral concern to human interests, and regards nothing but human wellbeing as valuable intrinsically' (Attfield, 2003:188).

3   An instrumental ethic is one which ignores the Other's 'agenda' or interests, considering it subordinate to one's own means and ends

4   Tentative because these indicators have only been tested empirically once (Harper, 2008). They are however in line with other descriptions of a green world-view, such as those of Goldsmith (1992), Hayward (1995), Metzner (1994), O'Riordan (1981), Porritt (1984) and Sterling (1990).

5   A 'male', disconnected sense of Self; a patriarchal orientation, and a power-based morality (Gaard,

1993:2, 3, 6; also Kheel, 1990, in Diamond and Orenstein, 1990:129–131). The (male) disconnected Self views everything else as 'Other' to itself, and thus as a potential object of management, exploitation, domination, or oppression. It manifests itself structurally and systemically as hierarchy and patriarchy (Birkeland, 1993, in Gaard, 13–59).

6   'The cultural, traditional and psychological systems of obedience and command, not merely the economic and political systems to which the terms class and State most appropriately refer. ... I refer to the domination of the young by the old, of women by men, of one ethnic group by another, of "masses" by bureaucrats who profess to speak of "higher social interests", of countryside by town, and in a more subtle psychological sense, of body by mind, of spirit by a shallow instrumental rationality' (Bookchin, 1982:4)

7   The 'male-dominated system of social relations and values' justified by the systematic devaluation of the feminine principle (Birkeland, 1993, in Gaard, 1993:17). The 'structure of patriarchy' is considered to rest on the 'four interlocking pillars' of 'racism, sexism, class exploitation, and ecological destruction' (Collins, 1973).

8   Speciesism is 'the belief that we are entitled to treat members of other species in a way in which it would be wrong to treat members of our own species' (Singer, 1973b, in Zimmerman, *et al.*, 1993:27). For example, racists 'violate the principle of equality by giving greater weight to the interests of members of their own race when there is a clash between their interests and the interests of another race. ... Similarly those I would call "speciesists" [human beings] give greater weight to the interests of members of their own species when there is a clash between their interests and the interests of those of other species [animals]' (Singer, 1979:361 in Botzler & Armstrong, 1998:361). In short, Singer argues that speciesism is a prejudice, just as is racism.

9   This idea is no longer confined to green politics. In a recent sermon, Archbishop of Canterbury Dr Rowan Williams noted 'that "human greed" threatens to distort the fragile balance of the Earth' (http://news.sky.com/skynews/article/0,,30100-1298358,00.html, accessed 25 December 2007.

10 An abstract concept meaning a human being concerned with maximizing utility, defined as want-satisfaction. 'The source of value is found in subjective individual wants, not in the needs of other human beings or other species.' Any normative evaluation of a person's definition of 'want' as equivalent to personal preference, is usually avoided in mainstream economic theory (Botzler & Armstrong, 1998:517)

11 The other two are wide ecological sustainability and social justice.

12 This means for example, preference for the human scale rather than agri-business in farming, for organic production methods that protect soil fertility, for organic, non-genetically modified foods, and concern for animal welfare.

13 Moral vegetarianism would include abstention from meat, for example, on anti-violence and anti-killing grounds. Others might embrace it on the grounds that it is elitist, or a wasteful use of resources.

References

Achterberg, W. (1993). Can Liberal Democracy Survive the Environmental Crisis? Sustainability, Liberal Neutrality and Overlapping Consensus. In Dobson, A. & Lucardie, P. (Eds), *The*

Politics of Nature. Explorations in Green Political Theory. London and New York: Routledge. pp. 81–101.

Bahro, R. (1983). Dare to Form Communes. Ten Propositions on the Line of the Social Alternative. In Bahro, R. (M. Tyler, Trans.). (1986). *Building the Green Movement*. London: Heretic Books. pp. 86–91.

Bahro, R. (1984a). Fundamental Thoughts on the Crisis of the Greens. In Bahro, R. (M. Tyler, Trans.). (1986). *Building the Green Movement*. London: Heretic Books. pp. 159–176.

Bahro, R. (1984b). *From Red to Green. Interviews with New Left Review.* London: Verso.

Bartelmus, P. (1986). *Environment and Development*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Birkeland, J. (1993). Ecofeminism: Linking Theory and Practice. In Gaard, G. (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. pp.13–52.

Bookchin, M. (1965). Ecology and Revolutionary Thought. In Bookchin, M. (1974), *Postscarcity Anarchism*. London: Wildwood House. pp. 55–82.

Bookchin, M. (1982). *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*. Palo Alto: Cheshire Books.

Bookchin, M. (1990). Recovering Evolution: A reply to Eckersley and Fox. *Environmental Ethics,* 12, 253–274.

Bookchin, M. (1993). What is Social Ecology? In Zimmerman, M.E., Baird Callicott, J., Sessions, G., Warren, K.J. & Clark, J. (Eds), *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. pp. 354–373.

Bookchin, M. (1995). Dialectical Naturalism. In Biehl, J. (Ed.), *The Murray Bookchin Reader*. London: Cassell. pp.197–224.

Botzler, R.G., & Armstrong, S.J. (Eds). (1998). *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence* (2nd Ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Collins, S. (1973). *A Different Heaven and Earth*. Valley Forge: Judson Press.

Davion, V. (1994). How Feminist is Ecofeminism? In VanDeVeer, D. & Pierce, C. *The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book*. Philosophy, Ecology, Economics. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company. pp. 288–295.

Die Grünen (1980). *Das Bundesprogramm [The Federal Programme]*. (The Saarbrucker programme). Bonn: Selbstverlag.

Die Grünen (ca. 1985). *The Programme of the Green Party of the Federal Republic of Germany*. Bonn: Selbstverlag.

Die Grünen. (undated but taken into stock in Archiv Grunes Gedachtnis in 1985). S.l: s.n.

Dobson, A. (2000). *Green Political Thought* (3rd Ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Elgin, D. (1981). *Voluntary Simplicity*. New York: Morrow.

Ferris, J. (1993). Ecological versus Social Rationality. Can There be Green Social Policies? In Dobson, A. & Lucardie, P. (Eds), *The politics of nature. Explorations in Green Political Theory*. London and New York: Routledge. pp. 145–158.

Gaard, G. (1993). (Ed.). *Women, Animals, and Nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Goldsmith, E. (1992). *The Way. An Ecological World-view*. London: Rider.

Harper, S.A. (2008). *Towards the Development of a 'Green' worldview, and Criteria to assess the 'Greenness' of a Text: Namibia Vision 2030 as Example.* Doctoral thesis, Department of

Psychology, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa. http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-05312009-012155/.

Hayward, T. (1995). *Ecological Thought: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jacobs, M. (1995). *Reflections on the Discourse and Politics of Sustainable Development, Part 1: Faultlines of Contestation and the Radical Model*. Lancaster: Lancaster University Centre for the Study of Environmental Change.

Kheel, M. (1990). Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology: Reflections on Identity and Difference. In Diamond. I. & Orenstein, G.F. (Eds), *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Book Club. Pp. 128–137.

McLaughlin, J. (2003). *Feminist Social and Political Theory: Contemporary Debates and Dialogues*. Houndsville, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Macnamara, M. (Ed.). (1980). A Theory of World Pictures. In Macnamara, M. (Ed.), *World Views*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. pp. 16–40.

Martinez-Alier, J., with Schlupmann, K. (1987). *Ecological Economics. Energy, Environment and Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Metzner, R. (1994). The Emerging Ecological Worldview. In Tucker, M.E & J.A. Grim (Eds), *Worldviews and Ecology: Religion, Philosophy and the Environment*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books. pp. 163–172.

Mies, M., & Shiva, V. (1998). Reading 52. Introduction to Ecofeminism. In Botzler, R. G. & Armstrong, S.J. (Eds), *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence* (2nd Ed.) Boston: McGraw Hill. pp. 480–489.

Naess, A. (1986). The Deep Ecological Movement. Some Philosophical Aspects. In Sessions, G. (Ed.) (1995), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century. Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala. pp. 64–84.

Naess, A. (1989a). *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle. Outline of an Ecosophy*. (D. Rothenberg, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Naess, A. (1989b). Ecosophy and Gestalt Ontology. In Sessions, G. (Ed.) (1995), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century. Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala. pp. 240–245.

Naess, A. (1992, revised 1993). Deep Ecology for the Twenty-second Century. In Sessions, G. (Ed.) (1995), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century. Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala. pp. 463–467.

Naess, A. (1993a). The Deep Ecology 'Eight Points' Revisited. In Sessions, G. (Ed.) (1995), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century. Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala. pp. 213–221.

O'Riordan, T. (1981). *Environmentalism* (2nd Ed.). London: Pion.

Plumwood, V. (1991). Nature, Self, and Gender: Feminism, Environmental Philosophy, and the Critique of Rationalism. In Warren, K. (1996) (Ed.), *Ecological Feminist Philosophies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 155–180.

Porritt, J. (1984). Seeing Green. *The Politics of Ecology Explained*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rassool, L. & Warren-Brown, G. (2007, December). Environment. Dreaming of a green Christmas. *Femina*, 12, 56–57.

Regan, T. (1983). Reading 39. Extracts from the Case for Animal Rights. In Botzler, R.G. & Armstrong, S.J. (1998) (Eds). *Environmental Ethics. Divergence and Convergence*. Boston: McGraw Hill. pp. 351–359.

Sachs, W. (1995). Global Ecology and the Shadow of 'Development'. In Sessions, G. (Ed.) (1995), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century. Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala. pp. 428–444.

Sagoff, M. (1998). Reading 59. Free-market versus Libertarian Environmentalism. In Botzler, R. G. & Armstrong, S.J. (Eds), *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence* (2nd Ed.) Boston: McGraw Hill. pp. 540–553.

Sessions, G. (1995). Historical Roots of Deep Ecology. Introduction. In Sessions, G. (Ed.) (1995), *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century. Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala. pp. 428–444.

Shiva, V. (1988). *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development*. London: Zed Books.

Shiva, V. (1990). Development as a New Project of Western Patriarchy. In Diamond, I. & Orenstein, G.F. (Eds), *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books. pp. 189–200.

Spretnak, C. (1990). Ecofeminism: Our Roots and Flowering. In Diamond, I. & Orenstein, G.F. (Eds), *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Book Club. pp. 3–14.

Singer, P. (1973). Animal Liberation. Reprinted from The New York Review of Books, 5 April 1973, in Zimmerman, M.E., Baird Callicott, J., Sessions, G., Warren, K.J. & Clark, J. (1993) (Eds), *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. pp. 22–32.

Singer, P. (1979). Reading 40. Equality for Animals? (Extracts from his Practical ethics, 1979) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 48–54, 60–62, 68–71. In Botzler, R.G., & Armstrong, S.J. *Environmental Ethics. Divergence and Convergence*. Boston: McGraw Hill. pp. 359–366.

Sterling, S.R (1990). Towards an Ecological Worldview. In Engel, J.R. & Engel, J.G. (Eds), *Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response*. London: Belhaven Press. pp. 77–86.

Stone, C.D. (1974). Should Trees Have Standing? – Towards Legal Rights for Natural Objects. Portola Valley: Tioga Publishing Company. pp. 3–18, 24, 27–33, 45–46, 48–54). In Van De Veer, D. & Pierce, C. (Eds). (1994), *Environmental Ethics and Policy Book: Philosophy, Ecology, Economics*. Boston: McGraw Hill. pp. 112–124.

Swaminathan, M.S. (1990). Foreword. In Engel, J.R. & Engel, J.G. (Eds), *Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response*. London: Belhaven Press. pp. xii–xiii.

Warren, K. (1990). The Power and Promise of Ecological Feminism. *Environmental Ethics*, 12(3), 125–146.

Zimmerman, M.E., Callicot, J.B., Sessions, G., Warren, K.J. & Clark, J. (Eds). (1993). *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.