

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE GREEN MOVEMENT: DIE GRÜNEN AS EXAMPLE

1. Introduction	234
1.1 Scope of this chapter	234
1.2 Sources	234
1.3 The 1960s/1970s ideas heritage of Die Grünen	235
1.4 “Ecological politics”	236
1.4.1 The “Fundi” and “Realo” versions of ecological politics	236
1.5 The objective of this chapter	237
2. Legitimizing narratives	237
2.1 The concept “Exterminism”	237
2.1.1 The critique of militarism	238
2.1.2 The critique of patriarchy, hierarchy and bureaucracy	239
2.1.3 The critique of existing society’s “industrialism”	240
2.1.3.1 Advanced capitalism is aggressive, destructive, and unecological	240
2.1.3.2 Advanced industrial capitalism for everyone is impossible, and dangerous	241
2.1.3.3. There must be an alternative conception of “development”	242
2.1.3.4 Industrial capitalism’s work process is exploitative and alienating	243
2.1.3.5 Industrialism’s values of materialism and consumerism critiqued	243
2.1.3.6 Capitalism: total break, or “reformist ecologism”?	244
2.2 Rhetoric, metaphors	245
2.2.1 “Life” and “survival”	245
2.2.2 Machine metaphor	246
2.2.3 Emancipation, salvation, hope	246
2.3 Die Grünen’s counter-exterminism ideology: core values	247
2.4 Key proposition on ecological crisis	248
3. Epistemology	248
3.1 “Netzwerkdenkens”	248
3.2 A critique of instrumental reason	249
3.2.1 and a place for emotion in thinking	250
4. Ontology	250
4.1 Some metaphysical thoughts: Philosophical holism and vitalism	250
4.2 A view of nature	251
4.2.1 “Netzwerk” or holistic system	251
4.2.2 The interrelatedness of things [“Gesamttzusammenhänge”]	252
4.2.3 Cyclical process, change, and dynamic balance [“Werden und Gehen”; “Bewegung”]	252
4.2.4 “Ecology” as secure foundation for green movement thought, policy and practice	253
4.3 A view of the human being	253
4.3.1 Self-realization is a right	253



4.3.2 A re-orientation of personal values is needed	254
4.3.3 Spirituality in personal and social transformation	254
4.3.3.1 Spirituality amongst Die Grünen	255
4.3.4 From Homo <i>conquistador</i> to Homo <i>occidentalis simplicissimus</i>	256
4.3.5 “Frauenphilosophie”	257
4.3.5.1 Equal but different; the feminine principle [post-patriarchal values]	257
5. The ethic	258
5.1 Theory of motivation to ethical behaviour	258
5.2 Theory of value	258
5.2.1 Biocentrism and/or ecocentrism?	259
5.2.2 “Naturalness”	259
5.2.3 Vitalism, and preservation of the “Lebensbasis” as theory of value	259
5.2.3.1 Traces of “vitalism”	259
5.2.3.2 Sustaining the ecological life foundation [“Lebensbasis”]	260
5.3 The scope of the ethic	261
5.3.1 Biosphere, ecosystem and species protection	261
5.3.2 <i>And</i> animal welfare	261
5.3.2.1 Animal experimentation, factory farming	262
5.3.3 <i>And</i> future generations	262
5.4 The moral obligation: protecting the “Lebensbasis”	263
5.4.1 Observe the precautionary principle	263
5.4.2 Re-orient the growth economy to a cyclical, dynamic economy	263
5.4.3 Protect biodiversity and its habitat	264
5.4.3.1 Oppose biotechnology	264
5.4.4 Protect animal welfare	264
5.4.5 Protect land, water and air	264
5.4.6 Provide insight into ecological principles	265
5.4.7 Extend the United Nations role in environmental protection	265
6. A View of culture/society	265
6.1 “Ökologisch”	266
6.1.1. Ecology as normative for society	266
6.1.2 The economy	267
6.1.2.1 Re-orient the one-way growth economy to an ecological cyclical economy	267
6.1.2.2 The economy’s Gross National Product must be quality of life, not consumption	267
6.1.2.3 Prioritize “investments in the future”	268
6.1.2.4 The economy must deliver social justice	269
6.1.2.5 Democratize the economy and its management	269
6.1.2.6 Introduce publicly-accountable ecological bookkeeping	269
6.1.3 Energy	269
6.1.3.1 Stabilize energy use	269
6.1.3.2 Derive energy from renewable resources	269
6.1.3.3. Halt all atomic energy projects	270
6.1.3.4 Democratize and decentralize energy provision and storage	270
6.1.3.5 Increase research into alternative energies	270
6.1.4 Agriculture	270
6.1.4.1 The primary aim must be food security, and healthy food	270
6.1.4.2 Re-orient agricultural production to ecological, not industrial, production	270



6.1.5 Transport and mobility	271
6.2 “Sozial” [or living in solidarity]	271
6.2.1 Work, employment and unemployment	272
6.2.1.1 Work is for Self-realization, not only payment	272
6.2.1.2 Work must be a right	272
6.2.1.3 There must be protection against unemployment in the system	272
6.2.1.4 Democratize the economy, and its management	273
6.2.1.5 The use of technology must be democratically decided, and add to, not detract from the meaningfulness of work	273
6.2.2 Education	274
6.2.2.1 Education must be holistic, that is, involve the whole person	274
6.2.2.2 Education must produce people reflecting Die Grünen’s core values	274
6.2.3 Human habitat	275
Spatial planning must be “humanised”	275
6.2.4 Health	275
6.2.5 Third World issues	276
6.2.5.1 The population issue	277
6.2.6 Womens’ issues	277
6.2.6.1 Barriers to women’s equal legal rights, social roles, and work rights must be removed	277
6.2.6.2 Women must have control over their own fertility	277
6.3 “Basisdemokratisch” [“grassroots” or direct democracy]	278
6.3.1 “Dare to form communes”: the new “utopian” society	278
6.3.2 Extend people’s political space; democratize bureaucracy	279
6.3.3 Protect fundamental human rights	279
6.3.4 No discrimination against marginalized groups	280
6.3.5 Democratize public information, protect private data	280
6. 4 “Gewaltfrei” [non-violence]	281
6.4.1 The aim: radical, and global, eco-pacifism	281
6.4.1.1 Peace and ecology are indivisible	282
6.4.1.2 Peace and base democracy are indivisible	282
6.4.2 There should be no violence between peoples and nations	282
6.4.2.1 There should be radical disarmament	282
6.4.2.2 Social defence is the alternative to armed defence	282
6.4.2.3 Self-reliant, diverse bio-regionalism instead of one-dimensional technological-materialistic industrialism	283
6.4.3 A non-violent society can only be achieved through non-violent means	283
6.4.3.1 No physical violence	283
6.4.3.2 No hate behaviour	284
6.4.4 There should be no violence at institutional level	284
6.4.5 Dissent may be expressed through non-violent resistance, including civil disobedience	285
6.4.5.1 Green criteria for acceptable non violent resistance	285
7. Praxis	285
8. Critique of, and by, other sample members	286
8.1 Their own corruption by power	286
8.2 Their “selling out” to the “system”	287
9. Summary.	287

1. Introduction

“While trying to explain to journalists what green politics was all about in a crisp, quotable phrase, Petra [Kelly] reached hopefully for the words ‘feminism, ecology and non-violence’ ...” (Parkin, 1994, p. 116)

This chapter represents one possible “real world” combination of all three levels of Wissenburg’s heuristic, (Chapter One, Figure 2) - metaphysics/ethics, political philosophy and theory, and “real world” politics. It is the thought of the new social movements in West Germany around the end of the 1970s/early 1980s, as they moved from extra-parliamentary or “street” politics, to an “anti-party” party¹, and then to an alternative “green” parliamentary opposition, tempered rather rapidly by “Realpolitik”. In this introduction, I note (1.1) the scope of the chapter, (1.2) sources used, and (1.3) some ideas which informed “Die Grünen” at the time of their establishment as national political party. In (1.4) I introduce their “ecological politics”, and its “Fundl” and “Realo” versions. In (1.5), I set out this chapter’s objective.

1.1 Scope of this chapter

This chapter is not a discussion of the green movement generally, or of the incipient ecologism of the time, or of its formalized green political theory². It is limited to the green movement in West Germany, specifically to its expression in Die Grünen, who understood themselves as part of the green movement³, and primarily to the years from 1979 to 1985, because in this period, I believe, one can see green movement green at its street greenest⁴.

1.2 Sources

For the chapter, I use (a) Die Grünen’s party-political statements⁵ of the time, (b) writings of some Greens actually involved at the time: philosopher Manon Maren-Grisebach⁶, political philosopher and ideologist Rudolf Bahro⁷, activist Petra Kelly⁸, and (c) deep ecologist Fritjof Capra and ecofeminist

¹ More on this idea at 8.1

² At the time of Die Grünen’s emergence [roughly, 1977-1979], ecologism did not exist as a formally-formulated ideology. Several detailed analyses of green political theory are now available, e.g. Dobson (2000), Dobson & Lucardie (1993), Doherty & De Geus (1996), Goodin (1992), and Matthews (1996)

³ “Wir verstehen uns als Teil der grünen Bewegung in aller Welt” they said in their March 1980 Federal Programme (1980b, p. 4)

⁴ Though some authors suggest that Die Grünen are an a-typical, and to-be-avoided example of street green politics transformed into electoral politics (Bramwell, 1994; Ferris, 1993), others consider Die Grünen’s 1983 Bundestag political platform (1983a) as “foundational”, “seminal”, even “canonical” for the green movement/green political position worldwide (Eckersley, 1996, in Doherty & de Geus, footnote 1, p. 234; Goodin, 1992, p. 184)

⁵ Most of these are available from either Die Grünen’s website (www.gruene.de), or from the Heinrich Böll Foundation’s Archiv Grünes Gedächtnis in Germany (<http://www.boell.de>)

⁶ Dr Manon Maren-Grisebach, a philosophy professor, was one of Die Grünen’s chairpersons from 1981 to 1983. In 1982 she published *Philosophie der Grünen*, a book seeking primarily to make clearer the fundamentals of the worldview on which their political proposals were based (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 7)

⁷ Rudolf Bahro, [“the epitome of Green fundamentalism” (Sandford, 1986, p. 8)], was the early Greens’ leading ideologist (Bramwell, 1994, p. 102; Goodin, 1992, p. 89, footnote 10; Sandford, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 7-10). He was well-schooled in Marx’s historical materialism (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 218-220), and in Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin’s versions of socialism, but was a critic of Marx (Bahro, 1984e, p. 219), and of “realexistierender Sozialismus” [“actually existing socialism”, a term coined to justify the difference between what Marx and Lenin had said, and what actually developed in the Soviet-dominated eastern socialist bloc (Bahro, 1984e, p. 47)]. He was deeply and negatively influenced by the 1968 Czechoslovakian “Prague Spring” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 49, p. 62). It convinced him that “progressive tendencies” in the East and West were basically the same, an idea he continued to hold during the formative years of Die Grünen (Bahro, 1984e, p. 56). In 1977 he published *The alternative in Eastern Europe*, a direct critique of “actually existing socialism” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 107), following which he was imprisoned in East Germany. He was permitted to leave East for West Germany under a general amnesty in October 1979 (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 26). Soon afterwards, Bahro joined Die Grünen (Bahro, 1984e; Sandford, 1986a), and became a member of their national executive committee (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. vii; Sandford, 1986a, p. 7). Bahro considered himself a utopian socialist, with a “populist orientation” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 220, p. 235). Other influences were, inter alia, Thoreau, Martin Luther King’s non-violent resistance (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. xx), Thomas Münzer’s populist views on liberation (Bahro, 1984e, p. 220), and Gramsci’s ideas on cultural hegemony (Bahro, 1983e, pp. 61-62, 1983e, pp. 74-75; 1984e, pp. 59-60, pp. 220-221). According to Sandford (1986a, p. 9), Bahro was more interested in Die Grünen’s “accumulating a greater share of people’s consciousness” than he was in their acquiring formal political power. Bahro was also influenced by Norwegian resource economist Johan Galtung (Sandford, 1986b, p. 216), whose ideas were already introduced in Chapter Four:

Charlene Spretnak's (1984) recollections of interviews with West German and other European Greens during 1983 (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. viii).

1.3 The 1960s/1970s ideas heritage of Die Grünen

A variety of thought contributed to the genesis of Die Grünen's "ecological politics", and its "Fundist" and "Realist" versions [1.4.1]. Throughout this chapter's period, Die Grünen felt themselves in solidarity with, and a political voice for, the plethora of grassroots, and counterculture movements⁹ from which they had emerged: "den Lebens-, Natur- und Umweltschutzverbänden, den Bürgerinitiativen, der Arbeiterbewegung, christlichen Initiativen, der Friedens- und Menschenrechts-, der Frauen- und 3.-Welt-Bewegung"¹⁰ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4; also Bahro, 1983a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 42, Bahro, 1983d, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 51-54).

In 1983, Capra and Spretnak describe four, overlapping, and sometimes contradictory ideological groups¹¹ amongst Die Grünen: (1) the visionary/holistic greens, or the "moral" or "ideological Greens" concerned with the bringing about a new non-violent, non-exploitative society based on "the connectedness of things" (2) the Eco-Greens or "green Greens" who focused on protecting the natural environment and who included values-based conservatives as well as liberal ecological reformists (3) the peace movement Greens, many of whom joined the Greens from the anti-nuclear missile and peace movement; and (4) the radical-left, or Marxist oriented, or socialist, or "red" Greens (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 4-5, p. 23).

6.3.3.1

⁸ Kelly was born of German parents in Bavaria in November 1947. She moved with her family to the USA in 1960, where she completed her education with a BA degree *cum laude* (World Politics and International Relations) at the American University's School of International Service in Washington in 1970. Already as university student, Petra organized, took part in, and assimilated the ideas and political strategies of the anti-nuclear movement, the anti-Vietnam protest movement, and the civil rights movement. She returned to Europe in 1970, to complete her education. From 1973, Kelly worked in the European Economic Commission's Secretariat of the Economic and Social Committee, on social questions, health and education, and the environment. She was also active in the international and European women's, peace, anti-nuclear, and ecology movements. Between 1972-1979 she lectured in Japan and Australia on anti-nuclear and feminist issues, was involved in peace and social defence issues, and also a member of the Soziale Partei Deutschland [SPD]. In 1979, she became an executive member of the Bundesverband der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz [BBU], and resigned from the SPD (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 8) to become one of Die Grünen's European parliamentary candidates. Kelly became one of Die Grünen's chairpersons in 1980, and was a speaker of the Green Parliamentary Group between March 1983 and March 1984 (Bramwell, 1994, pp. 101-102). "Kelly brought charismatic politics over from her American experience...The German Greens formed themselves in her mould, more than in that of any other activist..." (Bramwell, 1994, p. 110). But she was also a controversial figure in Die Grünen, both admired and resented [see for example, Capra & Spretnak's observations of Kelly, whom they met during their lecture/interview tours in 1982 and 1983, and her visit to the USA in 1983, of the ambivalence towards her amongst Die Grünen, and of her frustration with them (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 7-10). Other assessments of Kelly's contribution to "seeing green" and to Die Grünen, are Bramwell (1989, p. 222, p. 272 footnote 21, and 1994, pp.108-111), and former UK Green Sara Parkin (1994)

⁹ As examples, Die Grünen list the freedom and human rights movements (1979, p. 11, p. 16), the international green movement (1980b, p. 4), the peace movement (Kelly, 1984, p. 38, p. 47, p.50, p. 57, p.59), the ecology movement (Kelly, 1984, p. 69), and the civil rights movement in Eastern European states (Kelly, 1984, p. 56). Bramwell (1989, 1994) highlights the fusion of nineteenth century German holism and vitalism with twentieth century resource economics. Ferris (1993, p. 149) argues that "Green politics have been shaped by (but are not synonymous with) three distinct social movements: those of feminism, ecology and peace". Capra and Spretnak identify the formative influences as (1) the environmental protection groups and the ecological movement (2) the anti-nuclear campaigners and peace movement (3) the alternative movement, and (4) the remains of the Marxist-inspired university student rebellion, i.e., the K-groups of either dogmatic or nondogmatic Marxist orientation (1984, p. 13)

¹⁰ "the life, nature, and environmental protection associations, the workers' movement, Christian initiatives, the women's and Third World movements..."

¹¹ Bramwell (1989, p. 223) describes the early Greens as a coalition containing "the Red-Greens, the Green-Reds, the eco-libertarian wing represented by Hasenclaver, the eco-socialists like Schily, fundamentalists, realists and Buddhist revivalists"

1.4 “Ecological politics”

“ ... We represent a total concept...Our policies are guided by long-term visions for the future and are founded on four basic principles: ecology, social responsibility, grassroots democracy, and nonviolence”¹² (Die Grünen, 1980b, p.4; translation from Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 30)

Die Grünen themselves described their ideas as “ecological politics”, a “total concept”, guided by a long-term perspective, and based on four interrelated fundamental principles [“pillars¹³”] - ecology as normative, living in solidarity, direct democracy, and non-violence. The ethic of ecological politics is “Partnerschaft”, the essence of which is recognition of mutual interdependence: “...Partnerschaft, die die wechselseitige Abhängigkeit anerkennt...” (Die Grünen, 1983a, p. 6).

While the key premises of each of the four fundamental principles or values are discussed separately in more detail at sections 6.1 to 6.4, they are all inter-related. In their documents, Die Grünen present views on the economy in terms of the values of ecology, solidarity and direct democracy (1983a, p. 6); views on living in solidarity [“sozial”] together with views on the need to live in harmony with nature [“ökologisch”], and the need for direct democracy; direct democracy is linked to ecological limits, as is non-violence; non-violence is seen as fundamental to an ecological society. The theme of “Partnerschaft” is pervasive.

1.4.1 The “Fundis” and “Realo” versions of ecological politics

The ideological *Fundi-Realo* split, which was incipient in Die Grünen’s birth really, occurred in 1985. Ideological traces of both are found in the political statements from 1980-1983.

In the context of this chapter, “Fundis” and “Realo” can be regarded as “more radical” and “less radical” ideas about society and economy. Fundamentalist Bahro saw the difference between Fundis and Realo as “fundamental opposition” to the industrial system on the one hand, and on the other, a reformist eco-socialism within the industrial system¹⁴. What Greens like Bahro wanted, was, “... a total alternative to the capitalist as well as the (pseudo-) communist industrial system...” (Bahro, 1983d, in Bahro, 1986, p. 55). By contrast, Realos argued that “Abbau und Umbau” [dismantling and re-building] of the industrial system was the better route. This is for example, the predominant view in Die Grünen’s (1983a) “Sinnvoll arbeiten – solidarisch leben ” programme against unemployment and decline in social welfare.

The ideological difference between Fundis and Realos also had to do with the chance to share in parliamentary power (Bahro, 1983e, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 60-85). Already in November 1982, delegates at the Hagen national congress had agreed to eight conditions on which they would “tolerate” an alliance with an SPD government, should that party win at the March 1983 elections (Sandford, 1986b, p. 213, note 2 to “Basic positions of the Greens”). By 1984, the party was, in Bahro’s view, more eco-socialist than green; the green reformist train to eco-industrialization had already departed (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 161, pp. 163-164). He was horrified when Die Grünen’s parliamentary group put forward proposals for *reducing* the military budget, rather than rejecting it outright (Bahro, 1984c,

¹² “Gegenüber der eindimensionalen Produktionssteigerungspolitik vertreten wir ein Gesamtkonzept. Unsere Politik wird von langfristigen Zukunftsaspekten geleitet und orientiert sich an vier Grundsätzen; sie ist ökologisch, sozial, basisdemokratisch und gewaltfrei” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4)

¹³ The four pillars are present in the 1979 Europaprogramm, an indication that they were perhaps already decided on during the preparatory Frankfurt meeting, the minutes of which have not been preserved (pers.communication, Anne Vechtel, Archiv Grünes Gedächtnis, 15 October 2005). All principles except “gewaltfrei” were part of the draft Constitution presented for approval during the January 1980 Karlsruhe meeting. At Roland Vogt’s request, “gewaltfrei” was added (minutes of Karlsruhe meeting January 1980, p. 4 (Die Grünen (1980d))

¹⁴ The reformist trend seems to have been led by Greens such as Joschka Fischer, Otto Schily, and Joseph Huber, the latter a “social-democratic writer and champion of an ‘ecological modernization’ to be led forward by industry and science” (Sandford, 1986b, p. 216, note 2 to “The Third World and us”)

in Bahro 1986, p. 160), as one would have expected from a party born, inter alia, of the peace movement. He was unconvinced that any new society could emerge from parliamentary politics; he saw any participation in red-green government as a betrayal of what the new social movements and the early Die Grünen (in his view) stood for (Bahro, 1983d, in Bahro, 1986, p. 54; Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 167). “The fundamentalists will either give the whole party a new basic direction – out of and not into the system or they will go off in their own basic direction. That will be above all a new unification with the movement....” (Bahro, 1984d, in Bahro, 1986, p. 177).

1.5 The objective of this chapter

Almost every political statement made by Die Grünen in the years 1979-1983, on almost any topic, could be construed as a seminal “green” real-world politics position. Their programme content, even if restricted to that period, is extensive, and could not be reproduced here. Capra and Spretnak (1984, pp. 29-142) discuss it broadly under seven key principles: ecology as normative, social responsibility, grassroots democracy, non-violence, decentralization, post-patriarchal perspectives, and spirituality. Goodin’s (1993, pp. 181-203) work includes a synthesized, generic, green political programme covering themes such as ecology, technology, social relations, and foreign relations, much of which is based on Die Grünen’s (1983a) *Sinnvoll arbeiten – solidarisch leben. Sofort programm gegen Arbeitslosigkeit und Sozialabbau*¹⁵. He ties their whole political programme together with what he calls their “green theory of value”, i.e “naturalness” (Goodin, 1993, pp. 19-85, p. 56, discussed at section 5.2.2). By contrast, I tie it together with the seldom-mentioned political-philosophical concept “exterminism” (section 2.1).

In this chapter then, my objective is to place what Die Grünen say in their political statements within what I see as the greater philosophical framework within which their by no means internally consistent “total concept”, and its four fundamental values, is embedded. The “total concept” is, I think, the “forgotten context” of what are today the rather watered-down, sustainable development versions of “seeing green”. It does injustice to Die Grünen’s standpoints on issues as varied as what it is to be a human being, or technology, or the economy, if they are lifted out of their green “total concept”. To do so, and to use them as add-ons in other political contexts [“Go Green – Vote Blue”], or as sales gimmicks in the marketplace [“go green” shopping bags], is to change their meaning.

The chapter now follows the standard presentation format: (2) a discussion of Die Grünen’s legitimating narratives, including “exterminism”, as well as their perspectives on (3) epistemology (4) ontology/psychology (5) ethics (6) view of society, (7) praxis advocated, (8) critique, and (9) a summary of Die Grünen’s contribution to “seeing green”.

2. Legitimizing narratives

In this section I introduce (2.1) the ideology of exterminism: Emancipation from exterminism is the framework within which Die Grünen’s critique of patriarchy, hierarchy, industrialism, and militarism makes sense. It provides the context for (2.2) their rhetoric, (2.3) their four pillars, which in combination, I understand as a counter-ideology to “exterminism”, and their (2.4) key premise on the cause of, and solution to, the environmental crisis.

2.1 The concept “Exterminism”

Bahro gave much thought to the articulation of exterminism (e.g. Bahro, 1983j, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 142-158; Bahro, 1984b, p. 137, p. 142; Bahro, 1984e, p. 204). He defined it as “the tendency towards mass destruction of all life”, and linked within it, “the industrial system, the dynamic of capital, the

¹⁵ *Work meaningfully – live in solidarity. An immediate programme against unemployment and social welfare decline*

European cosmology, patriarchy, i.e. the whole mental drive of the spiral of death” (Bramwell, 1989, p. 27). The concept “exterminism” [the logic of self-destruction] does not appear directly as a word in Die Grünen’s political statements of the period, but indirectly, in phrases such as the “Dynamik der Selbstvernichtung” (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 4). It is present in the thought of Greens of the time though, as in Kelly’s comment “The ultimate result of unchecked, *terminal* patriarchy will be ecological catastrophe or nuclear holocaust” (Kelly, 1997, in McLaughlin, 2003, p. 168, my italics), and also in that of Porritt, and Vogt (section 4.1 of this chapter).

On Bahro’s view, exterminism manifests itself in “surface phenomena”, such as -

(1) militarism, i.e., the arms race and the tendency to nuclear war, (2) patriarchy, (3) the destruction of nature and culture by aggressive capitalist industrialism, and (4) the “daily exterminism” of mass starvation lived by the millions in the Third World, both as a result of capitalist industrialism’s relentless pursuit of raw materials, cheap labour, and new markets, and at the hands of their own ruling elites. Underlying and tying together these surface phenomena of exterminism is Bahro’s critique of pathological Western individualism (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 214-217).

I discuss next, the critique of (2.1.1) militarism, (2.1.2) patriarchy, hierarchy, and bureaucracy, and (2.1.3) industrialism. Bahro’s view of the human being is included in section 4.3. Throughout this discussion, I shall illustrate how Bahro’s political-philosophical critique of “exterminism” leaves real-world, empirical traces in Die Grünen’s political statements.

2.1.1 The critique of militarism

Here Bahro drew on the work of British historian EP Thompson, who shared Bahro’s thorough grounding in Marx’s historical materialism. Thompson was the European peace movement’s leading theorist. He demanded a “socialist humanism” as “a third way between the oppositional but mirrored ideologies of the Soviet and Natopolitan systems” (Soper, 1994), and also called on peace and human rights activists to pool their efforts “in a movement that would remove the weapons ‘from the Atlantic to the Urals’ and take Europe ‘beyond the blocs¹⁶’” (Soper, 1994). An influential publication which he co-authored was the 1980 *Appeal for European Nuclear Disarmament*, a key document for the European Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which called inter alia for a nuclear-free Europe from Poland to Portugal¹⁷. He was also articulator of the concept of exterminist nuclearism. In the 1980s, he identified this as an ideology held by military, government and corporate bureaucracies in both the United States of America and the [then] Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which had acquired a life of its own beyond the control of ordinary people, was prepared to take world’s peoples to the brink of nuclear extermination, and was exploiting people’s fears in order to curb basic democratic rights (Bahro, 1984e, p. 204; Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 68, p. 58).

Bahro criticized militarism driven by the aggressive industrial worldview of competition, economic growth, and advanced technology (Bahro, 1984e, p. 134, p. 138), which manifested itself in the arms race, the willingness to consider a “limited” nuclear war, and the political consensus in the 1970s/1980s for a “Rapid Deployment Force” to guarantee, through military means, an uninterrupted supply of natural resources for the industrial economy (Bahro, 1984e, p. 138, p. 141)]. Traces of Thompson’s and Bahro’s theorizing appear in Die Grünen’s political statements as, for example,

“The established parties conduct themselves as though on this limited planet Earth, unlimited increase in industrial production is possible. Through that, they are leading us into a dead-end decision between an atomic state, or an atomic war...” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4, par. 2)

“Instead of international easing of tensions and prospects for world peace, the struggle for areas containing

¹⁶ A reference to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and Warsaw Pact blocs in Europe

¹⁷ A direct link from Thompson’s work to the thought of Die Grünen can be seen in this sentence from their 1983 election manifesto: “Unser Ziel ist ein atomwaffenfreies Europa von Polen bis Portugal” (1983b, p. 5)

raw materials, and for new markets is sharpening. If the raw materials continue to be wasted as they are now, the danger will increase that limited raw materials are distributed through wars ... We completely reject considering any military measures designed to “protect” the provision of energy and raw materials, or access to markets ...” (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 3, and p. 6).

Kelly blamed patriarchy for militarism. Patriarchal values were to blame for the oppression of human beings by human beings, and of the earth by human beings. She described the nuclear arms race and nuclear technology as behavioural products of masculine values and thought (Kelly, 1984, p. 38). “The arms race, I believe, is insane, but an inevitable outcome of science in a world where men wage war against feminine values, women and nature. If we trace the myths and metaphors associated with the conquest of nature, we must conclude that humanity’s long term future depends on a radical re-evaluation of masculine institutions and ideologies” (From Kelly’s E.F. Schumacher Memorial Lecture, undated, in Kelly, 1984, p. 39). Nuclear technology was for Kelly “the epitome of violence”, in its death threat to people and nature, and in its withdrawal of money and expertise from such life-affirming activities as poverty alleviation (Parkin, 1994, p. 106).

All four values [ecology as normative, living in solidarity, direct democracy, and non-violence] can be understood as response to militarism, but perhaps “Gewaltfrei” [section 6.4], expressed as radical “Ecopax”, is the lead response.

2.1.2 The critique of patriarchy, hierarchy and bureaucracy

Die Grünen’s critique of patriarchy, hierarchy, and bureaucracy in social institutions and practices, is reflected in the political statements in terms such as “Herrschaftsverhältnisse”, “Hierarchiedenken” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 5, par. 2), “Obrigkeitsstaat” (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 11), “Polizei- und Überwachungsstaat” [this latter particularly i.c.w. nuclear energy (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 6)], “anonyme Apparate” (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 4), and “überhandnehmende Bürokratie”:

We reject the bureaucracy which is taking over our lives, and rendering the citizen helpless; we reject the increasing autocracy of the economic and state apparatus, and their increasing misuse of power.¹⁸ (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 3).

I understand this particular critique to be largely inherited from the neo-Marxist Frankfurt School/New Left/countercultural critique of instrumental reason and demand for self-management already encountered in Chapter Five: Social Ecology.

Like Bookchin [their shared historical materialist background?], Bahro understood the emergence of patriarchy as the result of one of the earliest social conflicts, along with the generation conflict. He therefore believed, like Bookchin, that the feminist movement, in its critique of patriarchy, had a particularly liberatory role to play - humanity’s exterminist tendency could be overcome by rejecting patriarchal-type civilization.

Other than their countercultural heritage, Die Grünen also derived guidelines against hierarchy from ecology. During their 1983 visit, Capra and Spretnak asked Maren-Grisebach “about the political implications of multileveled order in nature, an order of systems within systems, integrating nonorganic materials as well into living systems”. She replied: “Integrated doesn’t mean primary or secondary. *Green politics must expose the tendencies to set up hierarchies...* [In arguments I try to intervene and say] ‘Why don’t you let yourselves be guided by the meaning of ecology, that everything is interwoven, that there is no such thing as a first or a second?’” (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 32-33, my italics).

¹⁸ “Wir wenden uns gegen die überhandnehmende Bürokratie, der die Bürger hilflos ausgeliefert sind, gegen die zunehmende Willkür und den zunehmenden Machtmissbrauch der wirtschaftlichen und staatlichen apparate” (1980c, p. 3)

As countervalues to patriarchy, hierarchy, and bureaucracy, Die Grünen proposed not only “Gewaltfrei” [no structural violence, no war, section 6.4] but also “Basisdemokratisch” [direct democracy, section 6.3]. Anti-hierarchical/bureaucratic values such as “Dezentralisierung”, “Überschaubarkeit”, “Selbstbestimmungsrecht”, and “Selbstverwaltung”, are advocated:

... wir [setzten] uns für direkte Demokratie ... [ein]. Dadurch werden Entscheidungen über öffentliche angelegenheiten am wirksamsten überschaubar. Diese form der Demokratie lässt sich auf dezentraler Ebene verwirklichen... (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 3).

2.1.3 The critique of existing society’s “industrialism”

Dobson (2000, p. 180) suggests that Greens believe that “industrialism¹⁹” is a “super-ideology” subsuming both capitalist and socialist modes of production, and leading to a dead-end in civilization.

Die Grünen were opposed to it:

Our politics ... opposes the exploitation of humanity and nature within the capitalist competitive economy and in the existing central planned economies ... The Greens want ... neither the growth, industrial, or social politics of capitalism or of any actually existing socialism ... (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 2; and annexure (p. 15))

The industrial system of European civilization, in which the human being is understood as exploiter and dominator of other human beings, and in which nature is experienced as an enemy has increasingly led society into a cul-de-sac... The exploitative relationship amongst human beings and towards nature has led humanity to the brink of extinction. (Die Grünen, 1981, pp. 1-2).

Their ideological critique of industrialism follows several lines: (2.1.3.1) of the capitalist system itself, and (2.1.3.2) of the impossibility of its extension to all peoples, based on ecological and social limits. An alternative concept of development is therefore needed (2.1.3.3). Capitalism’s human-exploitative work process (2.1.3.4), and its over-valuing of materialism (2.1.3.5) is also critiqued. There were however, agreements and differences amongst Die Grünen, on the role of industrial capitalism in the new alternative society (2.1.3.6).

2.1.3.1 *Advanced capitalism is aggressive, destructive, and unecological*

Bahro described industrial capitalism as simultaneously the most aggressive, the most successful, the most destructive, and the most life-threatening form of production ever invented by human beings. “The merciless struggle to remove competitors – first between private individuals, then between firms, and finally between multinational and state corporations – has proved to be the mightiest economic impetus of all times. The East and the South are only emulating it; often with even worse direct consequences for the people affected.” (Bahro 1982a, in Bahro 1986, p. 11).

He pointed out the overlooked misfit between the humanist ideology of “progress”, endless growth, and ecological realities:

Marx took it for granted that inevitable development was to be equated with inevitable progress – but this is far from proven. If we look at biological evolution, we see that the development of a species is not a linear upward movement: a species can die, the evolutionary process can take a wrong turning. Every historical biologist will tell you that one has to fear for the survival of a successful species or genus that

¹⁹ Sounding quite familiar from Die Grünen’s arguments here, green environmental philosopher Keekok Lee provides in 1993 (Dobson & Lucardie, 1993, pp. xii-xiii, 105-117) a radical ecological and social critique of industrialism. On her view, the idea of industrialism comprises (a) industrial modes of production, requiring at least two kinds of mass production to increase the productivity and efficiency needed to propel growth (i) the division of labour, and (ii) the use of machines produced by science and technology (b) constant pursuit of productivity and efficiency means more concentration of expertise in the hands of fewer people, deskilling of jobs, increasing replacement of people by machines (c) high universal consumption, practically guaranteed by inbuilt obsolescence (d) indefinite exponential economic growth. Her critique includes industrialism’s degradation of nature, its abuse of animals, its structural [inbuilt] unemployment, the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the few, its supply-led production which ignores non-profitable needs and stimulates profitable wants; its impossibility of global extension, because of its resource-use and waste-production intensity

disturbs the balance of the other species among which it lives. There is no biological analogy to the power and success of *Homo sapiens*. Marx never asked whether the earth might have finite limits, because in his time there were no limits in sight. But when we look at the rising world population, and cannot find a square inch of land that has not been dug up and cultivated or built on, it is clear that our material consumption and our squandering of energy and other resources cannot go on in the same way. (Bahro, 1984e, p. 143)

Production must take place within the biological equilibrium (Bahro, 1983i, in Bahro, 1986, p. 117). Die Grünen's "dynamische Gleichgewichtswirtschaft" ("Dynamically balanced economy", 1979, p. 2, par.2) reflects this biological principle: "Ausgehend von den Naturgesetzen und insbesondere von der Erkenntnis, dass in einem begrenzten System kein Unbegrenztes Wachstum möglich ist, heisst ökologische Politik"²⁰ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4, my italics).

2.1.3.2 *Advanced industrial capitalism for everyone is impossible, and dangerous*

According to "the principles of social justice everyone should have what we ourselves have ..." (Bahro, 1982b, in Bahro, 1986, p. 23). But on his view, because the earth's resources are finite, it is "impossible to think in terms of an expanding industrial system for everyone" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 145). There "simply aren't enough resources" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 111) to reproduce "the present standard of living in the developed countries for the whole of the present population of the world"²¹ (Bahro, 1984e, p. 147). That would mean "total natural catastrophe" (Bahro, 1982b, in Bahro, 1986 p. 23). Not only that, but the industrial economies' "excessive use" of non-renewable natural resources was also "at the expense of generations to come." (Bahro, 1984e, p. 144). But the crisis is not just one of limited natural resources, it is also a social one.

2.1.3.2.1 *The centre-periphery argument*

He based this point of view on a centre-periphery argument (Bahro, 1984e, p. 208), familiar from ecofeminist Plumwood (Chapter Six, section 4.2.1, and 5.1). European capitalist-industrialism [the centre, the metropolis] had only been able to maintain its aggressive, expansionist thrust in support of economic growth "through exploitation of the periphery", through "Raubwirtschaft"²² in peripheral countries. This took the form of underpaying them for their natural resources, or pressurising them through technological aid disguised as "development" to produce for the export market rather than for their own people's basic needs, or locating basic production there while retaining value-adding processes themselves. These moves reduced the periphery to dependence upon the centre. In Bahro's view, Third World poverty "is a consequence of capitalist industrial development" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 207). In Die Grünen's political statements:

...the interests of the exploited, the suffering, the hungry and the starving in the Third, even more so in the so-called Fourth World²³ of absolute poverty demand our withdrawal from the prevailing international division of labour (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 6).

But Bahro was well aware that "All experience shows that those who have less want to have the same as others, and essentially in the same form because it is the only one they can conceive" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 147). But the reality is, these developing countries do *not* have the colonial option. Their only option is for their own centres ["the metropolis"] to exploit their own periphery ["the hinterland"]. For the successful in the metropolis – the "elites" – the reward is a "Mercedes" culture; for those from the periphery, nothing but "third-class industrialization", as they move from the hinterland to a "shanty-

²⁰ "Based upon the laws of nature and above all the realization that infinite growth is not possible in a closed system...." (Die Grünen, 1985, p. 4)

²¹ Bahro's interviewer was critical of this viewpoint, suggesting it to be "undemocratic", "harking back to the Stone Age", and condemning "poorer countries to continued poverty" (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 211-213). But Bahro remains adamant that the industrial route is inappropriate for humanity as a whole, not just for developing countries

²² This concept is explained in Chapter Nine, section 3.2

²³ Bahro actually believed that there were only two "worlds": the expansive European capitalist-metropolitan-industrial civilization, and the non-capitalist other (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 203-204)

town on the edge of the city”, and then in the next generation, buying “a run-down car, trying to reproduce what exists in the metropolis” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 211-212). Western-type industrialism in the Third World/developing countries would mean “poverty for whole generations and hunger for millions” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 184), a “tunnel without an exit, because the living standard they are aiming for is no longer achievable” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 211).

As alternative: “We can only hope that their vision of the good life²⁴ is different from that in Washington, London or Paris” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 110). Those in the highly developed countries, where “the terrible treadmill is in operation”, need to tell other peoples not to “go further along this [existing] path” of industrial progress (Bahro, 1984e, p. 112):

We Greens consider it amongst our most important international tasks to remove here at home this destructive model of “the good life”, which lures the remainder of humanity into a tunnel without an exit. (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 7).

If all countries of the world pursued the aggressive worldview of industrial capitalism in the face of dwindling resources, how could its growth ever be maintained except by increased war-mongering? (Bahro, 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 18-19). War and ecological catastrophe would be inevitable in the long run (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 138-140). In Die Grünen’s political statements:

“A continued intensification of this energy imperialism will lead to political and military conflict...” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 10).

“Only a consistent peace politics can deflect the danger of war, which has also arisen from the struggle for increasingly limited raw materials (oil, uranium)” (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 7).

2.1.3.3. There must be an alternative conception of “development”

As did deep ecologist Naess [Chapter Four, section 6.3.3.1], Bahro drew on Norwegian resource economist Johann Galtung’s work²⁵ for an alternative model of development, not only for the Third World’s but also for the First World’s salvation from war and ecological disaster (Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p. 90). Galtung’s concept of development (Bahro 1984a, in Bahro 1986, pp. 123-131; Bahro, 1984e) was much more than just a soft-technology based, regionally appropriate self-reliance. In his view, the concept of development comprised culture, economy, social structure, and international relations, and must be considered at four levels:

- (1) **Nature.** This relates mostly to maintaining “the complexity and maturity of nature”, maintaining ecological balance (Bahro, 1984a, in Bahro 1986, p. 123).
- (2) **The world.** Important for Galtung here was that “one country does not transform others economically into its peripheral zones and that a country does not have defence forces at its disposal which are intended for offensive use” (p. 123).
- (3) **Social.** Two aspects are important. (a) An external anti-imperial policy on the one hand, non-intervention; on the other, a specific policy of not diminishing the scope of other countries “through aggressive economic policies” (pp. 123-124). (b) Nationally, self-reliance and self-sufficiency should be the main pillars of economic policy. A developing country should *not* make its raw materials available to a developed country²⁶. “They should do something with these themselves, either

²⁴ Bahro’s hopes appear to be wishful thinking. Former East European nations are on the way to European-style consumerism, China’s demands for energy to fuel western-style economic progress are pushing oil prices to new highs based on nervous stock market expectations of scarcity (November 2007); Namibia’s Vision 2030 demands for Namibians the material standards of the western industrial nations

²⁵ Bahro had studied it (1984e, p. 180, p. 182), and had also held discussions with Galtung (Bahro, 1984a, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 123-131; 1984e, p. 169)

²⁶ Writing on neoclassical economics and principles of sustainable development, Goodland and Ledec (1998, p. 557) also suggest that, contrary to the hypothesis that increased growth in the industrialized countries will promote economic growth in developing countries, the alternative hypothesis that “increased resource consumption in the North actually hurts development prospects in the South, merits closer attention”

independently or in collaboration with each other, that is as South-South trade, not South–North. If this is problematic for us, that is our problem. We must find a solution for it, and the best solution is in general a green economic policy at home” (p. 124).

(4) **Personal.** Fundamental needs [which are beyond the “basic needs” concept] must be met. They are partially material, and partially non-material. The latter included “the possibility of attaining a state of identity with the world and with what is otherwise called the transpersonal or God, with the meaning of life, and something that has much to do with freedom. That you have possibilities of choosing, that it is not only possible to drive or listen to the radio but that you also have the material at your disposal to enable you to make spiritual journeys” (p. 123).

Galtung (Bahro 1984a, in Bahro 1986, pp. 127-128) advocated a specific, fixed order, six-point model for alternative development which would be applicable to both industrialized and Third World countries: (1) and (2) a seizure of power by the people, and a selective severing of ties vis-a-vis one colonial power [or metropolis] at a time (3) a re-distribution of the factors of production, which would include land reform, access to education, health, credit facilities and so on, but also a re-distribution of decision-making power (4) agricultural production aimed first at food security, and then at producing the raw materials needed for your own industry (5) then industrial production, first of simple consumer goods such as things needed in the home, before moving on to the production of capital goods, i.e. the means of production. (6) Then, when the previous strategies have been implemented to some extent, production for exchange, but primarily, South-South exchange.

Bahro’s/Galtung’s views are partly reflected in Die Grünen’s policy of peace and solidarity with Third World peoples [section 6.2.5].

2.1.3.4 Industrial capitalism’s work process is exploitative and alienating

Crudely stated, in the Marxist critique of capitalist production, the employer pays the worker the subsistence labour value of the commodity produced, and pockets the surplus value as profit. This is exploitation, further enhanced where work processes are rationalized, and led, instead of being supported, by technology (Bramwell, 1989, pp.244-246). Topics such as the intrinsic meaningfulness of work serving human creative potential, the critique of alienating technology, or of the stress of conveyor-belt methods of production, are plentiful in Die Grünen’s political statements. As one example:

Technical progress and work organization follow a growth dynamic which is alien to people, and in which the development of creative powers cannot achieve its conscious expression²⁷ (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 2, par 1).

This last aspect is highlighted in section 6.2.1.5.

2.1.3.5 Industrialism’s values of materialism and consumerism critiqued

Available in the green movement consciousness was Schumacher’s (1974) influential critique, on both spiritual and ecological grounds, of industrialist society’s materialism²⁸. Both capitalism and Marxism

²⁷ The German reads: “Der technische Fortschritt und die Organisation der Arbeit folgen einer Wachstumsdynamik, die dem Menschen entfremdet ist und in der die Entwicklung der Produktivkräfte nicht seiner bewussten Gestaltung unterliegt” (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 2, par 1). I understand this in the sense of Bookchin’s “what is” failing to represent “what should be” (Chapter Five)

²⁸ “In the excitement over the unfolding of his scientific and technical powers, modern man has built a system of production that ravishes nature and a type of society that mutilates man. If only there were more and more wealth, everything else, it is thought, would fall into place. Money is considered to be all-powerful... The development of production and the acquisition of wealth have thus become the highest goals of the modern world (p. 246). [Yet] ... An attitude to life which seeks fulfillment in the single-minded pursuit of wealth – in short, materialism – does not fit into this world, because it contains within itself no limiting principle, while the environment in which it is placed is strictly limited. Already, the environment is trying to tell us that certain stresses are becoming excessive... (p. 23). [All this] implies, above all else, the development of a life-style which accords to material things their proper, legitimate place, which is secondary and not primary.” (pp. 246-247)

“saw the achievement of human happiness as basically conditional on the expansion of material goods’ production” (Mies & Shiva, 1998, p. 487). Both are based on the same conception of the human-nature relationship [the transcendence of dependence] (Mies & Shiva, 1998, p. 489). Bahro believed that there was a powerful connection between “ideological and material processes”; that material factors shape ideologies and whole civilizations (Bahro, 1984e, p. 118). “Under the capitalist pattern we have assumed that man needs everything that capitalism offers him, needs more and ever more. The fact that the earth’s resources are limited, like the earth itself, compels us to ask what man really needs for his development as a human being.” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 112). Industrial production, argued Bahro, is no longer “... geared to human needs but has become an end in itself²⁹.” (Bahro 1982b, in Bahro 1986, p. 24).

Die Grünen advocate non-materialism, not because poverty is a desirable end in itself, but because non-materialism is the way of return to being fully human (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 21). Their non-materialist philosophy manifests itself as “das Prinzip der Sparsamkeit” within the Party (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 21); in solidarity with the Third World expressed in supporting Third-World goods; new kinds of development politics; in “hate for environmental destruction” (p. 21); in repugnance for the ethos of maximal consumption as bringer of happiness (p. 23); in the seeking of voluntary simplicity, inner peace, and integration in their personal lifestyles (p. 23).

At real world level, something of Die Grünen’s anti-material philosophy can be seen in this excerpt from their 1979 European political programme:

The new Europe can only become a reality if Europeans’ worldview changes: Images of the good life must be ‘liberated’ from an over-valuing of standard of living and quantitative, material single-mindedness. A more decisive meaning to life is to be found in peoples’ spiritual self-realization. The so-called ‘education’ of people for economic purposes must be changed into an education which enables them to fashion their own lives (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2, par.3).

2.1.3.6 Capitalism: total break, or “reformist ecologism”?

In their political statements, Die Grünen consistently described growth and profit-oriented industrial capitalism as economic system and culture in negative terms: “Industriewachstumsgesellschaft” (1980c, p. 4); “quantitative Wachstum” (1980c, p. 3); “profitorientierte Wirtschaftsziele” (1980c, p. 3). They agreed on the source of the problem:

What we have here, is a single world system of unlimited power struggle, social injustice and destruction of nature (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 7),

and agreed on what they wanted to do:

We Greens want to put an end to this life-threatening growth ... As consumers, producers and taxpayers we want to make a difference now already, that foodstuffs are not poisoned, that Nature’s exploitation is reduced, that work is constituted in a less alienating way, and produces civic-minded and useful goods... (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 2, par. 2)

But there were differing interpretations of the role of capitalism in the new society. To deal with the ecological, social and economic crisis, Bahro argued that a cultural revolution (Bahro, 1984e, p. 112) was needed - the development of a world-wide alternative to the capitalist version of civilization (Bahro, 1984e, p. 113). He was adamant that “reformism” was not the road to the new society: “... the main criticism of reformism is that it wants to repair a system that we must leave behind us altogether. ... ‘Radicals against reformist ecologism!’ ” (Bahro 1982b, in Bahro 1986, p. 23, and p. 28). But here he parted company with many of Die Grünen. He was completely opposed to what he called a “policy

²⁹ Bahro, for example, comments that “More important than the quality or quantity of consumer goods, in my view, is the need for a new consumption pattern geared to the *qualitative* development of the individual, so that the length of young people’s education, for example, becomes a higher priority than the addition of one more piece of clothing to my wardrobe” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 103)

of ecological repair to the German [economic] model” (Bahro 1983e, in Bahro, 1986, p. 65) and “reformist tinkering that changes nothing essential whatsoever” (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 161). Die Grünen’s cyclical economy [section 6.1.2] could not be achieved, he argued, by “introducing a bit of ecological reason ...” (Bahro, 1982b, in Bahro, 1986 p. 25). Recycling, any expanded large-scale production for environmental protection (Bahro, 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, p.12), catalytic converters for cars, filters in factory chimneys³⁰, for example, “are all primarily reformist ideas” (Bahro, 1982b, in Bahro, 1986, p. 25). They also sent out the wrong signals:

If we build a new eco-storey onto our metropolitan industrial system here ... we leave the whole of the rest of the world, degraded to the periphery, with the solid recommendation to first catch up with our auto-culture, the “good life” of Washington, London, Paris and Frankfurt” (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 162).

What we need, he said, is “a fresh start in the development of the [human] species” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 149), a new society “which no longer makes itself dependent on the production machine” (Bahro, 1982b, in Bahro, 1986, p. 25), in which the emphasis has changed from satisfying consumerist wants, to satisfying basic human needs, from pathological individualism to self-realization, in harmony with others and with the ecology. “In the face of the total catastrophe which is emerging from the womb of Western civilization to fall upon the whole of humanity, and which is inevitable if we don’t get at its roots, we cannot afford any more reformist half-measures. ... The only work which will stop the apocalypse is to cleanse and assemble the psychological forces for an Ecopax formation of culture” (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 176). In his commune-based new cultural order [section 6.3.1], he anticipated that “...as many people as possible ... [would] have a real option of dropping out and switching over to a different context of life, beyond wage-labour and the market” (Bahro, 1983c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 50).

But the reformist Greens believed that the capitalism as economy and culture *could* be re-oriented, and reformed. They favoured the “investments in the future” proposed in Die Grünen’s views of the new ecological cyclical economy [section 6.1.2], which Bahro rejected³¹ as simply propping up the industrialist system through job creation and capital investment in eco-friendly industry and technology.

2.2 Rhetoric, metaphors

Die Grünen’s rhetoric and metaphors can be explained in terms of the concept of exterminism: (2.1.1) Life and survival [Leben und Überleben], (2.1.2) the machine metaphor, and (2.1.3) the rhetoric of emancipation, salvation, and hope.

2.2.1 “Life” and “survival”

One is struck by the recurrence of the themes of crisis, the threat to all life, and *survival* in the key source documents:

“...Europe is today threatened by an ecological and economic crisis, by a military catastrophe, and by a continual erosion of democracy and fundamental rights” (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2)

“ ... our central issue is survival ...” (Vogt, speaking to Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 68)

“The environment, peace, society and the economy now pose such a threat to survival that they can only be resolved by structural change...” (Kelly, 1984, p. 18)

³⁰ “It is quite right to want to install filters in factory chimneys. The direction this leads in, however, is away from the cultural revolution” (Bahro, 1983h, in Bahro, 1986, p. 109)

³¹ Bahro considered the “investments in the future” [section 6.1.2] which were part of Die Grünen’s 1983 economic programme, “notorious” (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 161-162)

“The continued existence of life on our planet Earth can only be ensured through a survival society of all individuals and peoples” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 16, 1. Weltpolitik)

Much of this rhetoric of threat and holocaust must of course be understood within the historical context of the cold war standoff between East and West, the stationing of nuclear weapons on West German soil, nuclear weapon proliferation on both sides, and particularly, the readiness of both sides to use them. But their ideological context is exterminism. I suggest that the “seeing green” theme of the valuing of all life, is not exhausted by the environmental ethical biocentrism or ecocentrism usually suggested, for example, in Wissenburg’s heuristic in Chapter One. The concept “vitalism” [section 4.1] perhaps captures its essence more.

2.2.2 Machine metaphor

The machine metaphor [“Megamachine”, “Big Machine”, “Modern Megamachine” (Bahro, 1983j, in Bahro, 1986, p. 152)] appears in green movement rhetoric, to represent the industrial-technical system - for example in this excerpt from Bahro’s writings: “Whilst the independent, alienated Megamachine is preparing to collide against the bounds of the Earth, pressing us – its original creators – up against the wall and crushing us... .” (Bahro, 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 11). Or, “Our parliamentary practice ...must concentrate on preventing any steps which continue in the same dangerous direction [i.e of expanding industrialism]. This means in particular all investments in the expansion of the Big Machine, i.e. any military installations, any installations of the nuclear industry, any projects to extend the heavy transport infrastructure (airports, motorways, trunk roads, canals, river straightening, ports), all large industrial projects, as well as all large projects in the school and university system, in the health service, and in public administration, the police, computerized control of society, etc.” must be stopped (Bahro, 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 17). The metaphor as image appeared in a poster in Die Grünen’s offices³², and in their 1983 economic manifesto: under the caption “Technik-Opfer” is a picture of Charlie Chaplin caught up in the cogs of a machine. The accompanying text contains no reference to the picture. Clearly, the message of the machine metaphor was self-evident.

2.2.3 Emancipation, salvation, hope

This rhetoric is to be understood I think in the context of ordinary people’s experience of “exterminism”.

First existential fear, the realization by ordinary people that politicians in the East and West were busy with, and prepared to implement, plans for Mutually Assured Destruction (Kelly, 1984, p. 12). Together with fear [“Fear drives us....” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 15, pp. 17-19)], there were also amongst people, feelings of meaninglessness, apathy and pessimism, manifesting themselves in a lack of “Lernlust”, “Arbeitslust”, and “Lebenslust”, a “tiredness of the soul” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, pp. 11-12), and a laming sense of powerlessness [“Ohnmacht”]. This was ascribed to the terrifying militarism, in tandem with a bureaucratic state’s undermining of base democratic rights:

The politics of the established parties has, with its breaking down of democratic rights, ... elicited a milieu of adaptation and resignation... The results are a further and unchecked hollowing out of democracy, as well as powerlessness and fear amongst citizens... (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 9).

In that context, life itself, and the Earth, was experienced as both precious and vulnerable. “Standing up for life” is a green value (Kelly, undated, in Kelly, 1984, p. 11); green “is the colour of life, a future, and hope” (Die Grünen, 1979, page 3, paragraph 6).

The pervasive numbness which the unimaginably destructive power of [these] weapons has created, is

³² A Thoreau poster hung on the walls of Die Grünen’s national headquarters in Bonn (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 43-44). “Let your life be a counter friction to stop the machine”, he counselled (Rodman, 1977, p. 118, citing from Thoreau’s “Civil disobedience” in Thomas (1966, p. 231)). Proto-green Lewis Mumford also employs the metaphor, for example, in his (1966) *The myth of the machine*

beginning to loosen its hold. Hope is beginning to spread, that despite our feelings of powerlessness in the face of over-powerful military structures, that survival may perhaps have a chance (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 1, par. 1).

The emphasis on “Selbstbestimmungsrecht” [self-determination] in the political documents (e.g. the founding Constitution (1980a, p.1, par. 5), where it is added to the four pillars as a value, or statements such as “Nur durch eine Selbstbestimmung der Betroffenen kann der ökologischen, ökonomischen und sozialen Krise entgegengetreten werden” in the Saarbrucker programme (1980b, p. 5), partly reflects the need, I think, for *psychological* emancipation from powerlessness.

2.3 Die Grünen’s counter-extermism ideology: core values

Now if one compares the critique of exterminism’s ideology above, with one example of Die Grünen’s “real world” analyses of society’s ills:

We have not only reached the limits of our economic system, but our whole industrial civilization is in a crisis which will prove to be our demise, if we are not prepared to alter our entire direction. The immediate is dominated by fears of unemployment, and decline in social security ... But behind that there arises threateningly, the danger of nuclear extinction, increased by stationing of new weapons of mass destruction ... as well as chemical and biological instruments of murder.

In the Third World, hundreds of millions of people are leading a life of misery because of the unfair international economic order...

And in ever-increasing tempo, the European initiated production methods, and lifestyle are spreading throughout the world, destroying the Earth which sustains us, especially the biosphere, from which we came... (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 3)

then I suggest that Die Grünen’s four cardinal values of ökologisch, sozial, basisdemokratisch, and gewaltfrei [the “four pillars”], and their “Partnerschaft” ethic, can be seen as a counter-ideology to “exterminism”.

Other green values pervade these five cardinal values. All oppose industrial hierarchical society’s values: holism instead of reductionism; re-integration [“Eingliederung”] instead of separation or pushing away [“Trennung” or “in die Ecke schieben”]; unravelling and decentralization [“entflechten” and “dezentralisieren”] instead of “Konzentration”; self-regulation and self-decision-making power [“Selbstverwaltung” and “Selbstbestimmungsrecht”] instead of bureaucracy [“Bürokratie”]; human-friendly social and economic scale [“überschaubar”] instead of gigantism [“mammoth” scale]; diversity [“Vielfalt”] instead of “mono”:

The one-sided orientation of school education ... must again be extended to include those areas which are essential for the development of the whole personality...³³ (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 13), AND “At the centre of health care stands the whole person. Illness is not simply a matter of disturbance in chemical and physical processes...³⁴ (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 10).

The growth oriented policy which brought about the overdevelopment and concentration in urban centres has also led to an extreme separation of living space, place of work, recreation, education, and shopping³⁵ (Die Grünen, 1985, p. 15) ... all these aspects of life must be spatially integrated with one another in meaningful ways. This means decentralization ³⁶ (Die Grünen, 1985, p. 14)

The dismantling of mammoth-sized schools and universities which make difficult, the kind of education we

³³ “Die einseitige Ausrichtung der Schulbildung ... muss wieder um die Bereiche ergänzt werden, die für die Entwicklung der Gesamtpersönlichkeit unerlässlich sind”

³⁴ “Im Mittelpunkt der Gesundheitspflege steht der ganze hilfsbedürftige Mensch. Krankheit ist nicht nur eine Störung chemischer und physikalischer Prozesse ...”

³⁵ “Die wachstumsorientierte und konzentrationsfördernde Politik und Wirtschaft haben zur übermäßigen Trennung der Lebensbereiche, insbesondere von Wohnen, Arbeiten, Einkaufen und Freizeit geführt” (1980c, p. 5)

³⁶ “Die Lebensbereiche Wohnen, Arbeit, Erholen, Sich-Bilden, Einkaufen müssen in sinnvoller Weise räumlich miteinander verbunden werden. Das bedeutet Dezentralisierung...” (1980b, p. 14)

seek ...³⁷ (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 13) The Greens demand ... decentralized and human-scale schools...³⁸
(Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 12)

...Partnership with nature and with people. This is best achieved in self-determined, self-maintaining, human-scale units in enterprise and administration ...³⁹ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 5)

“... there must be attention to diversity and decentralization⁴⁰ (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 14).

2.4 Key proposition on ecological crisis

Die Grünen’s key proposition the cause of the crisis could be phrased something like:

The world-wide capitalist-industrial-materialistic-bureaucratic system, both western and socialist, is responsible for all current and interconnected crises, both at cultural level [the ecological crisis, the economic crisis, the military crisis, and social decline crisis] and at personal level [a sense of existential threat, pessimism, and powerlessness].

3. Epistemology

It appears correct to say that green movement epistemology combines (3.1) “Netzwerkdenkens”, which is a kind of dialectical thinking, (3.2), a neo-Frankfurt School critique of instrumental reason, and (3.2.1) a defence of the place of emotion in thinking.

3.1 “Netzwerkdenkens”

Maren-Grisebach (1982) notes, as does Schumacher (1974), the westerner’s carving up of the world into either-or propositions. Drawing on Hegel’s thought, she asserts that Die Grünen by contrast, are “Dialektiker” (1982, p. 56). Dialectical thinking dissolves distinctions, without denying any of them (p. 56). She equates dialectical thinking with “Netzwerkdenkens”: “Dialektisches Denken ist mit Netzwerk denken gleich...” (p. 56).

Then, from “Netzwerkdenkens” as norm, she derives two further norms:

(a) The first is that the nature of ecology itself suggests that there must be more to human thought than just the reconciliation of opposites: “Vernetzungen, Verkettungen, Überlagerung im kompliziertesten Wechselgefüge machen andere Entscheidungswege notwendig” (p. 59). So the lesson taken from “Netzwerkdenkens” by Die Grünen is the possibility of *more than* only an impoverished either-or option in thinking and doing⁴¹ (1982, p. 59).

(b) Then she suggests that as the very nature of ecology is movement and change, becoming and passing, there should be in human thinking too, an open-ness to movement and change, to “process” thought, rather than a reification or “absolutising” (p. 58) of fundamentals. To ecology’s cycles, Maren-Grisebach traces the acceptance of process and change which is integral to the green way of thinking: “Veränderung bleibt ... das Stichwort, das ... auf den grünen Leib geschrieben ist” (1982, p. 49). She (1982, p. 57) cites as example, the comment on p. 37 of the 1980 Bundesprogramm (1980b): “This programme constitutes the current status of

³⁷ “Abbau von Mammutschulen und Mammutuniversitäten die eine Erziehung im dargelegten Sinne erschweren....” (1979, p. 13)

³⁸ “Die Grünen fordern ...dezentrale und überschaubare Schulen... (1980c, p. 12)

³⁹ “Partnerschaft mit der Natur und dem Menschen. Sie gelingt am besten in selbstbestimmten und selbstversorgenden überschaubaren Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungseinheiten.” (1980b, p. 5)

⁴⁰ “...auch hier [ist] auf Vielfalt und Dezentralisierung zu achten” (1980c, p. 14)

⁴¹ Bahro doesn’t agree with this principle. For example, “So far we have got out of the question of the relationship between perspectives within the system and those transcending the system by saying “both one and the other” ...Anyone who still has a trace of Marxist training in them as far as method is concerned, can never be satisfied with this eclecticism, that is with the mixing of positions instead of integration on one particular position. A consistent programme will only be possible if we build either on the old principle or the new” (Bahro, 1983b, in Bahro, 1986, p. 46)

discussion amongst Die Grünen at national level. In accordance with our understanding of direct [or “base”] democracy, the discussion of the programme is being continued by all members, and informed by new insights, and practical experience.”⁴² While their political opponents considered this non-fixing of ideas [“Nicht-Festsetzungen” (p. 56), “Nichtfestschreiben” (p. 57)], that is, their process-thinking, a sign of their instability (p. 57), Die Grünen considered it a strength, because it reflected life: “Green is the colour of continually-changing life” [“Grün meint die Farbe des sich ändernden Lebens” (p. 57)].

Together, these two kinds of thinking – both/and, movement and change – are the essence of *truly democratic* thinking, that is, base-democratic thinking, which is Die Grünen’s preferred way of making decisions [“Entscheidungsweg”]. Where one thinks only in terms of unchanging fundamentals, and either/or options, there the possibility exists that each party in the conversation will insist on his/her version of things as the only, and enduring, version of things. But where one allows diversity of thinking, coupled with the possibility of movement and change, there base-democratic decisions “*emerge*”, they are not “taken” or “made” [“Eine Entscheidung ist dann nicht getroffen, sondern sie *wird*” (1982, p. 59, her italics)]. In base-democratic thinking, no one person may speak for all the others, because no one person⁴³ has the truth. There is however a dynamic truth, and the way to it, is through base-democratic thinking: “Das Basisdemokratische ist als Mittel zur Wahrheitsfindung nicht zu leugnen, weil die Wahrheit eine der *Bewegung* ist” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 59, her italics).

Traces of Die Grünen’s “Netzwerk” thinking can be seen throughout their early philosophy and ideology: the conscious effort to re-unite rationality and emotionality in the human being’s relationship with nature, or rationality and intuition in the human being’s understanding of his/her world (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 11); a seeking after holism in the value of solidarity; yet individualism in the idea of self-realization; re-integration of body and soul in medicine (Kelly, 1984, p. 93), a restoration to the citizen of a sense of agency and autonomy, yet control by central authorities where necessary. Die Grünen sought to deal with these antinomies within a holistic philosophy [“ganzheitliche Philosophie”] (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 11).

3.2 A critique of instrumental reason

Traces of the Frankfurt School’s critique of instrumental reason (Chapter 5, section 2.1.2), its coupling of the domination of people and the domination of nature, the search for a new people-people, and new people-nature ethic are plentiful in Die Grünen’s key sources:

A complete break from our short-term and economically-oriented instrumental thinking is necessary...⁴⁴
(Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4)

We must give up our striving to rape and manipulate nature, if we want to survive⁴⁵ (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 9)

It is our conviction that we must combat the exploitation of nature by people, and of people by people, to be able to meet the acute and serious threat to life⁴⁶ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4).

⁴² “Dieses Programm schreibt den jetzigen Diskussionsstand der Grünen auf Bundesebene fest. Nach unserem basisdemokratischen Verständnis wird die Programmdiskussion von allen Mitgliedern laufend fortgesetzt, orientiert an neuen Erkenntnissen und Erfahrungen aus der Praxis”

⁴³ This belief probably underpins Die Grünen’s distrust of chairpersons, party representatives, or “top” functionaries: “weil sie so tun werden, als könnte *einer* immer rechthaben” (p. 59, her italics)

⁴⁴ “Ein volliger Umbruch unseres kurzfristig orientierten wirtschaftlichen Zweckdenkens ist notwendig...” (1980b, p. 4)

⁴⁵ “Wir müssen uns Streben, die Natur zu vergewaltigen und zu manipulieren, aufgeben, um zu überleben” (1979, p. 9)

⁴⁶ “Unsere Überzeugung ist, daß der Ausbeutung der Natur und des Menschen durch den Menschen entgegengetreten werden muß, um der akuten und ernststen Bedrohung des Lebens zu begegnen” (1980b, p. 4)

3.2.1 and a place for emotion in thinking

Perhaps within the same neo-Frankfurt School heritage, Maren-Grisebach writes of Die Grünen's wish for a return to a closer relationship with nature ["Naturzugehörigkeit"]. Our estranged relationship is compounded by the accumulation of plastic, concrete, and wire in our environment. While arguing that "Ecology" provides a secure fundamental value to guide the human-nature [and the human-human] relationship because it is based on science (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 32), she also writes freely (1982, pp. 24-26, p. 49) of the importance of allowing usually-repressed *feelings* for, or *sensations* of, nature ["Naturgefühle"] to re-emerge. She writes of Die Grünen's love for animals, of compassion for them ["Liebe zu Tieren, das Mitleid mit ihnen"], in the context of animal experimentation, industrial farming, habitat pollution, and misused draft animal power; of empathy with the forests being cut for industry. She writes of smelling the wet earth, feeling cold in the wind, tasting the soil on the plants from the ground [Namibians will think here of the *amajova* from the anthill!], feeling the ground underfoot, hearing the silence, absorbing the milieu. Similar to deep ecologist Naess's argument for a phenomenological apprehension of nature, Maren-Grisebach (1982) argues that thought is *permissably* phenomenological.

4. Ontology

In this section, I consider (4.1) the role of philosophical holism and vitalism in Die Grünen's ontological thought, and then present (4.2) a view of nature, and (4.3) a view of the human being.

4.1 Some metaphysical thoughts: Philosophical holism and vitalism

Bramwell has noted the influence of holistic biology in informing ecological ideas (Bramwell, 1989, p. ix); green historian Derek Wall (1994, p. 90) writes that "Green philosophy, as opposed to environmentalism ... always espouses holism ... Vitalism, the concept that living things are animated by a spark or force absent from the non-living is also sometimes embraced ...".

First, holism. German zoologist Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919)'s organic biology, and the vitalist thought of his student, biologist-philosopher Hans Driesch (1867-1941) contributed to the elements of holism and Monism in the German naturism tradition (Bramwell, 1989). From Maren-Grisebach's *Philosophie* it is clear that Die Grünen embrace a "ganzheitliche Philosophie" (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 11), and that she attributes some of their holism ["Ganzheit"] at least, to Haeckel's holistic understanding of ecology. His definition of ecology - "The economy of the Nature-Whole" (1982, p. 31) - is given prominence in her explanation of "ecology" (1982, p. 30), which, in her view, is an "Einheitslehre" (1982, p. 33).

What about vitalism? It would probably be going too far to assert the German heritage of holism, organicism and vitalism as the unifying philosophical basis for all the ecology-oriented Citizens' Initiatives of the 1970s, but it was clearly part of the thought of Roland Vogt, who came into Die Grünen from the executive of the Bundesverband der Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz [BBU, the alliance of Citizens' Initiatives for environmental protection], which, from its 1972 start, combined ecological and sociological concerns. Vogt, speaking to Capra and Spretnak around 1983, said:

The major problem with the growth the Greens are experiencing is that more and more people are coming into the party who are not really Green, not holistically minded. The core Greens may become a minority!" (Roland Vogt, founder member of the Greens, in Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 22).

Vogt made the interesting comment to Capra and Spretnak that "The original focus [of our activities] was ecology, then we joined peace, and then we realized neither had a chance without restructuring the economy. Once we realized that Green thinking can inform every area of politics and life and that *our*

central issue is survival, I created the term ‘vitalism’ as a contra-term to ‘exterminism’” (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 68, my italics). UK Green Porritt (1984, pp. 217-218) also refers to the use of the concept “vitalism” in Germany as counter to the concept “exterminism”. Of course, one cannot be sure whether Vogt’s concept “vitalism” in response to exterminism was a deliberate or merely unintentional re-turning to the nineteenth century German-holistic-biological idea of vitalism, then used as counter to the physical thermodynamic determinism of entropy⁴⁷ and death (Bramwell, 1989, 1994). Vitalism is also posed as counter-attitude to the nihilism of exterminism in Bahro’s careful exposition of the latter (1983j, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 142-158; specifically the matrix on pp. 152-153).

4.2 A view of nature

Here I draw on Maren-Grisebach’s ontology, as presented in her *Philosophie der Grünen* (1982), because it, rather than Bahro’s critique of Marx’s historical materialist ontology⁴⁸, is I think, traceable in Die Grünen’s founding political statements.

Capra and Spretnak (1984) were keen to draw parallels between the philosophy of Die Grünen, and the holism, interconnectedness, interdependence, and process-orientation of their own systems thinking philosophy⁴⁹. According to them (1984, pp. 31-32), Die Grünen expressed the principles of systems theory “in numerous conversations ... and in much of their printed material”, but using terms other than “system⁵⁰”, such as network, dynamic balance, and total interconnectedness [“Gesammtzusammenhänge”, “Zusammenhängen und Fließgleichgewichten” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 46, p. 49)] to express these principles.

4.2.1 “Netzwerk” or holistic system

Maren-Grisebach (1982, p. 71) used the metaphor of network⁵¹ to convey the holistic structure of reality, for example, “Die sich durch die Natur ziehenden netzartigen Strukturen...”, or “Die grosse Vernetzung” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 32). A similar ontological understanding, and realization of its implications, can also be seen at “real world” level, in Kelly’s use of concepts such as “system”, “interconnection” and “whole”: “As human beings, we are collective creatures, living parts of various communities which interconnect to form a living social system. Thus we are responsible for the whole, for society and for the life system that supports us all.” (Kelly, 1984, p. 80).

In the political statements, one finds sometimes the network metaphor to convey nature’s holistic, interconnected quality, in expressions such as “Taking heed of the intermeshed and interconnected life circumstances of living and dead material”⁵² (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 8), or “... the encouragement of thinking in terms of interrelated systems as the on-going goal of teaching, in order to encourage a better understanding of social interrelations, ecological cycles, and prevailing contradictions”⁵³ (Die Grünen, 1985, p. 40). But more often, the concept “household” is used, as in “Kreisläufe des Naturhaushalts” [“the cycles of nature’s household” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4, last paragraph)].

⁴⁷ The concept of entropy is explained in Chapter Nine, section 3.2

⁴⁸ See Bahro’s discussion, 1984e, pp. 213-218

⁴⁹ For example, Capra’s 1983 *Turning Point*; Spretnak’s 1982 *The politics of women’s spirituality* (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. xiv)

⁵⁰ “We asked Manon Maren-Grisebach, a philosophy professor and one of the three speakers of the Green party from 1981 through 1983, about this paradox. ... She explained their preference for the terms ‘network science’ and ‘network thinking’ rather than ‘systems thinking’: ‘We who have grown up with the history of philosophy [which is more influential in European thought than American] have a certain aversion to the connotations of ‘system thinking’ because often in the course of the history of ideas ‘system’ stood for something that was closed, that was a self-contained doctrine and thus was quite different from a living object. ... Only since the nineteenth century have we begun to connect ‘system’ with living phenomena. ‘ ...’ (Maren-Grisebach in Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 32-33)

⁵¹ It seems she derived this metaphor from the work of biologist Frederic Vester (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 34, p. 37)

⁵² “Beachtung der vernetzten Lebenszusammenhänge von lebendiger und toter Materie” (1983b, p. 8)

⁵³ “Denken in vernetzten Systemen als durchgängiges Unterrichtsziel, um das Verständnis von ökologischen Kreisläufen und sozialen Zusammenhängen und Gegensätzen zu fördern.” (1980b, p. 32)

4.2.2 The interrelatedness of things [“Gesamttzusammenhänge”]

In her conversations with Capra and Spretnak, Maren-Grisebach also touched on the interrelationship of things, a central ecological concept. She uses the words “Verkettungen” (for example, in Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 32), or “Gesamttzusammenhänge” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 46) to convey the idea of interrelatedness, drawing in places on Bateson⁵⁴’s thought:

The emphasis on relations and interconnections - in Gregory Bateson’s words, ‘the pattern which connects the crab to the lobster and the orchid to the primrose and all four of them to me’ - is the foundation of Green thought and being ... This consciousness is simply there in the Greens” (Maren-Grisebach, in Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 32-33).

“Vernetzung” also means that the crises of society – economy, war, and environmental destruction, for example - cannot be considered in isolation, because they are interconnected and mutually-influencing in a thousand different ways: “...drohend zeigen sich die tausendfältigen Wechselwirkungen [holism and circular causality!] zwischen Wirtschaft, Krieg, Naturvernichtung, Bevölkerungsflut und neuen Grosstechniken” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 12).

Important to learn from ecology’s interrelatedness of things, is the message of symbiosis: co-operation between living things, and between them and their environment: “Unter Ökologie wird die Lehre vom Haushalt der Natur verstanden; besser das Zusammenwirken der Lebewesen untereinander und mit der Umwelt” (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2, my italics).

Whether “systems” or “network”-based, Capra and Spretnak (1984, p. 30) note that “Green politics, then, is inherently holistic in theory and practice. It is based on ecological, or ‘network’ thinking, a term used frequently by the Greens. Ecological thinking also includes the realization that the seemingly rigid structures we perceive in our environment are actually manifestations of underlying processes, of nature’s continual dynamic flux ...”.

4.2.3 Cyclical process, change, and dynamic balance [“Werden und Gehen”; “Bewegung”]

From the thought of classical Greek philosopher Heraclitus, via Goethe’s influence [the Romantic input into ecologism which both Bramwell (1989) and Wall (1994) note], Maren-Grisebach (1982, p. 15) proposes a cyclical, and process understanding of ontology. She writes that “Zum Naturprinzip der grossen Vernetzung kommt ... die Bewegung, die Veränderung hinzu.” (1982, p. 49). She speaks of life’s natural and cyclical becoming and passing: “der Kreislauf von Werden und Vergehen” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 16). Within the becoming, being and passing of nature’s cycles, sometimes called “Bewegung” in the political statements, a dynamic balance can be discerned, which she calls “Fließgleichgewicht” (e.g. 1982, p. 71).

One finds in Die Grünen’s political statements, empirical traces of such dynamic balance ontological descriptions, for example, “... des eingespielten Gleichgewichts und der Kreisläufe der Natur (Die Grünen, 1979, page 9, par 3). The concept “stability” is also used to express this dynamic balance: “die Stabilität der Ökosysteme” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4). Ecological-ontological metaphors are carried over into their descriptions of the kind of economy they sought: a “dynamische Gleichgewichtswirtschaft” (Die Grünen, 1979, page 3, par 2), or a “dynamische Kreislaufwirtschaft” (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 4, par. 1).

⁵⁴ Maren-Grisebach (1982, p. 33) describes Gregory Bateson as a philosopher of the green movement in America

4.2.4 “Ecology” as secure foundation for green movement thought, policy and practice

Maren-Grisebach, in her *Philosophie*, and in her conversations with Capra and Spretnak (1984, pp. 32-33), asserts that “Ökologie” provides a secure fundamental value for green philosophy because it is not based on belief, conviction, or the social construction of reality, but on science. Because ecology is about the laws of being [“Gesetze des Seins”] which include human beings too (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 32), it is “zwingend” - inavoidably normative one could say - if life on earth is to survive:

... *Ökologie ist zwingend*. ... Daher hat der Partei der Grünen mit ihrem Grundsatz *ökologisch* ein so sicheres Fundament. Das ist nicht Glauben, Überzeugung, Gesellschaftsentwurf, sondern *Wissen*. (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 32; her italics).

From the “is” of ecology’s holism, network and dynamic cyclical process, Die Grünen moved easily to “oughts”: the human being’s place in, and proper relationship towards nature [section 5], and how society, including its economy, should conduct itself (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 49, pp. 53-90).

Ecology at ontological level, become social ecology⁵⁵ at ideological level, has something to say about almost every aspect of human existence. For example, in the Europe programme (Die Grünen, 1979), all the following themes are placed in an ecological context: changing worldview and values (p. 3); preserving the basis of life for people, plants and animals (p. 2); considering the what, how, where and who of the production process from an ecological, not economical point of view (p. 2, 4, and 5); transport planning (p. 6); agriculture [a return to natural, as opposed to industrial processes in farming (p. 6); energy use (p. 7); environmental protection and natural resource planning (pp. 9-10); health care and delivery (p. 10); education (p. 13), foreign, and particularly Third World policy (p. 3); even fundamental and human rights (p. 11).

4.3 A view of the human being

The most fundamental view of the human being, is that humanity is part of the planet’s ecology:

Based on the laws of nature ecological politics [also] means understanding ourselves and our human environment as part of nature. The human life is also bound up with the regulatory cycles of the ecosystems... (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4).

I discuss next, (4.3.1) Self-realization as a right, (4.3.2) the need for a re-orientation of personal values, (4.3.3) the role of spirituality in achieving personal and social transformation, (4.3.4) Bahro’s *Homo occidentalis simplicissimus*, and (4.3.5) some of Die Grünen’s *Frauenphilosophie*.

4.3.1 Self-realization is a right

For Die Grünen, a person’s self-realization is not only of decisive importance:

Die geistige und seelische Selbstverwirklichung des Menschen hat entscheidende Bedeutung (1979, p. 3, par 3),

it is a right:

“Wir gehen vom *Recht* auf Selbstverwirklichung eines jeden Menschen ... aus...” (1979, p. 13, my italics).

Their early political statements abound with views on what it is to be fully human: a being of creativity, of imagination, of soul or spirit, capable of mature critical thinking, self-initiative, self-responsibility, and self-determination, who should have the opportunity to unfold fully and freely, in solidarity with other human beings, and with nature (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 2, p. 4, p. 11, p. 26).

⁵⁵ Maren-Grisebach sometimes uses the concept “Sozialökologie” to represent the oughtness of ecology for human arrangements. Bahro too pursued the idea of social ecology (e.g. in Hosang, 2000, pp. 10-13). I have not attempted here to analyze to what extent each of their understandings of social ecology agrees with, or deviates from Bookchin’s social ecology philosophy (Chapter Five)

Two versions of how to achieve Self-realization are present in their early political statements – the one more radical than the other. In both, the human being is to be emancipated from the one-sided economic production⁵⁶ and materialism of the industrial society, from being a “wage-labour commodity and appendages to machinery” (interviewer’s comment, Bahro, 1983e, in Bahro, 1986, p. 81), into a work milieu in an ecological society which will free the individual’s creative capacities in service of self-realization. While Bahro’s cosmologically-anthropologically derived Homo *occidentalis simplicissimus* [a spiritual being in a spiritual community, almost] is the more radical view of the two, in that his ecological society is outside the world market, both versions require a re-orientation of personal values from the material to the spiritual.

4.3.2 A re-orientation of personal values is needed

The basic premise in Die Grünen’s thought appears to be, that the industrial system, though self-created, is leading the individual towards a *false* and one-dimensional Self-realization locked into materialism and consumerism. A new understanding of Self-realization-in-ecology⁵⁷ is needed, a “Neugestaltung auf ökologischer Basis” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4, par 2):

Ein volliger Umbruch unseres kurzfristig orientierten wirtschaftlichen Zweckdenkens ist notwendig. Wir halten es für einen Irrtum, dass die jetzige Verschwendungswirtschaft noch das Glück und die Lebenserfüllung fordere; im Gegenteil, die Menschen werden immer gehetzter und unfreier. Erst in dem Masse, wie wir uns von der Überschätzung des materiellen Lebensstandards freimachen, wie wir wieder die Selbstverwirklichung ermöglichen und uns wieder auf die Grenzen unserer Natur besinnen, werden auch die schöpferischen Kräfte frei werden für die Neugestaltung eines Lebens auf ökologischer Basis (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4, Preamble, par. 2).

Die Grünen consistently linked their new design for civilization - deep societal and economic structural changes, together with changed attitudes to nature, to the need for personal transformation:

... wir müssen unser Leben grundlegend ändern, wir müssen die Zivilisation neu entwerfen... (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 3).

Um diese Ziele zu erreichen sind umfassende Wandlungen in der Einstellung des Menschen zu seinem Leben und zur Umwelt sowie Änderungen der Wirtschaft und der Gesellschaft nötig” (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2, par. 2)

That in spirituality, recognised or not, is the indissoluble link between a person and an ecologically-sustainable society is a generally “green” thought⁵⁸. Spirituality is the practice needed “to dismantle ... previous psychological structures and be socialized anew” (Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p. 90).

4.3.3 Spirituality in personal and social transformation

Calls for spiritual renewal, such as those from Illich (1971)⁵⁹, Schumacher (1974), and Fromm (1976), were part of the 1970s green movement consciousness (Bramwell, 1994; Dobson, 2000, Ferris, 1993). Schumacher called for an end to the philosophy of materialism, and the “religion” of economism, which manifested itself in “a system of production that ravishes nature and a type of society that mutilates man” (1974, [1986 reprint], p. 246). Drawing on both Buddhism and Christianity, Schumacher suggested that to end the western social and environmental *malaise*, each of us could begin by putting “our own inner house in order” (Schumacher, 1974 [1986], p. 250; also cited by Dobson, 2000, p. 131). Erich Fromm’s 1976 work “To have or to be?” dealt with two possible modes

⁵⁶ “Fixation with economics is today *the* original Marxist sin” (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 172)

⁵⁷ Self-realization is also an important concept for the deep ecologists, but there mature self-realization is understood as increasing identification with nature. Die Grünen’s views, for all their “ecology” as value, seem to me far more homocentric

⁵⁸ “It seems to me so obvious that without some huge groundswell of spiritual concern the transition to a more sustainable way of life remains utterly improbable” (UK Green Jonathon Porritt, 1984, p. 210). Dobson phrases this “green” idea as “personal transformation leads to altered behaviour; which in turn can be translated into sustainable community living” (Dobson, 2000, p. 131).

⁵⁹ Bramwell (1994, p. 63) notes Illich’s “unworldly moral fervour, his interest in the state of humanity’s soul”

of existence: having (acquiring, controlling) and being (experiencing, sharing), and he argued that humankind must necessarily shift from the one to the other (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 54). According to Capra and Spretnak (1984, p. 54), the final chapter of Fromm's book "Features of a new society" was "a remarkable previewing of green politics"⁶⁰.

4.3.3.1 Spirituality amongst Die Grünen

This religious renaissance which is not an economic thing, ... is the living seed of the next social order ... This renaissance is as yet not a great river but it is already moving in countless brooks and rivulets. ... Otherwise it would hardly be possible to explain how even a new *political* party like the Greens has from the start – usually shamefacedly denied – a spiritual component ... (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 173-174, his italics)

Although most of Die Grünen interviewed by Capra and Spretnak in 1982 and 1983 felt there was a spiritual dimension to their green politics, "almost no one could discuss the concept"⁶¹ except in vague terms" (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 53). Exceptions were Bahro, Kelly, and Roland Vogt, who "was not afraid of the language of spirituality" (Parkin, 1994, p. 80). Some Greens felt that the spirituality element had been stronger before they became a mainstream party, for example, the Anthroposophists [inheritors of Steiner's teachings] were more influential in the formative years; there had been a marked influx of radical left supporters as the Greens' electoral successes improved from 1979, and they followed Marxist tradition in rejecting any spiritual dimension to life anyway (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 53-55). Die Grünen's general manager Lukas Beckmann felt that the Greens did represent a spiritual movement, but that there were members "who still think in the old ways", who still needed to understand that "ecological politics involves a changing of themselves" (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 55).

The spirituality took both religious and secular forms. Kelly's spirituality, which was "conspicuous" (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 174; also Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 9) had a metaphysical basis.⁶² Bahro too believed that no transformation of civilization could take place, unless there were a "conversion", "rebirth" or "psychological transformation" in individual human beings (New Left Review interviewer's understanding of Bahro's position, in Bahro, 1984e, p. 214 and p. 215). But a combination of freedom of spirit and a sense of connectedness in "Gemeinschaft" seems best to express the nature of Bahro's secular spirituality, rather than any religious understandings of God (Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p. 90; Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 56 citing from Bahro's *From Red to green* (1984, no page number given); Bahro, 1984e, p. 221).

In summary, green political theorist Dobson (2000, p. 133) notes that spirituality "is of greater importance to the green perspective than is probably publicly realized....".

⁶⁰ Fromm's influence can be traced in Bahro's work. In 1984, Bahro asked: "What is fundamentalism? Externally it puts ecology before economics, and fundamental long-term interests before immediate short-term ones. ... Simply in order to survive it has to be a policy with spiritual impetus and moral standard. A policy of conversion in the metropolises begins with the readiness to change oneself ... Those who stand for the transition from Having to Being must make it clear that this means a change in values such as can only succeed through what up till now has been described as a religious experience. 'Transformations can only come from the transformed'" (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 171). In an interesting green movement link, deep ecologist Naess (1988) also draws on Fromm's work on self-ishness, and unself-ishness to inform his idea of "the ecological self" [Chapter Four, section 4.2]; and Bahro notes briefly, but approvingly, Naess's idea of the ecological self (Bahro, 1997, in Hosang, 2000, p. 28)

⁶¹ They, and Kelly [and Bramwell too] ascribe this non-articulation of spirituality in politics to Hitler's misuse of the German (spiritual) naturist tradition in this regard (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 53-55)

⁶² Her "extremely ambitious Catholicism" (Bahro, quoted in Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 9) for a start, but Kelly notes her own "uneasy relationship with the Catholic church", which she had left (Kelly, 1984, p. 59), particularly on the issue of abortion and birth control. See for example, her "A challenge for the Catholic Church", and "Open letter to Pope John Paul II" in Kelly (1984, pp. 59-65, and pp. 66-72). She was also interested in the then newly-emerging "liberation theology" as a kind of return to the values of early radical Christianity, Martin Luther King's Christianity, Gandhi's non-violence, Tibetan Buddhism (Bramwell, 1989, p. 222, p. 272 footnote 21; Bramwell, 1994, pp. 98-111; Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 7-11; Kelly, 1984, p. 59, p. 70, p. 72, pp. 119-121), and in earth spirituality (e.g. Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 55; Kelly, 1984, p. 108)

4.3.4 From *Homo conquistador* to *Homo occidentalis simplicissimus*

Bahro's critique of western pathological individualism, and his search for an ecologically-appropriate form of Self-realization, are intimately connected with his critique of exterminism, and his utopian view of a commune-based society.

Combining his own thought with that of resource economist and peace protagonist Johan Galtung⁶³, and later with that of German philosopher Jean Gebser⁶⁴, Bahro argued that the fundamental aggression of the "European form of individualism"⁶⁵ (Bahro, 1984e, p. 167, pp. 172-173) was cosmologically inspired (Bahro, 1984e, p. 215). There is, he suggested, "... an aggressive Indo-Germanic disposition"⁶⁶ inherent in our European civilization which was already displayed by the Hittites in Asia Minor, the Greeks at Troy, and the Germanic tribes in their struggle against Rome" (1984e, p.169). Over centuries, this aggressive, expansive disposition - "exterminist in its innermost dispositions, modelling itself on individual competition and the Olympia principle of 'more, higher, better, faster'⁶⁷" (Bahro 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p. 89; Bahro, 1984e, p. 213) - manifested itself as the European culture of capitalism (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 215-216), and in Galtung's concept of "*homo occidentalis*"⁶⁸ (Bahro, 1984e, p. 169).

While the process of human development (self-realization) is about "the full development of Individuality" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 217), which included uninhibited development of sensuality and sexuality⁶⁹ too (Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p.91), it is precisely in "European individualism", and its various exterminist manifestations, that human development went wrong. Bahro's view was that no "profound transformation in European civilization" could take place until the ethos of *homo occidentalis* had been "spiritually exorcised" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 169), and replaced by that of a *homo occidentalis simplicissimus* - not a pathologically individualistic Self-realization, but a self-realization in community⁷⁰, producing for genuine material needs, and outside the world market.

To achieve emancipation from both *Homo conquistador* and industrial society, the right kind of alternative society was needed (Bahro, 1984e, p. 223). A commune-based society would provide a suitable alternative social structure, in which the individual would have "a sense of being sheltered by a community", and in which genuine human needs - physical, social, economic - are met, where technology is subordinated to genuine human needs, and in which a person's economic being and social being is more closely integrated (Bahro, 1984e, p. 222). A genuine communal spirit in genuinely

⁶³ The Galtung-Bahro cosmology-capitalism link is also mentioned by Bramwell (1989, pp. 28-29)

⁶⁴ Gebser's concept of *Homo integralis* is not discussed here; see Bahro, 1997, in Hosang, 2000, pp. 23-33

⁶⁵ While Bahro begins with a European cosmology to derive his view of the human being, he sees it as a view which encompasses all humanity (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 213-215)

⁶⁶ This is similar to the ecofeminist "breakdown" theory, in which the Goddess-worshipping cosmology of the matriarchal, peaceful, earth-loving Bronze Age tribes is dislodged by the Sky God - worshipping cosmology of the warlike Iron Age tribes (Chapter Six, section 2.2.1, and 4.1)

⁶⁷ This was the Leitmotif of green prophet Schumacher's (1974, pp. 129-130) "people of the forward stampede", who felt that the "threefold crisis" of society (see pp. 122-123) could be dealt with by "methods current", rather than a fundamental review of what it is to be human, and the human-nature relationship

⁶⁸ Galtung proposed that the European cosmological disposition, which he called "*homo occidentalis*", was primarily an expansive, aggressive, and conflict-oriented one, which at its most extreme, manifested itself as "*homo conquistador*" (Bahro, 1984, p. 169). The capitalist, aggressive, ever-expanding type of reproduction was the historical instrument by which this disposition advanced its interests. Galtung proposed instead, a culture and economy of self-reliance, based on "simple reproduction", a system which he thought particularly suitable also for Third World countries (Bahro, 1984e, p. 180)

⁶⁹ This because Bahro understood repression of sensuality as part of the patriarchal worldview: "I see the Christian and Buddhist hostility to sensuality as a tribute to patriarchy. The logos is male" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 217). Kelly too develops thoughts on sexual emancipation (1984, Chapter 7, pp. 109-118); Die Grünen proposed several measures to end discrimination against gays and lesbians, and to "equalize" homo- and heterosexuality (1980b, pp. 30-31)

⁷⁰ Die Grünen's philosopher Maren-Grisebach also reflected on the balance between individualism and community on ecological grounds: "Wenn wir für *Selbstbestimmung* und *Selbstverwirklichung* uns stark machen, dann kommen wir in Konflikt mit unserem Wunsch nach mehr *Gemeinschaft*, nach Abbau des Konkurrenzverhaltens und nach *kollektiven* Zusammenschlüssen. ...Der Zusammenhang von Ich und Gemeinschaft ist wie eine Vernetzung, nichts ist zuerst und nichts zuletzt...." (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, pp. 71-80; these citations from p. 71 and p. 75)

communal living was for Bahro [non-religious] spirituality. “Kommunismus verstehe ich als Begleitererscheinung jeglicher spiritueller fundierte Gemeinschaft”. He often referred to these grassroots communities, as invisible churches, or new monasteries [“Unsichtbaren Kirchen”, “neue Klöster”] (Herzberg & Seifert, 2000, p. 9, p. 8 respectively)]. Bahro’s vision of a commune-based society is discussed further at 6.3.1.

4.3.5 “Frauenphilosophie”

Capra and Spretnak note that feminism in Germany was originally a product of the Marxist-inspired student movement, and so until the mid-1970s, “much of it had a Marxist orientation” (1984, p. 20, footnote), critiquing hierarchy, patriarchy, and capitalism for women’s oppression. Its main ideas are discussed in Chapter Six, sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3. Besides the Marxist/socialist feminist critique, Die Grünen’s ideological approach tended to link the oppression of women with the oppression of nature, and also take an “equal but different” view of what it is to be a female.

4.3.5.1 *Equal but different; the feminine principle [post-patriarchal values]*

Maren-Grisebach, in her *Grüne Frauenphilosophie* chapter (1982, pp. 91-106), first dispels the traditional [patriarchal] notions that women are the more “feeling” sex [and thus are less rational], that they are the receptive sex [and thus have no creative role to play], and that they are “near to nature”. This was a particularly useful male construction, she notes, allowing the simultaneous patriarchal subjugation and exploitation of both, and the delimitation of the realm of culture as “male” territory (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, pp. 91-95).

But women do just relate to other human beings, and to nature, differently to men (Gilligan, 1982). The liberation that Die Grünen’s women sought, was *not* emancipation into male ways of being. “Gleichstellung *muss* aber nicht Gleichheit ... bedeuten. Vom Mittelpunkt der Natur her behalten wir die Unterschiede zwischen Mann und Frau. Wagen wir es ruhig, auch im Politischen Weibliches hereinzuschieben” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 99). Kelly agreed: “ ... In recent years, I have also observed that some women have sought to overcome their inferior role by becoming part of the masculine world (Mrs Thatcher, Indira Gandhi, etc.). When women fight for equal status with men, they run the risk of joining the ranks in times of war. We are so conditioned by masculine values that women often make the mistake of imitating and emulating men at the cost of their own feminism. When I assess the world of male values, it is clear to me that I do not want this kind of ‘equality’” (Kelly, 1984, p. 107). To achieve peace, Kelly urged men “to break out of their rigid patriarchal institutions”, and women “not to let themselves become corrupted by male power” (Kelly, 1983, in Kelly, 1984, p. 73). Bahro thought similarly. The kind of communal society he envisaged would only be possible if men were to give up the power orientation of the masculine consciousness, and “submit to the feminine part of their own nature. This seems to be a condition of salvation.” (Bahro, 1983g, in Bahro, 1986, p. 95). One of his many reasons for supporting the commune as new social unit, was that its structure would promote women’s liberation, and the emergence of “the feminine element” in the regulation of community affairs (Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p. 88).

Gender politics inside a still predominantly patriarchal framework was a hot topic for the early female Greens who pushed for “big-picture feminism⁷¹,” as part of a non-patriarchal, non-exploitative society. What the green movement women were seeking was a society in which the development of both masculine and feminine qualities was permissible (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 103), a liberation from fixed ideas of what it is to be a woman, and fixed ideas about male and female roles in society (p. 105).

⁷¹ I understand this as equivalent to the radical feminist strand of ecofeminism (Chapter Six: 2.1.4). “Most of the Green women, and many of the men, see issues of women’s rights as part of a larger context of postpatriarchal values that are essential to the goal of a nonexploitative society. This sense of ‘big picture feminism’ is ... not widely understood outside the Green party and the feminist movement” (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 52). But Die Grünen’s women had a difficult time of it in the world of politics, mostly because they were not interested in the male political style of operating (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 50-52)

Still, they opposed the call for women to join the army as a “perversion” of women’s legitimate interests in equal rights and full emancipation (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 8): “Frauen zum Bund – Nein Danke!” (Die Grünen, 1980a, p. 27).

5. The ethic

Unsere Politik ist eine Politik der aktiven Partnerschaft mit der Natur und dem Menschen [Our political standpoint is one of active partnership with both nature and human beings] (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4)

Die Grünen’s critique of the existing ethic towards nature, and their proposed “Partnership” ethic, usually deals with people and planet in the same breath. In place of instrumental reason’s domination of nature and people [“Unsere Politik ... wendet sich gegen die Ausbeutung von Mensch und Natur....” (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 2)], the appropriate relationship is active partnership with both nature and human beings (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4) in an ecological politics society. Here I focus on the people-nature dimension of the partnership ethic: (5.1) the theory of motivation to ethical behaviour, (5.2) the theory of value in nature, (5.3) the scope of the ethic, and (5.4) the moral obligation.

5.1 Theory of motivation to ethical behaviour

Maren-Grisebach⁷² (1982) notes that there are two sources for Die Grünen’s “Partnerschaft” ethic with nature: either a mystical feeling of unity with all that is⁷³, or, for those rational types for whom such “reverence” sounds uncomfortably like metaphysics, the simple message of natural science ecology: interrelationship, interdependence. But she argues, recognition of *relationship* rather than difference between people and nature [plants and animals], on either “mystical” [“gefühltes Ineinanderleben mit den Tieren” (p. 43)] or scientific-ecological grounds, should bring with it, a recognition of the *responsibilities* people have towards nature, a stepping-back from instrumental attitudes of dominion and exploitation (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, pp. 43-44).

The motivation is then to bridge the subject-object/people-planet divide created by instrumental reason, and to live in partnership with nature:

“... ecological politics ... [is for us] ... more than environmental protection ... Its particular aim is to bring people back again into partnership with nature⁷⁴ ...” (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 8).

Partnership with nature means not isolated practices of environmental protection in specific places, but a cyclical dynamic economy in harmony with nature’s capabilities, conservation of nature “out there”, and protection of the nature surrounding us right here [our environment]: in our towns and settlements (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 8).

5.2 Theory of value

In this section I consider (5.2.1) whether “biocentrism” or “ecocentrism” really do capture the essence of the green movement/ Die Grünen’s “theory” of value, (5.2.2) Goodin’s (1992) proposed theory of

⁷² Philosophically, Maren-Grisebach (1982, pp. 39-46) discusses the western historical-social construction of the divide between humanity and nature, and particularly, between humanity and animals: humanity is created in God’s image, has rationality, creates cultures, is capable of symbolic communication through speech, has an eternal soul, all of which animals and plants do not have, so the social construction goes, which therefore legitimates humanity’s domination and exploitation of the animal and plant worlds. She discusses some of the alternative and opposite views available in western thought to this constructed divide: Aristoteles, Porphyrios, Francis of Assisi, Schopenhauer, Darwin, whose scientific theory of evolution seriously undermined the “otherness” of nature, and more recently, Albert Schweitzer. This is more or less the same alternative western philosophical tradition which inspires the bio-ethic of ecocentric environmentalism (O’Riordan, 1981) and the deep ecology movement’s ecological egalitarianism (Sessions, 1995)

⁷³ Perhaps as a result of Horkheimer and Adorno’s “ambitious and contradictory” attempts during the 1940s to re-orient instrumental reason through the injection of “transcendentalist nature reverence” (Wall, 1994, p. 21)

⁷⁴ “...ökologische Politik ... [ist für uns] mehr als Umweltschutz. ...[Es] will besonders zum Ziel, den Menschen wieder in Partnerschaft mit der Natur zu bringen...” (1980c, p. 8)

green value, and (5.2.3) my own thoughts on “vitalism” as a possible description of Die Grünen’s theory of value.

5.2.1 Biocentrism and/or ecocentrism?

The theory of value sometimes suggested for the green movement is “biocentrism” (Porritt’s “Distinguishing features of a green paradigm” (1984, pp. 216-217, in Chapter Four, as Figure 5). But as biocentrism does not acknowledge the intrinsic value of ecosystems, which Die Grünen do⁷⁵, their “theory” appears to be something different. But it isn’t quite ecocentrism either, which, in formal environmental ethical form, values ecosystems and species as wholes, above their individual components⁷⁶. Die Grünen value both wholes and individuals in nature.

5.2.2 “Naturalness”

Robert Goodin (1994, pp. 19-83) has proposed a green theory of value which is neither biocentrism or ecocentrism. He says charmingly that the theory “is *largely* my own invention”, and even if it is not the theory of value which underlies the green political programme, “it would be politically prudent for greens to adopt [it] forthwith”! (1994, p. 54, his italics). He believes that it is capable of subsuming many standard green culture and nature values (p. 55), such as liberation, authenticity, sustainability, and futurity.

Goodin holds that “naturalness” is the green source of value, on the grounds that

- a. it subsumes history and process as sources of value (1992, p. 27, footnote 17 on p. 27),
- b. “value-imparting properties are natural, rather than being somehow artefacts of human activities” (1994, p. 25), and that
- c. “those value-imparting qualities somehow inhere in the objects themselves, rather than in any mental states (actual or hypothetical, now or later) of those who partake of those objects” (1994, p. 25)
- d. “People want to see some sense and pattern to their lives” (1994, p. 37)
- e. “That requires, in turn, that their lives be set in some larger context” (1994, p. 37) and
- f. “The products of natural processes, untouched as they are by human hands, provides precisely that desired context” (1994, p. 37).

While Goodin’s is a perfectly plausible *generic* green theory of value in nature, it fails, I think, to capture the sense of threat, crisis and urgency in Die Grünen’s political statements.

5.2.3 Vitalism, and preservation of the “Lebensbasis” as theory of value

I suggest from a study of the source documents, that, understood in opposition to “exterminism” [section 2.1], the concept “vitalism” [section 4.1] - the ensured continuance of the “Lebensbasis” or “Lebensgrundlage” - best captures Die Grünen’s “theory” of value.

5.2.3.1 Traces of “vitalism”

Die Grünen’s “theory” emphasises the value of life, - *all* life - and the need to protect that which supports life, for example, Maren-Grisebach’s comment that “Unser Thema der ‘Lebensgrundlagen’ is so bitter ernst...” (1982, p. 9). The industrial-technical society spends vast sums of money on the death and destruction of war, rather than protecting “Umwelt und Natur and das Leben” (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 9). Bahro refers to the “suicidal character of our civilization which amounts to the mass

⁷⁵ “... Auch das menschliche Leben ist in die Regelkreise der Ökosysteme eingebunden...” (1980b, p. 4)

⁷⁶ Attfield (2003, p. 189 and 192 respectively) defines biocentrism as “A normative stance that holds that all living creatures have a good of their own, and have moral standing accordingly, and that their flourishing or attaining their good is intrinsically valuable” and ecocentrism as “The normative stance that holds that ecosystems have a good independent of that of their component individuals, and as such have their own moral standing, and that their attaining or sustaining their good has intrinsic value”

extermination of humans, animals, plants and life itself” (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 162). He refers to the need for the creation of a new “biophile culture” (Bahro, 1984c, in Bahro, 1986, p. 176).

Political statements reflect the “value of all life” theme too: The 1979 Europe programme (1979, p. 3, par. 5) emphasizes that the fight for nature, the fight for all life, is as important as the fight for basic rights: “We have a passion for democracy and fundamental rights, and their non-violent realization. Our commitment to that is as important as for the preservation of all life!⁷⁷”. The 1980 political programme repeats this theme⁷⁸ (1980b, preamble, par. 2).

Die Grünen considered their most important task to be “the conservation of the ecological life foundation [“Lebensbasis”] for people, and for the animal and plant life. Nature is particularly threatened in this respect⁷⁹” (1979, p. 2).

5.2.3.2 Sustaining the ecological life foundation [“Lebensbasis”]

Sustaining the ecological life foundation “Lebensbasis” means above all, sustaining nature’s balance, nature’s stability:

The elimination of natural environments and the eradication of animal and plant species destroys *the balance of nature* and so our life basis⁸⁰ (Die Grünen, 1985?, p. 22, my italics).

The ecological balance is being sacrificed to the economy’s growth imperative and to the improvement of its competitive and profit opportunities...⁸¹ (Own translation from Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 6, my italics).

We define ecological politics as those measures that understand human beings and our environment as being part of nature. Human life, too, is embedded in the life cycles of the ecosystems; we interfere with our actions and this, in turn, acts back on us. *We must not destroy the stability of the ecosystems....*⁸² (Capra & Spretnak, 1985, p. 33, translating from Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4, my italics).

Sometimes the life of plants and animals is accorded its own value, along with that of human beings:

...Spatial planning is ... essential ... for the conservation of large reserves for nature. These serve not only people, but also the conservation of plant and animal species, which are otherwise doomed to certain death, closely followed by that of humanity⁸³ (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 9, par. 4).

... wetlands [must] be preserved and new ones created, because not only are they important habitats for animals and plants (Biotope), but also valuable water storage areas in times of drought⁸⁴ (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 8).

In an ecological society, the economy, lifestyle, and consumer patterns are informed by consideration for the environment ... by respect for the life of plants and animals. The present lifestyle of the industrial

⁷⁷ “Aus unserer Leidenschaft für Demokratie und Grundrechte und um ihrer gewaltlosen Verwirklichung willen ist unser Einsatz dafür ebenso wichtig wie der für die Erhaltung allen Lebens!” (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 3)

⁷⁸ “Die Zerstörung der Lebens- und Arbeitsgrundlagen und der Abbau demokratischer Rechte haben ein so bedrohliches Ausmass erreicht, dass es einer grundlegenden Alternative für Wirtschaft, Politik und Gesellschaft bedarf” (Die Grünen, 1980b, preamble, par. 2)

⁷⁹ “...die Bewahrung der ökologischen Lebensbasis für den Menschen und für die Tier- und Pflanzenwelt. Die Natur ist hier besonders gefährdet.” (1979, p. 2)

⁸⁰ “Die Einengung der natürlichen Lebensräume und die Ausrottung von Tier und Pflanzenarten zerstören das *Gleichgewicht* in der Natur und damit unsere Lebensgrundlage...” (1980b, p. 20, my italics)

⁸¹ “Das ökologische Gleichgewicht wird dem Wachstumsstreben der Wirtschaft und der Verbesserung ihrer Wettbewerbs- und Gewinnchancen geopfert” (1980b, p. 6).

⁸² “Ausgehend von den Naturgesetzen und insbesondere von der Erkenntnis, daß in einem begrenzten System kein unbegrenztes Wachstum möglich ist, heißt ökologische Politik, uns selbst und unsere Umwelt als Teil der Natur zu begreifen. Auch das menschliche Leben ist in die Regelkreise der Ökosysteme eingebunden: wir greifen durch unsere Handlungen ein und dies wirkt auf uns zurück. Wir dürfen die Stabilität der Ökosysteme nicht zerstören” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p.4)

⁸³ “...Raumplanung ist ...vonnöten ... zur Erhaltung grossräumiger Reservate der Natur. Diese dienen nicht nur dem Menschen, sondern auch der Erhaltung pflanzlicher und tierischer Arten, die sonst dem sicheren Untergang geeweiht wären, dem der Mensch bald folgen würde” (1979, p. 9, par. 4).

⁸⁴ “... Feuchtgebiete [müssen] erhalten und neu angelegt werden, weil sie nicht nur wichtige Lebensräume von Tieren und Pflanzen (Biotope) sind, sondern auch wertvolle Wasserrückhaltegebiete für Trockenzeiten darstellen” (1980c, p. 8)

countries threatens humanity's natural conditions of existence ...⁸⁵ (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 6).

But more often than not, the continued life of plants and animals is seen instrumentally:

The restoration of the ecological basis of life for humans, animals and plants is of primary importance since this single basis determines the well-being of a people⁸⁶ (Die Grünen, 1985?, p. 20).

The elimination of natural environments and the eradication of animal and plant species destroys the balance of nature and with it the foundation of human life. A biologically intact environment must be preserved or re-established if we are to secure for future generations a continuation of a life worthy of humankind⁸⁷ (Die Grünen, 1985?, p. 22).

These are altogether more anthropocentric statements than the theory of value found for example in deep ecology [Chapter Four, section 5.2], and provide a further argument that neither “biocentrism” nor “ecocentrism” quite captures Die Grünen’s theory of value. In agreement with Wissenburg’s scale for the “real world” level [Figure 2 in Chapter 1], they appear to “place” somewhere in the middle range between the biocentrism and anthropocentrism of his ethics level.

5.3 The scope of the ethic

5.3.1 Biosphere, ecosystem and species protection

So, based on both inherent and instrumental values, the scope of the ethic includes all life: animal, human, and plant; “das Lebewesen” (Die Grünen, 1979, page 1, par. 3, 1980b, p. 22). It expresses itself in protection for ecosystems and their species (1980b, p. 20), and in the protection of individual animals.

5.3.2 *And* animal welfare

Die Grünen also argued from “Ökologie”, as they sought to bring animal concerns into the political arena. Their premise is generally that industrialism has increased animal cruelty, and “The Greens, within their fundamental ecological framework are consistently committed to the protection of animals...”⁸⁸ (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 44, citing from the 1982 Bayern electoral programme, my translation).

But there were differences within Die Grünen on animal welfare. Particularly the left-Greens, given their Marxist heritage of human emancipation as ultimate value, had problems with animal welfare: “You would rather pat your neighbour’s dog than intervene to prevent her child from being beaten?” was a typical left criticism (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 45, my translation). Others had problems with the concept of animal rights, given that no corresponding responsibilities could be expected from animals. Still others supported the welfare of animals, but only in an *instrumental* way – animal welfare which served human interests was understandable and acceptable; animal welfare as an independent value was going too far, best left to formal ethical theory, or religious/personal conviction (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 45). The counter-response, suggests Maren-Grisebach (1982, p. 45) is that

⁸⁵ “In einer ökologischen Gesellschaft sind die Wirtschaftsweise, der Lebensstil und die Konsumgewohnheiten geprägt von Rücksicht auf Umwelt ... von Ehrfurcht vor dem Leben der Pflanzen und Tiere. Die gegenwärtige Lebensweise in den Industriegesellschaften gefährdet die natürlichen Existenzbedingungen der Menschen...” (1983b, p. 6)

⁸⁶ “Wiederherstellung der ökologischen Lebensgrundlagen für Mensch, Tier und Pflanze ist unerlässlich, weil nur diese letztlich das Wohlergehen eines Volkes bestimmen.” (1980b, p. 18)

⁸⁷ “Die Einengung der natürlichen Lebensräume und die Ausrottung von Tier und Pflanzenarten zerstören das Gleichgewicht in der Natur und damit unsere Lebensgrundlage: Eine biologisch intakte Umwelt muß erhalten oder wiederhergestellt werden, wenn ein menschenwürdiges Überleben unserer zukünftigen Generationen gesichert werden soll” (1980b, p. 20)

⁸⁸ “Die Grünen setzen sich im Rahmen ihrer ökologischen Grundhaltung konsequent für den Schutz der Tiere ein...”

love for animals does not exclude love for humans, in fact, where the one is missing, the other is doubtful⁸⁹ (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 45).

5.3.2.1 *Animal experimentation, factory farming*

The animal protection law is about to be amended in parliament, and our concern is with two key points which expose the nerve of our scientific-industrial barbarism: factory farming and animal experiments (Bahro, 1985a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 196)

These two issues were to become an area of tension in Die Grünen's thought between 1979 and 1985. In 1979 their position on animal experimentation was categorically that "Cruel animal experiments may not be conducted, even less so where their necessity cannot be shown" (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 10). But by 1985, when Die Grünen were in parliament, and had the opportunity of speaking in favour of this position, Bahro, at the Hagen Congress, accused the parliamentary group of backtracking in favour of "political feasibility" (Bahro, 1985a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 196). Instead of arguing for an "unqualified 'no'" and using the opportunity "to put forward their plan for a fundamentally different policy on health, research, agriculture and industry" (Bahro, 1985a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 196), the parliamentary group opted for restriction of animal experimentation in principle, with many "individual justified exceptions" allowed (p. 197).

Whether one opposed animal experimentation or not, was for Bahro, the "litmus" test for being green (Bahro, 1985a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 208). While this might appear to be strong support for Wall's (1994, p. 66) statement that fundamental green – "dark" green – implies commitment to deep ecology and animal rights, one must perhaps rather see Bahro's defence of animal rights here within his critique of the exterminist industrial system (Bahro, 1985b, in Bahro, 1986, p. 211). "As far as I can see", he wrote, "animal experiments are one of the most political questions we ever had to deal with. To become a radical in this area [i.e. to oppose it] means to slaughter one of the holiest cows in modern Western idolatry, the 'freedom of science'" (p. 202). He opposed animal experiments *inter alia*, because "... [they] have an extremely important role in underpinning, facilitating and justifying the machinery of progress with which we are working on our own annihilation" (p. 202; see pp. 200-209 for his full argument). The animal experimentation incident was the last straw for Bahro, who noted in his resignation statement that "There is not a single issue where the Greens are taking seriously the purpose for which they ostensibly entered the political scene" (p. 210). He resigned from Die Grünen on the following day (Bahro, 1985b, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 210-211).

Green arguments against factory farming too, were based not solely on objections to animal torture, but on the preservation of jobs in organically-based animal production, and the protection of countryside life (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 23).

5.3.3 **And future generations**

Die Grünen claimed that their "total concept" was a long-term one, as opposed to the short-term politics of industrial society. Their proposed ethic of partnership thus included future generations:

... the world's natural resources must be very sparingly used as the common, non-renewable inheritance of the human race; such a policy will ensure that the needs of people everywhere and of coming generations can be met⁹⁰ (Die Grünen, 1985?, p. 18).

Our politics is ecological, because they accord priority to the conservation of the natural conditions of

⁸⁹ She also presents (pp. 46-47) a short discussion of animal welfare in the philosophical context of is-ought, and instrumental-independent value, hoping for a time when our moral behaviour towards nature is not only grounded in instrumentalism

⁹⁰ "Die Bodenschätze der Erde müssen als gemeinsames - nicht erneuerbares - Erbe der Menschheit höchst sparsam verwendet werden, damit die Bedürfnisse der Völker und kommender Generationen auch noch einen Anteil erhalten können" (1980b, p. 20)

existence for us, and for future generations⁹¹ (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 2).

I nowhere encountered any indication of how many generations are meant, such as one finds in the Deep Ecology long-range seven-generation view (Chapter Four, section 5.1.2).

5.4 The moral obligation: protecting the “Lebensbasis”

Die Grünen proposed a series of measures to reflect their “partnership” ethic with nature, from which I have extracted some principles, the first and foremost of which is (5.4.1) the precautionary principle, (5.4.2) a cyclical, dynamic economy, (5.4.3) protection of biodiversity, (5.4.4) protection of animal welfare, (5.4.5) protection of land, air and water, (5.4.6) awareness-raising on ecological principles, and (5.4.7) participation in global environmental protection measures. Some of the Greens’ specific proposals are mentioned in these paragraphs. More detail can be obtained from their 1980 Federal programme (Die Grünen, 1980b).

5.4.1 Observe the precautionary principle

The overriding principle to observe in protecting the Lebensbasis, is what we would call today, the “precautionary principle” to ensure that the delicate interrelationship of nature’s dynamic balance is not disturbed:

A prerequisite of an ecologically oriented political view is the recognition of the interdependence between the balance of nature and life cycles, and an awareness of the consequences of human interference in nature⁹² ” (Die Grünen, 1985?, p. 22) ... Our greatest imperative must be the least possible alteration of natural processes. Our actions must be directed towards reversing the current disturbance of the ecosystem (Die Grünen, 1985?, p. 22)

...when a thing is meshed together in a complicated way, and is at the same time also in unending motion [change], it is highly *risky* to intervene. Without its being immediately obvious, some valuable dynamic connections could have been severed. So, never plan interventions, or specify projects from behind your desk, but first consult with those knowledgeable about interconnections and dynamic balances⁹³ (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 49, my translation and italics).

...In particular, ecological politics presents an all-encompassing rejection of an economy of exploitation and plundering of natural resources and raw materials, as well as *the destructive intervention* into the cycles of nature's household. (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 33, my italics).

5.4.2 Re-orient the growth economy to a cyclical, dynamic economy

Amongst Die Grünen’s demands to achieve a partnership relation with nature, was a cyclical dynamic economy, in which the “development and application of ways of production which ensure the greatest possible re-use, which use less energy and raw materials, and which are in harmony with the requirements of nature and the environment”⁹⁴ (1980c, p. 8). The “cyclical dynamic economy” is discussed under the value of “Ecology” at section 6.1.2.

⁹¹ “Unsere Politik ist ökologisch, weil sie der Erhaltung der natürlichen Lebensgrundlagen für uns und die zukünftige Generationen den Vorrang einräumt...” (1980c, p. 2)

⁹² “Die Kenntnis der Abhängigkeiten des eingespielten Gleichgewichts und der Kreisläufe der Natur sowie alle Folgen der menschlichen Eingriffe ist die Voraussetzung einer ökologisch orientierten Politik. ... Oberstes Gebot muss eine möglichst geringe Veränderung der natürlichen Abläufe sein. Unser Handeln muss darauf gerichtet sein, die heutige Störung der Ökosysteme rückgängig zu machen ... (1980b, p. 20)

⁹³ “...wenn etwas kompliziert verzahnt und dann noch in unaufhörlicher Bewegung ist, wird es höchst *riskant* einzugreifen. Ohne dass es gleich sichtbar wird, können schon wertvolle Fliessketten zertrennt werden. Also nie vom Verwaltungstisch aus Eingriffe planen und Projekte festlegen, sondern erstens den Kenner von *Zusammenhängen und Fließgleichgewichten* befragen ... (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 49, my italics)

⁹⁴ “die Entwicklung und Anwendung von Produktionsweise, die eine weitestgehende Wiederverwendung sicherstellen, weniger Rohstoffe und Energie verbrauchen und mit den Erfordernissen der Natur und Umwelt im Einklang stehen” (1980c, p. 8)

5.4.3 Protect biodiversity and its habitat

Uncontrolled human behaviour is exterminating an increasing number of species ever quicker, which is upsetting the ecological dynamic balance more and more (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 22, par. 6 “Tier- und Pflanzenwelt (Artenschutz”). Spatial planning must not only be oriented to securing space for industrial society growth, but to the preservation of habitat for animal and plant species to ensure their survival (1979, p. 9; 1980b, p. 20). The protection of indigenous animals and plants in their natural habitat must enjoy priority over economic development plans (1980b, p. 22, par. 6 “Tier- und Pflanzenwelt (Artenschutz”). A species register was to be implemented which would provide an overview of a species’ status. Other measures included the protection or re-instatement of original landscapes [“Urlandschaften”] and animal habitats, the re-introduction of endemic flora and fauna species decimated by hunting, protection for threatened species against hunting and trade (1979, p. 10; 1980b, p. 23), the substitution of chemical by biological control methods in agriculture (1980b, p. 23).

Die Grünen proposed the transfer of the responsibility for plant and animal protection away from the Ministry of Agriculture to a to-be-created Ministry of the Environment⁹⁵, for environmental protection. But there was, Capra and Spretnak (1984, p. 35) note, divergent opinion on the creation of such a Ministry: “Some Greens maintain that such a top-level agency is necessary to develop effective positive programs as well as halting the damage. Other Greens are horrified at the thought of swelling the federal bureaucracy in the name of Green solutions”.

5.4.3.1 Oppose biotechnology

Die Grünen were opposed to genetic manipulation of both animals and humans⁹⁶ (1980b, p. 23).

5.4.4 Protect animal welfare

Die Grünen’s use of the word “rights” in connection with animal welfare suggests a direct derivation from the animal rights/rights for nonhuman nature philosophy introduced in Chapter Three. To achieve the level of animal protection they sought, they proposed new or revised legislation, instructional information [“Aufklärung”], and awareness-raising (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, pp. 44-45).

They opposed “gruesome” seal hunting, “avian murder” [a reference to the bird trade in Italy], and industrial whaling (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 23). One principle informs the three main injunctions listed next, that is, “Animals may no longer be considered as objects, but must be accorded a special legal status” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 23):

- Animal torture is strictly punishable
- Agricultural animals must be kept in conditions according to their species-nature
- Reduce, strictly control, and eventually phase out, animal experimentation.

The 1980 Bundesprogramm (1980b, p. 23), Die Grünen’s first national political programme, contains several animal welfare provisions.

5.4.5 Protect land, water and air

Land, water and air can no longer be treated as a throw-away commodity (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 20) or convenient dumping ground (1980c, p. 8). Priceless drinking water, for example, was not something to be squandered on flushing toilets and washing cars (1980b, p. 21): “**We are concerned, and refuse to accept that it should be so**⁹⁷” (1980b, p. 20, their bold emphasis). For *land*, Die Grünen’s guiding value in their proposed measures was protection of its regenerative capacity for present and future

⁹⁵ “Wir werden dafür sorgen, daß die Zuständigkeit für den Tier- und Pflanzenschutz vom Landwirtschaftsminister auf ein Umweltministerium übertragen wird.” (1980b, p.23)

⁹⁶ They place this opposition in the context of animal protection (1980b, p. 23)

⁹⁷ “**Wir sind beunruhigt und werden es nicht hinnehmen**” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 20, their emphasis)

generations; it was not to be “valued, marketed, or destroyed on primarily commercial grounds”⁹⁸ (1980b, p. 20). They proposed a series of radical measures, including limiting harmful emissions to land, water, and air, and the strict application of the polluter pays principle (“Verursacherprinzip”) (Die Grünen, 1979, pp. 9-10; 1980b, p. 20, pp. 21-22; 1980c, pp. 8-9). Many of their measures (for example, 1980b, pp. 20-23) have yet to be achieved today.

5.4.6 Provide insight into ecological principles

A knowledge of nature’s interdependencies of highly attuned cycles and balances, as well as of the consequences of human intervention, is the premise of ecologically-oriented politics. Our primary aim is to make people aware of [give people insight into] these interconnections⁹⁹ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 20, my translation).

This instructional, insight-promoting information [“Aufklärung”] should be provided both in schools, and in ongoing adult education, in a *philosophical-ecological context*: what Maren-Grisebach (1982, p. 52) calls “the science of networks” [“Vernetzungswissenschaft”]. This differs from the environmental education model envisaged by behaviourist-inclined environmental psychologists, or the model enthusiastically taken up in sustainable development literature: better environmental information → better environmental attitudes → better environmental behaviour. It should involve rather, a deep change of consciousness.

5.4.7 Extend the United Nations role in environmental protection

At international level, Die Grünen argued for strengthening the role of the United Nations in “the protection of the planet’s ecological balance”¹⁰⁰ (1980b, p. 16). This would include the negotiation of international environmental protection treaties, the protection and restoration of the world’s forests as protection for global soil fertility and water and carbon cycles, and as protection against climate change, the protection of oceans against over-fishing, deep sea mining, and pollution (1980b, pp. 16-17).

6. A View of culture/society

Two, sometimes similar, sometimes different, but always intertwined views of the radical ecologically re-oriented society for which Die Grünen were striving, can be discerned in their early political statements. One can be called the fundamentalist “Total Alternative”, get-out-of/transcend-the-industrial-system vision (Bahro, 1983b, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 45-48). While Bahro’s writings on this topic are extensive, I think they can be reduced to three main ideas (1) the total rejection of capitalist expansionist production and culture, and (2) the commune as the basic social unit of the new society, adopting a self-reliant contractive economic system which would not form part of the world market [section 6.3.1], tied together by (3) a concept of “Selbstverwirklichung” not based on materialist values [section 4.3.3]. The second view could be called the “repair the system” view, which though “reformist” in Bahro’s view, is still radical by today’s standards.

Though Die Grünen themselves did not, I choose to present their views on *selected* social and economic issues in terms of their four fundamental values: (6.1) Ecology, (6.2) Living in solidarity, (6.3) Direct democracy, and (6.4) Non-violence. As suggested in section 2.3, these values represent a programmatic response to exterminism’s “logic of self-destruction”. As with the human-nature

⁹⁸ “überwiegend nach kommerziellen Gesichtspunkten abgeschätzt, vermarktet und vernichtet...” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 20)

⁹⁹ “Die Kenntnis der Abhängigkeiten des eingespielten Gleichgewichts und der Kreisläufe der Natur sowie alle Folgen der menschlichen Eingriffe ist die Voraussetzung einer ökologisch orientierten Politik”. Unser vorrangiges Ziel ist daher die Aufklärung der Bevölkerung über die Zusammenhänge (1980b, p. 20)

¹⁰⁰ “Die zusätzlich gewaltige Aufgabe der Vereinten Nationen ist die Bewahrung des ökologischen Gleichgewichts auf diesem Planeten.” (1980b, p. 16)

relationship, “Partnerschaft” is the salvational human-human ethic. It is to be achieved through a series of supportive values: self-decision-making, self-reliance, the establishment of human scale businesses and administrative units, the breakdown of dominating relationships, the elimination of the achievement and competitive orientation, the cultivation of solidarity, the exercise of direct democracy.

6.1 “Ökologisch”

Our politics is “ecological”, because it gives priority to the preservation of the natural conditions for existence, for us and for future generations, and because it orients itself towards peoples’ needs as well as their creative capacities. It is opposed to the exploitation of humanity and of nature within the capitalist competitive economy and in the existing centralist planned economies (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 2).

Under this value, I discuss Die Grünen’s views on (6.1.1) ecology as normative, (6.1.2) the economy, (6.1.3) energy issues, (6.1.4) agriculture, and (6.1.5) transport. Other ecological issues, such as habitat and species preservation, animal welfare, and protection of land, air and water, have already been discussed at section 5.4. Still other issues such as monetary and taxation policies¹⁰¹, though part of the ecological re-orientation of society, have been omitted altogether.

6.1.1. Ecology as normative for society

Capra and Spretnak explain the meaning of the ecology pillar in terms of deep ecology¹⁰²:

The first of the ‘four pillars’, ecology, has several meanings in Green politics. All of them can be understood within the context of ‘deep ecology’, a concept that has also informed American ecophilosophy and activism in recent years. Far more than protecting or repairing the status quo, which is generally the goal of environmentalism, deep ecology encompasses the study of nature’s subtle web of interrelated processes and the application of that study to our interactions with nature and among ourselves. The teachings of deep ecology include implications for our politics, our economy, our social structures, our educational system, our healthcare, our cultural expressions, and our spirituality” (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 30).

Die Grünen themselves, however, do not make this connection. In one explanation of their four fundamental values, (1980b, pp. 4-5), ecology is the primary value which –

- (1) is normative for the place of human beings in the order of things. We must understand ourselves, our society, and our economy, as part of nature
- (2) indicates that the proper ethical relationship to nature, to each other, and to future generations, is “aktive Partnerschaft”, best achieved through human-scale, decentralized, self-managing units in both economic and political spheres
- (3) rejects the power, competitive, and achievement-oriented relations of industrial society as “lebensfeindlich”.

Ecology, not economy, is now the value within which *all* issues in society are to be evaluated:

...Europe cannot remain trapped in the industrial society, which assesses all issues in economic terms. Europe’s future will be determined in future by ecology, not economy¹⁰³ (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2, par.4).

¹⁰¹ These however favoured taxation of energy and raw material use, of products which were harmful to the environment and health, and tax concessions for small and medium businesses producing eco-friendly goods, and employing eco-friendly and base-democratic production processes (1980c, p. 4)

¹⁰² So does deep ecologist Naess indirectly. “Whereas the shallow movement suggests increases in environmental budgets, forcing polluters to pay for the pollution caused, and many other changes in social policies, these proposed changes are not “deep”. Green political party programs usually imply changes on the same deep level as those implied by the Deep Ecology movement.” (Naess, 1995a, in Sessions, 1995, p. 211)

¹⁰³ “... Europa [kann] nicht bei der Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft stehen bleiben, die alle Fragen unter ökonomischen Gesichtspunkten behandelt. Die Zukunft Europas wird nicht mehr von der Ökonomie, sondern von der Ökologie bestimmt werden” (1979, p. 2, par.4)

6.1.2 The economy

Die Grünen's economy is not a "capitalist", or a "growth" or "global" economy, it is named and described in ecological concepts: it is a "dynamically balanced economy" or an "ecologically-appropriate, dynamic circular economy"¹⁰⁴, a dynamically stable economy: "dynamische Gleichgewichtswirtschaft" (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 3, p. 4). The ethic of "Partnerschaft" is achieved by recognizing that the economy should not, by disturbing the ecological equilibrium, threaten the "Lebensbasis" for current and future generations. The one-dimensional, profit-oriented growth economy must become an ecological cyclical economy [6.1.2.1], it must deliver quality of life not quantitative growth [6.1.2.2], prioritize "investments in the future" [6.1.2.3], deliver social justice [6.1.2.4], be democratically controlled [6.1.2.5], and include ecological book-keeping [6.1.2.6] (1983a, pp. 6-8). Typically, Die Grünen's view of the economy's role in society is informed by their view of Self-realization [section 4.3]: work provides people with the opportunities to develop and express their capacities: "... die Chance, ihre Fähigkeiten breit zu entfalten" (Die Grünen, 1983a, p. 4).

6.1.2.1 Re-orient the one-way growth economy to an ecological cyclical economy

In the steady-state versus expanding economy debate, Die Grünen adopted the "limits" side:

The world's material resources, such as oil, coal or iron ore, are fast being depleted. Our civilization, with its established technology and structure of needs, cannot be maintained. I don't understand how one can refuse to face this. (Bahro, 1984e, p. 115).

Because development in the context of limits is inevitable...¹⁰⁵ (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2, par.2).

The limits to "endless growth in industrial production"¹⁰⁶ (Die Grünen, 1980b, Preamble, p. 4 par. 1) were not only ecological (land, water, air), but included human-social limits: the limits posed by the industrial society's growing dependence on the natural resources of other countries (the centre-periphery argument discussed at 2.1.3.2), and the limits posed by senseless and damaging materialism and consumerism (1979, p. 2, par. 6): "We Greens want to put a stop to this life-threatening growth..."¹⁰⁷ (1981, p. 2, par. 2, my translation).

In its place there should be an ecological cyclical economy based on a partnership ethic, both with people and nature:

An ecological economy rejects industrial growth as its guiding value... Ecological production understands the relationship between humanity and nature not as an exploitative one-way street, but as a partnership which recognizes mutual interdependence. An ecological economy recognizes social wealth therein, that nature is re-claimed, and preserved as a vital element for humanity¹⁰⁸ (Die Grünen, 1983a, p. 6, my translation).

6.1.2.2 The economy's Gross National Product must be quality of life, not consumption

Social wealth does not comprise, and is not measurable in, the quantities of goods and services consumed [GNP]. Industrial society's "consumer" and "throw-away" mentality (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 4) is seen as a sop ["Ersatzbefriedigung"] for meaningless work (1983a, p. 6), and an inauthentic division between "work time" and "free time". Reduction of production to what a society *really* needs, would mean a radical reduction in work day hours, and offer self-chosen work and leisure opportunities: "freie Tätigkeit, die sich als Selbstzweck gilt" (1983a, p. 6). The Greens rejected the so-

¹⁰⁴ "dynamische Gleichgewichtswirtschaft" (1979, p. 3), an "ökologische angepasste, dynamische Kreislaufwirtschaft" (1979, p. 4)

¹⁰⁵ "Da die Entwicklung in die Knappheit unausweichlich ist..." (1979, p. 2, par.2)

¹⁰⁶ "unendliche industrielle Produktionssteigerung" (1980b, Preamble, p. 4 par. 1)

¹⁰⁷ "Wir Grünen wollen diesem lebensfeindlichen Wachstum ein Ende setzen..." (1981, p. 2, par. 2)

¹⁰⁸ "Eine ökologische Wirtschaft wendet sich ab von industriellem Wachstum als wirtschaftlichem Leitwert.... Ökologische Produktion sieht der Beziehung zwischen Mensch und Natur nicht länger als eine die Natur ausbeutende Einbahnstrasse, sondern als Partnerschaft ... Eine ökologische Wirtschaftsweise erkennt gesellschaftlichen Reichtum darin, die Natur als Lebenselement der Menschen zu erhalten und widerzugewinnen" (1983a, p. 6)

called “social market economy” [“soziale Marktwirtschaft”], in which every possible expression of being human, from work, to sport, to recreation and culture is commercialized (1983a, p. 6). Manipulative privately-controlled industrial advertising designed to increase consumerism is to be replaced by independent information which protects the consumer. Die Grünen advocated no advertisements over radio and television, and certain consumerist products such as cigarettes, alcohol, and sweets were to be barred from any advertisement at all (1980b, p. 7). “A free and socially-responsible society would render such ersatz consumption unnecessary; in its place would be quality of human life, which would unfold itself in free time and self-chosen activities. We Greens welcome all efforts which would enable such a new lifestyle to be practised”¹⁰⁹ (Die Grünen, 1983a, p. 6, my translation).

6.1.2.3 Prioritize “investments in the future”

In the less radical understanding of the new economy, an ecological cyclical economy would prioritize “investments in the future” (Die Grünen, 1983a, pp. 14-20), that is, the dismantling of life-threatening industries such as the nuclear and weapons industries, and re-orientation of their production to ecology-protecting activities, for example; a change to technology limited to the use of materials which would not upset the long-term sustainability of ecological balance; reduction in extraction rate, and thrifty use of energy and raw materials; the re-use of materials; the re-cycling back into nature of waste products; the production of durable, repairable goods. Instead of the economy’s primary orientation to imports, exports, and the world market, there should be local/regional production as close as possible to those who would be consuming it. Such production would not exclude meaningful, although reduced international trade¹¹⁰ (1983b, p. 7).

The more radical interpretation of investments in the future was the call for funding of self-administered alternative projects *outside* the industrial system, outside the world market. To this end, “The Greens set themselves the goal of diverting one thousand million marks into the alternative sector, to make possible there a kind of primary accumulation for the new social formation. ... We consider it our main task to provide political cover for this long-term transitional process and to help secure the material foundation for it” (Bahro, 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 20-21). Traces of Bahro’s cultural “withdrawal from the industrial system” (Bahro, 1982b, in Bahro, 1986, p. 27) appear in Die Grünen’s political statements, as, for example:

The building up of *holistic community projects, which encompass all aspects of life*. The overcoming of the alienating division between theory and praxis, between mental and manual work, between where one resides and where one works, between work time and leisure time, can only be achieved in communities, in which holistic life connections can be established ... These communities should be diverse, and large enough to achieve self-provisioning ... to achieve the maximum possible independence from the existing, alienating economic and social systems. We associate with that a vision of larger communities, which do not orient themselves towards the structures of existing systems ... a whole new kind of grassroots social organization ... They [these communities] should form the germ cells of a new socially and ecologically-responsible society...¹¹¹ (Die Grünen, 1983a, pp. 23-24, their italics, my translation).

¹⁰⁹ “Eine frei und soziale Gesellschaft wird solchen Ersatzkonsum überflüssig machen; an die Stelle standardisierten Konsums wird eine Qualität des menschlichen Lebens treten, die sich in freier Zeit und selbstbestimmter Tätigkeit entfaltet. Wir Grünen begrüssen alle Ansätze, die einen solchen neuen Lebensstil praktizieren helfen”

¹¹⁰ “soll eine möglichst verbrauchernahe Produktion in lokalen/regionalen Wirtschaftsräumen treten. Eine verbrauchernahe Produktion schliesst keineswegs einen sinnvollen, allerdings verringerten internationalen Handel aus” (1983b, p. 7)

¹¹¹ “Aufbau *ganzheitlicher Gemeinschaftsprojekte*, die alle Lebenszusammenhänge umfassen. Die Überwindung der entfremdenden Trennung von Theorie und Praxis, von Kopf- und Handarbeit, von wohnen und arbeiten, von Arbeitszeit und Freizeit, kan letztlich nur in Gemeinschaften gelingen, in denen sich ganzheitliche Lebensbezüge herstellen lassen. ... Diese Gemeinschaften sollen vielfältig und gross genug sein, um durch weitestgehende *Selbstversorgung* ... ein Höchstmass an Unabhängigkeit von herkömmlichen, fremdbestimmten Wirtschafts – und Gesellschaftssystemen zu gewinnen. Wir verbinden damit also die Vorstellung von Grossgemeinschaften, die sich nicht an den vom herkömmlichen System vorgegebenen Strukturen orientieren.... einen ganz neuen Typ sozialer Basisorganisation... Sie sollen somit zu Keimzellen einer neuen sozial und ökologisch verantwortlichen Gesellschaft werden...” (1983a, pp. 23-24)

6.1.2.4 The economy must deliver social justice

The economy must not be oriented solely to short-term economic rationality and profit, but ensure the delivery of social justice, a concept including secure social services; a basic, but sufficient income for all; a fair distribution of goods produced so that the disadvantaged sections of society also benefit; meaningful and dignified work; protection against unemployment; and the use of technology which contributes to human quality of life and the conservation of nature (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 4; 1980b, pp. 7-8, pp. 25-27). The economy must also dismantle exploitative, inegalitarian economic relations with the Third World (1983b, p. 6, pp. 8-10). More detail is provided at 6.2.1 and 6.2.6.

6.1.2.5 Democratize the economy and its management

This aspect of the cyclical dynamic economy is discussed at 6.2.1.4.

6.1.2.6 Introduce publicly-accountable ecological bookkeeping

Here, as with the limits to growth idea, one sees the ideas-influence of ecological economics, which in the 1980s, was a “new field of knowledge” looking both for an academic home, and “plausible political groups” to adopt it as an ideology¹¹² (Martinez-Alier, 1987, p. 234). Martinez-Alier (1987) defines ecological economics¹¹³ as the study of the use of energy in the economy (p. xv), which is viewed not as a “merry-go-round between producers and consumers, but rather as the one-way entropic throughput of energy and materials” (p. xv). Inputs into the economic process - the use of nature’s stocks and flows of energy and materials – must be taken into account, and outputs must include accounting for the production of waste. “Ecological economics questions the ability of the market to value such effects accurately...” (pp. xvii-xviii). Die Grünen’s demand for the introduction of a publicly-accountable ecological book-keeping in businesses, to track their environmental and social impact (1979, p. 4; 1980b, p. 8) was then, ahead of its time.

6.1.3 Energy

Die Grünen’s critique of existing energy policy can be reduced I think to three main arguments: (a) non-renewable energy sources are limited (b) the use of nuclear energy poses threats to both the environment and to civil liberties, so is not a viable alternative to fossil fuel energy sources, and (c) the way forward is via people- and eco-friendly alternative energies (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 6). I identify five major demands: stabilize energy use [6.1.3.1], derive energy from renewable resources [6.1.3.2], halt all atomic energy projects [6.1.3.3], democratize and decentralize energy provision and storage [6.1.3.4], and increase research into alternative energies [6.1.3.5].

6.1.3.1 Stabilize energy use

Currently available energy sources must be used sparingly, and their efficiency rate increased (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 6).

6.1.3.2 Derive energy from renewable resources

Fossil fuel use must be decreased in favour of energy derived from alternative sources such as sun, wind, water, and biogas. An alternative energy network should be provided (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 8; 1980c, p. 6).

¹¹² He calls the ideological version of egalitarian ecological economics “ecological neo-narodism... an ideology for the dispossessed of the earth” (1987, p. 234). Neo-narodism is “pro-peasant” and pro-“energy-efficient traditional models of [agricultural] production” (Martinez-Alier, 1987, p. 235, p. 236), and opposed to an economic growth which helps preserve inequality (p. 236). It could be combined, he argued, “without excessive difficulty” with some varieties of anarchism and of Marxism (p. 247). Martinussen (1997) also mentions it in his discussion of development theory

¹¹³ Also called energy economics (Bramwell, 1989, pp. 64-91), finite resource ecology (Bramwell, 1989), or human ecological energetics (Martinez-Alier, 1987, p. viii)

6.1.3.3. Halt all atomic energy projects

Die Grünen considered nuclear energy to be a “Pakt mit dem Teufel” (1979, p. 7, par 3). It represented a threat to the environment, to people’s health (1981, p. 2, par. 4), and to fundamental and democratic human rights, because of the heightened security measures needed to reduce risk (1979, p. 2, par. 7). Nuclear plants are also a prime target in wartime (1981, p. 8). The nuclear process used to produce energy can just as well be used to produce nuclear weapons¹¹⁴ (1981, p. 2, par. 4), which are a threat to the continuance of life itself (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2, par. 7; 1981, p. 2, par. 5, par. 7 as examples). All planning, construction, running of, and export of nuclear technology and facilities must be immediately stopped (1980c, p. 6).

6.1.3.4 Democratize and decentralize energy provision and storage

This demand involved decentralization of energy storage and provision, as well as allowing private enterprise to contribute to the energy provision network (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 5; 1980c, p. 6).

6.1.3.5 Increase research into alternative energies

There should be a complete re-orientation of research from fossil fuel energy to the raising of energy from alternative and renewable energy sources. To encourage that, the monopoly of the large energy concerns should be ended (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 6).

6.1.4 Agriculture

In their 1980 election manifesto, Die Grünen succinctly summarize their viewpoint on agriculture. It again amounts to a holistic critique of industrial society:

We reject the industrialisation and chemicalization of agriculture, because it increasingly diminishes the number of rural jobs and businesses, makes the farmers increasingly dependent on industry and banking, desolates the landscape, decimates flora and fauna species, destroys the natural regenerative capacities of the soil and its vegetation, reduces food quality, leads to the torture of animals, and disturbs rural cultural life” (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 5).

I extract as their major demands:

6.1.4.1 The primary aim must be food security, and healthy food

Die Grünen argue that our continued human existence depends not on industrial production, but on agricultural production. The emphasis must be on a secure supply of healthy food, by which is meant, food produced organically (1980b, pp. 12-13).

6.1.4.2 Re-orient agricultural production to ecological, not industrial, production

Agriculture should not be dependent on industry (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 12). Kelly (1989, pp. 79-82) conveys some of the critique of industrial agricultural methods:

The structure of industrial agriculture is one of large fields, and mass application of artificial fertilisers, pesticides and high yield plants. Agriculture is currently organized on the basis of competitive pressure to expand and intensify. But this puts a strain on the whole ecological system. In agricultural terms, pressure to expand means draining marshlands with a purpose-built excavator and plastic pipes. Alternatively, it means clearing hedgerows or ploughing right up to the hedges bordering the woodlands. We Greens must become the parliamentary representatives of the birds, the plants and the marshes, the voice of ecological

¹¹⁴ Bramwell (1994) in her critique of Die Grünen on this point, says that “Whether or not nuclear power plants can easily be put to military uses is a matter for controversy: atomic energy specialists say it is impossible” (p. 106). One does wonder then why the USA and the UN Atomic Energy Agency are currently [2007] so concerned about nuclear energy production in Iran and North Korea? Even more strangely she argues (p. 106) that [in 1994, after the Chernobyl disaster in 1986] “Certainly, there is as yet no evidence that nuclear energy has threatened democracy and human rights...”

stability (Kelly, 1984, pp. 79-82).

The European Union requirement for quantitative, industrial agricultural production must be re-oriented step by step towards ecologically-oriented production (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 7, par. 1); the latter's methods are "particularly economical in their use of raw materials and energy..." (Kelly, 1984, p. 79). Monocropping is critiqued (Die Grünen, 1980b, pp. 12-13). Ecological production protects jobs and the rural way of life (Die Grünen, 1980b, pp. 12-13): "The Greens do not want to see agriculture managed on industrial lines by a small number of employers. What we need is an agriculture where the backbone is provided by independent small and medium scale family enterprises. Farmers should remain farmers, not become agricultural industrialists" (Kelly, 1984, p. 79).

6.1.5 Transport and mobility

Industrial society mentality, and its resultant spatial planning, is blamed for the extensive road network needed to connect the separated spheres of peoples' lives [work, living, shopping, etc.], resulting in a people-unfriendly environment [noise, long-distances to be travelled, increased accident risk, aesthetic damage to intact landscapes, danger to people on bicycles], as well as damage to the ecology through vehicle emissions, the use of salt to improve slippery road surfaces, and irresponsible use of non-renewable energy.

From the many measures proposed by Die Grünen (1980b, pp. 14-15; 1980c, p. 5), I derive four principles:

- Make *all* transport more friendly to people and to the environment: less noise, less danger; less landscape destruction, less energy consumption, less pollution
- Favour space and energy-saving rail as urban and intra-national traffic network
- Ensure that the urban network is friendly to the handicapped, to pedestrians, and for bicycles
- Use the mass transport system whenever possible, rather than privately-owned cars.

6.2 "Sozial" [or living in solidarity]

Die Grünen provide a brief explanation of their value "sozial" as:

Our politics is - ... 'social', because we are of the opinion that humanity can only confront the ecological crisis when peoples' self-determination and their unrestricted unfolding can become a reality, jointly, and in solidarity with other people, and in harmony with their environment. We devote our energy to ensuring that the radical changes which the ecological crisis, and its overcoming, are bringing our way, will not add to the burden of the working population, of the disadvantaged and handicapped of our society. (1980c, p.2).

Their critique of the social welfare system, of work opportunities, work content, the role of technology¹¹⁵, and the injustice of unemployment, is perhaps conveyed most powerfully in their 1983 *Sinnvoll arbeiten – solidarisch leben* political statement (Die Grünen, 1983a). This document is also a site of the tensions between the fundamentalist get-out-of-the-system altogether versus the patch-up-the-industrial-model approach. Bahro noted that amongst the left-Greens, there was still a tendency to deal with unemployment along the [Marxist] lines of " 'wages and bread for everyone' – in other words, 'reproduce the world market and so on'", basically, redistribution within the system. What fundamentalist Greens were arguing for, was "redistribution out of the system: redistribution on a totally different foundation, not capitalist...", not based on "expanded reproduction or expansion [what Bahro called the "European" conception of reproduction], but on "simple reproduction" (Bahro, 1984e, p. 182). He was critical of the priority given in the programme (Die Grünen, 1983a) to the creation of new jobs rather than "self-confidently, positively and forcefully" outlining a total ecological alternative

¹¹⁵ Bahro's critique of industrial technology is similar to Arne Naess's deep ecology critique: technology is dictating culture (Bahro, 1984, p. 138), rather than being adjusted to a society's cultural aims (Naess, 1982a, in Bodian, 1982, in Sessions, 1995, p. 32)

(Sandford, 1986, p. 213, note 3 under “This time the Greens. Why?”; Bahro, 1983a, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 36-38; Bahro, 1983b, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 45-48). Capra and Spretnak¹¹⁶ (1984, p. 35) also comment on Die Grünen’s ideological differences in interpreting “sozial”. Despite these ideological differences, the humanistic ideals and core values of socialism¹¹⁷ appear to be held in common.

Under this value, I discuss (6.2.1) Work, employment and unemployment, (6.2.2) education, (6.2.3) human habitat, (6.2.4) health, (6.2.5) social assistance, (6.2.6) Third World issues, and (6.2.7) womens’ issues.

6.2.1 Work, employment and unemployment

This section comprises (6.2.1.1) work as means to Self-realization. This premise provides a context of understanding for demands of (6.2.1.2) work as a right, (6.2.1.3) a programme against unemployment, (6.2.1.4) democratization of the economy and the workplace, and (6.2.1.5), worker-controlled, humane technology.

6.2.1.1 Work is for Self-realization, not only payment

Die Grünen condemned the meaninglessness, and physical and psychological destructiveness, of many jobs: “Die Arbeit vieler Menschen ist sinnentleert...” (1980c, p. 3), endured just for the sake of the money at the end of the day. They wanted to recover work as a “free self-decided activity, as an opportunity for self-unfolding¹¹⁸” (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 7). They were not so naive as to think that there would be no alienation, no “dreary and depressing moments” in some jobs and some work content, but then there must be egalitarianism in such jobs’ distribution amongst people (1983b, p. 7).

6.2.1.2 Work must be a right

In the profit-oriented industrial work process, the few decide over the opportunities of the many to work at all. This is unjust. “We reject an economic order in which the economically powerful decide on the work process, the work product, and the conditions of existence for the vast majority of the people...”¹¹⁹ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 7). Forced unemployment [2 million people, projected to rise to 3 million by the end of 1983], and the dismantling of the welfare system, were pushing more and more people to the edges of society. Die Grünen saw this as an injury to the human condition generally: “Diese Globalverletzung menschlicher Tätigkeiten...” (1983a, p. 3). In a socially-oriented economy, there would be no unemployment, because the work – socially-necessary work serving material needs, not profit – would be fairly divided between all (1983a, pp. 6-7). There must be a programme against unemployment in the system.

6.2.1.3 There must be protection against unemployment in the system

“Am I a proper human being only when I stand on the assembly line? ... Is my main concern wage-labour and income? Or is it the maintenance of life, something essentially natural?” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 173)

¹¹⁶ On their view, radical-left Greens “read *sozial* as a codeword for socialism, that is, democratic Marxism”, a model not supported by the visionary, conservative, or liberal Greens [section 1.3], the majority of whom wanted a setup which was neither capitalist status-quo or communist-style socialism (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 35)

¹¹⁷ Janet Biehl, social ecologist, sums up socialism’s values: “In the aftermath of the cold war, in a world that glorifies markets and commodities, it sometimes seems difficult to remember that generations of people once fought to create a very different kind of world. ... Yet for a century preceding the First World War, and for nearly a half century thereafter, various kinds of socialism – statist and libertarian; economic and moral; industrial and communalistic – constituted a powerful mass movement for the transformation of a competitive society into a cooperative one – and for the creation of a generous and humane system in which emancipated human beings could fulfill their creative and rational potentialities...” (Biehl, 2003, <http://www.social-ecology.org>, retrieved 9 October 2006, follow “Library”, then “Bookchin”, then “The Murray Bookchin Reader” link)

¹¹⁸ “freie selbstbestimmte Tätigkeit, als Möglichkeit der Selbstentfalten (1983b, p. 7)

¹¹⁹ “Wir wenden uns gegen eine Wirtschaftsordnung, in der die wirtschaftlich Mächtigen über den Arbeitsprozess, das Arbeitsergebnis und die Existenzbedingungen der grössten Mehrheit der Bevölkerung bestimmen...” (1980b, p. 7)

“At the crucial conference of the Greens last autumn [ca. 1982]”, Bahro wrote, “I attacked the section of the [1983 *Sinnvoll arbeiten- solidarisch leben*] draft programme on unemployment because it was completely based on the traditional left social-democratic model. Then I wrote something, very rapidly, in which I said that unemployment releases energies from the old bonds, that it gives us the opportunity to provide the unemployed with a new perspective. Of course the polemic developed in such a way that I was soon said to be arguing that five million unemployed are five million opportunities to climb out of the industrial system ...” (Bahro, 1984e, pp. 170-171). His point was that “...unemployment no longer causes the same hopelessness that it did twenty years ago. The existence of the Green alternative is an important factor in this. Unemployment is not just a crisis of need, then or now, but a crisis of identity for the individual. The immediate impression is that, out of work, you are a nobody. ... But according to social workers involved in this field, many young people begin to feel after a few months ... that perhaps work isn’t the most important thing after all, that it is necessary to rediscover themselves...Among at least half of the young generation today the search for identity through a career is definitely on the decline” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 176).

Despite Bahro’s view that a programme against unemployment, “by its very name” is “bound to the system and preserving the system” (Bahro, 1983b, in Bahro, 1986, p. 46), Die Grünen called for an active programme of job creation [“(die) Schaffung vieler Arbeitsplätze”] within the system. Many jobs could be created through their “Investments in the future” programme, for example, in the fields of alternative energy creation, alternative technology, the change-over from chemicalized to organic farming, the extension of the railway network, and environmental protection fields (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 4, 1983c) – Bahro’s despised eco-storey on the metropolitan industrial edifice! [2.1.3.7].

6.2.1.4 Democratize the economy, and its management

Ecological cyclical economic politics is also about solidarity politics:

Die Grünen support all movements which aim for decentralized and human-scale production units. The major businesses must be unravelled into human-scale enterprises, which are self-administered by those who work in them. Small, medium, and particularly alternative enterprises must be preserved, established and promoted¹²⁰ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 8).

An ecologically-oriented economy is under democratic control, not the control of banks, insurance companies and multi-nationals (1983a, p. 5). Die Grünen were in favour of unravelling [“unbundling” in today’s terminology] massive business concerns, multi-nationals and monopolies, whether controlled by private capital or the state. The economy was to comprise self-managed businesses constituted at “überschaubare” scale [“human-scale”], and without hierarchical structures (1983a, p. 8). Die Grünen were opposed to employer autocracy [“Unternehmerwillkür”], and supported the extension of worker rights in the workplace (1980c, p. 4). “Essentially, it is those who are affected, who should be making the decisions about WHAT is produced, HOW, and WHERE”¹²¹ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 7, their capitalization; 1983a, pp. 7-8): “... workers themselves must be able to determine the work process, the planning, performance and the end result of their work”¹²², (1980b, p. 8).

6.2.1.5 The use of technology must be democratically decided, and add to, not detract from the meaningfulness of work

In the pursuit of profit, industrial capitalism not only rationalizes the work process through the division of labour, but wherever possible, substitutes technology for people. Mass unemployment was one

¹²⁰ “Die Grünen unterstützen alle Bewegungen, die sich für dezentrale und überschaubare Produktionseinheiten ... einsetzen. Die Grosskonzerne sind in überschaubare Betriebe zu entflechten, die von den dort arbeitenden demokratisch selbstverwaltet werden. Kleine, mittlere und vor allem alternative Betriebe sind zu erhalten, einzurichten und zu fördern” (1980b, p. 8).

¹²¹ “Es geht im Kern darum, dass die Betroffenen selbst Entscheidungen darüber treffen, WAS, WIE oder WO produziert wird” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 7, their capitalization; 1983a, pp. 7-8)

¹²² “Die Arbeitenden müssen über Arbeitsplanung, Arbeitsdurchführung und Arbeitsergebnis selbst bestimmen”

result; physical and mental stress another. It is not the person performing the work who decides on how the machine should operate, instead, the machine is dictating his/her work movements, and work pace¹²³ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 8). People are exposed to physical and mental stresses which make them ill¹²⁴ (1980c, p. 3). Technology, which should properly be at the disposal of human creativity, and provide the conditions for self-realization, is now utilized in the service of cost efficiency, competitiveness, and profit (Bahro, 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 15-16). In such rationalized, automated processes, the organic connection which used to exist between the worker and his/her total product is dually broken – the hands-on element is no longer there, and the worker has only a partial, and often time-driven connection with the commodity produced. Such technology only compounds the alienation, and meaninglessness, of the industrial work process. As ecologically thinking and acting people, Die Grünen demanded a new work process orientation, in which technology does not dominate people, but in which people decide between different, human-scale, technological options¹²⁵ (1981, p. 2, par. 2).

But Die Grünen are not in principle anti-technology. They have a critical awareness of technology's capabilities; there where technology is human- and nature-friendly, it is used as a matter of course¹²⁶ (Maren-Grisebach, "Sind Die Grünen technikfeindlich?", 1982, pp. 107-125).

6.2.2 Education

Die Grünen's proposed measures on education are derived, I think, from one major premise: like work, education serves a person's "Selbstverwirklichung" or "Selbstfinden" (1979, p. 13; 1980c, p. 12) - a nostalgic 1970s phrase! Subsidiary premises (1979, p. 13; 1980c, p. 12) are that [6.2.2.1] education must be holistic, and [6.2.2.2] must produce people reflecting Die Grünen's core values [2.3].

6.2.2.1 Education must be holistic, that is, involve the whole person

The aim of Die Grünen's proposals was to change the structure of schools, as well as syllabus content (1980b, pp. 31-32). Schools must not be machines ("Schulmaschinen") primarily oriented towards producing economic beings. Instead of producing technocrats and "well-adjusted" [industrial society] citizens¹²⁷, education must include spiritual, moral, and social responsibility components, as well as develop a person's physical and creative talents (1979, p. 13; 1980b, pp. 31-32). It must be daily-life oriented, break down the existing gulf between the worlds of learning and work (1980c, p. 12), and the gulf between the sexes too. A radical demand was, for example, home economics and child-rearing instruction as mandatory subjects in schools for both sexes (1980b, p. 26).

6.2.2.2 Education must produce people reflecting Die Grünen's core values

Education must produce people capable of and motivated to self-responsibility as well as social responsibility, ecological awareness, democratic behaviour, conflict negotiation, living in peaceful solidarity with, and toleration of, other human beings (Die Grünen, 1980b, pp. 31-32).

¹²³ "Der arbeitende Mensch bestimmt nicht den Gang der Maschinen, sondern diese diktieren seine Arbeitsschritte und sein Arbeitstempo"

¹²⁴ "Die Menschen sind physischen und psychischen Belastungen ausgesetzt, die sie krank machen..."

¹²⁵ "Als ökologisch denkende und handelnde Menschen streben wir eine neue Organisation der Arbeit an, in der ... die technologischen Möglichkeiten nicht als Sachzwänge über die Menschen beherrschen, sondern die Menschen die Alternativen der technischen Entwicklung nach menschlichen Mass bestimmen" (1981, p. 2, par. 2)

¹²⁶ "Grüne sind nicht technikfeindlich. Grüne sind technisch-skeptisch, sie sind technikbewusst. ... Da, wo sich die Technik –als naturverträglich, –als umweltgerecht und –als menschenfreundlich erweist, wird sie selbstverständlich eingesetzt" (Maren-Grisebach, "Sind Die Grünen technikfeindlich?", 1982, pp. 107-125).

¹²⁷ "Die einseitige Ausrichtung der Schulbildung und der Studiengänge auf industrielle Tätigkeiten, die den angepassten Bürger und Technokraten hervorbringt, muss wieder um die Bereiche ergänzt werden, die für die Entwicklung der Gesamtpersönlichkeit unerlässlich sind" (1979, p. 13)

6.2.3 Human habitat

The industrial society has forced people into “inhuman” mass areas of living and working [“Ballungsräumen”, “conurbations”], yet in which the different spheres of one’s life - work, living, shopping, leisure time – are physically separated, increasing energy consumption, using up green spaces. A different kind of spatial planning, other than one oriented only to purely economic interests, is needed to restore feelings of solidarity, a sense of human scaleness, and possibilities for direct democracy: a people-friendly living environment, taking into account the importance of culture and nature (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 14; 1980c, pp. 6-7). Human habitat spatial planning¹²⁸ must, in effect, also reflect Die Grünen’s core values [section 2.3].

Spatial planning must be “humanised”

There are two key thoughts in Die Grünen’s spatial planning measures, I think. Citizens should have opportunities for real participation in all urban planning [“wirkliche Beteiligungsmöglichkeiten”] (1980b, p. 14; 1980c, pp. 5-7), and spatial planning should be premised on the integration, not separation, of people’s life spheres. Conurbations should be broken down into human-scale entities, with integrated residential, business, and cultural areas, and self-management rights (“Stadtteildemokratie”). Community centres should be provided. Whole cultural and historical landscapes rather than single buildings should be preserved. Instead of disregarding nature’s aesthetic value in people’s habitat, it should be protected. Non-commercialized “green” and recreation spaces should be made available, as well as urban gardening lots. The building of massive projects such as canals and airports in previously “intact” landscapes should be stopped: not a “single square metre of land not previously built on” should be used, unless it were balanced by an equivalent area set aside for re-cultivation (Bahro 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 17), a demand also present in the 1980 Bundesprogramm¹²⁹ (1980b). There should be an end to sealing off the landscape with concrete and tar (1979, pp. 9-10).

6.2.4 Health

On Die Grünen’s view, the ecological crisis – the poisoning of air, water, food and utensils – and the industrial society-engendered stress [noise, inhumane work conditions; lack of opportunities for meaningful human relations] which damages soul and spirit, is negating the beneficial effects of modern medicine (1979, p. 10; 1980b, pp. 34-35). Additionally, there is a danger that modern medicine is succumbing to domination by powerful economic interests, i.e., over-use of medication and sophisticated equipment produced for profit by private companies (1980b, p. 36; 1980c, p. 13).

Die Grünen advocated an “alternative, ecological and holistic medicine” (1980c, p. 13). Its premises are:

- (a) Holism rather than reductionism: “As central focus of health care, should be the person considered as needing total help¹³⁰” (1979, p. 10). The potential contributory role of social, moral and psychological factors in illness must be considered together with chemical and physical factors (1979, p. 10).

¹²⁸ If only there were space here to note all the green ideas links! [But Bramwell (1989) has traced many of them]. It cannot be random that town planner, back-to-the-land, and small-scale community supporter Patrick Geddes (Bramwell, 1989, pp. 77-80) inspired the ‘organic ideology’ of town planner Lewis Mumford, (1895-1989), whom Martinez-Alier (1987, see index) also discussed for his contribution to ecological economics. Mumford was “a radical town planner and critic of the industrial ‘mega-machine’” (Wall, 1994, p. 91). He, in turn, inspired post-war Green thinkers such Murray Bookchin, who wrote books inter alia, on urban planning (Wall, 1994, p. 91 and Chapter Five, section 1). Bookchin’s thought was significant in green movement thought... hence I think, Die Grünen’s, as well as the UK Greens’ (Porritt, 1984, Chapter 4) very specific proposals on town planning

¹²⁹ “Dem Luft- und Wasserhaushalt wie der Natur überhaupt durch Bauten entzogene Grün- und Waldflächen sind immer voll zu ersetzen” (1980b, p. 21)

¹³⁰ This is a clumsy rendition of their elegant “Im Mittelpunkt der Gesundheitspflege steht der ganze hilfsbedürftige Mensch” (1979, p. 10)

(b) A focus, beyond preventative medicine and health care even, to root social causes: “The forces which are disturbing our health, and the health of the environment, are the same forces which drive our current economic system¹³¹” (1980b, p. 34). Preventative medicine and health care should also concern itself with providing insight-raising information about, and improvement of life conditions¹³² (1980c, p. 13).

(c) Partnership and self-responsibility: Partnership between health care personnel and patient, as well as self-responsibility, could be achieved inter alia, by providing patients with comprehensive information on their treatment, access to their treatment files, insight into the outer-inner connections of their illness, such as between the need for an intact natural environment, humane living and working conditions, the need for healthy food and healthy eating habits, and substance use avoidance: “Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe” (1980 b, p. 34, 1980c, p. 13).

(d) Decentralized rather than centralized health care: “the creation and promotion of small medical centres, evenly distributed throughout urban areas and countryside, in which all the sub-disciplines of medicine are gathered together”¹³³ (1980c, p. 13).

6.2.5 Third World issues

Die Grünen’s Third World policy is best understood in terms of the ideological critique of the centre-periphery model of development [2.1.3.2], and its ideological alternative [2.1.3.3].

... ‘technology transfer’ ... industrial-capitalist ‘development’ are just different names for the plot between the north, and the so-called ‘elites’ of the south, who are only interested in their share of the cake, and in cementing the social basis of their power positions. Those are the main reasons behind the continued dependence and misery of half of humanity¹³⁴ (Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 6).

We categorically reject the idea that ‘development’ means economic growth at the expense of irreplaceable natural and human capital. The model of development, and also so-called development aid are leading to countries in the ‘Third World’ being exploited by industrial countries, and robbed of their own resources and cultural ways of life¹³⁵ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 18).

Instead, they said, “we will seek to develop together with Third World countries, new ecological ways of being, which will counteract their becoming victims of the increasing world crisis”¹³⁶ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 18).

Material and social support from the rich countries will only have effect as help to self-help, if it contributes to recreating, supporting and extending those conditions in which the people there [i.e. the Third World] can create their own food, clothing, homes, health and education in self-responsibility, and in accordance with local conditions¹³⁷ (1983b, p. 7).

¹³¹ “Die Kräfte, die unsere Gesundheit und eine gesunde Umwelt zerstören, sind die gleichen, die das gegenwärtige wirtschaftliche System antreiben” (1980b, p. 34)

¹³² “Ursachenaufklärung und Verbesserung der Lebensbedingungen” (1980c, p. 13)

¹³³ “Schaffung und Forderung von kleinen medizinischen Zentren, gleichmässig in Stadt und Land verteilt, in welchen alle medizinische Teildisziplinen einbezogen sind” (1980c, p. 13)

¹³⁴ “Technologietransfer” ... industriekapitalistische “Entwicklung” schlechthin sind nur ebensoviele Namen für das Komplott zwischen den nördlichen und südlichen sogenannten Elite, die sich nur um den Anteil am Kuchen und um die Sozialversicherung ihrer Machtpositionen streiten. Dahinter verbergen sich die Hauptursachen für die fortgesetzte Abhängigkeit und Verelendung der halben Menschheit” (1983b, p. 6)

¹³⁵ “Wir wenden uns mit Nachdruck dagegen, daß unter „Entwicklung“ lediglich Wirtschaftswachstum verstanden wird auf Kosten von unwiderbringlichem Natur- und Kulturkapital. Dieses Entwicklungsmodell und auch die sogenannte Entwicklungshilfe führen dazu, daß die Länder der „Dritten Welt“ von den Industriestaaten ausgebeutet, ihrer eigenen Lebensformen und Ressourcen beraubt werden...” (1980b, p. 18)

¹³⁶ This is a free translation of “... werden wir mit den Ländern der „Dritten Welt“ gemeinsam jene neuen ökologischen Verhaltensformen zu entwickeln versuchen, die davor bewahren, zu Opfern der heraufziehenden Weltkrise zu werden.” (1980b, p. 18)

¹³⁷ “Materielle und finanzielle Mittel aus den reichen Ländern werden nur dann als “Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe” für die Betroffenen wirken, wenn sie dazu dienen, diejenigen Bedingungen wiederherzustellen, zu stützen und auszubauen, unter denen sich die Menschen dort Nahrung, Kleidung, Wohnung, Gesundheit und Bildung gemäss den örtlichen Gegebenheiten in eigener Verantwortung verschaffen bzw. Bewahren

Die Grünen's Third World "partnership" policy (1980b, pp. 16-17, p. 18, p. 19; 1983a, pp. 8-10; Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 63-66) aimed to end immoral exploitation, and ensure peace, and survival. Major policy elements, all of which can be understood as a "partnership" ethic in practice, included (1) solidarity between the greater peace movement and Third World liberation movements, (2) the right of developing peoples' to self-determination, (3) fair trade prices for raw materials, (4) a "help to self-help" policy achieved through a consistent basic needs ["Grundbedürfnisse"] strategy, emphasis on eco-friendly, intensive human-use, alternative technology, self-reliant economic activity [preferably independent of the world market], and food security, and (5) a call to industrialized nations to meet the target recommended by the United Nations of 0.7% of GNP for development aid, without conditions, or repayment requirements attached.

6.2.5.1 The population issue

The deep ecologists' (Chapter Four) overriding concern about population reduction and stabilization, receives no more than one-sentence, but significant, attention in Die Grünen's 1980 Bundesprogramm: "The overpopulated countries must on their request receive all possible aid towards birth control, *because otherwise the problems are beyond solution...*"¹³⁸ (1980b, p. 17, my italics).

6.2.6 Womens' issues

Women, noted Die Grünen, are disadvantaged and suppressed in almost every social sphere (1980b, p. 5). They are only ever "discovered" by [male] politicians during election time, or during times when they are needed in the economy. For the remainder of the time, they are reminded that their actual place is in the home. Their disadvantages there, in their careers, and in raising their family, continue to be ignored (1980b, p. 26; 1980c, p. 10). At fault is women's socialization into passivity, inappropriate education, and unequal allocation of social responsibility roles. That must change. Equal rights, and equal right to self-determination ["Gleichberechtigung"; "Selbstbestimmungsrecht"] are the operative values for women's emancipation (1980c, p. 10).

6.2.6.1 Barriers to women's equal legal rights, social roles, and work rights must be removed

Apart from the obvious demand for equal education, equal career opportunities, and equal pay, some of Die Grünen's more radical demands (1979, p. 12; 1980b, pp. 26-28; 1980c, p. 10; 1983a, p. 7, p. 27) were -

- Recognition of being a house-carer, and child-carer, *as a fully-paid career*
- Re-oriented thinking on role allocation in this regard: men to be equally involved in these two important social tasks
- Legislation preventing violence and discrimination against women, including the female youth, at all levels, and in all spheres of society. Women's centres to be recognized. Women officials to be present in health procedures, and judicial hearings, involving crime, rape and violence
- Part time work for men and women so that parents have time for raising children, politics and culture
- Protection of part time work through social insurance mechanisms.

6.2.6.2 Women must have control over their own fertility

Die Grünen noted in 1980, the contradiction in their own values on the issue of fertility: on the one hand, their valuing of all life; on the other, their insistence on women's right to decide for themselves on contraception and abortion (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 11). More or less repeating Kelly's views (Kelly,

können." (1983b, p. 7)

¹³⁸ "Die übervolkerten Länder müssen auf Wunsch alle Hilfen zur Geburtenkontrolle erhalten, weil sonst die Probleme unlösbar werden...." (1980b, p. 17)

1984, p. 71), or she theirs, they argue that decisions on abortion, which are actually personal moral and life circumstance decisions, cannot be a matter of criminality¹³⁹: Rather, socially-responsive material and social help, better birth control methods, and “Aufklärung”, should obviate its necessity at all (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 11). Neither the State, nor doctors, should treat women as children incapable of making up their own minds, or discriminate against them¹⁴⁰ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 28).

Despite their specific attention to women’s issues, Capra and Spretnak (1984) suggest that the feminist perspective is strangely lacking in Die Grünen’s 1980 Bundesprogram (1980b) in issues such as “militarism, economics¹⁴¹, education, and healthcare” (p. 50). They note (1984, pp. 65-66) that Die Grünen seem unconcerned that their insistence on the right to complete self-determination of developing peoples conflicts with the usually invidious position of women in such areas. Most rural women in the Third World suffer under institutionalized, and/or traditional patriarchy, a situation which Capra and Spretnak felt, compromised Green principles of non-exploitation, non-violence and social responsibility (1984, p. 65).

6.3 “Basidemokratisch” [“grassroots” or direct democracy]

Our politics is - ... ‘grassroots democratic’, because we are committed to direct democracy. In that way, decisions about public matters are the most effectively tracked. This form of democracy is best realized at decentralized levels. We are opposed to the bureaucracy which is currently gaining the upper hand, and rendering citizens helpless; opposed to the increasing capriciousness and the increasing misuse of power by the industrial and state apparatus. (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 3)

I understand this value, a key element of anarchism (Chapter Five, section 2.1.4.1), as a primary response to Die Grünen’s critique of patriarchy and hierarchy [section 2.1.2]. Hierarchical thought and its social-structural manifestations, which include a tendency to “cosiness” or collusion amongst powerful interests [“Verfälschung” (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 24)], and to surveillance [“Überwachung” (1980b, p. 24)], isolate and marginalize citizens, limit people’s Self-realization, create an atmosphere of fear, powerlessness, submissiveness, and moral cowardice [“Duckmäusertum” (1980b, p. 24)], and also threaten fundamental and human rights (1979, p. 11, par. 4). Instead of bureaucracy, there should be the greatest possible level of direct democratic decision-making, the greatest possible openness in public information provision.

In this section, I discuss (6.3.1) the role of communes in the new utopian society, (6.3.2) extending ordinary people’s political space, (6.3.3) protecting fundamental human rights, (6.3.4) minority rights, and (6.3.5) democratising public information while protecting private data.

6.3.1 “Dare to form communes”: the new “utopian” society

“Dare to form communes¹⁴²” is of course, fundamentalist Bahro’s challenge. In his view, the way to exit the industrial system into an alternative way of life and production in a new society which comprises an ecological cyclical economy, decentralized organization, and self-determination, is through the broad commune movement, which allows all three criteria simultaneously: “The commune is the germ cell of the social formation which will replace the existing one, the basic unit of the new social network” (Bahro, 1983d, in Bahro, 1986, p. 57). Commune-type communities would be able “...to develop the spiritual foundation from which a biophile culture beyond our suicidal patriarchal civilization can feed” (Bahro, 1983g, in Bahro, 1986, p. 95); to provide the framework of living within which the economy is subordinate to, and does not dictate, a system of values (Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro,

¹³⁹ “Die Schwangerschaftsunterbrechung kann als eine Frage der moralischen Einstellung und der persönlichen Lebensumstände nicht Gegenstand juristischer Verfolgung sein” (1980c, p. 11).

¹⁴⁰ “Keine Bevormundung und Diskriminierung der Frauen durch Staat und Ärzte”

¹⁴¹ In 1983/84, Capra & Spretnak noted, women worldwide delivered 2/3 of total work hours performed, yet received 1/10 of the income and owned less than 1/100 of the property (1984, pp. 65-66)

¹⁴² Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p. 86

1986, p. 89), to provide a context supportive of self-realization, rather than the “individualism” of capitalist industrialism. How to achieve this?

Through self-reliant decentralism, rather than dependence on the world market. Without discussing all its detail, Bahro’s idea was that the world market was to be dissolved in its present form, and reconstructed in another. “We must now enter into a phase of contraction, which in the first instance has to be economic. If I may pick an arbitrary figure¹⁴³, ... an area fifty by a hundred kilometers wide. It must be possible to organize reproduction at this level: food, homes, schools, clothing, medicine, perhaps as much as ninety per cent of what we need. For another nine per cent we could deal on a national or provincial level, and for the further one per cent we would be dependent on a world market” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 180). The idea is that “you produce the things you need to become socialized and to reproduce yourself physically by your own labour” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 29). This paragraph scarcely does justice to Bahro’s vision, expressed in many papers. The important idea to convey here, is that the basis of the new society is a network of semi-autonomous communes, practising a self-reliant form of production outside the world market system. Traces of it in Die Grünen’s political statements were presented at 6.1.2.4.

6.3.2 Extend people’s political space; democratize bureaucracy

Risk more grassroots democracy! was Die Grünen’s challenge¹⁴⁴. Direct democracy is a green idea borrowed from anarchism [Chapter Five, section 2.1.4]; it is qualitatively different from liberal democracy which is an indirect democracy based on tacit consent (Lucardie, 1993a, p. xii). It is best achieved in decentralized, human-scale units (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 3), whether in business, politics, or administration. “Überschaubarkeit” and decentralization are corollary values, and many 1983-Greens felt that the principle of decentralization should have been a fifth “pillar” (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 47-49).

Through direct democracy, Die Grünen wanted to achieve the greatest possible devolution of decision-making power on ecological, social and democratic issues to citizens [“mehr eigene, autonome Befugnisse der Bürger, statt der zentralistischen Verwaltung” (1980c, p. 9)], including the right to petition for a referendum, and for plebiscites at local and regional levels (1980c, p. 9); to create political space for the citizens’ initiatives and the new social movements at all levels of government, so that they could make their political views known, and influence legislation; to extend ordinary people’s political space beyond voting once in a while, and to protect their right to meet unhindered, to demonstrate, to freedom of expression, and to access government officials. There should be the greatest transparency in, and accountability of, bureaucracy to Parliament, and of Parliament to citizens (Bahro, 1982a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 19; Die Grünen, 1979, pp. 11-12, p. 14; 1980c, p. 9; 1983b, pp. 11-12).

6.3.3 Protect fundamental human rights

Kelly believed that “One of the most important tasks for a parliamentary, extra-parliamentary party is to campaign for the recognition and protection of human rights. Food, health care, work, housing, freedom of religion and belief, freedom of assembly, freedom of expression, humane treatment of prisoners – all these human rights ... continue to be abused. These rights derive from a human being’s right to life. Abuse of human rights can lead to the outbreak of war. Respect for human rights can help to build peace” (Kelly, 1984, p. 19).

Die Grünen describe fundamental and human rights as inter alia, “unscathed” [“unversehrtes”] life, healthy food, humane working conditions, an intact biosphere [“unversehrten Lebensraum”], right to

¹⁴³ Bahro recognized that exactly this area, and these ratios, were not everywhere possible in the world; what he was interested in was “the principle of contraction and the dissolution of the world market as we know it” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 180)

¹⁴⁴ Bahro, 1983a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 41, and Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 11

free gathering and demonstration, freedom of opinion (1979, p. 11). They believed that the ecological, economic, cultural, political, and religious dimensions of fundamental rights are indivisible, everywhere. They therefore supported freedom, and human rights movements¹⁴⁵ and initiatives everywhere (1979, p. 11):

We reject any political suppression anywhere in the world, and support all peoples and groups who commit themselves to achieving their freedom and democratic right to self-determination, against dictatorship, colonial oppression, and foreign domination¹⁴⁶ (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 24).

6.3.4 No discrimination against marginalized groups

Die Grünen critiqued the state's social support network as anonymous, discriminatory, unreliable, fostering dependence, and geared only to financial support. Awareness of, and insight into the reasons why people become "social cases", should replace discriminatory attitudes (1980c, pp. 4-5; 1983a, pp. 25-27).

In place of separation and isolation, solidarity with, and their integration into society (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 12; 1980b, p. 29), is the value guiding policy for all socially-marginalized groups: minority cultures, old people, the sexually different, the immigrants, the criminals, the handicapped, the "social cases": "We want to live together with them" (1980b, p. 36). Self-determination, self-management and self-realization for these groups are corollary values (1980c, p. 12). Minority groups and marginalized groups have the same fundamental rights as any other group (1979, p. 12, par. 1).

Multi-culturalism is valued. The Self-realization of minority cultures [such as that of the "Zigeuner"], must become a taken-for-granted right (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 12). Old people should not be cut off from their social environment, or treated as second-rate citizens. Preferably they should be helped to achieve their right to a dignified old age through close-to-home assistance in day-care or small centres which they help to manage (1980c, pp. 11-12). Homosexuality must be treated on the same equal rights footing as heterosexuality (1980c, pp. 11-12). "Prevailing politics must no longer encourage the isolation of our immigrant fellow-citizens and their deprivation of rights¹⁴⁷" (Die Grünen 1983b, p. 12; based on the translation in Bahro, 1983a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 41). Criminals should not be subjected to solitary confinement, there should be equal and improved conditions for all prisoners, the aim of imprisonment should be help for self-help in re-socialization (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 12; 1980c, p. 9). The handicapped should also not be pushed into a corner somewhere. Opportunities to work must be made available to them; above all, physical infrastructure must be geared to their special needs (1980b, p. 36; 1980c, p. 14).

The social support net should be decentralized, self-administered, co-funded by local authorities, and also provide non-material help, in that it educated people ("Aufklärung") towards self-help, self-responsibility, and self-organization (Die Grünen, 1980c, pp. 4-5; 1983a, pp. 25-27).

6.3.5 Democratize public information, protect private data

Die Grünen's basic premise here is that effective direct democratic decision-making rests partly on the availability of multi-language, comprehensive, and multi-dimensional information, which is independent of particular economic, party-political¹⁴⁸, advertising, or other monopoly interests. The

¹⁴⁵ One wonders how Die Grünen reconciled their values in a case such as Namibia, where achieving freedom and self-determination was accompanied by unspeakable violence on *both* sides?

¹⁴⁶ "Wir wenden uns gegen jede politische Unterdrückung in der gesamten Welt und unterstützen alle Völker und Volksgruppen, die für ihre Freiheit und demokratische Selbstbestimmung, gegen Diktatur, koloniale Unterdrückung und Fremdherrschaft eintreten. (1980b, p. 24)

¹⁴⁷ Bramwell (1994) notes that Die Grünen had proposed more legislation to protect the social and civil rights of women and minorities, including the [then] nearly 4 million foreign "guest workers" in Germany than any other party, but sees a contradiction in this latter aspect: the movement of goods and people, but seemingly not the movement of "Gastarbeiter", is a waste of energy

¹⁴⁸ "Parteiherrschaft und Proporzsystem bei Rundfunk und Fernsehen führen zu Einschränkungen der Meinungsfreiheit" (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 14)

media should regularly publish information on the interconnections between the ecological, economic and social crises (Die Grünen, 1980c, p. 13). Diversity in, decentralization of, and de-monopolization of information sources is the primary aim (1979, p. 14; 1980c, p. 13).

For Die Grünen, the gathering and analysis of data by public and private bodies represents a significant intrusion into the private and political sphere of every citizen, so much so, that they demanded the right to refuse to give such data. A duty should be imposed upon those collecting and analysing such data to explain its use or further transmission. They also called for the destruction of personal data and software which could potentially be politically misused (1980c, p. 10).

6.4 “Gewaltfrei” [non-violence]

Our politics is - ... ‘non-violent’¹⁴⁹, because only in a non-violent society can the oppression of people by people and the violence of people against people be abolished. In a time in which politics both national and international is dominated by force and threat of force, we advocate many and diverse forms of non-violent resistance. Examples of such forms of resistance are ‘civil disobedience’ or active social resistance. (Die Grünen’s 1980 election manifesto, 1980c, p.3).

A major source of inspiration in Die Grünen’s non-violence principle was Gandhi’s Hindu principle of *ahimsa*¹⁵⁰ [non-violence] to all living things (Callicott, 1994, p. 33; Chapple, 1994, p. 117), and love. Kelly (1984, p. 30) refers to Gandhi’s “faith in the power of the spirit, and the superior strength of goodness, gentleness ...”. The ecological values of interconnectedness, interdependence and symbiosis (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 60) were also a source of inspiration. “Ökologie heisst Frieden!”¹⁵¹. Strengthening this value were at least two other contextual factors. First, the playing out of the West-East Cold War and the nuclear arms race in the years 1979-1983, between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation [NATO] and Warsaw Pact blocs in West Germany¹⁵², and in those Third World countries under their influence. And second, they were mindful of what they considered to be the German heritage of subjugation, wars and genocide (1981, p. 8).

Under this non-violence value, I discuss (6.4.1) Die Grünen’s aim of radical, global pacifism, (6.4.2) non-violence between peoples and nations, (6.4.3) the need for non-violent means to reach non-violent ends, (6.4.4) the elimination of violence at structural level, and (6.4.5) the praxis of non-violent resistance, including civil disobedience.

6.4.1 The aim: radical, and global, eco-pacifism

Bahro’s ideological response to the militarism of exterminism was radical eco-pacifism [“Ökopax”¹⁵³], which is not at all the same as “traditional pacifism”, the latter being simply part and parcel of the liberal, industrialist vision (Bahro, 1984e, p. 142). Die Grünen’s vision was of a gentle, violence-free,

¹⁴⁹ Die Grünen’s non-violence was influenced by the thought of Gandhi, Thoreau, Martin Luther King, Gene Sharp, and Prof Dr Theodor Ebert (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 61-62) of the Freie Universität Berlin. Since the 1960s, Ebert’s project had been to systematize the concept of non-violent action and civil defence. In 1989, he, Petra Kelly, and Roland Vogt, founded the Association for Civil Defence, a body working for non-violence and weapon free conflict management (retrieved 1 October 2006 from <http://www.soziale-verteidigung.de/> and http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theodor_Ebert)

¹⁵⁰ *Ahimsa* [non-violence] and *aparigraha* [non-possession] are for example, the twin pillars of Gandhi’s self-sufficient, environmentally friendly system of economic reproduction [and colonial resistance!] (Chapple, 1994, p. 117). *Ahimsa* in relationships with both people and nature was for Gandhi a recurring theme: “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, p. xiii). It is surely a mark of Gandhian influence on Kelly that she refers to “living with cooperation, gentleness, non-possessiveness and soft energies”? (Kelly, 1984, p. 108)

¹⁵¹ Motto of Die Grünen’s October 1981 federal meeting (Maren-Grisebach, 1982, p. 60)

¹⁵² Capra & Spretnak (1984, pp. 57-81) present an account of this

¹⁵³ In Bahro’s view, both the old and the New Left of 1968 shared “the same conflict orientation” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 178), but the “Ökopax” of the Greens was young people’s answer to this: “a greater tolerance for a diversity of opinions”, a “greater acceptance of diversity of thought, of pluralism and the ability to unite around an agreed goal. This appears to me to be politically and culturally very important” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 178)

green [“sanfte, gewaltfreie, grüne”] society at peace both internally and externally (1983b, p. 5), in a world community also living together in non-violence (1981, p. 6). They hoped that they would find partners in the peace movement to achieve this “whole new world order” vision (citation from Bahro, 1984e, p. 229; Bahro, 1984e, p. 134, pp. 229-230; Die Grünen, 1983b, p. 6).

6.4.1.1 Peace and ecology are indivisible

Respect for the ecology of the planet [in the sense of protection of the life-base for all living beings], and the valuing of all living beings, were for Die Grünen indivisible from the achievement of peace: “Das Prinzip der Achtung und Wertschätzung allen Lebens – d.h. der Lebens- und Naturschutz – bildet für unsere ökologisch- und friedenspolitischen Ziele in gleicher Weise die Grundlage” (1981, p. 1). There could be no peace while societies continued with a lifestyle and means of production which depended on a continual inflow of natural resources - used extravagantly at that – because that merely laid the ground conditions for aggression against others holding the needed natural resources and cheap labour. Responsible in-country use of natural resources presupposes “the dismantling of tensions and the capacity for world peace”¹⁵⁴ (1981, p. 2, par. 3).

6.4.1.2 Peace and base democracy are indivisible

One finds in Die Grünen’s programme, statements such as “FRIEDEN IST FÜR UNS MEHR ALS DIE ABWESENHEIT VON KRIEG ... Frieden, Freiheit und Selbstbestimmungsrecht gehören für uns zusammen...”¹⁵⁵ (1980c, p. 7; their capitals).

Supporting radical peace meant for Die Grünen, supporting base democratic movements, and movements for human rights, civil rights, and liberation from either foreign domination or internal oppressive regimes everywhere. They specifically supported Third World peoples struggle for liberation from the domination of the power of any of the bloc countries: “there can only be peace for Third World peoples, if in their own development, they find a way to political and economic independence”¹⁵⁶ (1981, p. 5).

6.4.2 There should be no violence between peoples and nations

Partnership and co-operation [“die partnerschaftliche Zusammenarbeit” (Die Grünen, 1980, p. 16, 1. Weltpolitik)] are the lead values for Die Grünen’s internal security and foreign policy. Principles for achieving this include (6.4.2.1) radical disarmament, (6.4.2.2) social defence, and (6.4.2.3) self-reliant, diverse bioregionalism.

6.4.2.1 There should be radical disarmament

Radical means radical, *inter alia*, (a) no arming anywhere in the world, (b) global disarmament (c) the destruction of all atomic, biological and chemical weapons, (d) no foreign troops on foreign soil, and (e) the conversion of munitions manufacture to peaceful purposes (Die Grünen, 1980b, pp. 17-18; 1980c, p. 7).

6.4.2.2 Social defence is the alternative to armed defence

Die Grünen proposed social defence¹⁵⁷ as alternative to military armament and defence (1980c, pp. 7-8). They defined it as defence with non-military means against an internal or external military attack. Its fundamental premise was that a people cannot be controlled indefinitely unless they consent to it

¹⁵⁴ “Abbau von Spannungen und die Fähigkeit zum Frieden in der Welt” (1981, p. 2, par. 3)

¹⁵⁵ Peace is for us more than simply the absence of war ... Peace, freedom and the right to self-determination belong for us together...”

¹⁵⁶ “Frieden kann es für die Völker der “Dritten Welt” nur geben, wenn sie in ihrer eigenständigen Entwicklung einen Weg in die politische und wirtschaftliche Unabhängigkeit finden” (1981, p. 5)

¹⁵⁷ Influenced by the work of Theodor Ebert and Gene Sharp (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 61-62). Parkin (1994, p. 106) notes that Kelly’s “bibles were Thoreau and Gene Sharp (an American expert on non-violent action)”

(1981, pp. 5-6). Where militarism assumes that the enemy will not be prepared to pay the high price demanded for violating a nation-state's borders, social defence assumes that the enemy will not be prepared to pay the high price of trying to remain safely in the occupied area (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 62; Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 17). Resistance is rendered through "Zivilcourage" and decentralized non-co-operation. Social defence also included self-provisioning and alternative, decentralized communication networks (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 17), backed up by "well-organized, tightly bonded affinity groups"¹⁵⁸ in every neighborhood who are prepared to conduct nonviolent civil disobedience on short notice", including tactics such as large-scale symbolic actions, economic boycotts by consumers and producers, social and political boycotts of institutions, strikes, overloading of facilities and administrative systems, stalling and obstructing, deliberate inefficiency, ostracism of persons, and numerous forms of non-compliance in all sectors of a society" (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 62). Die Grünen were however well aware of problems in gaining acceptance for the idea, as well as in its actual implementation (1981, pp. 5-6).

6.4.2.3 Self-reliant, diverse bio-regionalism instead of one-dimensional technological-materialistic industrialism

Die Grünen supported the principle of self-determination, self-reliance, and cultural diversity for all peoples as part of both the peace process, and world survival (1980b, p. 16 1. Weltpolitik). "Our aim is to preserve the self-sufficient capacity of each region of the earth. This reflects our principle of decentralization ... Each population group should be able to develop an economy suited to its ecology, and to preserve its indigenous culture. We condemn the presumptuousness of industrial nations, who in their own economic interests, wish to force their techno-material mono-civilization on all peoples"¹⁵⁹ (1980b, p. 16). Die Grünen's idea of a "Europe of the Regions" – human-scale, decentralized, self-managed areas whose boundaries are defined by geographical features, not national interests, fits here (Die Grünen, 1979, p. 2; 1979 "Wirtschaft im Dienst des Menschen", section 3, p. 5; "Demokratie und Grundrechte in Europa", section 2, p. 11, section 3, p. 12; 1980b "Weltpolitik", p. 16; Parkin, 1994, p. 138).

6.4.3 A non-violent society can only be achieved through non-violent means

Non-violent ends can only be achieved through non-violent means: "Ends and means cannot be seen in isolation from one another. They are inseparably joined and must agree with one another"¹⁶⁰ (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 6). There could be no physical violence, and no hate behaviour, in seeking to achieve a non-violent society.

6.4.3.1 No physical violence

An early problem for the "Gewaltfrei" value, was the opposition to the concept of active, *nonviolent* resistance from the early Greens' more Marxist-oriented members (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 45). This opposition had already manifested itself at the 1979 Offenbach congress where the radical-left group had demanded that non-violence be excluded as a green principle (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 35). The radical left Greens believed that resistance could be escalated into violence – along the lines of the Marxist "vision of armed struggle in the streets" - if non-violence to bring about social change proved ineffective (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 45). Radical left Hamburg Green Jurgen Reents suggested that "an absolute, inviolable ideology" of non-violence might mean that one remains

¹⁵⁸ A concept from anarchism, and from the American peace movement, where it was well-developed, and with which Kelly was familiar (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 62)

¹⁵⁹ "Unser Ziel ist, den einzelnen Regionen der Erde auch dann ihre Lebensfähigkeit zu erhalten, wenn sie auf sich selbst gestellt sind. Dies entspricht unserem Prinzip der Dezentralisierung ... Jedes Volk und jede Bevölkerungsgruppe soll die ökologisch gemässe Wirtschaft entwickeln und jedes Volk die ihm eigentümliche Kultur bewahren können. Wir verurteilen die Anmassung der Industrieländer, aufgrund wirtschaftlicher Interessen ihre technisch-materialistische Einheitszivilisation allen Menschen aufdrängen zu wollen" (1980b, p. 16)

¹⁶⁰ "Ziel und Weg können aber nicht getrennt voneinander gesehen werden, sondern sind untrennbar miteinander verbunden und müssen übereinstimmen" (1981, p. 6)

“morally clean”, perhaps even a “martyr”, but it could also mean that one ends up “politically without success” (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 46). However, this was a position at odds with most Greens who felt, along with Petra Kelly¹⁶¹, that there was never justification for compromising the non-violence principle (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 45). Bahro agreed too: “I ... agree with the Greens’ idea that non-violent resistance has greater prospects of bringing about the necessary change: non-violence is a line followed only by those who are active supporters of a new world” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 119).

The value of non-violence extended to children’s upbringing as well. Die Grünen advocated no war toys for children, and also no physical violence or threats of it in their upbringing (1980c, p. 11).

6.4.3.2 No hate behaviour

Die Grünen believed that expressions of hate – in speech, physically, or psychologically (1981, p. 1, par 7) were incompatible with non-violence. There should be no hate speech; no violent talk: “Calling a policeman a pig means you have already abandoned a non-violent attitude” (Kelly, 1984, p. 31). Military style vocabulary should be avoided (1981, p. 7, par. 6). There should be no projection of “Feindbilder” [no construction of the Other as “enemy”] as psychological preparation for aggression against either external or internal opponents (1981, p. 1). People must be encouraged to believe in the “guten aktivierbaren Kern im Menschen”, and so to distinguish between the enemy-person [someone just like us] and his/her role (1981, p. 1, pp. 6-7). Sounding rather like Carl Roger’s unwavering, unconditional love for the person, while not necessarily agreeing with his/her behaviour (Hjelle & Ziegler, 1981, p. 412), Kelly believed that the “so-called enemy should be given the opportunity to rethink, to modify his behaviour, and to appreciate that any action we take is not directed against him as a person, but against the element of violence in his role. In this context, I would support the idea of a dialogue with the police and the armed forces, again as a means of focussing on the person, not his role in society.” (Kelly, 1984, p. 31).

6.4.4 There should be no violence at institutional level

Under the value of non-violence, Die Grünen condemned what Kelly called “structural violence”, that is, violence by the state through its institutions. Some examples they gave were the systematic marginalization of women in society through patriarchally-inspired social structures, failure by governments to vaccinate children against the most common and dangerous children’s diseases, the over-spending on military defence paid for in the currency of “poverty, inflation and despair in the world” (Kelly, 1984, p. 13), or expenditure on nuclear energy, paid for in the currency of insidious harm to health, future shortages of natural resources, and intolerable future environmental waste burdens (Kelly, 1984, pp. 11-14). Once in the Bundestag, the application of the structural non-violence principle became immediately problematic for Die Grünen. Can one authentically advocate non-violence while being part of the state machinery, itself violent? How does one justify when and where for example, the police should be called in to deal with a situation, such as tenants who do not pay their rent, even though they receive a welfare grant from the state? Should they be evicted by force once the necessary notices have been given? (Roland Vogt, speaking to Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 43). The problem, Vogt felt, was that “...there are still no thought-out concepts of how one can reconcile the demands of social responsibility with the demands of nonviolence” (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 43).

¹⁶¹ For Kelly, and for Die Grünen, “the ends do not justify the means. You cannot do away with violence by using violence, or war by waging war, or injustice by resorting to injustice. It follows, then, that the ends are part of the method of action, and likewise that the method of action is included in the ends” (Kelly, 1984, p. 19). She re-iterated this position during interviews with Capra and Spretnak: “... I cannot say that the violent people are part of the Green movement. I would like to include them once they see that violence is no solution, but right now their aims are diametrically opposed to an ecological society. Both our methods and our goals must be nonviolent...” (Kelly, in Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 71)

6.4.5 Dissent may be expressed through non-violent resistance, including civil disobedience

“Dissent without civil disobedience is consent!” wrote Kelly (1984, p. 61), citing Thoreau. Die Grünen’s motto for non-violent resistance was “Be gentle and subversive” (Kelly, 1984, p. 32). Kelly personally understood non-violent opposition as an expression of “spiritual, physical and moral strength”, shown most clearly “by consciously and specifically *not doing* anything which could be construed as participating in injustice. This could mean *not* obeying unjustified orders, or *not* holding back in situations where injustice is being meted out to others.” (Kelly, 1984, p. 27, her italics).

Die Grünen argued that civil disobedience is a permissible non-violent strategy (1981, p. 7; 1983d, p. 1). They partly located its justification in the philosophical thought of Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and Thoreau¹⁶²: “If ... the law is so promulgated that it of necessity makes you an agent of injustice against another, then I say to you: Break the law” (Translation by Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 44, of Thoreau in Die Grünen’s Peace Manifesto (1981, p. 7, par. 2). Kelly (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 44; Kelly, 1984, p. 32) defined civil disobedience as open and deliberate infringement of what are considered to be unjust laws and regulations “on grounds of conscience”. Those who employ this escalated form of non-co-operation and direct action “take full responsibility upon themselves for breaking the law ... They would rather receive punishment or violence, than become violent themselves, or incur the blame for other people’s violence by doing nothing”. To be consistent and effective, civil disobedience required more than only spontaneous action, it also required long-term objectives, political analysis, and intensive preparation (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 7).

6.4.5.1 Green criteria for acceptable non violent resistance

Criteria for acceptable non-violent resistance included –

- (i) dialogue
- (ii) “legitimate action”, such as writing letters to the press, signing petitions, knocking on doors and canvassing, distributing leaflets
- (iii) “symbolic action” such as slogans, vigils, silent marches, as well as “light-hearted events” to raise public awareness on a particular issue or issues
- (iv) non-co-operation “with violent elements in the social system”; this would include legal methods such as strikes, consumer boycotts, non-violent sabotage, conscientious objection and non-acceptance of state honours
- (v) active propagation by teachers in schools of “Friedensfähigkeit” and awareness-raising of the environmental impacts of the “dominating ideology of technical progress”, especially nuclear energy, and active “de-enemizing” of the enemy by journalists in the media
- (v) “gentle” civil disobedience, including law infringement (Die Grünen, 1981, p. 7, par. 2; Kelly, 1984, pp. 31-32).

7. Praxis

In 1983, Die Grünen listed as ways of demonstrating dissent with the current industrial system, and opening the way to their new ecological politics society, non-violent resistance, intensive information, a “front of refusal”, the innovation of alternative projects, self-organization by those disaffected, struggle in the trade unions¹⁶³ and industries, and parliamentary work. In a nice example of ecosystemic recursivity, Die Grünen (1983a, p. 32) note that “Die Krise enthält aber auch eine Chance ... die gesellschaftliche Kräfte in diesem Lande zu mobilisieren und eine Umstrukturierung einzuleiten...”: The solution is in the problem.

¹⁶² The concept comes from Thoreau’s thoughts in his essay “Resistance to civil government” (Turner, 1991, in Sessions, 1995, pp. 331-32)

¹⁶³ Bahro was however dubious about this role for the trade unions, as they were part of the very system which, in his view, had to be dismantled (Bahro, 1983e, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 60-85)

8. Critique of, and by, other sample members

I see the critique of Die Grünen as following three broad directions: (8.1) their corruption by parliamentary power, (8.2) their “selling out” as they increasingly followed the road of within-the-system accommodation and eco-industrialization. As the eco-reformist trend gathered momentum mostly after the Fundi-Realo break, it falls outside the period of this chapter, and so is not dealt with in any great detail, and (8.3) green political theory critique, such as the viability or otherwise of their direct democracy vis-a-vis the predominant western society representative democracy. This aspect also falls outside this chapter’s scope, and is thus not discussed further.

8.1 Their own corruption by power

Die Grünen believed that the political parties of the time had lost touch with, or were not listening to, the fears, worries and concerns of ordinary people on the street (Kelly, 1984, pp. 21-22). Instead of “responding to the demands of local action groups” (p. 22); they were “authoritarian ruling elites”, with “fat salaries”, working their way “up the party career ladder” (Kelly, 1984, p. 11, pp. 21-22). They were unconcerned with starvation, malnutrition and other basic needs in the Third World, while spending “\$2.3 million a minute” (Kelly, 1984, p. 12) on perfecting machinery capable of wiping people off the face of the earth; installing nuclear energy deleterious to people’s health, and failing to recognize that the very means of human survival – the earth’s natural resources - were becoming increasingly scarce (Kelly, 1984, pp. 11-14). “The system is bankrupt” wrote Kelly (1984, p. 12). Their 1980 Bundesprogramm therefore contained proposals on the democratization of all political parties (Die Grünen, 1980b, p. 24).

Inwardly and outwardly, Die Grünen originally saw themselves as an anti-party Party (Kelly, 1984, p. 18), a “parliamentary, extra-parliamentary party” (Kelly, 1984, p. 19). Their founding constitution¹⁶⁴ contained measures to minimize or eliminate power and privilege within the party. Despite that, after their 1983 electoral success, Bahro noted a possible danger: the “incredible political weight” which Die Grünen’s parliamentary group [“Fraktion”] now had in relation to the green movement in West Germany as a whole. He felt it important that the Fraktion “doesn’t lose the link with the movement, that the discussion is built up from the base in such a way as to prevent the fraction from becoming too absorbed in Realpolitik” (Bahro, 1984e, p. 175).

There were originally ideals on eschewing parliamentary power. Kelly wrote that Die Grünen would not be seeking to “find a place in the sun alongside the established parties, nor to help maintain power and privilege in concert with them. Nor will we accept any alliances or coalitions” (Kelly, 1984, p. 18). But that was not everyone’s opinion. The question of whether or not to “tolerate” alliances with other parties constituted a further tension between the Fundi and Realo wings within the party: Die Grünen’s extraordinary June 1985 Hagen Bundesversammlung (1985) [the “base” of the party] resolved the issue between the fundamentalist and realo factions within the party by deciding that the full range of parliamentary options, from opposition to majority or coalition government should be open to the party¹⁶⁵.

¹⁶⁴ Die Grünen’s constitution entrenched a number of measures designed to minimize or eliminate power and privilege within the party. They tried to avoid hierarchical structure (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 37). There was also originally, the rotation of leaders after a two-year period, a rule inherited from the steering committees of the grassroots movements to prevent the concentration of information and power in the hands of a few, or in charismatic leaders (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, pp. 41-42), or the “cult of personality” (Bramwell, 1994, p. 102). Party policy was set according to voting from the floor at large assemblies (Capra & Spretnak, 1984, p. 36)

¹⁶⁵ “Gegenüber Teilen des fundamentalistischen Flügels stellt die Bundesversammlung fest: Für Die Grünen gehört die gesamte Bandbreite parlamentarischer Möglichkeiten von der Opposition bis zur Alleinregierung zu den selbstverständlichen Handlungsmöglichkeiten unserer parlamentarischen Arbeit. Eine freiwillige Selbstbeschränkung auf Opposition lehnen wir ab ... Gegenüber Teilen des realpolitischen Flügels stellt die Bundesversammlung fest: Das Streben nach Macht um nahezu jeden Preis als angebliche Schicksalsfrage der Grünen ist ...für die auf grundlegende Veränderung der Gesellschaft zielende Politik der Grünen nicht akzeptabel.” (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen. Chronik. Regieren? Streit der Strömungen 1984-1989. Retrieved 9 February 2005 from http://www.gruene-partei.de/cms/gruene_work/rubrik/0/239.198489.htm)

8.2 Their “selling out” to the “system”

Bahro too remained skeptical of any political party’s ability to remain untouched by the system of power within which it operated, either outwardly or inwardly. An indication of this was presented in section 1.4.1, and in Bahro’s views, for example, on the failure of Die Grünen’s parliamentary group to categorically oppose animal experimentation as “one of the holiest cows” (Bahro, 1985a, in Bahro, 1986, p. 202) of industrial science and research.

Social ecologist Bookchin is also critical of Die Grünen’s “appalling degeneration”; their “selling-out” to the system:

... most Greens, or at least many of the ones I have encountered--especially in Britain and Germany--are little more than environmental lobbyists. Up to now they have not created a new politics (and in Germany, perhaps they never will). Their leaders have tried to function as parliamentarians within a conventional party framework, and their programs, apart from the hortatory rhetoric that usually precedes the practical proposals, are as pedestrian as those of most center parties... I learned to distrust the promises of statist parties--indeed, of parties generally--after my very considerable experience with the Green parties in Europe, particularly the German Greens. *Die Grünen*, a classical example of a ‘nonparty-party’, ... has turned into a disgusting bureaucratic apparatus; ... and the party has increasing tailored its program and its policies to fit the needs of the status quo. None of these developments is accidental; indeed, during lecture tours of Germany over the past fifteen years, I vehemently warned that the party would move in the direction it has--not because I possess any clairvoyant power but because even the most superficial study of statism provides ample evidence that such developments are systemic. They are structured into the very nature of the state *as such*” (Bookchin, 1992, in Fotopoulos interview, his italics).

Today Die Grünen write that without their original idea of being a total alternative system, they would never have achieved parliamentary representation. The decisive difference since their formation, is that “we want to, we must, develop into a reform party, to remain successful” (Bündnis 90/ Die Grünen, 2002, p. 21). We “are no longer the ‘anti-party party’” (p. 21) – the green movement which did not wish to be part of the parliamentary system it rejected - we are the alternative party within the parliamentary (p. 21) [and capitalist, one could add] system. Co-optation completed?

9. Summary.

Here are summarized the green movement/ Die Grünen’s contribution to the idea of “green”, under a theme heading, a short description of their more, or less radical, but always intertwined ideas, and their location in this chapter.

WORLDVIEW: Die Grünen don’t use the concept “worldview” in their political statements. Instead they talk about a “Totalkonzept”, that is, a total concept ecological politics based on four main values: respect for ecology, living in solidarity, direct democracy, and non-violence. Of these, one could call “ecology” the lead value, the normative value context for all other values. “Partnerschaft” as ethic towards both people and nature, is a fifth value [1.4]. It is clear though from the writings of green thinkers of the time, that this “Totalkonzept”, apart from its explicit ethic, also included implicit views on epistemology [3], ontology [4], what it is to be a human being [4.3], and how society should constitute and conduct itself [6].

LEGITIMATING NARRATIVE: I have proposed that Die Grünen’s main legitimating narrative is exterminism [2.1]. Its critique of militarism, patriarchy, hierarchy, bureaucracy and industrialism, and their domination and exploitation, [2.1.1 –2.1.3], provide the context within which to understand Die Grünen’s rhetoric of Life and Survival [2.2.1], of their use of the Megamachine image to portray industrial society’s mindless destruction [2.2.2], and their rhetoric of emancipation, salvation, and hope

[2.2.3]. Exterminism also provides the context, I argue, in which to understand all five values, and their pervasive co-values - of holism instead of reductionism, inclusion instead of exclusion, dismantling instead of conglomerating, small scale instead of mammoth, diversity instead of one-dimensionality, self-determination instead of bureaucracy [2.3, 4.1, and 5.2.3].

EPISTEMOLOGY: It appears correct to say that Die Grünen’s implicit epistemology combines “Netzwerkdenkens”, an ecologically-modified kind of dialectical thinking, with the neo-Frankfurt School critique of instrumental reason’s domination of nature and people [3.2]. Die Grünen’s version of dialectical thinking proposes that (a) the nature of ecology itself suggests that there must be more to human thought than just the reconciliation of opposites, and (b) as the nature of ecology is movement and change, becoming and passing, there should be in human thinking too, an open-ness to movement and change, to “process” thought, rather than to reification or “absolutising” either-or thought [3.1]. Feeling in apprehending and knowing is awarded epistemological legitimacy [3.3].

ONTOLOGY:

-View of nature: Die Grünen’s view of nature contains nothing explicitly metaphysical, it is presented in ecological terms such as “household”, “network”, “cycles”, “ecosystems”, and particularly, “dynamic balance” [4.2.1 – 4.2.3]. Yet I suggest there might be in it, traces of nineteenth century German philosophical holism and vitalism [4.1].

-View of the human being: Within the normative view of ecology, human beings are to understand themselves as part of nature’s ecosystems and cycles [4.3 and 6.1.1]. Die Grünen understand being fully human – achieving Self-realization-in-ecology – as something beyond the one-dimensionality of industrial society’s “economic man”: a being of creativity, of imagination, of soul or spirit, capable of mature critical thinking, self-initiative, self-responsibility, and self-determination, who should have the opportunity to unfold fully and freely, in solidarity with other human beings, and with nature [4.3]. To achieve Self-Realization, simultaneous self-transformation *and* societal transformation [4.3.2, 6] is needed; in this spirituality plays an implicit role [4.3.3]. Die Grünen’s demand for women’s radical emancipation is based on their implicit view of women as socially equal to, but different from men. The “feminine principle” must be a part of the new society [4.3.5.1]. The most radical view of what it is to be a human being is Homo *occidentalis simplicissimus* [4.3.4.]

THE ETHIC: Vitalism as theory of value leads to an ethic of partnership, understood as people-people partnership [solidarity], and a people-nature partnership [5]. The partnership with nature is sometimes based on its independent value, but more often than not, on its instrumental role as life support for human beings, making vitalism a more anthropocentrically-inclined theory of nature’s value than biocentrism or ecocentrism [5.2.3]. The ethic’s scope includes nature’s cycles, ecosystems, and species, as well as individual animal welfare [5.3]. The moral obligation is to protect the “Lebensbasis” [5.4], including for future generations [5.3.3]. This entails observing the precautionary principle [5.4.1], re-orienting the growth economy to a cyclical, dynamic economy [5.4.2], protecting biodiversity and its habitat [5.4.3], protecting animal welfare [5.4.4], protecting land, water, and air [5.4.5], providing consciousness-changing environmental education [5.4.6], and strengthening the United Nations’ role in maintaining global ecological stability [5.4.7].

- Animal liberation issues: Based on the principle that animals may no longer be considered as objects, but must be accorded a special legal status. Die Grünen proposed several concrete measures to improve animal well-being.

VIEWS ON ECONOMIC ISSUES

-The economy: The ethic of “Partnerschaft” is achieved by recognizing that the economy [6.1.2] should not threaten the “Lebensbasis” for current and future generations by disturbing the ecological equilibrium. The uni-dimensional, profit-oriented growth economy must become an ecological cyclical

economy [6.1.2.1], it must deliver quality of life not quantitative growth [6.1.2.2], prioritize “investments in the future” [6.1.2.3], deliver social justice [6.1.2.4], be democratically controlled [6.1.2.5], and include ecological book-keeping [6.1.2.6]. Typically, Die Grünen’s view of the economy’s role in society is informed by their view of Self-realization [4.3].

-Work, employment and unemployment: Die Grünen’s critique of current society, their demands and measures for changed work politics [6.2.1] derive from their conviction that work is a means to Self-realization [6.2.1.1]. Following that premise, meaningful work is a right [6.2.1.2], the system must provide a programme against unemployment [6.2.1.3], work management must be democratized [6.2.1.4], and technology must be democratically controlled to ensure it contributes to Self-realization [6.2.1.5].

-Energy: Die Grünen’s critique of energy policy [6.1.3] can be reduced to three main arguments (a) non-renewable energy sources are limited (b) the use of nuclear energy poses threats to both the environment and to civil liberties, so is not a viable alternative to fossil fuel energy sources, and (c) the way forward is via people- and eco-friendly alternative energies. I identify five major demands: stabilize energy use [6.1.3.1], derive energy from renewable resources [6.1.3.2], halt all atomic energy projects [6.1.3.3], democratize and decentralize energy provision and storage [6.1.3.4], and increase research into alternative energies [6.1.3.5]

-Agriculture: Die Grünen rejected industrial agriculture; agriculture should be independent of industry [6.1.4]. Their major demands are food security and healthy food [6.1.4.1], and the step-by-step re-orientation of industrial agriculture towards organic farming [6.1.4.2].

-Transport and mobility: Industrial society mentality, and its resultant spatial planning, has meant that the different spheres of people’s lives have become disconnected, necessitating an extensive eco-unfriendly transport network [6.1.5] to re-connect them. Four principles underlie Die Grünen’s measures: (a) *All* transport is to be more friendly to people and to the environment (b) rail is to be favoured as urban and intra-national transport medium (c) in addition, the urban network must be people, including handicapped people, and cycle-friendly, (d) eco-friendly, energy saving, and noise-reduced engines must be researched and developed.

IEWS ON SOCIAL ISSUES

(a) Living

-Education: Die Grünen’s premises and proposals on education [6.2.2] derive from their view that education serves Self-realization. Education must be holistic and promote a person’s full flowering, not only produce technocrats and “well-adjusted” citizens [6.2.2.1]. It must also produce people reflecting green values [6.2.2.2].

-Human habitat: The areas where humans live [6.2.3] must be “humanized”. In effect, human habitat spatial planning must reflect Die Grünen’s core values [2.3].

-Health: Die Grünen advocated an alternative, ecologically-based, and holistic health policy [6.2.4]. It should focus beyond prevention only to root social causes; provide decentralized rather than centralized health facilities and care; and promote self-responsibility for health.

-Social assistance: This must be decentralized, and self-administered in the community [6.2.5].

-Women’s issues: Equal rights [“Gleichberechtigung”] and equal rights to self-determination [“Selbstbestimmungsrecht”] are the major principles guiding policies on women [6.2.6]. Women must have equal legal, and social role rights [6.2.6.1], and control over their own fertility [6.2.6.2].

-population size: This receives only the barest attention [6.2.5.1] in the context of Third World issues, and amounts to providing help with birth control measures on request.

(b) Political arrangements

-living in communes: The more radical version of ecological politics calls for a new commune-based society [6.3.1], outside the world market, in which a self-reliant ecological cyclical economy, and decentralized political self-determination, allow the achievement of authentic Self-realization.

-direct democracy: The aim of direct democracy [6.3.2] is to democratize government and bureaucracy, and to extend ordinary people's political space, through decentralization, and self-determination. Direct democracy serves Self-realization.

-fundamental human rights: Die Grünen's policy and measures here [6.3.3] included food, health care, work, housing, freedom of religion and belief, freedom of assembly, freedom of expression, humane treatment of prisoners, "unscathed" ["unversehrtes"] life, and an intact biosphere. Minority groups and marginalized groups [6.3.4] have the same fundamental rights as any other group. Self-determination, self-management and self-realization should be the values guiding policies for all socially-marginalized groups.

-information: Die Grünen simultaneously demanded full information from government, bureaucracy and business to assist direct-democracy decision-making, and the greatest possible protection for private data ["Datenschutz"] [6.3.5].

(c) Foreign relations

Die Grünen advocated radical, global eco-pacifism [6.4.1], which involves more than simply the absence of war. It presupposes respect for ecology [6.4.1.1], and base or direct democracy [6.4.1.2]. Principles for achieving this include [6.4.2.1] radical disarmament, [6.4.2.2] social defence, and [6.4.2.3] self-reliant, diverse bioregionalism, which includes protection of own culture.

-including Third World issues: Die Grünen's Third World policy is best understood in terms of the ideological critique of the centre-periphery model of **development** [2.1.3.2], and its ideological alternative, influenced by resource economist Galtung's thought on self-reliance and soft technology [2.1.3.3]. I extract five principles for Die Grünen's Third World policy [6.2.5], all expressions of the ethic of "partnership": (1) solidarity with liberation movements (2) the right to self-determination (3) fair trade prices for raw materials (4) a "help to self-help" aid policy, (5) a call to industrialized nations to meet the recommended 0.7% of GNP for development aid, without conditions, or repayment, attached.

PRAXIS

In both public and private spheres, means of achieving ends must match ends [6.4.3]. That meant **non-violence:** no physical violence [6.4.3.1], no hate speech [6.4.3.2]. There was to be no structural violence [6.4.4]. Dissent could however be expressed through non-violent resistance, including civil disobedience [6.4.5], and other measures [7].

CHAPTER EIGHT: A SEEING GREEN WORLDVIEW

1. Introduction	296
1.1 Other syntheses of the ecological or green worldview	296
1.2 What does seeing green mean?: Applying Sylvan’s method	298
1.3 Presentation of “seeing green”	299
2. Legitimizing narratives	300
2.1 The feminist-ecological androcentric critique, which encompasses the ideas of anthropocentrism, hierarchy, and techno-industrialism	300
2.1.1 Green stories	300
2.1.2 Hierarchy and patriarchy: their expressions as capitalism, industrialism, militarism, parliamentarianism, bureaucracy, techno-science, naturism, and “power over” critiqued	301
2.1.3 Metaphors	302
2.1.3.1 Mechanistic imagery used negatively	302
2.1.3.2 Relational, non-hierarchical imagery used positively	302
2.1.4 Rhetoric: resistance, liberation, emancipation, freedom!	302
2.1.5 Key theses on causes of ecological crisis	303
2.2 Ecology seen as normative	304
2.2.1 Green stories	304
2.3 Spirituality as motivation in personal and social transformation	304
2.3.1 Green stories	304
3. Epistemology	305
3.1 Green stories	305
3.2 Rationalism problematized	306
3.3 Holistic [both/and], relational, dialectical, processual, epistemologies advocated	307
3.4 The role of language in dominating, exploitative, human-human, human-nature, human-animal relationships problematized	307
4. Ontology	309
4.1 A holistic, purposive view of reality/nature	309
4.1.1 Green stories	309
4.1.2 A holistic view of reality	309
4.1.3 Nature as non-hierarchical	310
4.1.4. Nature as alive, manifesting rationality, consciousness, subjectivity, “mind”	310
4.1.5 Nature as manifesting “power to”, directionality, and self-organization, towards its own ends, such as greater complexity, diversity, self-reflexivity	310
4.1.5.1 but not a deterministic telos	310
4.1.6 Nature as displaying and maintaining dynamic balance and stability	310
4.2 A reconceptualized human being vis-a-vis nature	311
4.2.1 Green stories	311
4.2.2 Dichotomy between humans and nature [the “discontinuity problem”] rejected	311
4.2.3 Continuity rather than discontinuity with nonhuman nature emphasized	311



4.3 A reconceptualized Self	312
4.3.1 Green stories	312
4.3.2. Western atomist, aggressive, selfish individualism problematized	313
4.3.3. The new, better human being: liberated, re-integrated, embodied, connected	313
4.3.3.1 Complete liberation and freedom, especially for women, from all forms of hierarchy, patriarchy, and any other form of domination, or coercion	313
4.3.3.2 Unrepressed re-admittance of the body into what it is to be a fully-functioning human being	314
4.3.3.3 The ‘feminine principle’: feminine values re-integrated into views of the better person	314
4.3.3.4 The fully functioning person understood as the whole person: re-integrated, well-rounded	314
4.3.3.5 An interconnected sense of Self, in which a non-dominating, non-exploitative relationship with nature is part of what it is to be an integrated, mature, human being	315
4.3.3.6 Spirituality recognized	315
5. Ethic, including a nature, and animal, ethic	316
5.1 Green stories	316
5.2 A different account of the ethical	316
5.2.1 The epistemological and ontological assumptions underpinning rational-instrumentalism towards nature (women, animals) critiqued	317
5.2.2 Emotion (including empathy, identification, care, compassion) re-integrated into accounts of the ethical	317
5.2.3 Context (the particular, the personal, the process, “place”) re-integrated into accounts of the ethical	317
5.2.4 The body re-admitted into accounts of the ethical	317
5.2.5 The rights concept in human-human, and human-nonhuman relationships rejected, problematized, and employed	317
5.2.6 Environmental ethical theory [biocentrism, ecocentrism] and its technical understandings of value in nature do not quite encompass seeing green’s nature ethic	318
5.3 A “new consciousness” as motivation in bridging the human/nature (self/Other) divide	318
5.3.1 Green stories	318
5.3.2 Recognizing nature’s value-for-itself	318
5.3.2.1 Nature’s value-for-itself ascribed to	318
5.3.2.2 Values in nature	319
5.4 The scope of the green ethic, with focus on nature	319
5.4.1 Green stories:	319
5.4.2 Variation in scope:	320
5.5 The intent of the new nature ethic: long-range, wide ecological sustainability	321
5.5.1 Green stories	321
5.5.2 Understandings of long-range ecological sustainability	321
5.5.3. Animal well-being achieved through appeals to identification, sentience, the practice of care, special legal status, rights (justice)	322
5.5.4 Ecological sustainability achieved philosophically by	322
5.5.4.1 Assigning legal standing to sue, thus rights, to some of nonhuman nature	322
5.5.4.2 Biospherical egalitarianism – empathetically respecting every life form’s equal or same right to “live and blossom”	322
5.5.4.3 Actively employing human creativity to restore and maintain biological evolution towards mutuality, diversity, and increasing subjectivity	322
5.5.4.4 Practising an ethic of care	322
5.5.4.5 Practising a partnership ethic with nature which protects the life basis for all living beings	322



6. An ecological society: some real-world views on culture, politics, the economy, and the natural environment	323
6.1 Green stories	323
6.2 Key proposition: Fundamental, ecologically-informed, post-patriarchal reformation of ourselves, and society's structures needed	323
6.2.1 Ecologically-informed, and/or post-patriarchal personal and social values advocated	323
6.2.2 Ecologically-informed, post-hierarchical forms of political and socio-economic organization advocated	324
6.2.3 Reform environmentalism is not the answer	326
6.3 Authentic development, and the good life	326
6.3.1 Green stories	326
6.3.2 Capitalism problematized/rejected as cultural/socio-economic system	327
6.3.3 Development understood as advanced capitalist techno-industrialism challenged	327
6.3.3.1 The ideology of "progress" and "industrialism" ["development"] critiqued	327
6.3.3.2 Materialism and consumerism critiqued as end values	327
6.3.3.3 Rational-instrumental science and technology, problematized, rejected	328
6.3.3.4 "Naturism" critiqued (instrumental exploitation, domination and destruction of nature)	329
6.3.3.5 Global "advanced" industrial capitalism problematized	329
6.3.4 An alternative conception of "the good life"	330
6.3.5 Alternative forms of development proposed	330
6.4 Assuring ecological sustainability	331
6.4.1 Green stories:	331
6.4.2 Take a long-range ecological protection, not short term economic view of the environment ["futuraity"]	331
6.4.3 Establish international controls to assure global ecological sustainability	332
6.4.4 Stabilize, reduce human population growth	332
6.4.5 Protect land, water and air's long-term capacity to sustain life	332
6.4.5.1 Reduce excessive intervention into/disturbance of natural processes and habitats; exercise prudence when intervening	332
6.4.5.2 Reduce waste, pollution, and wastefulness	332
6.4.6 Protect remaining biodiversity and its habitat	332
6.4.6.1 Set aside, and restore, large areas of "free nature" from human techno-industrial progress to protect biodiversity and its habitat	333
6.4.6.2 Scale down industrial activities which threaten wide ecological sustainability	333
6.4.6.3 Problematize biotechnology	333
6.4.7 Reduce resource consumption: energy as example	333
6.4.7.1 Stabilize and reduce use of non-renewable energy	333
6.4.7.2. Use renewable energy	333
6.4.7.3 Increase research into alternative energies	334
6.4.7.4 Avoid/stop all use of nuclear energy	334
6.4.7.5 Democratize and decentralize energy provision and storage	334
6.4.7.6 Favour energy-saving transport systems	334
6.4.8 Practice reciprocal land use: agriculture as example	334
6.4.8.1 A demand for organically-produced food; a rejection of genetically modified foods	334
6.4.8.2 Concern for the protection of human scale farming	334
6.4.8.3 Attention to animal welfare in farming	334
6.4.9 Treat animals ethically	335
6.4.9.1 Eliminate animal experimentation including vivisection, and product-testing, completely, or almost completely	335



6.4.9.2	Totally dissolve, or radically reform, commercial animal agriculture	335
6.4.9.3	Total or partial moral veganism, vegetarianism, as personal statement and economic boycott	336
6.4.9.4	Wildlife: commercial, culling and sport hunting, trapping, and related trade totally or partially condemned, except in cases of vital human need	336
6.4.9.5	No animals confined for education, or used in entertainment	336
6.4.9.6	Animal torture strictly punishable	336
6.4.10	Provide insight into, and exposure to, the interconnectedness of the ecological life basis	336
6.5	An ecologically re-oriented economy	336
6.5.1	Green stories:	336
6.5.2	Recognizes ecological limits, and promotes ecological sustainability	337
6.5.3	Practises ecological accounting, incl. “greening” of GDP as indicator of development	337
6.5.4	Prioritizes life-affirming economic activities	338
6.5.5	Delivers quality of life, not quantitative growth	338
6.5.6	Encourages production for needs not profit	338
6.5.7	Encourages ecologically-appropriate local production for local use	339
6.5.8	Democratic control, both of the economy, and in the workplace	339
6.5.9	Provides creative activity, not meaningless labour	339
6.5.10	Uses “soft” (non-demeaning, non-exploitative) technology	340
6.5.11	Provides a “social wage” for all	340
6.5.12	Protects people against misleading encouragement to materialism and consumerism	340
6.5.13	Practices fair trade/development aid	341
6.6	Living in solidarity	341
6.6.1	Green stories	341
6.6.2	“Masculine” values rebalanced with ecologically-informed, and/or post-patriarchal personal and social values	342
6.6.3	Non-violence, and radical peace	342
6.6.3.1	Militarism, nuclearism, and threat of force critiqued; instead, radical peace, total disarmament, locally-organized non-violent social defence	342
6.6.3.2	No structural violence	343
6.6.3.3	Dialogue, consensual process, respect for difference, not ‘power-over’ in our relations and actions	343
6.6.3.4	No physical violence; no hate behaviour, no violent speech, no vilification	343
6.6.3.5	Fair trade practices	343
6.6.4	Full emancipation for women; post-patriarchal gender roles	343
6.6.5	Multi-culturalism valued	343
6.6.6	Social inclusion	343
6.6.7	Non-patriarchal, holistic, close-to-home health care	343
6.6.8	Re-integrated, ecologically-harmonious human habitat spatial planning	343
6.6.9	Holistic, real-world education	343
6.6.10	Considering future generations	343
6.7	Grassroots [“direct”] democracy	344
6.7.1	Green stories	344
6.7.2	Decentralized political self-management, and real citizenship	344
6.7.3	Non-violent, direct action, including civil disobedience	345
6.7.4	Fundamental rights protected	345
6.7.5	Public accountability, and private data protection	345
7	Praxis	345
7.1	Green stories	345



7.2 Living out/enacting your personal moral beliefs in the public sphere too	345
7.3 “Self-work”	346
8. Summary of “seeing green”	346
8.1 Its challenge	347

1. Introduction

We live during a period of millennial change in the Western world view ... One world view, the modern mechanical world view, is gradually giving way to another. Who knows what future historians will call it – the organic world view, the ecological world view, the systems world view...? (Callicott, 1992, p. 142).

The purpose of this chapter is to provide, from the green sample database in Chapters Three to Seven, one possible answer to research question 1: What does “seeing green” as worldview mean? In this introductory section, I explain (1.1) that this study is by no means the first attempt to characterise the “green” worldview, yet why I felt that asking what “seeing green” means, was still worthwhile, (1.2) my approach in arriving at this particular synthesis of “seeing green”, and (1.3) how I have presented it. Thereafter, follows a textual presentation of a “seeing green” worldview under the by-now familiar themes of (2) legitimating narratives, (3) epistemology, (4) ontology, (5) ethic, with emphasis on seeing green’s nature and animal ethic, (6) views on political, social and economic issues, and (7) praxis. In section 8, I present a summary of seeing green’s key ideas. In Chapter Ten: section 3.4, I draw on this chapter to compile a list of criteria and indicators by which to judge the green-ness of any text, such as *Namibia Vision 2030* (Chapter Eleven).

1.1 Other syntheses of the ecological or green worldview

Other writers have attempted the task of synthesizing an ecological or green worldview, often in contradistinction to what they variously call “technocentrism”, “the politics of industrialism”, or the mechanist/Cartesian worldview. Those I have encountered are -

- a. O’Riordan, in his 409-page book, *Environmentalism* (1981). In Figure 10.1¹ “The pattern of environmentalist ideologies”, O’Riordan (1981, p. 376) seeks to characterise in brief phrases, the key ideas of “Ecocentrism”, which he divides into two versions, a more ecocentric version: “Deep environmentalists” and a less ecocentric version, called “Self-reliance, soft technologists”. In the next two columns, he presents the key ideas of the “Technocentrism” ideology, also in two versions: a less extreme version entitled “Accommodaters”, and a more extreme version, called “Cornucopians”;
- b. Porritt, in his 249-page book “*Seeing green*” (1984), provides on pages 216-217, a table entitled “Distinguishing features of a green paradigm”. In it he compares the worldviews of “The politics of ecology” with “The politics of industrialism”. This table was introduced in Chapter Four, Figure 4;
- c. Sterling, who wrote a 10-page chapter in Engel and Engel (1990, pp. 77-86), entitled “Towards an ecological world view”. On p. 82, he compares in Table 5.1, “Mechanistic versus Ecological World Views”, under what he calls, “Descriptors”, “Primary”, and “Secondary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views”;
- d. Metzner, who wrote a 10-page chapter in Tucker and Grim (1994), entitled “The emerging ecological worldview”. In an unnumbered table entitled “Transition from the industrial to the ecological age” (pp. 170-171), he compares key ideas in these two worldviews under descriptors such as “epistemology”, “values in relation to nature”, “technology” and “agriculture”.

¹ O’Riordan’s table is reproduced as Figure 9, in Chapter Eleven

² The keynote citation for this book was from fundamentalist Die Grünen Rudolf Bahro’s work, Die Grünen activist and founding party member Petra Kelly wrote its foreword, and Charlene Spretnak, deep ecologist and ecofeminist wrote of it that “No one who reads this book will ever again confuse ecological politics with mere environmentalism” (back cover). The book’s credentials are therefore a darker shade of “green”

- e. Edward Goldsmith, author of *Blueprint for survival* (1972), has also (1992) authored *The Way: An ecological world view*, a 442-page book, in which he describes the ecological worldview in terms of 66 principles, to which he devotes a chapter each.

All these writers' synthesizing attempts, but particularly the first four, have been invaluable in contributing to the ecological validity of this study, as I explain in section 1.3.1.

So why did I not in turn, synthesize their attempts – a seemingly obvious, and tempting, shortcut to understanding “seeing green”! - in order to reach a set of criteria by which the green-ness of any text could be assessed? For several reasons.

First and foremost, initially completely uninformed as to what “green” might mean, other than a vague “environmental-friendliness”, most of the descriptors were puzzling: “Land ethic: think like mountain” (Sterling, 1990, p. 82), or “Ecology, not environmentalism” (Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217). What did they mean?

The second reason, which emerged as my knowledge of the green sample members' viewpoints increased, was that the writers had been necessarily selective, as I have been, in their choice of indicators, or “markers”, but not always transparently so. I use Metzner's excellent table (1994, pp. 170-171) as example. Under “Role of the human”, he uses “extended sense of self” as descriptor of the Ecological Age, in contradistinction to the Industrial Age's “Individual vs. world”. There is no indication that this green marker comes from a *deep ecology* context, nor any indication either, that is a highly contentious understanding of Self, critiqued by social ecologists and ecofeminists alike (Chapter Four: 4.2.3). But, remaining with “Role of the human”, Metzner uses “ecological stewardship”, which I have assumed to be taken from a *social ecology* context (Chapter Five: 5.4.2.5), as marker of the human's role in the Ecological Age, and not, as could reasonably have been expected, the *deep ecology* “partner” to “extended sense of self” for the human's role in nature, which is “biospherical egalitarianism” (Chapter Four: 4.2.2, 5.1.1). *Social ecology*'s influence in his choice of phrases under the descriptor “Human/social values” is clear. Yet social ecologist Bookchin's rejection of any supernatural element in nature is not present in Metzner's list of indicators at “Theology and religion”. In neither Metzner's table, nor any of the other three tables, is Bookchin's sustained, and biting, critique of capitalism – fundamental to his *social ecology* critique - even mentioned. In other words, I found to be missing in the four summary syntheses: (1) the *philosophical/ideological context* of the key phrases/words chosen, something I consider all-important to retain the rich meaning of any particular green idea. It is exactly this discarding of the rich context of green ideas which makes their co-optation, and absorption, into mainstream thinking possible, which turns their “green-ness” to “grey”, “grue” or “brown”. (2) Also largely missing I thought, is an indication of *the variation*, or downright *disagreements*, in the different versions of green thinking. An exception here is O'Riordan's (1981, p. 376) table, which does seek to show “within-green” variation.

Other reasons were purely practical: it would have required taking some liberties with these writers' presentations to coax their descriptors and key phrases/words, into the kind of standard themes environmental philosopher Sylvan (1985b) encouraged in coming to grips with the ideas of a worldview. In addition, some of the indicators are so phrased as to be difficult to apply concretely to a text: Sterling's (1990) “The quality of interrelationships between systems equated with well-being”, or “Concern with the qualitative” are good examples, as is Porritt's “Ecology” (1984), or Metzner's (1994) “ecofeminism”. Finally, I wanted to arrive at a personal, not derived, understanding of what a “seeing green” worldview might mean.

1.2 What does seeing green mean?: Applying Sylvan's method

To produce *this* synthesis of a seeing green worldview, from which seeing green criteria will be derived in Chapter Ten, I followed Sylvan's (1985b) qualitative thematic survey method (Chapter Two, section 1). Sylvan began by (a) assembling a set of sources on his topic [deep ecology in his case, seeing green in mine], (b) identifying and "unscrambling" the themes which seemed to be present or "emerge" from the identified sources [the standard worldview elements of Chapters Three to Seven], (c) discarding those themes which to him appeared "evidently remote and irrelevant", and then (d) applying "the elementary set operations of union and intersection" to the present or emerging themes in order to establish the "total theory"/"paradigm" [union] and "common core" [intersection] of his research topic. It is step (d) with which this section 1.2 is concerned.

Here is Sylvan's description of it:

Once the sources are assembled a beginning can be made on unscrambling themes, something that calls for a good deal of judgement also, especially in such matters as deciding whether themes from different sources come to the same [thing] or not. Here and elsewhere care is required not to penetrate too deeply, to expose only so much of the surface themes as is necessary (a well-known principle in logical analysis). When the themes are duly marked out, there is some smoothing of the thematic data, for instance evidently remote and irrelevant themes in one source may be deleted. (It is like the judging of a diving contest or the massaging of statistic[s]: isolated wild elements are removed from the sample used for assessment.) Then the elementary set operations of union and intersection are applied, again subject to some qualification. In particular, if a very prominent theme in some formulations is omitted from, or only approximated in, one formulation, then that theme will be put, initially at least, in the intersection ...

Before presenting my own attempted synthesis, some comments are in order:

I wanted a substitute for Sylvan's mathematical-sounding "union" and "intersection" terms. Qualitative replacement terms often used are "core" and "periphery", but after intensive exposure to ecofeminist thought, that sounded too "centric" (Chapter Six: 4.2.1). It implies that ideas occurring more often, or on which there is consensus, are more important than ideas less agreed on, or occurring less often. Nor does this kind of quantitative approach "work" for seeing green: (a) The strongly present feminist critique of 'male' views on Self and Other in ecofeminism is not an explicitly-discussed aspect of all sample members, yet feminist thought is significant in seeing green (Ferris, 1993, p. 149, pp. 150-151³), (b) the sample members have been chosen to represent the different levels of Wissenburg's heuristic (Chapter One, Figure 2); it is to be expected then that their focus, and their choice of issues, differs, and (c), welcoming of diversity of opinion is itself a marker of green. So, instead of mathematical or centrist terms, I have settled for "Green stories"⁴ to represent what seeing green is trying to say on any particular point.

It was indeed no easy task, as Sylvan warned, to decide to what extent ideas in the standard themes across the sample came to the "same thing", or not. For example, holism in perception of reality is a mostly common thought across the seeing green sample, but it varies from metaphysical understandings to emphatic naturalism (Chapter Eight: 4.1.2). There is agreement that animal suffering matters morally, and that economic policies must change to reflect that, but animal liberation theory and ecofeminism arrive at that conclusion from completely different epistemological and ontological premises. Ferris (1993, p. 151), in the context of wondering whether such a thing as green social

³ "Green politics have been shaped by (but are not synonymous with) three distinct social movements: those of feminism, ecology and peace" (p. 149), and "What changed political ecology after 1980, was the coming together of the peace movement and feminism with green concerns. This injected into ecological thought the historic concerns of the left, especially the critique of social domination and concern with equality and justice." (pp. 150-151)

⁴ I considered, but rejected "trend", as too linear, and "pattern" as conveying more orderliness than I found in seeing green. The concept "stories" can convey an important message, even if in a roundabout, rather than direct, way

policies is possible at all, notes that a “... careful documentation” of the “conflicting currents in green ideology” is required, and that the “spectacular synthesis ... transmitted by writers like Parkin⁵ and Porritt is far from having been achieved either intellectually or politically....”. Diversity of opinion, not homogeneity, is a marker of green! Nevertheless, I do believe, along with the writers mentioned in this chapter’s section 1.1, and others such as Capra and Spretnak (1984), that such a thing as “seeing green” does exist.

1.3 Presentation of “seeing green”

It is no easy task to present seeing green’s diversity and complexity⁶, either compactly or coherently. Sterling (1990, p. 77) for example writes: “The most pressing need is for the emergence, clarification, and adoption of a new ecological world view ... Its articulation is inherently difficult, however, for it relates to a way of thinking and being which is far deeper and more extensive than any single attempt to express it, and which goes beyond any one individual’s interpretation....”.

In sections 2-7, I present in textual format, my understanding of seeing green’s ideas according to the standard worldview themes developed through Chapters Three to Seven. As far as possible, within-theme presentation has been standardized, under “green stories”, “variations”, “green sample data”, and “green external data”. These are explained next.

The worldview element/theme, and sometimes its sub-themes, begin with **green stories**, which are not to be understood as an exact quantitative reflection of how common a specific viewpoint is across the sample. Heeding Ferris’s call for “careful documentation” of conflicting ideas, **variations** in the green stories are pointed out. Then follows **green sample data**, presented as fully as possible, in the form of chapter and section references, to support the stories and their variations. This approach, though tedious, serves to remind the reader that all seeing green ideas are taken from a particular, and rich, philosophical/ideological context, *which informs their meaning*. The data provided also suggests, but only in a broad sort of way, the “sameness” of ideas across the green sample – for example the critique of patriarchy common to *ecofeminism* and *Die Grünen* owes its origins to feminist critique; the critique of hierarchy common to *social ecology* and *Die Grünen* can trace its origins to the counter-cultural influence of New Left thought.

In support of my green stories and their variations, I also refer the reader to similar ideas present in other authors’ attempts to synthesize seeing green [1.1 above]. Methodologically, I hope this **external green data** contributes to the ecological validity of the synthesis suggested here. Readers may judge for themselves to what extent this extraneously-derived green data supports or departs from my version of seeing green. Those external ideas which I did not encounter in the green sample elements, or which I encountered but did not include in my discussion, are clearly indicated in separately marked sections.

A note on the limitations of the synthesis. I feel somewhat dissatisfied with it, because it is a “flat” reflection of the richness, diversity, elusiveness, beauty, and challenge of the philosophical and ideological ideas which comprise each sample element. This synthesis is also limited in that the five base data chapters themselves represent a selection only of each sample member’s viewpoints on reality, self, and the self/nature relationship, based on some sources only. It is to be expected that some views on some issues are not represented here, for example, green views on sustainable fisheries, sustainable forestry, mining, or fiscal measures. Even so, despite these limitations, I am confident that the synthesis presented here, does convey the major ideas of “seeing green”.

⁵ Sara Parker, former UK Green, author of a biography on Die Grünen activist Petra Kelly, now a colleague of Jonathon Porritt in the UK organization Forum for the Future (www.forumforthefuture.org.uk)

⁶ “... the ecological world view is difficult to describe because it tends toward great complexity and because its elements and their origins are diverse. ...” (Bartlett, 1986, p. 234, noting Lynton K. Caldwell’s (1971, p. 209) “distillation” of it in *Environment: A challenge to modern society*)

2. Legitimizing narratives

The seeing green worldview blames a mixture of philosophical/ideological factors for the ecological crisis. Androcentrism, anthropocentrism, hierarchy, patriarchy, naturism, and western-techno-industrialism are the major candidates (2.1). The lessons of ecology are seen as normative for restoring what once were human beings' benign relationships with each other, and with nature (2.2). Spirituality, metaphysical or secular, provides essential motivation in the personal and social-structural transformation which comprises seeing green (2.3).

2.1 The feminist-ecological androcentric critique, which encompasses the ideas of anthropocentrism, hierarchy, and techno-industrialism

2.1.1 Green stories

A key, and practically universal theme in the green sample is a critique of anthropocentrism (discussed in more detail in Chapter Nine: section 6), two formal environmental philosophical definitions of which are:

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 well-being as valuable intrinsically (Attfield, 2003, p. 188).

... the philosophical perspective asserting that ethical principles apply to humans only, and that human needs and interests are of highest, and even exclusive, value and importance. Thus, concern for nonhuman entities is limited to those entities having value to humans (Botzler & Armstrong, 1998b, p. 309).

Some ecofeminists argue that androcentrism encompasses and explains anthropocentrism, and the idea of hierarchy too. Androcentrism is a 'male' and supposedly gender-neutral understanding of what it is to be a human being. Feminists/ecofeminists contend that its *masculine* dualistic, hierarchical, and dominating logic generates a Self divided against self, against human other, and against nature. 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. Androcentrism also encompasses seeing green's powerful critique of hierarchical and patriarchal thinking in the political and socio-economic spheres, including its justification of "naturism" – any way of thinking about, or acting towards nonhuman nature "that reflects a logic, values, or attitude of domination" (Warren, 1990, p. 141, in Chapter Six: 1.3).

Androcentric critique (understood to include the critique of anthropocentrism, patriarchy and hierarchy) forms the narrative context for seeing green's entire western cultural, psychological, ethical, social, and economic critique. Capitalism, militarism, parliamentarianism, authoritarian bureaucracy, and techno-science, are all critiqued as expressions of the 'power-over' [as opposed to creative "power-to"⁷] thought, competition, domination, manipulation and violence inherent in hierarchy and patriarchy (2.1.2). The androcentric/anthropocentric critique explains seeing green's rhetoric of liberation, of emancipation, from domination and oppression (2.1.3), its theses on the causes of the ecological crisis (2.1.4), its critique of western dominant views on, and demands for alternative views on epistemology, ontology and human-nature ethic.

⁷ "Power to," means the power to act, or to "be", or to self-realize, without external restraint. It also refers to the Earth's immanent power to self-organize [autopoiesis]. It is creative power, rather than power-over. Some of its ideas-origins are variously Earth spirituality, Spinozist-influenced metaphysics, and the absence of hierarchy/ presence of symbiosis in nature, normatively understood. In seeing green, "power to" – an essential element of freedom - can be achieved by removing all forms of hierarchy, patriarchy, domination and oppression, and rebalancing "masculine" with "feminine-principle" thinking

Green sample data:

deep ecology Ch 4: 2.1, 5.1.1, 5.2, 5.4.1, and Ch 5: 8.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.2.2 and subdivisions; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.3, 2.3, 3.1, 3.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.3.2.2, 5.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2(3); *Die Grünen*: Ch 7: 2.1.

Variations:

1. *animal liberation theory* does not problematize androcentrism/anthropocentrism at all, but speciesism⁸ - Ch 3: 5.1.1.1
2. *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) problematizes the lack of legal standing for natural objects in the legal system, not anthropocentrism, but his critique of atomist individualism's desire to possess and to dominate begins to approach such critique - Ch 3: 5.1.3, 5.4.3, 6.1
3. Not "anthropocentricity", but the idea of hierarchy in human affairs, and projected onto nature, is blamed for human-human and human-nature oppression – *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.2.2
4. I understand as not unlike much of the androcentric critique⁹, yet different, *Die Grünen* Bahro's exterminism. Defined as the logic of self-destruction, or the tendency towards mass destruction of all life, it manifests itself in the surface phenomena of (1) militarism, (2) patriarchy (3) the destruction of nature and culture by aggressive capitalist industrialism, and (4) the "daily exterminism" of mass starvation in the Third World, both as a result of capitalist industrialism's relentless pursuit of raw materials, cheap labour, and new markets, and at the hands of their own ruling elites (Bahro, 1984, pp. 214-217) - *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.

2.1.2 Hierarchy and patriarchy: their expressions as capitalism, industrialism, militarism, parliamentarianism, bureaucracy, techno-science, naturism, and "power over" critiqued

Green sample data:

- a. Patriarchy – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.2.3.2 last par., 6.2.1 footnote 66; *social ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.5.2 footnote 61; Ch 5: 4.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1, 1.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1.1, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2.2, 4.3.2.3, 5.4.2, 5.4.2.1, 5.4.4.1(d), 5.4.4.2, 6.1.1, 6.1.2(9), 6.2, 7.4; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 4.3.4 footnote 67, 4.3.5
- b. Hierarchy – *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.1.4.1, 2.1.4.2.1, 2.1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 4.2, 4.2.2.2, 4.2.2.3, 4.3, 4.3.1, 5.1, 5.4, 5.4.2.2, 6.1, 6.1.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.2, 8.1, 8.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.2, 4.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2(5); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.2, 2.1.3.2.1
- c. Statism, parliamentarianism – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.4.3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 4.3, 4.3.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.1.1, 6.3.2 and subdivisions, 7.2, and Ch 7: 8.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4.1, 8.1
- d. Bureaucracy – *social ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.5.2 footnote 61, Ch 5: 2.1.3, 3.2, 4.3, 6.1.1.1, 6.3.2.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.2
- e. Capitalism as cultural-economic system – stories and data at section 6.3.2, this chapter
- f. Militarism – stories and data at sections 6.6.1 and 6.6.3
- g. Techno-industrialism ("advanced" industrialism) – stories and data at section 6.3.3
- h. Techno-science – stories and data at section 6.3.3.3
- i. Naturism – stories and data at section 6.3.3.4
- j. power-over the Other; will to power – *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.2.2, 4.2.2.2, 4.2.2.3, 6.1.1, 6.1.1.1, 6.3.1.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 3.1.1, 3.3.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.3.2.4, 5.4.4.2, 6.1.1, 6.1.2(5), 7; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.5.1, 8.1.

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, 1973, in Zimmerman et al., 1993, p. 27, in Ch 3: 5.1.1.1)

⁹ I feel this interpretation is justified by Bahro's commitment to post-patriarchal perspectives [for example, Ch 7: 2.1.2]

2.1.3 Metaphors

2.1.3.1 Mechanistic imagery used negatively

“The Machine” or “mega-machine” image is used negatively to portray our reification of animals as mere things, for example, in intensive factory farming, as resources-for-humans; the reification of nature; an out-of-democratic-control industry, science and technology; or patriarchy-inspired western-style development in developing countries.

Green data: *animal liberation* Ch 3: 2.2, 5.3.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1 footnote 11, 5.4.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.4, 6.1.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.2.2.

2.1.3.2 Relational, non-hierarchical imagery used positively

Relational images are used to convey ontological understandings which emphasize interdependence rather than hierarchy.

Green data:

- “field”, “Gestalt” - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.2, 3.1, 4.1.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.1
- “net”, “network”, “web”, “mesh” - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.4.5.2 footnote 61; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.4, 5.3.2; *Die Grünen* 4.2, 4.2.1, 5.4.1.
- “collage”, “mosaic”, “tapestry” - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.2.2
- “household” [from “oikos”] - *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 5.4.1
- “community”, “ecocommunity” - *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2.1, 4.3, 5.4
- “system” and “ecosystem” - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.2, 2.4; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2, 4.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.1, 6.1.2(4); *Die Grünen* 4.2.1, 4.3.

Variations:

- Images of nature as mindless matter, or demonic [female] Beast, are also critiqued – *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.4, but
- Nature portrayed in images and metaphors as nurturing female causes ecofeminist ambivalence - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.1.1, 2.4.
- Some writers within *social ecology* (Bookchin, Ch 5: 2.1.4.2.1) and *Die Grünen* (Maren-Grisebach, Ch 7: 4.2 footnote 50) are wary of the mechanistic implications¹⁰ of the term system/ecosystem and tend rather towards the concept “ecocommunities”.

2.1.4 Rhetoric: resistance, liberation, emancipation, freedom!

Green stories: The rhetoric is of egalitarianism, rights and justice, resistance, emancipation, liberation, and freedom [= choice, and self-direction].

Variations: The stories are variously of liberation for nature from humanity’s domination¹¹, humanizing, domestication, or “thingification”; for women from patriarchy; for animals from

¹⁰ Their concerns are valid if judged by influential early ecologist Arthur Tansley, who insisted that the term ‘ecocommunities’ carried organismic implications, and should be replaced by the term “ecosystem” to convey his view of nature “as a composite of strictly physical entities organized into a mechanical system” (Goldsmith, 1992, p. 18). The values implicit in the term “ecosystem” are discussed in Chapter Nine: 5.1

¹¹ Perhaps this is not stated emphatically enough. Modernity has defined human freedom *in opposition to* nature. This has given rise to two distinct, and opposing ethical traditions (Goulet, 1990, pp. 43-44). Given the key value of normative ecology, interdependence, both Goulet (1990, pp. 43-46), and Davidson (2000, pp. 35-37, referring to Goulet, 1990) discuss how to reconcile human freedom and nature’s freedom. Despite this, Goulet’s approach seems non-green to me, in that he continues to grant separate ontological status to nature, and to humanity, whereas “seeing green” rejects such ontological dualism. “Seeing green” is about seeking an end to the [masculinist] idea of human progress/development via the domination and exploitation of nature in a kind of “war” in which *either* humanity is “free” *or* nature is “free” [its integrity is maintained]. See for example, social ecologist Bookchin, in Chapter Five, section 4.2.2.3, ecofeminist authors in Chapter Six, sections 1.2, 1.3, 4.3.2.2 on the culture vs. nature debate, and naturism, or *Die Grünen*, Chapter Seven, section 2.1.3 on nature experienced as “enemy”

speciesism; for humanity from domestication, ‘necessity’, and any form of co-ercion; for Third World peoples from western ‘maldevelopment’; for ourselves from our role as dominators of nature. Some rhetoric is of healing, salvation, and survival.

Green sample data:

- a. Egalitarianism – *animal liberation* Ch 3: 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.2, 5.4.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.3.1, 2.4, 5.1.1.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.2.2.1
- b. Rights and justice – *animal liberation* Ch 3: 2.1
- c. Resistance, liberation, emancipation, freedom – *animal liberation* Ch 3: 2.1, 5.1.1.1; *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) Ch 3: 5.1.3.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.2, 4.1.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.3, 4.1.3.3, 4.3, 4.3.1, 5.2.1.2, 8.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1, 1.4, 2.4, 5.1, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.4.2, 5.4.4.3, 6.4(c), 7; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.2.3, 4.3.4, 6.4.1.2
- d. Life, survival, salvation/redemption for self and planet - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.2.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.6, 2.2.1, 2.2.3, 4.3.4
- e. “healing” the wounds inflicted on people and planet by hierarchy, oppression - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.4.

2.1.5 Key theses on causes of ecological crisis

Green stories: Seeing green has been insisting since the mid-1960s that there is a real, global, ecological crisis. A valid question here, I think, is: “Have we averted it, or is there still a crisis?” Yes, there is: “The scientists who mind the Doomsday Clock moved it forward two minutes on Wednesday [24th January 2007] to five minutes until midnight, symbolising the growing risk of the annihilation of civilisation, and for the first time said global warming was a threat...” (*The Namibian*, 25 January 2007, p. 7, article entitled “2007 is the crunch year on climate: enviro expert” citing from a NAMPA-Reuters report).

Variations, and green sample data: In that context then, green sample theses on the causes of the ecological crisis are variously:

1. *Animal liberation* theorists Singer and Regan make no key assumptions on the cause of the ecological crisis which would entail radical structural changes to society, but their ethic’s moral obligation to end animal suffering does. *Nonhuman nature rights* theorist Stone suggests that the lack of assignment of legal standing, thus rights, to some of nature at least, contributes to the environmental crisis – Ch 3: 5.1.3, 6.1

2. Anthropocentrism - the ontological divide between humanity and the rest of nature which it assumes, and the instrumental view of nature it legitimates – is the cause of the ecological crisis. A change towards a more ecocentric, non-dualistic ontological understanding of nature, and a new understanding of Self within it, must precede a change in our ethical attitudes towards nature – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.1

3. “deep-seated social problems”, such as economic, ethnic, cultural and gender conflicts, are the source from which all our ecological problems arise. These problems cannot be understood, or resolved, “without resolutely dealing with problems within society” (Bookchin, 1993, p. 354). Ecological problems are essentially social justice and political issues, “stemming from capitalism and problems of social hierarchy and social class domination” (Sessions, 1995f, pp. 265-266). It is the “hierarchical mentality” pervading our society which gives rise to “the very idea of dominating the natural world” (Bookchin, 1993, p. 355) – Ch 5: 2.2

4. Androcentrism – the male disconnected sense of Self, its patriarchal orientation, its power-based morality – is the cause of the ecological crisis. The disconnected male Self views everything as “Other” to itself, and thus as a potential object of management, exploitation, domination, or oppression. Androcentrism manifests itself structurally and systemically as patriarchy, hierarchy, and naturism – *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.3

5. Advanced industrialism, both western and socialist, is responsible for all current and interconnected crises, both at cultural/socio-economic level, and at personal level – *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.4.

2.2 Ecology seen as normative

2.2.1 Green stories

Ecology was originally seen as the “subversive” science, and its ideological status that of a resistance or revolutionary movement (*deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.4). In social ecologist Bookchin’s phrase, 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-harmonizing itself with nature; preserving nature’s richness, complexity, diversity] (*social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2). Ecology provides the secure foundation for seeing green’s thought, policy and practice (Maren-Grisebach, of *Die Grünen*, Ch 7: 4.2.4), and also our nature ethic. Rejecting the naturalistic fallacy¹² (e.g. *social ecology* Ch 5: 5, *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.2.4), seeing green proposes ecology as 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 (section 6.2, this chapter).

Herein lies a green challenge to traditional views of science as supposedly value-free (Botzler & Armstrong, 1998a, p. 11). To varying degrees, social ecologists, deep ecologists, and *Die Grünen*, for example, all welcome natural science ecology as partly-normative for their ontological views, and views on the new human being, new self, and new society (e.g. *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.4; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.2.4). Deep ecologists saw the new science of conservation biology which emerged in the mid-1980s, as normative for their views on the conservation of “free nature” and biodiversity (*deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.4, 4.1.4.2).

Variations: *animal liberation theory* appeals not to radical ecology, but to the humanitarian rhetoric of rights and justice, to justify its nature (animal) ethic - Ch 3: 2.1.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.4, 4.1.4, 4.1.4.2, 6.5.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.3 footnote 9, 2.1.4.2, 3.2, 4.1.3.4, 5, 5.2.1.1; *Die Grünen* 1.4, 1.5, 2.1.2, 4.2.4, 6.1.1.

External green data:

Ecological (and other natural) laws dictate human morality (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981, p. 376).

2.3 Spirituality as motivation in personal and social transformation

2.3.1 Green stories

Calls for spiritual renewal to end the philosophy of materialism, the “religion” of economism, and the pathology of individualism, are part of seeing green. Personal spiritual transformation is seen as essential in bringing about the new social transformation; in *Die Grünen* Bahro’s words, spirituality is the practice needed “to dismantle ... previous psychological structures and be socialized anew” (Bahro, 1983f, in Bahro, 1986, p. 90, and in Ch 7: 4.3.2). The sources of seeing green’s spirituality are diverse: alternative forms of Christianity such as the Christian mystics, St Francis, Meister Eckhart; Eastern religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism; Earth or goddess worship; the animism of some “primal peoples”; and naturalism [respect for evolutionary process] are some. Spirituality also expresses itself as a rejection of domination, and as a deep commitment to genuine

¹² “Positivists hold that, because all value judgments are subjective and unreliable, they do not constitute ‘proper knowledge’. By positing the ‘naturalistic fallacy’ they claim that it is not possible to infer ‘ought’ from ‘is’, the *prescriptive* (value) from the *descriptive* (fact)” (Sterling, 1990, p. 79, his italics)

communalism/mutualism. In spirituality, recognized or not, is the indissoluble link between the re-conceptualized human being, the re-conceptualized self [section 4.3.3], and an ecologically-sustainable society [section 6].

Variations:

1. *Animal liberation theory* makes no mention of spirituality as motivation to the practice of animal rights. However, *nonhuman nature rights theorist* Stone, with his diffident suggestion that we recognize nature's possible consciousness and subjectivity, begins to approximate it, I think (Ch 3: 5.1.3, 5.1.3.1, 5.2.3).
2. In Bookchin's *social ecology* view, there is no support for metaphysical spirituality; spirituality is understood as authentic complementarity with both human and nonhuman nature. Structural change must precede personal spiritual change/redemption (Ch 4: 6.5.1, and Ch 5: 1, 2.1.1, 2.1.4.1, 2.1.4.2.1, 4.3.1, 5.1, 5.4, 6, 7.1, as examples).
3. Marxist-inspired elements within the green movement, tend to reject any spiritual dimension to life (e.g. *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2; *Die Grünen*, Ch 7: 4.3.3.1).
4. Some green movement adherents critique what they see as "luxury spirituality [New Age and esoteric-type thinking for example] idealist icing on top of the material cake of the West's standard of living" (*ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2).

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.3, 6.2.4.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.2, 2.1.4, 2.2, 2.2.1, 5.3.2, 6.1.1, 6.1.2(2); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.5, 2.1.3.3(4), 2.1.3.5, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.3.1, 4.3.4, 6.3.1, 6.4.5.

External green data:

- a. A move towards spiritual, non-material values (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Animism: everything lives, not nature as background; nature as sacred, not nature as demonic/frightening; immanent divinity, not transcendent divinity; Creation spirituality¹³, not Creation as fallen, corrupt; pantheism and panentheism, not monotheism and atheism (Theology and religion in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

3. Epistemology

3.1 Green stories

Science originally referred to "the state or fact of knowing, and was contrasted with the notions of intuition or belief..." (Botzler & Armstrong, 1998a, p. 9). What separated science from intuition or belief, was dispassionate rationalism. Seeing green however, problematizes the primacy of reason and rationality as ways of knowing and acting, on various grounds (3.2): 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 legitimating rational-efficient, instrumental use of the Other [people and nature]; as favouring the analytical above the holistic; the value-free above the value-laden; and devaluing particular and local knowledge. In seeing green, *subjectivity, emotion, intuition, empathy, sensitivity, involvement, and value-recognition in knowing* are acknowledged, and appreciated.

¹³ Presumably a reference to Mathew Fox's (1990) creation spirituality (for example, Reading 25 in Botzler & Armstrong, 1998, pp. 228-235). I did not encounter it in the sources I consulted for each sample member, but from the Reading, it is clearly "green"

The seeing green critique of science and technology is not homogenous. Social ecology explicitly values humanist, non-rational-instrumental science and technology as “liberatory¹⁴” for the human condition (*social ecology* – Ch 5: 3.1, 6.2 as examples). Science’s supposedly value-free nature is critiqued on the one hand by some ecofeminists who reject this assumption (Ch 6: 3.3), and highlighted by deep ecologists on the other as unable, on its own, to provide normative values for society (Ch 4: 2.4). Consistently problematized, perhaps as heritage from Marcuse’s counter-cultural critique, is instrumental reason [e.g. economic rationality, rational self-interest], for its ethically bankrupt use of the Other for own ends. Rational-instrumental, exploitative forms of science, and of technology, which demean and dehumanize the human being, are exploitative of nature, and which provide short-term, “quick-fix” solutions to the ecological crisis rather than encouraging a review of fundamental values, are critiqued. This point is taken up again in section 6.3.3.3.

In addition to rationalism [but not instrumental rationalism], alternative holistic, dialectical, both/and, and process epistemologies are proposed (3.3). The influence of language in epistemological and ontological views is problematized: nature must also be emancipated from oppressive epistemological and ontological views in our words (3.4).

Variations:

1. Reason/rationality as way of knowing is preferred, not problematized - *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 3, 5.4.2(c)
2. The Enlightenment ideal of reason is affirmed. Non-instrumental science and technology is valued: *social ecology* Ch 5: 1, 3.1, 4.2.1.2, footnote 33 at 5.4, 5.4.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3.1.3, also in Ch 6: 3.5; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.2.1.5
3. Reason/rationality, and mechanistic, rationalist-instrumental, analytical, value-free, exploitative, context-inappropriate forms of science are seen as a “malestream” way of knowing, derived from a ‘masculinist’ worldview (Ch 6: 3.3): an oppositional view of Self [self divided against self], and oppositional view of Self/Other [other people, women, nature, animals], together with a devaluing of, and “power-over¹⁵” approach to, the Other – *ecofeminism* Ch 3: 8.5, and Ch 6: 1.2(5), 3, 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.3, 3.3.1, 4.3.2.2, 5
4. Least critically perhaps, the eco-socialist strands in *Die Grünen* championed an ecological reform of western industrialism, led forward by science and technology (Ch 7: 1.4.1).

3.2 Rationalism problematized

Green sample data:

Rationalism is problematized as -

- a. a dichotomising either/or epistemology, as in rationalism/emotion, thought/feeling, self/nature - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 3.1, 5; *ecofeminism* Ch 4: 4.2.3.2, and Ch 6: 1.2, 3.1, 3.1.1, 5.4.3(4), 6.1.2(6); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 3.1, 3.2.1
- b. a “severing”, distancing, subordinating, and instrumental epistemology - *nonhuman nature rights theory* Ch 3: 5.1.3.1, *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1 footnote 11, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.3, 3.1.1, 3.3, 5, 5.1.1(a) and (f), 5.4.2.1, 5.4.3(4); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 3.2
- c. universalizing, homogenising. There is a demand for epistemological recognition of particular, local, and contextual knowledge, particularly women’s and non-expert ecological knowledge, and for recognition of difference - *ecofeminism* Ch 4: 4.2.3.2(b), and Ch 6: 3.1.1, 3.3, 5.1.1(c)
- d. unable to apprehend the paradox of consistency and change in reality as development, evolution: *social ecology* Ch 5: 3.3, 3.4

¹⁴ Technology which will release human beings from the toil of producing the means of life, to pursue Self-realization (Ch. 5: 4.3, 6.2)

¹⁵ Ruether highlighted the *transcendence* in the dualisms of western [male] thought, including in her view, the idea of transcendence of nature’s limited resources by ever more sophisticated science and technology (Li, 1993, p. 274, discussing Ruether’s (1975) work (Ch 6: 6.3))

- e. In addition, objective, analytical, reductionist, atomistic, scientific epistemology is critiqued - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 3.1, 3.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 3.3 and 3.3.1.

3.3 Holistic [both/and], relational, dialectical, processual, epistemologies advocated

Green sample data:

- Spontaneous, intuitive, non-analytical, “right-brain” thinking/knowing recognized - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.3, 3, 3.1, 3.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 3.3.1, 5.2.8
- Emotion re-admitted into thinking; empathetic, relational, affective knowing recognized – *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) in Ch 3: 3, 5.1.3.1, *animal liberation theory* (sentience approach) Ch 3: 4.2.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.1, 3.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.2, 3.3.1, 5.2.8; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 3.1, 3.2.1
- Non-analytical dialectical thinking, which strives to apprehend dynamic change, advocated – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.1, 3.3, 3.4; a less philosophically-complex version of dialectical/process thinking is “network” thinking - *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 3.1, 4.2.2
- “standpoint” epistemology supported - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 3.3.1.

3.4 The role of language in dominating, exploitative, human-human, human-nature, human-animal relationships problematized

Green sample data: *Social ecology* Ch 5: 8.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 3.2, 4.2.2.1, 5.4.2.1, 6.2.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.4.3.2.

External green data on epistemology:

- Organic, holistic, participative, not mechanistic, reductionist, objectivist (Descriptors of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to mechanistic/Cartesian world views, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- Holistic synthesis and integration, not divisive, reductionist analysis (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- Reduction/integration, not reductionism (Epistemology of the ecological age, as opposed to that of the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- Intuition and understanding, not rationality and packaged knowledge (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- Concern with the qualitative, not emphasis on the quantitative¹⁶ (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- Fact and value closely related, not fact and value unrelated; subject and object interactive, not subject and object separate; knowledge indivisible, value-laden, both empirical and intuitive, empathetic, not knowledge divisible, value-free, empirical, controlling; synthesis given greater emphasis, not analysis key to understanding (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- Unconscious values explicated, not “value-free” knowledge pursued (Education and research in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

¹⁶ I understand this as a critique of quantification in the search for objective and precise knowledge, and as support for intuitive knowledge

Related external green data ideas encountered but not included in green sample data:

- a. Constructivism, not operationalism; Critical realism not logical positivism (Epistemology in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).
- b. Multidisciplinary, integrative, not Specialized disciplines; Unified worldview, not Science-humanities split (Education and research in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

(a) I did not directly encounter any rejection of operationalism or logical positivism in my sample reading. But I did encounter discussions of constructivism. Deep ecologist Naess notes that “The world we live in spontaneously cannot be degraded by being characterized as merely subjective. It is the real world we experience. Nothing is more real...” (Naess, 1989b, in Sessions, 1995, p. 244). Eco-feminist Charlene Spretnak is concerned about “...the ideological baggage ... of deconstructive postmodernism. Deconstructionists ... make a leap from noting that concepts are socially constructed to concluding that there is *nothing but* social construction in human experience. Every human perception appears to them to be socially invented in a particular time and place - *except* perceptions of difference....The perception of “nothing but difference” is believed by deconstructionists to be the sole island of neutrality from which one can scan social construction for 360 degrees” (Spretnak, 1997, p. 427, her italics). She rejects their notion of fundamental reality as nothing but difference, as well as their presentation of “the human story” as nothing but “power plays and language games” (Spretnak, 1997, p. 433), and insists on the physical groundedness of human experience (Ch 6: 4.3.1). Social ecologist Bookchin sees in the rationality of nature, an objective ground for ethics, and rejects postmodernism’s theoretical and ethical relativism (Ch 5: 5, 3.1). But there is also present in seeing green, a recognition of language’s constructive role (this section), and a highlighting of scientific epistemology’s western cultural origins (Ch 6: 3.3). Critical realism, which accepts the existence of a mind-independent world, recognizes the role of language in creating reality, the time-and-place social production of knowledge, and is more strongly committed to normative theory than most sociological theories (Sayer, 2000), does seem to be a good description of seeing green epistemology, as Metzner suggests, though I did not encounter any discussion of it in my sample reading.

(b) Although the idea of “Unified worldview, not Science-humanities split” was encountered in the sources consulted, it was not included in any sample member. The idea of science-humanities knowledge unified - a “*Ganzheitslehre*” - can be found in the work of Otto Neurath, nineteenth century ecological economist. Ecological economics is one of the many contributing ideologies to “green” (Martinez-Alier, 1987, Bramwell, 1989). Goldsmith also notes as a principle of the ecological worldview, that “Ecology is a unified organization of knowledge” (1992, pp. 1-6).

Related external green data ideas not encountered

- a. Multidimensional approach, not specialization (Secondary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- b. Cyclical concepts of time and causation, not linear concepts of time and causation (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82).

4. Ontology

4.1 A holistic, purposive view of reality/nature

4.1.1 Green stories

Nature as a random phenomenon of separate, independent, human-usable parts is rejected (e.g. what *deep ecology* calls, the “supermarket” view (Ch 4: 4.1)). Instead, there is a holistic view of reality conveyed in non-hierarchical metaphors such as *gestalts*, systems or networks (4.1.2 - 4.1.3). Nature is understood non-dualistically, i.e. the sharp human-nature divide is rejected [stories and data at section 4.2]. Nature is seen as a single organism, or systems of organisms, or ecological *gestalts*, alive, manifesting consciousness, subjectivity, or mind, having its own “agenda” as it were, its own interests [“conatus”; “nisis”], which are becoming, or self-development, or self-evolution towards greater complexity, diversity, self-reflexivity, as well as a capacity for self-organization and self-direction [autopoiesis] in achieving its “agenda” (4.1.4 - 4.1.5). In *Die Grünen*’s real-world politics, this self-organization is primarily understood as manifesting in a dynamic ecological balance¹⁷ and stability, which should not be disturbed. This ontological view (mind, nisis, conatus, self-organization) provides an objective basis (e.g. *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.1.3.4, 5), on which to ground a human-nature relationship ethic, and justifies, for example, the green demand for reduced excessive human interference in nature’s processes (Ch 4: 1.3.4.1, Ch 6: 6.1.2(4), Ch 7: 5.4.1 as examples).

Variation:

- a. The western non-holistic view of reality not problematized - *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 4.1, 8.4
- b. Within and across the other sample members, there is variation in understandings of holism, from metaphysical understandings to dialectical naturalism
- c. On the feminist/ecofeminist critique, prevailing dominant understandings of humanity and nature are products of a ‘malestream’ ontology (Ch 6:3.1, 4.2).

4.1.2 A holistic view of reality

Green sample data:

- a. A metaphysical, non-dualistic ontology; a belief in the unity, or Oneness, of all there is, sometimes denoted by the concept “Gaia” – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.1, 4.1.1, 4.2.1.2 footnote 36, 4.2.3.2 footnote 46; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2.1, 4.3.1
- b. Nature as single organism - *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) Ch 3: 4.1, 5.1.3.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2.1
- c. Nature as a single “household” - *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.1, 4.2.1
- d. Reality as *gestalts* within *gestalts*, where *gestalt* means, a “whole” and its network of non-extensional (internal) relations; or as an interconnected, interrelated network of systems within systems – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.2, *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.1, *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.2.1, 4.2.2
- e. Reality as organismic but non-metaphysical, a “developmental whole”, a “unity of diversity” - *social ecology* Ch 5: 1, 2.1.4.2
- f. A relational, interdependent understanding of reality, one which recognizes both difference and relatedness, autonomy and symbiosis in nature – *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.2.

¹⁷ In his discussion of this idea (Hayward, 1995, pp. 24-31, pp. 34-35), which goes together with ideas of holism and organicism, Hayward notes that it implies a kind of “teleological cosmology” (1995, p. 24) which is contested among ecological scientists, but “absolutely central” to other ecological scientists and ecologists [as in seeing green]. I discuss the idea more fully in Chapter Nine: 5.3

4.1.3 Nature as non-hierarchical

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.2.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.1.1, 4.2.2.3, 4.3; life as “web-like relationality” - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.4, 5.3.2.

4.1.4. Nature as alive, manifesting rationality, consciousness, subjectivity, “mind”

Green sample data: *Nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) Ch 3: 4.1, 5.1.3.1, 5.2.3; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3.1, 4.2.1.1, 5.2.1.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2.1, 4.3.1, 5.1.1(c).

4.1.5 Nature as manifesting “power to”, directionality, and self-organization, towards its own ends, such as greater complexity, diversity, self-reflexivity

Green sample data: *deep ecology*, Ch 4: 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 3.4, 4, 4.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.3.2, 5 footnote 30, 5.2.1.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2.1, 4.3.1, 5.1.1(b), 5.3.2.

4.1.5.1 but not a deterministic telos

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.1, 4.1.3.

4.1.6 Nature as displaying and maintaining dynamic balance and stability

Green sample data: *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.1.1, 5.2.1.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.3(1), 4.2.3, 5.2.3.2, 5.4.1.

External green data on ontology:

- a. Organic, holistic, not mechanistic, reductionist, objectivist (Descriptors of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- b. Nature understood as being made up of interrelated wholes which are greater than the sum of their parts, not made up of discrete parts [where] the whole is no more than the sum of its parts (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- c. Concern with physical and metaphysical reality, not emphasis on material reality (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- d. Organismic, not mechanistic; universe as process/story, not universe as machine; Gaia: Earth as superorganism, not Earth as inert matter; life as autopoiesis, not life as random chemistry; holism/systems theory, not atomism (Scientific paradigms in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

Related external green data ideas not directly encountered:

Indeterminacy, probability, not determinism; chaos, nonlinear dynamics, not linear causality (Scientific paradigms in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

While I did encounter in the sample members, a rejection of a deterministic teleology in nature, I did not come across the idea of reality as indeterminacy or probability, or chaos as part of seeing green. On the contrary, I found the idea of order and purposivity in nature [section 4.1.5]. These ideas of indeterminacy and chaos probably reflect the 1990s “deconstructive” or “permissive” ecology viewpoint in ecology as science: “Earlier views of holistic natural communities working in stable associations are being replaced by images of nature as fundamentally erratic, discontinuous, chaotic, and unpredictable. ... However, this perspective is being challenged by some environmental philosophers.” (Botzler & Armstrong, 1998a, p. 11, drawing on work by Worster (1990) and Callicott

(1996)). This shift in ecology-as-science thought is discussed in more detail in Chapter Nine, section 5.4.

4.2 A reconceptualized human being vis-a-vis nature

4.2.1 Green stories

In green stories, a call for a critical review of the “discontinuity problem” in the human-nature relationship is central. There must be a reconceptualization of what it is to be a human being, a reconceptualization of Self (wording from Australian *ecofeminist* Plumwood (Ch 6: 4.3.2.2)), and a correspondingly different ethic for nature [section 5, this chapter], in addressing current western pathological human-human and human-nature relationships. The reconceptualization of Self is discussed at section 4.3.

The idea of reconceptualizing the human being is not limited to ecofeminist thought. It is also present in German Fundi *Die Grünen* Bahro’s thought; he phrases it as the need for “a fresh start in the development of the [human] species” (Ch 7: 2.1.3.6). In *Die Grünen*’s real world political statements, it appears as a demand for a human being recreated on an ecological basis (Ch 7: 4.3.2). In the USA, *social ecologist* Bookchin argues for a fresh start for “second nature¹⁸” which has failed to live up to its potentiality for symbiosis, and has become “warped” through the idea of hierarchy (Ch 5: 4.2.2).

The reconceptualized human being is part of nature, not separate from it, or transcendent over it. The sharp ontological discontinuity between human beings and nature, or Self/world, or culture/nature, is problematized (4.2.2). Human beings’ continuity with nature is emphasized (4.2.3); there are calls for harmony with nature, that is, 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, p. 31, p. 59). The ideas-context from which human-nonhuman continuity is derived, varies from Hinduism’s *advaita*¹⁹, to Kropotkin’s nineteenth century anarchism, to feminist rejection of patriarchal dichotomizing epistemology. Alternative forms of political, economic, and social organization are proposed to provide the supportive context for the reconceptualized human being, and reconceptualized Self (section 6.2.2).

Variation: Seeing green acknowledges the specialness of the human being within human-nonhuman continuity, but to varying degrees, from ecological egalitarianism (deep ecology), to a relational connectedness which also recognizes nature as different, with different needs (some ecofeminists), to humanity as nature’s “voice” (social ecology). A common thought though, is that humanity’s specialness is *within* nature, and non-domineering (e.g. *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.1.1, 5.4.5.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 1, 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2).

4.2.2 Dichotomy between humans and nature [the “discontinuity problem”] rejected

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.3, 4.2, 4.2.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.2, 4.2.1.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3, 4.3.1, 5.1.1(b), 5.1.1(f), 5.4.3(4), and Ch 4: 4.2.3.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.

4.2.3 Continuity rather than discontinuity with nonhuman nature emphasized

Green sample data:

- a. Recognizing speciesism in dealing with animals, as yet another unfounded and unrecognized human prejudice which must be rejected, along with racism, sexism, et al. - *animal liberation* Ch 3: 5.1.1.1, 5.1.2

¹⁸ That is, humanity, “with its sociality, institutions, intellectuality, language, ethics, and political life” (Biehl, 1993, p. 387). Though it emerged from first nature, it remains a part of it, embedded in it (Biehl, 1993, p. 385, in Ch 5, section 4.2)

¹⁹ Radical non-duality (*deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.3.1; *ecofeminist* Spretnak Ch 6: 4.3.1)

- b. A call to “give up some psychic investment in our sense of separateness and specialness in the universe”, to recognize more how nature is like us, rather than different to us – *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) Ch 3: 5.1.3, 5.1.3.1
- c. A call for identification with, and empathy for “all living beings”²⁰ understood as part of an increasingly mature “ecological Self” - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2, 4.2.3.2, 5.4.5.2 [what some other green sample members critique as the submerged self, the totalitarian self, or the indistinguishability account of being human]
- d. A recreation of the human being living within ecology – *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.2.

Variations: Contrasting views, which acknowledge human beings’ continuity with nonhuman nature, yet also emphasize difference are -

1. A non-hierarchical understanding of human beings’ special relationship to nature, one in which human beings live with nature in a complementary, non-dominating relationship (“mutualistic harmony”), which has been achieved through a “redemptive social dialectic” (Ch 5: 4.3) - *social ecology* in Ch 4: 4.2.3.1, 6.5.2, and Ch 5: 4.2.2.3, 4.2.2.4, 4.3, 5.1
2. A felt sense of connection to the Other [nonhuman nature in this case], identification with the Other - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.1, 5.4.3(3), 5.4.3(5), 5.4.4.1(a) - but one in which “we see ourselves as both co-members of an ecological community and yet different from other members of it” (Warren, in Wilson, 1997, p. 390); one which recognizes nature’s “distinctness and independence from us and the distinctness of the needs of things in nature from ours” (Plumwood 1991, in Zimmerman et al., 1993b, p. 295) - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.2, 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.2, 5.4.3(1).

External green data on the reconceptualized human/nature relationship:

- a. Intrinsic importance of nature for the humanity of man (Deep environmentalists, O’Riordan, 1981, p. 376). On my view though, this is not a deep ecology view, which clearly ascribes to nature its own value, regardless of its value for man’s humanity)
- b. Harmony with nature, not domination over nature (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- c. People and nature inseparable – relation is one of systemic energy (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- d. Co-evolution, symbiosis, not domination over nature; living as part of nature, not conquest of nature (Role of the human in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

4.3 A reconceptualized Self

4.3.1 Green stories

Essential in bringing about the possibility of relating to nature, and other human beings, in a non-instrumental way, is personal transformation, the reconceptualized Self (*ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.2.2). The dominant western individualist-rationalist view of what it is to be a fully developed, fully functioning human being, and a Self vis-a-vis the Other (including nonhuman nature), is problematized/critiqued (4.3.2). Alternative understandings of the self, variously informed by socialism, libertarianism, post-patriarchalism, and metaphysical ontological understandings, are proposed (4.3.3). In this chapter, I sometimes use the term ‘self realization’ to describe this green reconceptualized self, without meaning either *social ecology*’s or *deep ecology*’s specific, and differing, versions of Self-realization. This use should be clear from the context in which it appears.

²⁰ Recalling that things customarily understood as nonliving such as rivers, mountains, and landscapes are included in Naess’s understanding of “living”

Variations:

1. Individualism explicitly supported, together with a rejection of holism - *animal liberation theory* (rights approach) - Ch 3: 4.2.2. The acceptance of individualism is inferred for the sentience approach in *animal liberation theory*, but with a suggestion that atomist individualism's implicit Self/Other [animals] divide can be bridged by the human capacity for identification - Ch 3: 4.2.1
2. *Deep ecology* (Arne Naess) gives primacy to the individual, but within the context of an understanding of "individual" that extends beyond human beings only, and within an extended sense of Self which seeks connection with the Other through empathetic identification – Ch 4: 4.2.1.2
3. *Ecofeminists* argue that the western-cultural sense of self - that is, a rationalist-individualist, disconnected sense of Self [self divided against self, an oppositional sense of Self/Other, a patriarchal/power-over orientation towards other human beings generally, and women, nature, animals specifically] is a male-based sense of Self (Ch 4: 4.2.3.2 as one example). Male-patriarchal accounts of Self, women and nature must be abandoned.
4. The *social ecology* view considers the cause of the ecological crisis to be social-structural (particularly hierarchy, and its manifestations as statism, parliamentarianism, capitalism, racism, classism), rather than located in pathological individualism. Still, *social ecology* (Ch 5: 4.3) espouses a rich definition of Self-realization as freedom.

4.3.2. Western atomist, aggressive, selfish individualism problematized

The roots of western-style atomist, autonomous, and competitive individualism, with its inimical, instrumental stance towards other people, women, nature and animals, are argued variously to be grounded in cosmological, or anthropological, or psycho-sexual developmental accounts of the male psyche, or in Enlightenment humanism, or in the scientific-mechanistic worldview. Whatever its roots, western cultural individualism is rejected as pathological for relationships with both people and nature, and unsuitable for a holistic nature ethic.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 3: 8.4, and in Ch 4: 4.2.1, 4.2.1.2(2); *social ecology* Ch 4: 4.2.3.1, and Ch 5: 4.2.2 and 4.2.2.2, 4.3.1; *ecofeminism* in Ch 4: 4.2.3.2 and Ch 6: 3.1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3.1, 5.2.6, 5.4.3(2), 6.1.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.6, 4.3.4.

4.3.3. The new, better human being: liberated, re-integrated, embodied, connected

Green stories of a liberated, re-integrated, embodied, connected human being can be understood as a convergence of differing start-up premises in the green sample: the libertarian²¹ anarchist-utopian informed²² understandings of self-realization found in the thought of *social ecology* (Ch 5: 1, 4.3) and Fundi *Die Grünen* (Ch 7: 4.3), the self deeply connected to nature found in *deep ecology* (Ch 4: 4.2), and the felt sense of connection to the Other of *ecofeminism* as response to male dichotomizing epistemological and ontological assumptions (Ch 6: 4).

4.3.3.1 Complete liberation and freedom, especially for women, from all forms of hierarchy, patriarchy, and any other form of domination, or coercion

The human being is conceptualized as capable of mature, self-responsible, and ethical behaviour (e.g. *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.3.1). There must be complete liberation, particularly, but not only, for women, from all expressions of patriarchal oppression. Freedom is ideally understood as self-chosen, self-directed, spontaneous, creative activity, within human-scale communities which are in harmony with each other, and with their natural environment. Liberation from the one-dimensional view of the

²¹ Libertarianism, in metaphysics the view that determinism is false and that people are free to choose to act other than they do; in social philosophy, the view that the right to freedom from restraint takes priority over all other rights (Velasquez, 1991, p. 88). It appears to be a subset of Enlightenment humanism. Informally, I take libertarianism to rest on the assumption that the human being is capable of mature self-responsibility, making any form of hierarchy imposed on him/her, a restraint on his/her freedom to self-unfold creatively

²² Based inter alia, on demands for re-integration of a Self split by the idea of hierarchy and domination

human being as *Homo economicus*²³, and liberation from entrapment within techno-industrialism, is included in the vision.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 4.1.3.3, 4.3.1, 5.2.1.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.2.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.5.1.

4.3.3.2 *Unrepressed re-admittance of the body into what it is to be a fully-functioning human being*

As examples, in epistemology, “embodied” knowledge is recognized by the re-admittance of feeling into knowing; in ethics, the body is re-admitted as moral agent, for example, in what we count as food; the uninhibited development of sensuality and sexuality [including for homosexuals, for example] is advocated.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.2, 4.2.1.2 point 4; *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.3, 4.3.1 and footnote 28, 6.2 footnote 45; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.3(6), 5.4.4.1(b), 5.4.4.1(e); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.4.

4.3.3.3 *The ‘feminine principle’: feminine values re-integrated into views of the better person*

In green stories of the better human being, and the better society, ‘masculine’ values are rebalanced with ‘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 (partnership, caring, compassion, nonviolence, nurturing, nondefensiveness, accommodation, and a welcoming of interdependence (*ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.1.4, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 7.4); “intimate communion with the natural world” (Starhawk, *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.2.4) and the desire to conserve it (Shiva, *ecofeminism*, Ch 6: 4.3.2.4); 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, *ecofeminism*, Ch 6: 4.3.2.4).

Variation: There are however within ecofeminism, ambivalent views on whether or not there is such as thing as a female “essence” (Ch 6: 4.3.2.3). Despite this, acceptance of the value of “the feminine” is demanded in new views of the Self, as well as an interconnected sense of Self vis-a-vis the Other.

Green sample data: *social ecology* Ch 5: Fig. 6: The evolution of social hierarchy in 4.2.2.2 [natural biological fact: sex = female]; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.1.4, 2.2.2, 4.3.2.4, 6.1.1, 6.1.2(8), 6.4(c), 7.4; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 4.3.5.1.

4.3.3.4 *The fully functioning person understood as the whole person: re-integrated, well-rounded*

The separated spheres [whether through the idea of hierarchy, or the ideology of techno-industrialism] of the modern human being (*Homo economicus*) are re-integrated: city and country, mental and physical activity, work and play, passion and rationality. Academic education, work, health practice, recreation, and political praxis, should all be geared to addressing, and promoting, the development of the whole person, not merely *Homo economicus*.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.5; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 4.3.1, 6.2 footnote 45, 6.3.1.6; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.1.

²³ An abstract concept meaning a human being concerned with maximising 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” is usually avoided in mainstream economic theory. (Botzler & Armstrong, 1998, p. 517). That is, personal preferences are normative. This idea is examined in more detail in Chapter Nine: 3.4.3.2, and 6.3.1

4.3.3.5 An interconnected sense of Self, in which a non-dominating, non-exploitative relationship with nature is part of what it is to be an integrated, mature, human being

An interconnected sense of Self, a “self-in-relation”, in which we recognize our connection to, and develop our sense of community with, *all* living beings. A non-dominating relationship with nature is recognized as part of what it is to be an integrated, mature, human being.

Variation:

1. Animal liberation theory limits its discussion to relations with animals
2. Autonomy vis-a-vis connectedness, individualism vis-a-vis community are problematized, but also integrated, into an interconnected sense of self: (a) *ecofeminists* continue to prize autonomy, individuality, and agency for women (Ch 6: 4.3.2.1), (b) *Die Grünen* philosopher Maren-Grisebach proposes a dialectical, network view to accommodate what appear to be the opposite values of Ich and Gemeinschaft (Ch 7: 4.3.4 footnote 70).

Green sample data: *animal liberation* Ch 3: 5.1.1, 5.1.1.1, 5.1.2; *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) Ch 3: 5.1.3, 5.1.3.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.2.1, 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 6.2.4.1; - *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2, 4.3.1, 5.1, 5.4, 5.4.1(4), 5.4.1(5); *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.1.1, 2.3, 3.1.1, 4.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.2, 4.3.2.4, 4.3.2.5, 5.1.1(a), 5.1.1(f), 5.2.6, 5.2.7, 5.3, 5.3.1, 5.4.3(2), 5.4.3(5), 5.4.4.1(a); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.4, 5.1, 6.1.2.1.

4.3.3.6 Spirituality recognized

Stories and data on the role of spirituality, metaphysical and secular, in bringing about “inward” transformation towards seeing green [changed personal and social values, and related social-structural change] are presented at section 2.3 above.

External green data on the reconceptualized Self:

- a. Libertarianism, not emphasis on law and order (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Flexibility and an emphasis on personal autonomy, not a deterministic view of the future (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- c. Inner directed motivation and personal growth, not outer-directed motivation (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- d. A move towards spiritual, non-material values, not materialism pure and simple (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- e. Integration of concepts of work and leisure through a process of personal and communal improvement (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981, p. 376)
- f. Extended sense of self, not individual vs. world (Role of the human in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- g. Reflection and creativity, not superiority and arrogance (Role of the human in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

5. Ethic, including a nature, and animal, ethic

5.1 Green stories

Seeing green tells stories of moral philosophy: what “the good life” is, and what right conduct should be. It critiques “the good life” as equated with the values of western capitalist techno-industrialism, and proposes alternative visions of the good life (section 6.3). These visions include a reconceptualization of authentic human development (section 4.3), and a reconceptualized human-nature relationship (section 4.2) which rejects anthropocentrism.

Seeing green tends to propose a single ethic, which is at the same time, a nature ethic (for example, *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5). For lack of a word or short phrase capable of encompassing all the nuances and variations within the various sample members’ description of their nature ethic, I call it an *empathetic, caring, respectful partnership ethic, one which recognizes nature’s value-for-itself* (e.g. *animal liberation* Ch 3: 1.1.3 or 5.2.2; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.2.1.2, 5.1.1, 6.3.2; an *ecofeminist* view in Ch 4: 5.4.5.1; more data at 5.5.5.2 – 5.5.5.5 in this chapter). It is in any event, not merely an anthropocentric-instrumental ethic which views nature as resources for human beings.

A key premise in green stories is that often unexamined, but dichotomising epistemological and ontological assumptions underpin our self/Other ethic (e.g. an *ecofeminist* view in Ch 4: 4.2.3.2). There is a new, different account of the ethical (5.2). A new consciousness, informed by alternative views of the human/nature relationship [4.2], what it is to be a better human being [4.3.3], and the recognition that nature has its own interests [4.1.1], which are independent of its usefulness to human beings, provide the motivation for a new nature ethic (5.3). The philosophical scope of the ethic varies widely, from some animals only, to all of animate and inanimate nature (5.4). The intent of the ethic is animal well-being and wide ecological sustainability, but the philosophical how-to of achieving these, varies widely (5.5).

5.2 A different account of the ethical

There is a new account of the ethical. The western epistemological and ontological assumptions which underpin and justify human rational-instrumentalism towards nature are rejected (5.2.1). Traditional western accounts of morality are widened to re-instate those aspects of morality which have been devalued in accounts of moral behaviour, particularly emotion, and the role which the human capacity for empathy, identification, and care, for example, should play (5.2.2). Instead of only the abstract, the a-contextual, and the universal, *context* is re-admitted – the personal, the particular, the process/history which preceded the actual ethical decision needing to be made. A sense of place is also recognized as a moral concern (5.2.3). The body is re-admitted as moral agent, for example, in what we are willing to count as food (5.2.4). The rights concept is problematized (5.2.5). The seeing green ethic does, through its rejection of anthropocentrism, tend towards the formal environmental ethical theories of biocentrism and ecocentrism, yet neither of these two concepts quite captures green’s diverse stories, or its less formal understandings of environmental ethical concepts such as intrinsic, inherent, or instrumental value²⁴. Also, Bookchin’s ethic of complementarity, with its interventionist role for human beings, sounds anthropocentric, yet is a far cry from formal environmental philosophical anthropocentrism (5.2.6).

²⁴ Botzler and Armstrong (1998, p. 54) have a brief but useful description of these

5.2.1 The epistemological and ontological assumptions underpinning rational-instrumentalism towards nature (women, animals) critiqued

Green sample data: *animal rights theory* Ch 3: 1.2; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5; *ecofeminism* in Ch 3: 8.5, and Ch 6: 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 4.2.2, 5, 5.1.1(a), 5.1.1(b), 5.1.1(f), 5.4.4.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.1 footnote 72.

Variations:

1. *Social ecology*, with its belief in rationality in nature (Ch 5: 3.2), accords far greater emphasis to the role of reason in ethical accounts than do other sample elements [animal liberation theory excepted], but still rejects instrumental reason. On the social ecology view, dialectical naturalism contains within it, a naturalistic ethic, an *objective* ethic, a universal truth, based in ontology (Ch 5: 5).
2. *Ecofeminists* (Ch 6: 5) critique *any* ethical theory derived from a *male* adversarial sense of self, for example, in which concepts such as reason, distance, disinterestedness, abstractness and universality are given primacy. Any ethic, of which a nature ethic is a subset, must also include emotion - a sense of connectedness, care, partnership, or love – and also include the personal, and the particular, in ethical decision-making. They have theorized the key features of an ecofeminist environmental ethic (Ch 6: 5.2); one of these is insistence on *pluralism* in moral accounts.
3. *Ecofeminists* also theorize the epistemological/ontological connections in western cultural history between the domination of women, the domination of nature, and abuse of animals (Ch 6: 4.2.2, 5.4.2).

5.2.2 Emotion (including empathy, identification, care, compassion) re-integrated into accounts of the ethical

Green sample data: *animal liberation theory* (Singer) Ch 3: 4.2.1; nonhuman rights theory (Stone) Ch 3: 3; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2, 5.4.2.2, *ecofeminism* Ch 4: 4.2.3.2, and Ch 6: 5.1.1(a), 5.2.8, 5.4.3(1), 5.4.3(5); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 3.2.1.

5.2.3 Context (the particular, the personal, the process, “place”) re-integrated into accounts of the ethical

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.2.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 4: 4.2.3.2, 5.4.5.3, and Ch 6: 5.2.2, 5.2.6, 5.2.7, 5.3.4, 5.4.3. Sense of place data is presented at section 5.4.2.

5.2.4 The body re-admitted into accounts of the ethical

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.3(6), 5.4.4.1(b), 5.4.4.1(e).

5.2.5 The rights concept in human-human, and human-nonhuman relationships rejected, problematized, and employed

Within seeing green, the concept of “rights”, whether applied to humans, inanimate nature, or animals, is problematized, and often rejected, primarily because of its individualistic-rationalist assumptions and implications, and the conceptual difficulty of assigning rights to an ecosystem, for example. But the rights concept is also defended, and employed, both technically and loosely. Animal rights theory supports the rights concept far more, and much ecofeminist theory, far less.

Variations:

1. Rights concept employed, technically and loosely: *animal rights theory* Ch 3: 5; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.1, 5.4.4(b)
2. Problematized: *deep ecology* in Ch 3: 8, and in Ch 4: 5.4.4(a), 5.4.4(b); *ecofeminism* - Ch 6: 5.1.1(a), 5.2.6, 5.2.7, 5.3, 5.3.1, 5.4.3
3. Appropriateness in some contexts not denied: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.4; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.1.1, 5.2.8, 5.2.9.

5.2.6 Environmental ethical theory [biocentrism, ecocentrism] and its technical understandings of value in nature do not quite encompass seeing green's nature ethic

Green sample data: *Animal liberation* Ch 3: 1.1.2; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.4.1, 5.2, 5.2.1, 5.3.1, 5.4.5.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 1, 5.4.2 and subdivisions; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.1, 5.1.1(a), 5.3.2, 6.1.2(2), 6.1.2(3), 6.1.2(4); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.2.1, 4.1, 5.2.1, 5.2.3.

External green data:

- a. Ethics and ordinary life integrated, not separated (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- b. Biocentric/ecocentric, not anthropocentric/humanist²⁵ (Values in relation to nature in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, in pp. 170-171).

5.3 A “new consciousness”²⁶ as motivation in bridging the human/nature (self/Other) divide

5.3.1 Green stories

The motivating new consciousness towards nature is informed really, by two things –

(1) the different sample members' views of what it is to be a better human being, one of which is a sense of non-instrumental connectedness [based on metaphysical or scientific ecological understandings, or metaphysical/secular spirituality] with all that there is [data at 4.3.3 above, particularly 4.3.3.5]. This non-instrumental connectedness includes the usually underplayed or completely eliminated emotional values of identification, empathy, compassion, and care [5.2.2 above], and

(2) the recognition that nature has its own order, agenda, and autonomy (logos, conatus, nisus, autopoiesis) independent of its usefulness to human beings, and so deserves to be preserved for itself (5.3.2). Those things [values] which are understood as contributing to nature's continued existence, hold lessons for how human beings should be as people [4.3.3], and how they should better construct their society [6.2]. Emphasized as particularly valuable, are nature's symbiosis, its dynamic equilibrium (stability), and diversity.

Variation:

1. Views of what it is to be a better human being vis-a-vis nature range in scope from rejecting speciesism to a Self totally identified with nature, or a Self which recognizes both its connection to, and difference from, nature [4.3.3.5]
2. In Bookchin's *social ecology* view, structural, not personal change is what will end our instrumental dealings with nature (Ch 4: 4.2.3.1, Ch 4: 6.5.1, and Ch 5: 5.1, 5.4, 6, 7.1 as examples)
3. Where exactly the locus of value in nature is, varies enormously (section 5.3.2.1 below).

5.3.2 Recognizing nature's value-for-itself

Green sample data:

5.3.2.1 Nature's value-for-itself ascribed to

- a. Sentience; having interests – *animal liberation theory* (Singer), Ch 3: 5.2.1

²⁵ Hayward (1995, pp. 53-86) devotes an entire chapter to considering whether or not enlightenment and ecological values are necessarily opposed in the field of ethics; he ends it by advocating an ethic of “ecological humanism”

²⁶ Ecofeminist Kheel talks of a “new consciousness” (Ch 6: 5.3.1); deep ecologist Rodman talks of an “ecological consciousness” (in Sessions, 1995, pp. 121-130)

- b. Being the-subject-of-a-life, having inherent value, possessing rights – *animal liberation theory* (Regan), Ch 3: 5.2.2
- c. Subjectivity or consciousness in natural objects which includes living things – *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone), Ch 3: 5.2.3
- d. The life spirit in everything, thus the sacredness of everything - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2, 5.3.2
- e. Its vitalism [striving for life] - *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.1, 5.2.3.1
- f. The striving (“conatus”) of each life form to unfold unfettered, in the way of its species (its flourishing, its well-being) - *deep ecology* Ch 4: point 1 of platform in 1.3.4.1, 4.1.3, 5.2
- g. The evolutionary process – its mutuality, creativity, diversity, “nisus” towards increasing complexity, subjectivity, freedom – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.2.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2, 4.1.3 and subdivisions, 5.2
- h. Having its own interests, its own direction, its own goal - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.2
- i. its ability to sustain life, both human and nonhuman – *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.1, 5.2.3, 5.2.3.1.

5.3.2.2 Values in nature

- a. Purpose, directionality, self-organization - *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.2
- b. Egalitarianism, together with symbiosis [seen as contributing to diversity], mutualism, interdependence, co-operation, harmony rather than conflict – *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.4, 4.1.2, 5.1.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2, 5, 5.2, 5.2.1.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.2.2, 6.4
- c. Diversity, unity in diversity - *deep ecology* Ch 4: points 1-3 of platform in 1.3.4.1, 4.1.2, 4.2.1.2 points 5 and 6, 5.2, 5.2.2, *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2; 5.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.1.1, *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.1, 5.1.1(c)
- d. Equilibrium, “balance”, stability in nature [often seen as a function of diversity] - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.4.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.1.1, 5.2.1.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.3(1), 5.2.3.2, 5.4.1
- e. Complexity [also seen as a function of diversity] - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.4; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2, 5.2, 5.2.1.1, 5.2.1.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.3(1)
- f. Richness (abundance) - *deep ecology* Ch 4: point 2 of platform in 1.3.4.1, 5.2.2
- g. Spontaneity, as serving the unfolding of diversity – *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.3.1, 5.2.

External green data:

Nature has intrinsic value, not nature has instrumental value (Values in relation to nature in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

5.4 The scope of the green ethic, with focus on nature

5.4.1 Green stories:

(1) Though the various ethics proposed in the seeing green sample include both human and nonhuman nature, the emphasis here is on human relationships with nature. However, an interesting difference in a seeing green ethic for human-human relationships, is its admittance of cultural diversity, and future generations, into the moral sphere. Sometimes “future generations” appears to mean future nonhuman generations too, for their own sake, not merely for humans’ sake.

(2) The scope of a seeing green ethic for nonhuman nature is extremely diverse, varying from individualism to holism, from some animals only, to all of nature, animate and inanimate, to “sense of place”. What the variation has in common though, is that seeing green extends the sphere of morality beyond human beings only.

5.4.2 Variation in scope:

1. Animals:

Included:

- (a) only those who are individual sentient beings. Sentience fades “somewhere between shrimps and oysters” *animal liberation theory* (Singer), Ch 3: 5.3.1
- (b) only those who are “subjects of a life”, basically, mammals and birds - *animal liberation theory* (Regan), Ch 3: 5.3.2
- (c) all – *nonhuman rights theory* (Stone; his is possibly a qualified approach though), Ch 3: 5.3.3, 5.4.3; *deep ecology* (but exact viewpoint on domestic/commercial animals not established) Ch 4: 5.3, 5.3.1; *social ecology* (again, exact viewpoint on domestic/commercial animals not established) Ch 5: 5.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.3, 5.4.4.3, 6.1.2(2); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.2.3.1, 5.2.3.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.2.

2. Plants:

- (a) Excluded - *animal liberation theory* (Singer), Ch 3: 5.3.1
- (b) Agnostic about their moral status - *animal liberation theory* (Regan), Ch 3: 5.3.2
- (c) Included - *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone, but possibly, a qualified approach), Ch 3: 5.2.3, 5.3.3, 5.4.3; *deep ecology* Ch 4: implied in 5.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.2, 6.1.2(2); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.2.3.1, 5.2.3.2, 5.3.1.

3. Species:

- (a) excluded: *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 5.3.1; 5.3.2
- (b) included in a both species and individuals approach - *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone²⁷, but possibly, a qualified approach) Ch 3: 5.3.3, 5.4.3; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.3, 5.3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.1.2(2); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.2.3.2, 5.3.1.

4. Non-animal living things, biosphere, ecosystems, ecological processes:

- (a) excluded: *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 5.3.1; 5.3.2
- (b) Agnostic about their moral status: *animal liberation theory* (Regan), Ch 3: 5.3.2
- (c) included: *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone, but possibly a qualified approach), Ch 3: 5.3.3, 5.4.3; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.3, 5.4.5.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.2.3.2, 5.3.1.

5. Inanimate natural objects:

- (a) Excluded: *animal liberation theory* (Singer), Ch 3: 5.3.1
- (b) Agnostic about their moral status: *animal liberation theory* (Regan), Ch 3: 5.3.2
- (c) Included: *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone, but possibly a qualified approach), Ch 3: 5.3.3; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.3, *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.2, 5.3.4.

- 6. Everything, whether animate, inanimate, individual, species, ecosystem, or ecosystemic process *nonhuman rights theory* (Stone, but possibly a qualified approach) Ch 3: 5.3.3, 5.4.3; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.3, 5.3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.3.3, 6.1.2(2); *Die Grünen* [but inanimate things are not expressly mentioned] Ch 7: 5.2.3.1, 5.2.3.2, 5.3.1, 6.4.1.1.

7. Sense of place

- deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.2, 6.4.3.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 4: 4.2.3.2(b), and Ch 6: 4.3.2.2, 5.1.1(a), 5.3.4.

²⁷ This is what I understand Stone’s position to be

8. Cultural diversity

deep ecology Ch 4: 4.1.2, 4.1.4, 6.1, 6.2.4.2, 6.4.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.2.2, 6.1.2.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.2.5, 6.3.4, 6.4.2.3.

9. Future generations

deep ecology Ch 4: 5.1.2, 6.2.4.3, 6.3.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.3.3.

5.5 The intent of the new nature ethic: long-range, wide ecological sustainability

5.5.1 Green stories

Influenced by deep ecologist Naess's hope for "beautiful" rather than "moral" acts towards nature (Ch 4: 4.2.1.2(7)), and the ecofeminist critique of (male) environmental ethical theory (section 5.1 of this chapter), I avoid here the term "moral obligation". The intent of the new nature ethic, which has various philosophical names in the different sample elements - "respect for interests", "respect for rights", "biospherical/ecological egalitarianism", "complementarity", "care", "partnership" - is long-range, wide, ecological sustainability. Though there is no numerical consensus on what "long range" means [one version is *deep ecology*'s "seven-generation" view (Ch 4: 5.1.2)], there is consensus that it must be longer than a short term, profit-oriented view of the planet's ecology (5.5.2). I use the term "wide" to mean, sustaining the "life base" for *all* living things in a way which preserves their diversity and abundance, not merely for their instrumental use by humans, but for their own sakes too. Human treatment of wild and commercially-farmed animals is firmly brought within the sphere of moral philosophy and ethical practice. It is thus a wider understanding than the natural-resource-management-for-human-beings ethic of environmental sustainability. While philosophical understandings of the new ethic for nature are presented here at section 5.5, its real-world expressions are discussed primarily at sections 6.4, and 6.5.

Supporting data for animal rights/well-being (5.5.3) is presented separately from Green sample data pertaining to wide ecological sustainability (5.5.4). This should not be interpreted as intending to suggest that animal liberation from oppression and exploitation is not a part of seeing green's wide ecological sustainability – it is.

Variation: There are considerable differences in

(1) how wide ecological sustainability should apply to animals. Singer and Regan's *animal rights theory* is more concerned with animal justice than it is with wide ecological sustainability, but formal and loose application of animal rights theory in defence of animals is also found in *deep ecology*'s ecological egalitarianism, in the *ecofeminist* ethic of care, and in *Die Grünen*'s partnership ethic. Some Marxist-inspired, and Realo-political elements of "seeing green" are less committed to animal rights (e.g. *Die Grünen*, Ch 7: 5.3.2, 5.3.2.1); and

(2) the philosophical means of achieving wide ecological sustainability. These various means, together with supporting data, are presented at (5.5.4).

5.5.2 Understandings of long-range ecological sustainability

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.4.1, 5.1.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4, 5.3.3, 6.1.

5.5.3. Animal well-being achieved through appeals to identification, sentience, the practice of care, special legal status, rights (justice)

Green sample data:

- a. Identification, recognition of sentience as criterion for equal consideration of interests, empathetic care - *animal liberation theory* (sentience approach), Ch 3: 1.2, 4.2.1, 5.4.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.2.1.2, 5.4.4(b); *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.4.1(a), 5.4.4.1(b), 5.4.4.1(c)
- b. Respect for the inherent value, thus rights, of an animal - *animal liberation theory* (Regan) Ch 3: 1.1.3, 1.2, 5.4.2
- c. Special legal status - *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.3.2, 5.3.2.1, 5.4.4.

5.5.4 Ecological sustainability achieved philosophically by

Green sample data:

5.5.4.1 Assigning legal standing to sue, thus rights, to some of nonhuman nature

nonhuman nature rights theory (Stone) - Ch 3: 1.2, 5.4.3.

5.5.4.2 Biospherical egalitarianism – empathetically respecting every life form’s equal or same right to “live and blossom”

The ethic of biological egalitarianism is to respect every life form’s equal or same right to “live and blossom”, employing the criteria of nearness and vitalness when faced with ethical dilemmas - *deep ecology* Ch 4: the *deep ecology* platform, specifically points 3, 5, 6, and 8 in 1.3.4.1, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 6.5.3.

5.5.4.3 Actively employing human creativity to restore and maintain biological evolution towards mutuality, diversity, and increasing subjectivity

The ethic of complementarity requires human beings to respect the purposivity of natural evolution, to place themselves in service to it, for example, by reducing needless suffering, and to function creatively in its unfolding, but with important caveats - *social ecology* Ch 5: 4.2.1.1, 5.2.1.1, 5.4, 5.4.1 [the caveats], 5.4.2.2, 5.4.2.3.

5.5.4.4 Practising an ethic of care

The ethic of care is perhaps best described as the ability to respond lovingly (with appropriate concern, compassion, trust, friendship, or responsibility) to an Other, without necessarily expecting reciprocity. More specifically as far as nature is concerned, it requires “restraint ... as opposed to the unrestrained use of our skills”. Whether or not an ethic of care includes total or partial veganism, or vegetarianism, is problematized - *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.1.1(a), 5.3.4, 5.4.4.3.

5.5.4.5 Practising a partnership ethic with nature which protects the life basis for all living beings

The concept of partnership, which is found in both *ecofeminism* and *Die Grünen*, encompasses the idea of identification-leading-to-solidarity (e.g. *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.4.1(a)), which is then expressed in concrete actions. A partnership ethic with nature, which respects and values all life, will also ensure the continuity of the life basis. The ethic is transformed into action through a series of principles, some of which are the precautionary principle, the polluter pays principle, the protection of biodiversity and its habitat, and participation in global environmental protection measures - *ecofeminism*: Ch 6: 2.2, 4.3.2.5, 6.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4, 2.3, 5 [opening citation], 5.1, 5.2.3.2, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4.1.1.

External green data:

- a. Biorights – the right of endangered species or unique landscapes to remain unmolested (O’Riordan, 1981 p. 376)
- b. Biocentrism, not anthropocentrism (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- c. Ecological stewardship, not Resource management (Role of the human in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- d. Instrumental and intrinsic values integrated through systemic value, not instrumental values (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82) – the “integrated through systemic value” part of this idea was not encountered in green sample elements, but the both instrumental value and value-for-itself approach to human-nature relationships was.

6. An ecological society: some real-world views on culture, politics, the economy, and the natural environment

6.1 Green stories

A key premise in seeing green is that radical, ecological reform of ourselves, and our societal structures is needed to deal with the ecological crisis, and to achieve ecological sustainability (6.2). The changes should be towards acceptance of ecologically-informed, post-patriarchal, personal and social values (6.2.1), towards ecologically-informed, post-patriarchal forms of social and political organization (6.2.2), and towards a non-anthropocentric nature ethic (discussed at section 5). Reform environmentalism – short-term political, economic, social or technical adjustments to western techno-industrialism - is not the answer (6.2.3). Long-term ecological sustainability must be achieved (6.3). Part of doing that is to arrive at new understandings of what authentic development and “the good life” mean (6.4). The economy must be ecologically re-oriented (6.5). Living in solidarity (6.6), and “grassroots” [direct] democracy (6.7) are also essential elements of an ecologically-reformed society.

6.2 Key proposition: Fundamental, ecologically-informed, post-patriarchal reformation of ourselves, and society’s structures needed

Green sample data: *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 5.4.1, 6.2, 6.3.1, 6.3.2; *deep ecology* Ch 4: platform principles 6 and 7 in 1.3.4.1, 6, 6.1; *social ecology* 1, 5.4.2.2, 6.1.2, 7.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.2.

6.2.1 Ecologically-informed, and/or post-patriarchal personal and social values advocated

Ecologically-informed, and/or post-patriarchal personal, social, and political values are advocated, such as re-integration instead of separation or marginalization; unbundling and decentralization instead of concentration, self-management instead of hierarchy and bureaucracy; human-scale instead of gigantism; diversity as opposed to homogeneity and “mono” (Ch 7: 2.3). All these values can be well-conceptualized within social ecologist Bookchin’s “redemptive dialectic” to achieve freedom for the individual, and a free society, i.e. one in which human beings and nature live in complementarity (Ch 5: 4.3, 6.3). I repeat his description of it here from Ch 5: 4.3, because I think its idea underpins much of “seeing green’s” less, but still radical, view of an ecologically-reformed society:

The absolute negation of the state is anarchism – a situation in which ... [human beings liberate] all the immediate circumstances of their everyday lives. The absolute negation of the city is community – a community in which the social environment is decentralized into rounded, ecologically balanced communities. The absolute negation of bureaucracy is immediate ... relations – a situation in which

representation is replaced by face-to-face relations in a general assembly of free individuals. The absolute negation of the centralized economy is regional ecotechnology – a situation in which the instruments of production are molded to the resources of an ecosystem. The absolute negation of the patriarchal family is liberated sexuality – in which all forms of sexual regulation are transcended by the spontaneous, untrammled expression of eroticism among equals. The absolute negation of the marketplace is communism – in which collective abundance and cooperation transform labor into play and need into desire (Bookchin, 1967/1968, in Bookchin, 1974, p. 41).

Green sample data:

- a. The ‘feminine principle’ recognized – stories and data already presented at section 4.3.3.3
- b. Interdependence, solidarity, mutual aid, complementarity, reciprocity, partnership valued - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.4, 4.1.2, 5.1.1, 6.4.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 4.2.2.1, 4.3.1, 5, 6.3.1.2, 6.3.2.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.3.2.5; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4, 2.3
- c. Pluralism, diversity, difference as asset- *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.4.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.4, 6.3.3.1, 6.4.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.2.1.3, *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.4, 4.3.2.4, 4.3.2.5, 5.2.2, 5.4.3(1), 6.1.2(1), 7.1, 8; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.3, 6.4.1 footnote 153 on Ökopax.
- d. Non-violence and radical peace – data at 6.6.3.

External green data:

- a. Emphasis on the cooperative, not the competitive (Secondary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- b. Cooperation, not competition (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- c. Ecofeminism, partnership, not sexism, patriarchy; respect and value differences, not racism, ethnocentrism; Social ecology, egalitarianism, not hierarchies of class and caste (Human/social values in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- d. Increasing diversity and integration, not homogeneity and disintegration (Secondary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- e. Pluralistic societies, not cultural homogeneity (Political systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.2.2 Ecologically-informed, post-hierarchical forms of political and socio-economic organization advocated

Decentralization and human-scale are key green values. Their ideological context is opposition to all forms of hierarchy, domination and coercion (e.g. Ch 5: 6.3). Local autonomy [self-determination, self-management, self-reliance], and direct democracy are further key values in post-hierarchical forms of political and socio-economic organization. Instead of the power-over mentality of patriarchy, hierarchy, militarism and bureaucracy, participatory, non-aggressive, non-competitive, non-hierarchical and egalitarian forms of organization and decision-making are advocated. The decentralized, human-scale *community* [not to be confused with the local authority (*deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.2)] is the basic political, social, economic and ethical unit [for example, *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.3.1.2] of the transformed society. It is well-rounded, in that it has psychologically and spatially re-integrated the separated areas of our lives. It is also ecologically-appropriate, and integrated with its physical surroundings. The community is seen as the supportive physical, social, economic and psychological context for the reconceptualized human being, and the reconceptualized Self [sections 4.2, and 4.3, of this chapter].

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 3.2, 6.3.3.1, 6.4.3, 6.4.3.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 2.1.4.2, 2.3.1, 4.3, 4.3.1, 6.2, 6.3.1.2, 6.3.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.1.2(1); *Die Grünen*: Ch 7: 1.5, 2.1.2, 2.2.3.

Variation: The same values are expressed in some of the more radical forms of political, social and economic community organization, which are conceptualized as outside statism/parliamentarianism, outside the capitalist market economy, and whose boundaries are determined by natural features and biomes, rather than history and nationalism. These alternative, and more radical social formations are understood as the ideal way to combine ecological sustainability, solidarity in living, and personal self-realization:

1. Bioregionalism/reinhabitory communities - *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.4.3.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.4.2.3
2. Small scale eco-communities/communes [this overlaps to a certain extent with data on communities above] - *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 2.1.4.2, 2.3.1, 4.3, 6.3, 6.3.1, 6.3.1.1-6.3.1.6, 6.3.2, 6.3.2.1-6.3.2.4; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4.1, 2.1.3.6, 4.3.4, 6, 6.1.2.3, 6.2, 6.3.1
3. Libertarian municipalism instead of statism – *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 4.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2, 6.3.2.3, 6.3.2.4.

External green data on radical forms of community organization:

- a. Internationalism and global solidarity, not sovereignty of nation state (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Multi-national federations, not nation-state sovereignty (Political systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- c. Decentralized bioregions, not centralized national authority (Political systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

External green data on less radical, but still ecologically-informed, and post-hierarchical forms of political and socio-economic organization:

- a. Post-patriarchal, feminist values, not patriarchal values (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Emphasis on smallness of scale and hence community identity in settlement, work, and leisure (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981 p. 376)
- c. Decentralization, human scale, not centralization, economies of scale (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- d. Non-hierarchical structure, not hierarchical structure (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- e. Decentralization of power, not centralization (Secondary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, in p. 82)
- f. Integration of concepts of work and leisure through a process of personal and communal improvement (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981 p. 376)
- g. A co-operatively based, communitarian society, not an ethos of aggressive individualism (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- h. Community-based economies, not multi-national corporations (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

- i. Production for use, not production for exchange and profit (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- j. Self-reliance, not ever-expanding world trade (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.2.3 Reform environmentalism is not the answer

Achterberg (1993, p. 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. [new paragraph]. 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 (see, for example, Dobson 1990: 13, 33).

Seeing green critiques "reform environmentalism", "reformist ecologism", or "anthropocentric reformism" which

argues that the root of our environmental problems is neither anthropocentric attitudes²⁸ 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, emphasizing 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, in Zimmerman et al., 1993, p. viii).

Instead, it calls for a total rejection of western industrialism's anthropocentrism [androcentrism, hierarchy, patriarchy], and its expression in socio-cultural-economic structures.

Variation: eco-socialists within *Die Grünen* were more disposed towards reform environmentalism (Ch 7: 1.4.1, 2.1.3.6) than were the Fundis; so are *liberal feminists* (Ch 6: 2.1.1 as example).

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.1, 1.3.1, 5.4.3, 6.2.5, 6.3; 6.3.2, 6.3.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.2.1, 4.3, 5.4.1, 5.4.2.4, 7.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 6.1.2(1), 6.1.2(9); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4.1, 2.1.3.6, 6.1.1 footnote 102.

External green data: Ecology, not environmentalism (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.3 Authentic development, and the good life

6.3.1 Green stories

Seeing green problematizes capitalism as cultural/socio-economic system (6.3.2). It critiques the idea that development means advanced capitalist techno-industrialism, and on a global scale (6.3.3). Alternative ideas of 'the good life' are proposed (6.3.4), with alternative development models to reflect these different values (6.3.5).

²⁸ More on anthropocentrism in Chapter Nine: Environment and development, section 6

6.3.2 Capitalism problematized/rejected as cultural/socio-economic system

Under neo-Marxist and counter-cultural influence, or in terms of ecology normatively understood, capitalism as cultural/socio-economic system is critiqued, for its aggressive, competitive, expansive spirit, its “commodification” and intensive media-marketing of almost every aspect of life, its overvaluing of materialism and consumerism, its failure to deliver social justice, its dehumanizing and alienating work processes and technology, its exploitation of nature. There is support for eco-socialism [for example, strongly expressed in *Die Grünen’s* (1983) *Sinnvoll arbeiten – solidarisch leben*], envisioned as a democratic transformation of society from below, by groups such as the workers/labour movement/trade unions, and including inter alia, collective ownership and base democratic control of the economy, as well as basic social provision.

Green sample data: *ecofeminism* - Ch 6: 2.1.2, 6.6; *Die Grünen* - Ch 7: 1.4.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.2, 2.1.3.4, 2.1.3.5, 2.1.3.6, 4.3.5, 6.1, 6.1.2, 6.2.

Variation: Some strands in seeing green (*social ecologist* Bookchin, Marxist-informed feminists, Fundi *Die Grünen*) reject capitalism altogether, whether in western free-market form, or the centralist planned forms of communism, or eco-socialism, as a hierarchy/patriarchy/centric-inspired, ecologically-destructive cultural/economic system.

social ecology - Ch 4: 4.2.3.1, Ch 4: 5.4.5.2 footnote 51, and Ch 5: 2.1.2, 2.1.4.2.1, 2.1.5, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.2.2.3, 4.3.1, 5.1, 5.4.1, 6.1, 6.1.2, 8.2; *Die Grünen* [Fundi version] - Ch 7: 2.1.3.6, 6, 6.3.1.

6.3.3 Development understood as advanced capitalist techno-industrialism challenged

The Enlightenment ideology of “progress”²⁹, now understood as western scientific-techno-industrialism, which tends to equate a society with its economy, and development with economic growth (Sachs, in Sessions, 1995, pp. 429-431, in *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2), is challenged (6.3.3.1). The critique includes problematizing materialism and consumerism as values (6.3.3.2); instrumental science and technology (6.3.3.3); the instrumental exploitation of nature (6.3.3.4), and global advanced capitalism for all (6.3.3.5).

6.3.3.1 The ideology of “progress” and “industrialism” [“development”] critiqued

While social ecologist Bookchin (Ch 5: 1, 3) affirms Enlightenment values, he critiques any degradation of Enlightenment rationalism into instrumental rationality. Thus he rejects any understanding of “progress” which involves the domination of people, or the idea of dominating or controlling nature (Ch 5: 4.2.2.3). Ecofeminist Shiva critiques the Enlightenment model of progress as dependent on a “masculine” model of what it is to be human (Ch 6: 3.1). Development devoid of the ‘feminine principle’ is critiqued – *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4. Shiva also criticizes notions of progress which elevate “modern scientific knowledge and economic development” to “sanctity” (for example, Shiva, 1988, p. xiv, in Hayward, 1995, p. 3), or which include the idea of human transcendence of dependence on nature (Mies & Shiva, 1998, p. 489).

Green sample data: *deep ecology* - Ch 4: 2.1 footnote 14, 2.2, 4.1.4.1, 4.1.4.3, 6.2.1-6.2.3, 6.3.3; *social ecology* - Ch 5: 2.1.3, 4.2.2.3; *ecofeminism* - Ch 6: 3.1, 6.4; *Die Grünen* - Ch 7: 2.1.3 and footnote 19, 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.2.1, 2.1.3.5, 2.2.2.

6.3.3.2 Materialism and consumerism critiqued as end values

Both capitalism and Marxism “saw the achievement of human happiness as basically conditional on the expansion of material goods’ production” (Mies & Shiva, 1998, p. 487). Economic growth becomes practically equated with moral desirability (idea from Mark Sagoff, in Botzler & Armstrong,

²⁹ On the Enlightenment view, “progress” was “self-realization through independence from necessity (nature) and freedom from social constraints (community)...” (Birkeland, 1993, in Gaard, 1993, p. 25). Human progress could be achieved by knowledge gained through a “... ‘masculinist’ notion of reason – removed from emotion and intuition and disciplined by scientific method...” (Birkeland, 1993, in Gaard, 1993, p. 24, in *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 3.1)

1998, p. 517, footnote 5). Industrial society-type materialism and consumerism, including “green” consumerism which does not query materialism [the pursuit of wealth] as value, are therefore problematized as representing the good life. Production should be for vital needs rather than consumerist wants.

Green sample data: *nonhuman nature rights theorist* Stone - Ch 3: 5.1.3.1; *deep ecology* - Ch 4: 4.1.4.4 footnote 35, 5.1.2, 5.4.2.1, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.4.1; *social ecology* - Ch 5: 4.3.1, 6.1.2, 6.2, 7.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4, 6.4(b); *Die Grünen* - 2.1.3.2.1, 2.1.3.5, 4.3.2, 6.1.2.2.

External green data:

- a. Implication that materialism for its own sake is wrong, and that economic growth can be geared to providing for the basic needs for those below subsistence levels (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981 p. 376)
- b. A move towards spiritual, non-material values (Distinguishing features of a green paradigm, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- c. The quality of interrelationships between systems equated with well-being, not the power of a unit equated with well-being (money, influence, resources) - (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82). The meaning of this ecological worldview indicator is unclear to me from Sterling’s discussion, but I take it as related to a non-materialistic view of well-being.

6.3.3.3 Rational-instrumental science and technology, problematized, rejected

Ambivalent seeing green stories on science were presented at section 3: Epistemology. Consistently problematized, perhaps as heritage from Marcuse’s critique of scientific and technical rationality, and their logic of domination (Stevenson, 1998, p. 28; see also Ch 2, section 2.3.1 “The counterculture”, and Ch 5: 2.1.2), are rational-instrumental, exploitative forms of science, and of technology, which demean and dehumanize the human being, are exploitative of nature [see also 6.3.3.4 below for data on “naturism”], and which provide short-term, “quick-fix” solutions to the ecological crisis rather than encouraging a review of fundamental values. There must be a reviewed, revised, non-dominating, non-exploitative relationship between technology and culture, technology and nature, technology and the human being (Ch 4: 6.3.3), technology and women (Ch 6: 6.3). *Within these premises*, soft technologies are favoured – supporting green sample data is presented at section 6.5.10.

Variations:

1. Non-instrumental science and technology is valued: *social ecology* Ch 5: 1, 3.1, 4.2.1.2, footnote 33 at 5.4, 5.4.1, 6.2, 6.3.1.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.2.1.5.
2. *Ecofeminism* critiques and rejects mechanist, rationalist-instrumental, analytical, value-free, exploitative, context-inappropriate forms of science and technology as an expression of a ‘masculinist’ worldview - Ch 6: 3.3, also sections 3.1, and 3.2 in this chapter.
3. Less critically, the eco-socialist strands in *Die Grünen* championed an ecological reform of western industrialism, led forward by science and technology - Ch 7: 1.4.1.

Green sample data: *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 6.3.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 2.4, 3.1, 4.1.4.1, 6.3.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 2.3.1, 3.1, 3.3, 4.1.2, 5.4.1(4); *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 3.3, 3.3.1, 3.5, 6.3; *Die Grünen* 2.1.1, 2.1.3.4, 5.4.3.1, 6.1.2.1, 6.1.2.4, 6.1.3.3, 6.2, 6.2.1.4, 6.2.1.5, 6.2.5.

External green data:

- a. Lack of faith in modern large scale technology and its associated demands on elitist expertise, central state authority, and inherently undemocratic institutions (O’Riordan, 1981, p. 376)

- b. Discriminating use and development of science and technology, not unquestioning acceptance of the technological fix (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- c. Ecocentric, not technocentric (Descriptors of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to mechanistic/Cartesian world views, Sterling, 1990, p. 82).

6.3.3.4 “Naturism” critiqued (instrumental exploitation, domination and destruction of nature)

Instrumentalism implies a denial of agency in the Other [here, nature], the “use of the periphery as the means to the center’s ends” (*ecofeminism* Ch 6: 4.2.1 (e)), and is unethical (section 5 of this chapter). It is variously blamed on anthropocentrism, hierarchy, or androcentrism. In this latter critique, instrumentalism is a product of a (male) dualist ontology which “typically polarizes difference and minimizes shared characteristics, construes difference along the lines of superiority/inferiority, and views the inferior side as a means to the higher ends of the superior side (the instrumental thesis, Ch 6: 5.1.1 (a)).

Seeing green critiques that form of techno-industrial development which (a) is informed by hierarchical, patriarchal ideas [“power over” ideas] of the human-nature relationship, particularly the idea that human mastery over nature is necessary for progress, (b) excludes “the feminine principle” [section 4.3.3.3] in the use of natural resources, (c) sees nature in human-instrumental terms and utility values only, (d) disrupts ecosystems and ecological processes, for current and future generations, because short term economic development is seen as having priority over ecological sustainability, and (e) “manages” environmental impacts on nature via rational-instrumental science and technology, rather than changing fundamental values and accepting the idea of natural limits.

Green sample data: *deep ecology*, Ch 4: 4.1.4.1, 6.2.1 footnote 56, 6.3.3, 6.3.3.1; *social ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.5.2 footnote 61, and Ch 5: 2.1.4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.2.3, 6.1.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.3, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 4.2.2, 5.1.1(f), 5.2.1, 6.3, 6.4, 6.4(c), 6.4(d); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3, 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.2, 6.2.5.

6.3.3.5 Global “advanced” industrial capitalism problematized

Global advanced industrial capitalism for all is problematized as (a) assuming universality of western economic concepts, such as “development” understood as ever-increasing commodity production, “poverty” equated with subsistence living, and “productivity” in nature equated with production of commodities from natural resources for profit; (b) representing increased production for wants [want-satisfaction is an economic definition of utility] rather than vital needs; (c) leading to increased poverty, and increased international economic inequality. In the Third World, advanced capitalism creates “new elites”, increases the economic gap between haves/have-nots, between men and women, and between the North and South, through, inter alia, unfair trade practices, and unfair division of labour. (d) It is ecologically impossible to universalize on a global scale, without encouraging militarism to secure access to natural resources, and (e) reduces cultural diversity through its homogenizing nature.

a. assuming universality of western economic concepts

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4(b).

b. producing for wants rather than vital needs

Green sample data: *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 5.1.3.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.4; *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.1.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.2.1, 2.1.3.5.

c. increasing national and global economic inequality

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4(a) and (c); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.2.1, 6.2.5.

d. being ecologically impossible to globalize; encouraging militarism

Green sample data: *deep ecology*, Ch 4: 6.2.3, 6.2.4.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.1, 2.1.3.2, 2.1.3.2.1, 6.4.1.1.

e. destroying cultural diversity

Green sample data: *deep ecology*, Ch 4: 6.2.4.2, 6.2.5; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.2.5, 6.4.2.3.

6.3.4 An alternative conception of “the good life”

Seeing green proposes an alternative conception of the good life, preferably spiritually-based, but if not, then at least based on rejection of consumption as bringer of happiness, rejection of non-material values, and valuing quality of life rather than increasingly higher standards of living. The “good life” conceptualized, as *Die Grünen* Bahro phrases it, as “... our auto-culture, the ‘good life’ of Washington, London, Paris and Frankfurt” (Bahro, 1984, in Bahro, 1986, pp. 161-162, in Ch 7: 2.1.3.6) is critiqued.

The new understanding of the good life [“quality of life”] manifests itself in the personal sphere, for example, as voluntary simplicity, not simply as a rejection of materialism and consumerism, but also as a statement of global solidarity with have-nots. In the public sphere, new understandings of the good life generate alternative forms of development for the Third World which deliver what is needed locally to combat poverty, hunger and sickness, not to promote western economism. “Solidarity” development politics (aid with no strings attached, for example) are proposed. Data on alternative development models is presented at section 6.3.5.

Green sample data: *nonhuman nature rights theory* (Stone) Ch 3: 5.1.3.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: point 7 of platform in 1.3.4.1, 5.4.3, 6, 6.2.4.1, 6.2.4.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4; *Die Grünen*: Ch 7: 2.1.3.2.1, 2.1.3.3, 2.1.3.4, 2.1.3.5, 2.1.3.6, 6.1.2.2.

External green data:

- a. Sustainability and quality of life, not economic growth and Gross National Product [GNP] (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Voluntary simplicity, not demand stimulation (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.3.5 Alternative forms of development proposed

Alternative forms of development which 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, recognize the role of spirituality in human development, protect cultural diversity, recognize ecological limits and protect nature’s diversity, which are regionally appropriate, tend towards increased economic self-reliance, harness renewable energies and soft technologies (see this chapter, section 6.5.10), and maintain international peace are recommended. Two positive examples are “ecodevelopment” (*deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.4.3), and Norwegian resource economist and peace activist Johann Galtung’s work (*deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.3.1, *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.3). A negative example is Shiva’s ‘maldevelopment’ (*ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4).

Sustainable development is viewed with scepticism or caution, because of its anthropocentrism, or neo-colonialism-in-disguise: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.3, 6.2.5, 6.5.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.4.3, 5.4.3, 5.4.5.2, 6.2.4.2, 6.2.4.3, 6.3.3.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4; *Die Grünen*: Ch 7: 2.1.3.3, 4.3.4 footnote 58, 6.2.5, 6.4.2.3.

External green data:

- a. Self-reliance, not ever-expanding world trade (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Production for use, not production for exchange and profit (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- c. Local production for local need, not a ‘free-market’ economy (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- d. Appropriate technologies, not profit-driven technologies (Technology in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).
- e. Labour-intensive production, not capital-intensive production (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217). This idea was not encountered.

6.4 Assuring ecological sustainability

... it is my opinion that a *necessary, but not sufficient, criterion of the fully attained greenness of a society is that it is ecologically sustainable in the wide sense* (Naess, 1995c, in Sessions, 1995, p. 402, his italics, in Chapter Four: 5.4.3).

6.4.1 Green stories:

Ecological limits are recognized as the ultimate “bottom line” for all endeavours of the current generation, as well as of future generations. The conditions of life must be preserved, excessive interference in nature’s stability/equilibrium/balance must be reduced, and the economy must be ecologically re-oriented [green stories and data on this aspect at 6.5]. Achieving ecological sustainability requires (6.4.2) a long-range approach [“futurity”] which protects the basis of all life, not a short term profit-oriented view of the planet’s ecology; (6.4.3) global controls, despite the green insistence on decentralization and self-management; (6.4.4) the curtailment of human population growth; (6.4.5) protection of land, water, and air’s capacity to sustain life; (6.4.6) immediate preservation of the planet’s remaining biodiversity, and its habitat; (6.4.7) reduction of natural resource consumption, particularly of energy; (6.4.8) the practice of reciprocal land use; (6.4.9) the ethical treatment of animals; and (6.4.10), education in the interconnectedness of the life base in schools, and in continuing education.

6.4.2 Take a long-range ecological protection, not short term economic view of the environment [“futurity”]

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.1.2, 5.4.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4, 2.1.3.2, 6.1.

External green data:

- a. Ecological stewardship, not resource management (Role of the human in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- b. Preserve biodiversity, not nature as resource; Protect ecosystem integrity, not exploit or conserve (Values in relation to nature in the Ecological age, as opposed to the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.4.3 Establish international controls to assure global ecological sustainability

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch4: 4.1.4.2, 6.4.3.2, *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.7.

6.4.4 Stabilize, reduce human population growth

The curtailment of population growth globally [not only in the Third World] is recognized, but not without contention, as one challenge among many which must be dealt with *in non-totalitarian, non-patriarchal ways*, if ecological sustainability is to be achieved. Various approaches proposed are to expand women's role in society; enable women to control their own fertility; increase women's health and economic welfare; end political leaders' demands for more babies to increase national strength; de-condition men from their patriarchal demands for more children.

Variation: Calls for population control are critiqued as First World elitism, and/or male attempts to control women's fertility (*social ecology*, and *ecofeminism* in Ch 4: 6.4.2.1).

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.4.1 point 4, 2.1 footnote 14, 4.1.4.3, 5.1.2, 6.4.2; *social ecology* in Ch 4: 6.4.2.1, *ecofeminism* in Ch 4: 6.4.2.1, and Ch 6: 6.5; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.2.5.1.

6.4.5 Protect land, water and air's long-term capacity to sustain life

Although all principles listed under "Ecological sustainability" can be understood as aimed at protecting land, water, and air's regenerative capacity to sustain life, this aspect refers to (6.4.5.1) prudence in intervention into nature's processes, unless all the effects of the intervention are known [the 'precautionary principle']; (6.4.5.2) the reduction of harmful emissions to land, water, and air [today's 'polluter pays' principle; the concept of the Clean Development mechanism, for example]; and the reduction of wastefulness – the 'three R's': reduce, recycle, and re-use. Examples of reduction in wastefulness would be the physical separation of drinking water from water for other uses, the production of durable goods, and the elimination of elaborate packaging. Reduction of natural resource use is dealt with at 6.4.7.

6.4.5.1 Reduce excessive intervention into/disturbance of natural processes and habitats; exercise prudence when intervening

Green sample data: *deep ecology*, Ch 4: 1.3.4.1 point 5, 4.1.2, 4.1.4.2, 5.2.2, 5.4.1, 6.4.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.4.1(4); *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.1.2(4); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.1.

6.4.5.2 Reduce waste, pollution, and wastefulness

Green sample data: *deep ecology*, Ch 4: 6.2.4.3, 6.3.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.1.2, 6.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.5.

External green sample data:

- a. Recycling, reusing, not waste overload (Technology in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- b. Protect and restore ecosystems, not exploitation/consumerism (Technology in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.4.6 Protect remaining biodiversity and its habitat

Some of seeing green's measures to maintain biodiversity [diversity and abundance] and its habitat include the implementation of a species register to provide an overview of species' status, the re-introduction of endemic flora and fauna species, protection for threatened species against hunting and trade, and the protection or re-instatement of original landscape (*Die Grünen*, 1979, p. 10; 1980b, p. 23; Ch 7: 5.4.3). Other measures, for which green sample data is presented next, include setting aside,

and restoring large areas of free nature, scaling down industrial activities which threaten wide ecological sustainability, and opposing biotechnology.

6.4.6.1 Set aside, and restore, large areas of “free nature”³⁰ from human techno-industrial progress to protect biodiversity and its habitat

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.4, 4.1.4.2, 5.1.2, 6.4.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.3.

6.4.6.1.1. Nature tourism

Seeing green tends to oppose the “commodification” of such areas for nature tourism. **Green sample data:** *nonhuman nature rights theorist Stone* Ch 3: 6.2; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.4.3.

6.4.6.2 Scale down industrial activities which threaten wide ecological sustainability

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.1.2; *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.3.1.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.3.

6.4.6.3 Problematize biotechnology

Green sample data: *Ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.3.1.

External green data:

Preserve biodiversity, not nature as resource; protect ecosystem integrity, not exploit or conserve (Values in relation to nature in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.4.7 Reduce resource consumption: energy as example

The entire seeing green energy approach is best understood within green alternative stories of the reconceptualized human being [4.3.3], the good life, and authentic human development [6.3]. Increased energy consumption should not be understood as a mark of progress. Non-renewable energy sources are limited: their use must be stabilized to within ecological limits, and their efficiency rate must be increased. Military use of nuclear energy is rejected. Civil use of nuclear energy is not favoured, as it poses threats to life, to civil liberties, to the basis of life, particularly in wartime, and to future generations. The way forward is via people-friendly, and eco-friendly, alternative energies such as biogas, sun, wind, and water, which allow the use of alternative [‘soft’] technologies, and which have the potential of promoting grassroots democratic, and local, energy self-sufficiency. Private alternative energy enterprise should be allowed to contribute to the energy network, which is ideally decentralized. There must be increased research into alternative energy generation.

Another obvious starting point in reducing resource consumption is energy saving, people and nature-friendly transport systems [the stereotypical image of a “greenie” on a bicycle fits here], within a spatial planning approach to human habitat which has re-integrated, for example, the severed areas of work, living, play, and shopping [6.6.8]. Some green indicators are –

6.4.7.1 Stabilize and reduce use of non-renewable energy

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.1, 6.3.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.3.1.

6.4.7.2. Use renewable energy

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.4.3, 6.3.3.1; *social ecology* 6.3.1.4, *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.3.2.

³⁰“Free nature” is meant here in the deep ecology sense (Ch 4: 4.1.4), not social ecologist Murray Bookchin’s “free nature” (Ch 5: 4.3)

6.4.7.3 Increase research into alternative energies

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.3.5.

6.4.7.4 Avoid/stop all use of nuclear energy

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.3, 6.3, 7.3; *social ecology* 6.3.1.4, 7.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.2, 6.3, 7.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.1, 6.1.3.3.

6.4.7.5 Democratize and decentralize energy provision and storage

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.3.4.

6.4.7.6 Favour energy-saving transport systems

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.3.1.4; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.5.

External green data:

- a. Renewable sources of energy, not nuclear power (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Reliance on renewables, not addiction to fossil fuels (Technology in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- c. Low energy, low consumption, not high energy, high consumption (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.4.8 Practice reciprocal land use: agriculture as example

To illustrate reciprocal land use, I use agriculture. Reciprocal agriculture means, agriculture in partnership with the land, which works on a complementary, not a one-way industrial-extractive, basis. It operates at human scale; maintains the landscape and preserves flora and fauna species; respects ecological limits; replaces chemical with biological control methods in food production, thus contributes to food quality; practices multi- rather than monocropping to maintain biodiversity; keeps industrial animals in conditions respecting their species-nature [i.e. a reflection of the animal liberation theory argument from sentience]; protects rural culture and rural jobs.

Variation: Animal liberation theory, invoking the concept of rights (Regan), rejects commercial animal production for food altogether [section 6.4.9.2 below]. Seeing green also includes calls for complete or partial moral vegetarianism [6.4.9.3] both as personal ethical practice and public economic boycott of industrialized animal production methods.

Some green markers are -

6.4.8.1 A demand for organically-produced food; a rejection of genetically modified foods

6.4.8.2 Concern for the protection of human scale farming

Green sample data on 6.4.8.1 and 6.4.8.2: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.4; *social ecology* Ch 5: 1, 2.1.4.2, 5.4.3, 6.2; 6.3.1.3; 6.3.1.4; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.1.2(4); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.4.

6.4.8.3 Attention to animal welfare in farming

Green sample data is presented at 6.4.9.

External green data:

- a. Land ethic: think like mountain³¹, not land use: farming, herding (Relation to land in the transition to the Ecological age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- b. Poly and permaculture, not monoculture farming; Community and family farms, not agribusiness, factory farms; Biological pest control, not chemical fertilizers and pesticides; Preserve genetic diversity, not [Use of] vulnerable high-yield hybrids (Agriculture in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.4.9 Treat animals ethically

Green stories: There is a call for radical changes to scientific, and economic structures and practices, as well as personal practices, which negatively affect animal well-being.

Variation: The philosophical ultimate premises which bring animal well-being into accounts of the ethical vary from ontological conceptions of human-nonhuman continuity, to arguments from sentience and rights [section 5, this chapter]. There is thus also real-world variation in what constitutes their ethical treatment:

6.4.9.1 Eliminate animal experimentation including vivisection, and product-testing, completely, or almost completely

Green sample data:

- a. Totally abolish animal experimentation, or, reduce it to experimentation for certainly-known vital needs only, strictly control it, and eventually phase it out, replacing it with computer models and tissue culture - *animal liberation theory* Ch 3: 1.1.3, 6.2, 6.3.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.5; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.4
- b. A moral obligation to oppose much, if not quite all vivisection, vivisection only with anaesthetic - *animal liberation* Ch 3: 1.1.3, 6.3.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.5; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.3.2.1
- c. Product testing [weapons including chemical and biological warfare methods, cosmetics, tobacco, alcohol, cleaning materials] rejected – *animal liberation* Ch 3: 1.1.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.5.

6.4.9.2 Totally dissolve, or radically reform, commercial animal agriculture

Green sample data:

- a. Total dissolution of commercial animal agriculture including intensive factory and feedlot farming – *animal liberation* (Regan), Ch 3: 6.2, 6.3.2, 7.1
- b. Animal suffering in factory, battery, and feedlot farming inter alia through the use of mechanistic-technological farming practices condemned; agricultural animals must be kept in conditions according to their species-nature; live transport to be banned - *animal liberation theory* (Singer), Ch 3: 1.1.3, 2.2, 6.2, 6.3.2, 7.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 5.4.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.4.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.4
- c. The killing of animals is acceptable, provided that the animals involved are non-persons, the killing is pain-free, and stress-free - *animal liberation* (Singer), Ch 3: 5.4.1, 7.1; some writers within *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.4.3. Despite that,

³¹ The ideas-context for this indicator is assumed to be Aldo Leopold, who advocated thinking like a mountain, or thinking ecologically (from Bartlett (1986, p. 233) who refers to Leopold's work in his discussion of ecological rationality). The phrase is taken up in the title of a book co-authored by deep ecologist Naess: *Thinking like a mountain: Towards a council of all beings* (Seed, Fleming, Macy, & Naess, 1988), and also in his own 1989a (pp 2-3) discussion of "mountain thinking" – the idea that modesty and humility should inform the human being's relationships with the natural world

6.4.9.3 Total or partial moral veganism, vegetarianism, as personal statement and economic boycott

Green sample data: *animal liberation* Ch 3: 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and 6.3.2 and 6.3.3 (by implication), 7.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.4, 7.5; some writers within *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4, 5.4.4, 5.4.4.1(c), 5.4.4.2, 5.4.4.3, 5.4.5.

6.4.9.4 Wildlife: commercial, culling and sport hunting, trapping, and related trade totally or partially condemned, except in cases of vital human need

Green sample data: *animal liberation* Ch 3: 1.1.3, 6.2, 6.3.3; *deep ecology*, Ch 4: 5.4.2.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.4.3, 5.4.5; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.4.

6.4.9.5. No animals confined for education, or used in entertainment

Green sample data: *animal liberation*, Ch 3: 6.3.4; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.4.5.

6.4.9.6 Animal torture strictly punishable

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 5.4.4.

6.4.10 Provide insight into, and exposure to, the interconnectedness of the ecological life basis

The emphasis on insight in environmental education which one finds in *Die Grünen's* thought for example, is derived I think, from the libertarian-anarchist view of the human being, in which the emphasis is on voluntary consent, and conviction, in human action (for example, *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1), rather than on behaviourist environmental education approaches. Environmental education is not only about awareness raising, or even insight: it should involve a deep change of consciousness, a sense of harmonious relatedness with nature.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.3.1 footnote 9, 4.2.1.2(3), 5 footnote 47, 6.2.4.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.2.1, 5.4.6.

6.5 An ecologically re-oriented economy

6.5.1 Green stories:

Green stories on an ecological re-orientation of the economy should be understood within the alternative stories of what it is to be a better human being (this chapter, section 4.3), an alternative conception of “the good life” (section 6.3.4), alternative models of development (6.3.5), and the conviction that *ecological sustainability* (6.4) is the ultimate “bottom line” of any human endeavour. This latter is in contradistinction to the sustainable development assumption that a simultaneous “triple bottom line” - economic, social and environmental sustainability - is possible.

An ecologically-oriented economy recognizes ecological limits (6.5.2); has introduced ecological accounting, including “greening” of Gross Domestic Product [GDP] as indicator of authentic development (6.5.3); prioritizes life-affirming economic activities (6.5.4); delivers quality of life, not quantitative growth (6.5.5); encourages production for reproduction [needs] not profit (6.5.6); makes place for ecologically-appropriate, self-managed, self-reliant forms of living (6.5.7); is democratically-controlled, also in the workplace (6.5.8); provides meaningful work (6.5.9); uses non-demeaning, non-violent technology (6.5.10); protects against unemployment (6.5.11); protects people against misleading encouragement to materialism and consumerism (6.5.12); and practices fair trade (6.5.13).

Variations: The tension between the more radical get-out-of-the-system versions of a green economy, and the less, but still radical ecological re-orientation of capitalism as economic system, is evident in the principles listed below.

6.5.2 Recognizes ecological limits, and promotes ecological sustainability

The ecological limits to growth idea – finite energy sources; acceptable limits to climate change - as a contributing influence in seeing green was introduced in Chapter Two: 2.3.1(d). Botzler and Armstrong (1998, p. 517, and footnote 4) briefly but usefully characterize steady-state economics as “stress[ing] the limits to resource use based on the carrying capacity of the earth”. The economy is seen as a subsystem of the natural environment. By contrast, mainstream economics “... maintain[s] that the earth’s carrying capacity is a function of the state of human knowledge and technology”. The ideas of mainstream economic theory are taken up in more detail in Chapter Nine, section 3. A seeing-green, ecologically-oriented economy takes the “limits” or “steady-state” side of the limits vs. continually-expanding economy debate, within the context of a “partnership”, not instrumental-only, ethic with nature.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 4.1.4.1, *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.1.2, *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.1, 2.1.3.2, 2.1.3.5, 5.4.2, 6.1.2.1.

External green data:

- a. Resources regarded as strictly finite, not environment managed as a resource (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Ecological limits determine technical limits, not few or no technological or ecological limits (Primary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- c. Limits to growth, not limitless progress (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- d. Steady-state economy or qualitative growth, not undifferentiated economic growth (Secondary characteristics of ecological/holistic world views, as opposed to those of a mechanistic/Cartesian worldview, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- e. Steady-state, sustainability, not “Economic development” (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- f. Economics based on ecology, not no accounting of nature (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.5.3 Practises ecological accounting, incl. “greening” of GDP as indicator of development

This idea comes from modern environmental economics which began to emerge in the 1970s, informed by the radical egalitarian approach of nineteenth century ecological economists (Chapter Two: 2.3.1(d), and Chapter Nine: 3.3). Seeing green critiques the ecology-independent and individualistic assumptions of GNP/GDP, and searches for greener indicators of human development which take ecological sustainability and quality of life into account. An ecologically-oriented economy practices publicly accountable ecological bookkeeping.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.1; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.4(b); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.2.6.

Although today’s natural resource accounting firmly situates the economic cycle within the ecological cycle, by accounting for natural resource inputs and outputs - the use of nature’s stocks and flows of energy and materials, and the production of waste - there are varying understandings of ecological sustainability. These are discussed in more detail in Chapter Nine: Environment and Development, section 3.4.

External green data:

Economics based on ecology, not no accounting of nature (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.5.4 Prioritizes life-affirming economic activities

An ecologically-oriented economy prioritizes what *Die Grünen* called “investments in the future”. By this they meant, for example, the radical idea [by western industrialism standards] of dismantling life-threatening industries such as the nuclear, weapons, and chemical industries, their re-orientation to life-affirming, ecology-protecting economic activities, and appropriate re-skilling of the employees involved.

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.2.3.

Seeing green also advocates a change to production techniques which limit resource use to a level which does not upset the long-term sustainability of the ecological balance; reduces emissions [for example, today’s global concept “Clean Development Mechanism”], uses energy thriftily [“energy-efficiency”]; re-uses materials; re-cycles waste products sustainably back into natural ecological cycles; and reduces wastefulness through, for example, the production of useful, durable, repairable goods. Data on this aspect is presented at section 6.4.5.2: “Protect land, water and air’s long-term capacity to sustain life”.

6.5.5 Delivers quality of life, not quantitative growth

An ecologically-oriented economy delivers not increased production and quantitative growth but quality of life. Some understandings of this nebulous concept are a milieu which preserves diversity in both human and nonhuman nature, ensures that people’s fundamental needs [understood as more than just basic needs] are met, provides an environment in which people are free of oppression, and have unfettered opportunities to develop their creative capacities, and undertake self-chosen activities. In essence I think, seeing green’s alternative conceptions of “the good life” and of “authentic development” [as for example in Galtung’s conception, Ch 4: 6.3.3.1] represent what is meant by “quality of life”. Data on these ideas is presented at sections 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.

The “quality of life” concept also includes ideas such as social egalitarianism: a fair distribution of goods produced so that the disadvantaged sections of society also benefit, a “social wage”, that is, a basic, but sufficient income for all (stories and data at 6.5.11); and social inclusion, understood partly at least, as secure, caring, social services (stories and data at 6.6.6).

External green data: Sustainability and quality of life, not economic growth and GNP (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.5.6 Encourages production for needs not profit

An ecologically-oriented economy encourages production for reproduction – i.e., production reduced to what society really needs, and not production for profit, materialism and consumerism. This would provide meaningful work for all, reduce working hours, allow genuine self-realization, and reduce the ecological burden of production.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.4.1, point 3, 6.2.4.3, 6.3.3.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.2.2, 6.2.1 and subdivisions, 6.3.1.

External green data:

- a. Implication that materialism for its own sake is wrong, and that economic growth can be geared to providing for the basic needs for those below subsistence levels (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981 p. 376)
- b. Production for use (Distinguishing features of a green paradigm, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.5.7 Encourages ecologically-appropriate local production for local use

An ecologically-oriented economy encourages ecologically-appropriate, local economic production, particularly of food, for local use. This value is partly reflected in some supermarkets’ attempts today, to reduce ‘food miles’ travelled. In its more radical forms, local production for local use is part of self-managing, self-reliant forms of social living and economic production, such as bioregionalism, or communes, inside or outside the market system [data on this idea is presented at 6.2.2: “Ecologically-informed, post-hierarchical forms of political and socio-economic organization advocated”, and 6.3.3: “Alternative forms of development proposed”].

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.3.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.2.3, 6.3.1.

External green data:

- a. Community-based economies, not multi-national corporations (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).
- b. Local production for local need, not a ‘free-market’ economy (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.5.8 Democratic control, both of the economy, and in the workplace

An ecologically-oriented economy is under democratic control, not the control of banks, insurance companies, or multi-nationals. The economy is decentralized, and integrated into all-round community living. Production units are local, and human scale, not giant corporates. Small, self-managed businesses without hierarchies are favoured. What should be produced, where it should be produced, and how it should be produced – particularly, the introduction of technology in the workplace - is democratically determined and controlled. In the more radical forms of decentralized economy, such as *social ecology*’s municipalized economy, or Fundi *Die Grünen* communitarian living, the community’s economy is managed through direct [face to face] democracy.

Green sample data: *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.3.1.3, 6.3.1.6, 6.3.2.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.4, 6.2.1.4, 6.2.1.5.

External green data:

- a. Emphasis on smallness of scale and hence community identity in settlement, work, and leisure (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981 p. 376)
- b. Community-based economies, not multi-national corporations (Economic systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- c. Decentralization, human scale, not centralization, economies of scale (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.5.9 Provides creative activity, not meaningless labour

An ecologically-oriented economy provides meaningful and dignified work, that is, activity which contributes to a person’s self-unfolding and self-realization, rather than work for a wage only. The ideas context is anarchism, as well as ecological complexity, understood normatively.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.5; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.3, 4.3, 6.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.2, 6.2.1.1.

External green data:

- a. Work as an end in itself, not employment as a means to an end (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Integration of concepts of work and leisure through a process of personal and communal improvement (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists, O’Riordan, 1981 p. 376).

6.5.10 Uses “soft” (non-demeaning, non-exploitative) technology

Usually within alternative understandings of development (section 6.3.5), and a reviewed, revised, non-dominating, non-exploitative relationship between technology and culture, technology and nature, and technology and the human being (Ch 4: 6.3.3), an ecologically-oriented economy uses “soft” [“alternative”, “liberatory”, “partnership”, “intermediate”, “ecosophically sane”, “beta”] technology. This is essentially eco-appropriate, human-scale technology which is at the service of a person’s self-realization, and which contributes to human quality of life rather than an economic rationality which serves profit. Mass mechanized production should be balanced by craftpersonship and handicrafts.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.4.3, 6.3.3, 6.3.3.1; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1 footnote 11, 2.1.4.2, 2.3.1, 3.1, 4.2.1.1 together with 4.2.2.4 and 4.3, 4.3.1, 5.4.1 opening citation, 6.2, 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.4; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.4, 6.2.1.5.

External green data:

- a. Discriminating use and development of science and technology (Distinguishing features of a green paradigm, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Appropriate technologies, not profit-driven technologies (Technology in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).
- c. Labour-intensive production, not capital-intensive production (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217). [This idea was not encountered].

6.5.11 Provides a “social wage” for all

The idea of a “social wage” for all came into green thought from the egalitarianism and redistributionism of the nineteenth century ecological economists (Bramwell, 1989, p. 87, p. 221, and footnote 73 on p. 260). An ecologically-oriented economy must provide protection against unemployment in the form of a basic income grant³², because work is regarded as a right.

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.2.1.2, 6.2.1.3.

Variations: *Social ecology’s* libertarian municipalism, and Fundi *Die Grünen’s* outside-the-system communitarian living, do not place the same emphasis on formal employment within the system.

6.5.12 Protects people against misleading encouragement to materialism and consumerism

An ecologically-oriented economy protects people against misleading encouragement [advertising] to materialism and consumerism [today’s ‘consumer rights’].

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.2.2.

³² In Namibia, the basic income grant [BIG] is church, not government-led, as one might expect (Haarmann, 2005; “BIG goes it alone” / Denver Isaacs, *The Namibian*, Wednesday 14 February 2007, p. 3)

6.5.13 Practices fair trade/development aid

An ecologically-oriented economy practices fair trade to redress the inequalitarian First World/Third World international division of labour, and unfair prices paid for natural resources. The fair trade principle [egalitarian development politics] also seeks to promote self-help, self-reliance, protection of livelihood opportunities, and locally-appropriate development in those areas where natural resources are acquired by “the centre”. The ideological context here is critique of the centre/periphery global development model, and the ideology of alternative development models.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 5.4.2.1, 6.3.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6:6.4(a); *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.2.1, 2.1.3.3(3), 6.2.5, 6.4.1.1.

6.6 Living in solidarity

6.6.1 Green stories

The value of solidarity is derived from both symbiosis [interconnectedness and interdependence] in ecology normatively understood, as well as from Gandhian principles such as *advaita* [radical ontological nonduality], *ahimsa* [non-violence], and *aparigraha* [non-possession].

Today, “living in solidarity”³³ is roughly translated in mainstream development as “social responsibility”. In green stories, the solidarity concept is richer. *Identification with the other* means one espouses “solidarity politics”, that is, living in genuine community, partnership, co-operation, 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, p. xiii, in Ch 7: 6.4 footnote 150). Stories and data for philosophical and practical living in partnership with nature are presented at sections 5 and 6.4 respectively.

This section (6.6) focuses on solidarity relations with people. Above all else, living in solidarity - “partnership” – requires a rebalancing of “masculine” with “feminine” qualities and values in our personal and social-structural values (6.6.2). These values - ecologically-informed, post-patriarchal values – are introduced at section 6.2.1 in this chapter. In a sense, living in solidarity with one’s Self also requires reclaiming one’s ceded, estranged, or denied other half – data pertaining to this aspect is presented at section 4.3.3.

The most fundamental expression of living in solidarity is (6.6.3) non-violence, and peace, the latter considered by deep ecologist Naess to be one of the three criteria³⁴ of a truly green society (Ch 4: 6.1). 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, as a Namibian example, 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 behaviour in either the public or private spheres. A **variation** here is the lesser commitment of some Marxist-informed seeing green elements to the principle of non-violence (Ch 7: 1.4.1, footnote 151 in 6.4.1, 6.4.3.1). On the green view, radical peace includes ethical trade practices,

³³ One of the four interrelated pillars of Die Grünen’s “total concept” (Ch 7: 1.4)

³⁴ The other two are wide ecological sustainability, and social justice

particularly in relation to natural resources (section 6.5.13). Radical peace is indivisible from grassroots democracy; stories and data on this green marker are presented in section 6.7.

Living in solidarity also includes -

(6.6.4) sustained attention to women’s full emancipation, reducing/eliminating their oppression and exploitation [for example, domestic violence against women; equalizing their education, work, and recreation opportunities; ensuring that women are in control of their own fertility; 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, p. 292, her italics, Ch 6:1) [e.g. both men and women to be involved in house-caring, and child-rearing]; and the revision of socio-economic structures to support such non-patriarchal sex and gender roles;

(6.6.5) the valuing of cultural diversity;

(6.6.6) social inclusion - ecology’s egalitarianism translates into ideas such as “a social ecosystem”: secure social services, a basic, but sufficient income for all [the “Social Wage” already discussed at 6.5.11], and the social inclusion, and rights protection, of the marginalized [prisoners, social welfare cases, the elderly, the disabled, the mentally-ill as some examples];

(6.6.7) holistic health care, which addresses the whole body-mind person, delivered as close to home as possible, and emphasizing 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 co-optation of the medical industry by profit-seeking companies;

(6.6.8) spatial re-integration to match our psychological re-integration. Human habitat spatial planning should seek to re-integrate 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.

(6.6.9) Integral education designed to develop the whole person, to support self-realization [4.3.3], to produce people imbued with the values needed in a new ecological society, and not just to ensure a person’s economic usefulness to society. Holistic education also seeks to re-integrate learning and living. Genuine participation in the political process is seen as part of a person’s well-rounded education; this aspect is discussed at “Grassroots democracy” section 6.7.2;

(6.6.10) Living in solidarity, means living in solidarity with future generations as well.

6.6.2 “Masculine” values rebalanced with ecologically-informed, and/or post-patriarchal personal and social values

Supporting data for this aspect has already been presented at section 6.2.1 “Ecologically-informed, and/or post-patriarchal personal and social values advocated”. Not discussed there were the ecological/post-patriarchal values of non-violence, and peace, next at 6.6.3.

6.6.3 Non-violence, and radical peace

6.6.3.1 Militarism, nuclearism, and threat of force critiqued; instead, radical peace, total disarmament, locally-organized non-violent social defence

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.3.1, 6.4.4; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 2.2.2, 6.1.1, 6.1.2(1); 6.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4.1, 2.1.1, 2.2, 2.2.3, 4.3.5.1, 6.4, 6.4.1, 6.4.1.1, 6.4.2.

6.6.3.2 No structural violence

Green sample data: *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 6.2, 6.6; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.4.4.

6.6.3.3 Dialogue, consensual process, respect for difference, not ‘power-over’ in our relations and actions

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 7.3; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 5.2.7, 5.2.8, 5.4.3(4), 6.1.1, 6.1.2(1), 6.1.2(7), 7.1, 7.4; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 3.1, 6.4.3.

6.6.3.4 No physical violence; no hate behaviour, no violent speech, no vilification

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.4.3, 6.4.3.1, 6.4.3.2, 6.4.5.1.

6.6.3.5 Fair trade practices

Supporting data for this aspect is presented at section 6.5.13.

External green data:

- a. Nonviolence, not institutionalized violence (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Commitment to nonviolence, not militarism (Political systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

6.6.4 Full emancipation for women; post-patriarchal gender roles

Green sample data: *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1, 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.1.1-2.1.4, 6.4(c), 6.5; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 4.3.5, 4.3.5.1, 6.2.2.1, 6.2.6.

6.6.5 Multi-culturalism valued

Green sample data is presented at section 5.4, point 8: “Cultural diversity”

6.6.6 Social inclusion

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.2.4.3; *ecofeminism* – Ch 6: 2.1.2, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 6.6; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.1.2.4, 6.3.4.

External green data:

Low income differentials, not high income differentials (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217).

6.6.7 Non-patriarchal, holistic, close-to-home health care

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.3.3.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.2.4.

6.6.8 Re-integrated, ecologically-harmonious human habitat spatial planning

Green sample data: *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.3, 6.1.5, 6.2.3.

6.6.9 Holistic, real-world education

Green sample data: *social ecology* Ch 5: footnote 45 in 6.2, 6.3.2.1.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.3, 6.2.2.

6.6.10 Considering future generations

Green sample data is presented at section 5.4.2, point 9 “Future generations”.

6.7 Grassroots [“direct”] democracy

6.7.1 Green stories

Green stories of grassroots [direct] democracy, instead of western liberal indirect/representative democracy, 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. Supporting data for the green critique of hierarchy, patriarchy, bureaucracy, and power-over mentality is provided at section 2.1.2.

Decentralized 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 which disempowers 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 – on the feminist critique, the personal *is* political (Ch 6: 6.1.2(8)).

Grassroots democracy’s most radical expression is face-to-face democracy in eco-communitarian living. In less radical understandings, it means authentic citizen participation in the political process. This requires society’s management to be de-professionalized, 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. Active and responsible participation in the political process is held to be an essential part of an individual’s holistic development (6.7.2). Today’s rather watered-down expressions of grassroots democracy are “participatory democracy” and “public participation”.

Direct action, which may range from mild social influence actions (letters, petitions, demonstrations, marches, street theatre for example), to economic boycott, civil disobedience, or forming “neighbourhood assemblies” with moral if not legal power, is considered an essential element of both the public democratic process, *and* self-realization (6.7.3). It should be non-violent in nature.

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 (6.7.4 - 6.7.6).

Variations: In the more radical anarchist-utopian influenced green stories, statism and parliamentarianism are rejected altogether, in favour of radical forms of decentralized political self-management such as communitarianism, which includes economic self-management as well [more stories and data on this aspect at 6.3.2 and 6.7.2]: *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 4.3, 4.3.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.1.1, 6.3.2 and subdivisions, 7.2, 7.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 1.4.1, 6.3.1, 8.1, 8.2.

6.7.2 Decentralized political self-management, and real citizenship

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 6.4.3; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 4.3, 6.1.1.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.3.1.5, 6.3.2, 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.1.1; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.3, 6.3.2.

6.7.3 Non-violent, direct action, including civil disobedience

Green sample data: *animal rights theory* Ch 3: 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 6.3.3.1, 7.1, 7.2; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.4.1 opening paragraph, 2.2, 6.5.3, 7.4; *social ecology* Ch 5: 2.1.4.1, 7; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.2, 7, 7.2; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.4.5, 6.4.5.1.

6.7.4 Fundamental rights protected

Green sample data: *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 6.3.3, 6.3.4.

6.7.5 Public accountability, and private data protection

Green sample data: *social ecology* Ch 5: 6.1.1.1; *Die Grünen*: Ch 7: 6.3.2, 6.3.5.

External green data:

- a. Internationalism and global solidarity, not sovereignty of nation state (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- b. Humans and environment focus, not national security focus³⁵ (Political systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171)
- c. Importance of participation in community affairs, and of guarantees of the rights of minority interests. Participation seen both as a continuing education and political function (Deep environmentalists/self-reliance, soft technologists; O’Riordan, 1981, p. 376)
- d. Participative involvement, not dependence upon experts (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- e. Descriptors: participative (Ecological/holistic world views, Sterling, 1990, p. 82)
- f. Direct democracy, not representative democracy (Distinguishing features of the politics of ecology in a green paradigm, as opposed to the politics of industrialism, Porritt, 1984, pp. 216-217)
- g. Egalitarian democracies, not patriarchal oligarchies (Political systems in the transition to the Ecological Age, from the Industrial Age, Metzner, 1994, pp. 170-171).

7. Praxis

7.1 Green stories

“Praxis” is used loosely in this study to mean, living out/enacting your moral beliefs in the public sphere (7.2) as well as undertaking “self-work” (7.3). Praxis is informed by the feminist/ecofeminist conviction that the personal is political. In seeing green, personal lifestyle choices represent not only a quest for self-realization, or inward transformation, but a political demand for social-structural change too. Some writers within *deep ecology* and *ecofeminism* have formulated philosophical-political platforms (Ch 4: 1.3.4, and Ch 6: 5.1.2, 6.1.2 respectively) to guide political action based on the new ecological/non-patriarchal consciousness.

A **variation** here is Bookchin’s view in *social ecology* (Ch 5: 7.1, also in Ch 4: 4.2.3.1) that there can be no personal redemption without social redemption.

7.2 Living out/enacting your personal moral beliefs in the public sphere too

Direct action and civil disobedience as examples of direct democratic personal-political practice are discussed at 6.7.3.

³⁵ The context for this Metzner green marker, is a critique of patriarchal nation-states

Other examples of living out your personal beliefs in the public sphere are consumer boycott, perhaps expressed as voluntary simplicity in protest against materialism and consumerism, or as demonstration of global solidarity against international economic inequality, or as boycott of animal-related “products of pain”, expressed in veganism, vegetarianism or semi-vegetarianism, or not wearing fur where one has choice, or refusing to buy products [cosmetics, poisons, weapons] tested on animals, or not attending events in which animals are exploited for entertainment.

Green sample data: *animal liberation* Ch 3: 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and 6.3.2 and 6.3.3 (by implication), 7.1; *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3.4.1 opening paragraph and point 8, 7.5; some writers within *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 1.2(8), 5.4.4.1(e), 5.4.4.1(f), 5.4.4.3, 5.4.5, 6.1.2(7), 6.1.2(8), 6.1.2(9), 7.3; *Die Grünen* Ch 7: 2.1.3.5.

7.3 “Self-work”

Some of the “Self-work” or inward, or self-examination work needed to achieve the transformation to a greener society is, for example, clarifying for yourself your worldview [your ultimate premises and values], making the paradigm shift needed to move towards an ecocentric value orientation, or liberating yourself from the idea of hierarchy, or “patriarchal programming”. Another aspect is speaking out in public in support of issues valued in seeing green, instead of remaining silent.

Green sample data: *deep ecology* Ch 4: 1.3, 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 2.4, 5.1.2, 7.1, 7.2; *ecofeminism* Ch 6: 7.4.

8. Summary of “seeing green”

Seeing green’s stories are about the pathological western Self/Other relationship [Self divided against self, against other human beings, against “the female”, against women, against nature, against animals], of which the ecological crisis is one manifestation. There will be no solution to this crisis, until the pathological Self/Other relationship is healed.

Within that context, one summary of seeing green’s key ideas is -

1. A fundamental critique of the dominant western capitalist techno-industrial society, including of the [masculinist] ontological idea that there is a Self/Other dichotomy, of the epistemological dominance of [masculinist] science, of the idea that human progress entails the conquest, mastery or exploitation of nature, thus legitimating an instrumental ethic towards the natural world; of the values of technological and rational efficiency, materialism and consumerism.
2. A fundamentally different view of self, of self vis-a-vis other persons, and of self vis-a-vis nature, is necessary to re-orient western culture, and to address the increasingly global ecological crisis.
3. A nature ethic which “crosses the species divide” in one way or another, 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, and animal suffering, matter morally, not merely instrumentally.
4. Personal transformation, and radical political and socio-economic changes are needed to achieve a green, or ecological society. This transformation involves the adoption of ecological/post-patriarchal values.
5. Adherents of seeing green are required to try to implement the necessary changes in self and in society’s structures, by clarifying their worldview, and by living out/enacting their personal beliefs in the public sphere.

8.1 Its challenge

While proponents of an ecological or “seeing green” worldview consider the normativity of their views on Self/Other to be rooted objectively in ecology, critics have accused them of being romantic, wrong, and radical (Anderson, 1996; Bramwell, 1994). Whether romantic or wrong, seeing green’s challenge to the mainstream social construction of reality has been perturbing. When its marginalization through ridicule failed (Bramwell, 1989, p. 12), its more radical elements were quietly sidelined, and its less radical elements quickly incorporated (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) into mainstream politics, in a process *Die Grünen’s* Petra Kelly called “Themenklau”, and historian of ecologism Anna Bramwell calls “clothes-snatching”.

What happens in this phenomenon, is that the mainstream neutralizes the subversivity of seeing green by co-opting some of its safer aspects [recycling, alternative energy, “soft” technology, “participatory” democracy], but remaining silent on its demand for a radically-changed Self, human/nature relationship, and society. On Sachs’s view (also noted in Ch 4: 6.2.5), for example, sustainable development has “emasculate[d]³⁶ the environmental challenge by absorbing it” into developmentalist assumptions (1993, in Sessions, 1995, p. 433). Bramwell went so far as to contend in 1994, that the Green movement was in decline³⁷, by which she meant, “... the end of the brief era of dedicated Green national politics...” (1994, p. 1).

This mainstream co-opting, de-radicalising tendency can be seen, I believe, in the next chapter on Environment and Development, Chapter Nine. This introduces the theoretical framework for the field of “environment and development”, which I assume to be the equivalent of Wissenburg’s “grue” [my grey-green] on the right hand side of his heuristic on the diminishing importance of green ideas (Chapter One: Figure 2).

³⁶ An unfortunate word choice which any ecofeminist would challenge; still, Sach’s meaning is clear!

³⁷ On a more positive note, she felt that such talk about the decline of the green movement “does not imply that environmentalism [Bramwell is using “environmentalism” here as shorthand for “radical environmentalism”, which is more or less, “ecologism” or “seeing green”] is finished...” (Bramwell, 1994, p. 1). The “impetus of radical ecologism still perturbs the fabric of our time, and will do so for many more years, as its creed leaks into the vulnerable texture of mass consciousness...” (pp. 5-6). The now-current attention to climate change by ordinary people, which is forcing both politicians and economists to act, is a good example