

H2-Introduction

This year, there are a large number of kritiks that generally fit under the rubric of “environmental ethics” or ecophilosophy — an inquiry into the ethical value of the physical world and what values ought to drive environmental protection. Theorists writing within the field of environmental ethics argue that particular ethical frameworks are superior to others. Contests over which ethical framework to endorse will drive your environmental ethics kritik debates.

...“our relationship with nature should be valued based on how our interactions with nature affect human beings...”

H2-Cornerstone Philosophies

There are a number of foundational environmental philosophies that drive most of the environmental ethics kritiks. Each are briefly introduced in this section and discussed in further detail in the sections that immediately follow.

Anthropocentrism. Anthropocentrism is the view that our relationship with nature should be valued based on how our interactions with nature affect human beings. Arguments that “we need to save the oceans to save humankind” fit into this category.

Intergenerational Anthropocentrism. Intergenerational anthropocentrists argue that human behavior should be judged based on how likely a particular practice is to threaten future generations. Arguments such as “global warming will destroy life on earth for future generations” fit into this category.

Nonanthropocentrism. Nonanthropocentrists argue that our behavior toward nature should be evaluated based on how it affects other living beings and ecosystems. Arguments such as “global warming will destroy all non-human life on the earth” fit under this rationale.

Nonanthropocentrists often advocate policies that protect species and the ecosystem at the expense of hu-

man populations. Rolston (1994) argues that “conserving the Earth is more important than having more people” (p. 233). Naess (1989) argues that the “flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of nonhuman life requires such a decrease” (p. 29).

Biocentrism. Biocentrists argue that our behavior toward the environment should only be evaluated on how it affects *living* things. This *includes* human beings. Often in debates, “Biocentrism” is associated with the argument that *only non-human life* matters, but what Biocentrists really argue is that only living things matter. Ecosystems, since they are not actually alive themselves, are not valued in a Biocentric paradigm – way of viewing the world.

Ecocentrism. Ecocentrists argue that our behavior toward nature should be evaluated on how it impacts the entire ecosystem and not just living things. Rolston (1994a), an Ecocentrist, writes that “an important ethical constraint in environmental decisions is concern for the integrity, stability, and beauty of biotic communities” (p. 82). Debaters often assume that Biocentrism and Ecocentrism are

the same. But, there is an important distinction: Biocentrism is primarily concerned with the survival of non-human species whereas Ecocentrism is concerned with the survival of the entire ecosystem, including humans.

Ontological Criticisms. Ontological criticisms question the fundamental relationship we assume with nature. Vogel (2002), for example, argues that if we see ourselves as separate from nature – as an outside force that comes in and destroys it – we will never be able to solve the environmental crisis.

Deconstruction. Deconstruction, a philosophical concept advanced by Jacques Derrida that argues that all experiences are *contextual* that there are no fundamental ecological essences. Vogel (2002) explains that “when the naturalist think persists....when we talk about nature we do so in categories we do so in categories drenched in contingent history and sociality...we hear (as so often in these discussions) what Derrida calls the moment of deferral, as each failed attempt to get to the ultimate foundation produces yet another claim that it’s just around the next bend. No experience is immediate; *all* experience only becomes possible on the basis of prior history, culture, thought – *and* on the basis, too, of prior human transformations of those landscapes we call natural.” Vogel (Ibid) explains that this philosophy chal-

lenges most traditional environmental philosophy because “environmental philosophy is thus characterized by a deep naturalism that claims to find in pre-social nature the basis for ethical and political imperatives. But it is the very idea of such a naturalistic basis that practices of deconstruction call into question, teaching us to look for the unexpressed and unexamined assumptions that lie behind such claims.” (p. 30) Soule (1995) and Rolston (1994) argue that deconstructionist philosophy threatens the environment because it assumes that the environment is not “real.”

H2-The Implications

The significance of the impact of disagreements related to environmental ethics is itself a hotly contested issue within the literature. Norton (1991) argues that the entire debate is not that significant since all advocates favor environmental protection and thus reach the same policy conclusions (p. 86).

Despite this criticism, a number of scholars argue that it is important to critically examine the ethics that drive how we relate to nature. Taylor (1986) writes that “It makes a practical difference in the way we treat the natural environment whether we accept an anthropocentric or a biocentric system of ethics” (p. 136). Vogel (2002) argues that unless we adopt an appropriate environmental ethics, the core causes of environmental problems will never be addressed:

This recognition in turn would include the realization that nowadays it is mostly for worse and not for better: the world of toxic waste dumps and ugly superhighways and dangerous global warming and ozone holes we confront is precisely the world produced by our own actions when they are *not* tempered by any recognition of responsibility, but rather occur in the context of a global economic system organized not make it impossible to acknowledge the social causes and consequences of our acts. The question for environmental theory is “what does nature require?” but rather “what sort of environment ought there to be?” or more to the point “what practices ought we to engage in?” The critical force of such a theory lies in point out that today the question is never asked, and certainly it is never democratically answered, and that as a result the environment we inhabit is the unplanned outcome of a whole series of private decisions that are made for private gain in a way that leaves it structurally impossible to take into account their public consequences” (pp. 36-7).

H2-Moving On To Specific Arguments

The sections that follow describe each of the main environmental frameworks in more detail and discuss more practically how they each will function as debate arguments.

Each of the arguments can be contextualized in terms of the “cornerstone” environmental philosophies just discussed. Social Ecology is an anthropocentric philosophy that argues that we must address fundamental *human inequality* before environmental problems can be solved. Deep Ecology, a non-anthropocentric philosophy that finds itself in direct clash with Social Ecology, argues that as long as we prioritize human concerns we will never solve environmental problems. Ecofeminism is an anthropocentric environmental philosophy that argues that we must address gender inequality before solving environmental problems. Ecophenomenology address our ontological relationship with the

environment. Ecopsychology is difficult to classify, but also deals with the fundamental relationship we have with the environment.

Understanding each of these philosophies and how they function is important for all debaters because each criticize traditional approaches to environmental policy-making. Affirmatives that are unable to defend their approach or criticize alternative approaches are not likely to win many debates.

H2-Social Ecology

Social Ecology is an environmental philosophy that was begun and developed by Murray Bookchin, now the Director Emeritus of the Institute for Social Ecology at the University of Vermont. As the bibliography demonstrates, Bookchin is a prolific author whose work is easily accessible. The cornerstone philosophy that is most directly associated with Social Ecology is anthropocentrism since it is concerned with *human inequality* and how that inequality impacts the environment.

The primary claim of Social Ecology is that environmental problems are “social” in nature – that all of our ecological problems arise from deep-seated social problems. Bookchin claims that our present ecological problems cannot be solved until social problems in society, particularly forms of inequality, are solved. Bookchin explains:

Indeed, to separate ecological problems from social problems—or even to play down or give token recognition to this crucial relationship— would be to grossly misconstrue the sources of the growing environmental crisis. The way human beings deal with each other as social beings is crucial to addressing the ecological crisis. Unless we clearly recognize this, we will surely fail to see that the hierarchical mentality and class relationships that so thoroughly permeate society give rise to the very idea of dominating the natural world. Unless we realize that the present market society, structured around the brutally competitive imperative of “grow or die,” is a thoroughly impersonal, self-operating mechanism, we will falsely tend to blame technology as such or population growth as such for environmental problems. We will ignore their root causes, such as trade for profit, industrial expansion, and the identification of “progress” with corporate self-interest. In short, we will tend to focus on the symptoms of a grim social pathology rather than on the pathology itself, and our efforts will be directed toward limited goals whose attainment is more cosmetic than curative.

H3-Winning the Kritik

Winning the link. The link will be the least difficult part for the negative to win. Most affirmatives will operate within the current economic-socio-political paradigm (capitalism/liberal democracy) that will continue to avoid confronting fundamental inequality.

Winning the impact. The negative will not have much difficulty winning the impact either. There is very good evidence from Bookchin that says unless we embrace a less hierarchical world environmental problems will continue.

Winning the competitiveness. If the affirmative has the right evidence, this will probably be the most difficult part of the argument for the negative to win. Although there is very good evidence that traditional approaches undermine less hierarchical ap-

proaches that the negative should read, there is also very good evidence from the negative's authors that says we should support practical measures in the interim even if those measures are anthropocentric. The negative will need to do a very good job refuting the permutation, spinning the plan as something very undesirable.

Respond to criticisms. There are many strong criticisms of social ecologists, particularly from Deep Ecologists. Deep Ecologists argue that it is not social inequality that is the root of environmental problems, but rather our entire philosophical outlook. One problem using the Deep Ecology criticism of Social Ecology to respond on the affirmative is that most affirmatives are not likely to adopt a deep ecological perspective.

H3-Defeating the Kritik

The best approach for affirmatives that do not adopt radical environmental policies is to argue for the environmental pragmatist position that was discussed in the introduction to this section. Although it is possible from a theoretical perspective to criticize Social Ecology from the perspective of Deep Ecologists, most affirmatives will not embrace a Deep Ecological framework, so it would be quite unwise to criticize Social Ecology from this point of view.

H2-Deep Ecology Kritik

Deep Ecology is an environmental movement philosophy that was started by Arnie Naess, a Norwegian philosopher, in 1972. Naess argued that we needed a "deeper" understanding about humanity's relationship with nature. Instead of a more anthropocentric approach that assumes that humans are unique we need to conceive of ourselves simply as one integral part of the biosphere. To support this "deep ecology" Naes argued that people need a self-realization where we learn to identify with plants and animals rather than our own families. Other scholars have supported Naess' work by drawing on the work of Martin Heidegger.

The Deep Ecology kritik argues that rather endorsing the affirmative plan, which is likely to simply carry-on with the existing anthropocentric approach, we need to embrace a realization that we are just one part of the biosphere. Since most affirmatives, such as the Law of the Sea, assume that we as humans can manipulate nature for our own ends and control it, they will fail to endorse the realization that Naess calls for and may actually undermine it.

H3-Winning the Kritik

Winning the link. The link will be the least difficult part for the negative to win. Most affirmatives will use modern scientific methods to protect the environment and will claim that if it is protected that humans will be in a unique position to benefit from those improvements. This is the heart of anthropocentrism.

Winning the impact. The negative will not have much difficulty winning the impact either. There is very good evidence from authors such as Zimmerman that says unless we embrace a deep ecological, biocentric worldview that we will not be able to survive an ecological apocalypse.

Winning the competitiveness. If the affirmative has the right evidence, this will probably be the most difficult part of the argument for the negative to win. Although there is very good evidence that anthropocentric approaches undermine Biocentric approaches that the negative should read, there is also very good evidence from the negative's authors that we should support practical measures in the interim even if the measures are anthropocen-

tric. The negative will need to do a very good job refuting the permutation, spinning the plan as something very undesirable.

Respond to criticisms. There are many strong criticisms of deep ecologists, particularly from Social Ecologists. These criticisms were discussed in the previous section. Deep Ecologists do respond to these criticisms and the negative should be prepared with answers.

H3-Defeating the Kritik

Attacking the competitiveness. As just discussed, the weak point of the kritik is the competitiveness. The affirmative should read, and extend, the evidence that advocates combining both approaches. You can find this in the "negative" sources.

Argue Deep Ecology is bad. There are many criticisms of Deep Ecology. First, many radical environmentalists such as *Earth First!* have adopted the philosophy and argue that it means that since humans play no special role they must be eliminated when necessary to save the environment. Some *Earth Firsters* have even embraced things like AIDS as the solution to environmental problems. Many argue that such logics are genocidal. Second, many Social Ecologists argue that Deep Ecologists ignore and mask the *social* roots of environmental destruction such as authoritarianism, patriarchy, and racism.

H2-Ecofeminism

Ecofeminists argue that environmental problems cannot be solved until the problem of patriarchy – the domination of men over women — is addressed because that inequality/oppression is reflected in how we treat nature/the environment. Ecofeminism was originally a French project. Simon de Beauvoir argue in 1952 that in the logic of patriarchy both women and nature appear as other. In 1974, Francoise d'Eaubonne coined the term "l'ecodomination" and argued it was necessary for women to begin the ecological revolution. The movement began in the U.S. in the same year when Sandra Marburg and Lisa Watson hosted a conference at Berkeley entitled "Women and the Environment."

Since then, Karen Warren has led the charge for an Ecofeminist approach toward environmental ethics, arguing that environmental problems cannot be solved until patriarchy is overcome and also defending Ecofeminism against its critics. If you only have time to do limited reading on the argument, and you want to defend the approach, you should read her 2000 book. Ecofeminism is most closely associated with the anthropocentric and Social Ecology perspectives, as it argues that inequality must be addressed before environmental problems can be effectively confronted.

H2-Winning the Kritik

Negatives who want to run the Ecofeminism kritik should argue that since the affirmative not only fails to solve patriarchy, but also may perpetuate it through traditional governmental action, that they will be unable to solve the environmental crisis. They should suggest an alternative along the lines of "rejecting patriarchy" to solve.

H2-Defeating the Kritik

Criticisms of Eco-feminism are similar to criticisms of most "feminist" positions. The best criticisms include.

Essentialism. Essentialism is the notion that feminist critiques assume that all women are "essentially" the same and that

when you argue that all women are essentially the same that that just increases gender oppression.

Classism and racism. Many scholars critique feminist philosophy by arguing that its more esoteric claims are only relevant to wealthy, usually white women.

Counter-kritiks. Affirmatives can argue that patriarchy is not the root of oppression but rather that other things are the root of oppression, such as classicism/capitalism or racism and that they solve those kritiks.

H2-Ecophenomenology

The Ecophenomenology kritik is based on the philosophical principle of phenomenology – that reality only consists of objects and events as we perceive them and that they have no independent meaning beyond that interaction. Phenomenology insists that we should just let “things be themselves” and not commit them to theoretical constructs that make them static. Instead, we should allow them to assume new identities/understandings/meanings in the ever-changing context of human social relations. Phenomenology was developed by Edmund Husserl in 1905.

Martin Heidegger, studying Husserl, argued that phenomenology was a method of ontological investigation, which addresses the nature of being. Some philosophers argue that until we properly understand the nature of being we will never be able to solve contemporary crises, such as environmental crises. This kritik is associated with Deep Ecology and concerns our fundamental ontological relationship with the environment.

H2-Winning the Kritik

To win the kritik, the negative needs to argue that the affirmative does not have the proper phenomenological approach to the environment – to simply let things be. Most affirmatives will link to this argument as they will attempt to manipulate the environment in particular ways in order to fulfill certain goals.

H3-Answering the Kritik

The most common criticism of the kritik is that radical approaches to environmental ethics fail and that environmental pragmatism is needed. Many of the criticisms of Deep Ecology are also relevant.

Ecopsychology

Introduction

According to the International Community for Ecopsychology (www.ecopsychology.org), Ecopsychology is “situated at the intersection of a number of fields of inquiry, including environmental philosophy, psychology, and ecolocology...ecopsychology suggests that there is a synergistic relation between planetary and personal well being...” In other words, in order to solve environmental problems, we need to be in harmony with nature, and to be in harmony with nature, we need to be in harmony with ourselves, which requires being psychologically in tune with nature.

Ecopsychologists argue that in order to live properly we need to recognize that there is more to our individual selves and that we need to connect with what is universal, such as the environment, and particularly, the oceans.

According to Ecopsychology Online, there are eight prin-

ciples of ecopsychology:

1. The core of the mind is the ecological unconscious....Open access to the ecological unconscious is the path to sanity.....

2. The contents of the ecological unconscious represent, in some degree, at some level of mentality, the living record of cosmic evolution, tracing back to distant initial conditions in the history of time.

3. Just as it has been the goal of previous therapies to recover the repressed contents of the unconscious, so the goal of ecopsychology is to awaken the inherent sense of environmental reciprocity that lies within the ecological unconscious.

4. For ecopsychology as for other therapies, the crucial stage of development is the life of the child.

5. The ecological ego matures toward a sense of ethical responsibility to the planet that is as vividly experienced as our ethical responsibility to other people. ...

6. Among the therapeutic projects most important to ecopsychology is the re-evaluation of certain compulsively “masculine” character traits that permeate our structures of political power and which drive us to dominate nature as if it were an alien and rightless realm...

7. Whatever contributes to small scale social forms and personal empowerment nourishes the ecological ego. Whatever strives for large-scale domination and the suppression of personhood undermines the ecological ego. Ecopsychology therefore deeply questions the essential sanity of our gargantuan urban-industrial culture, whether capitalistic or collectivistic in its organization.....

8. Ecopsychology holds that there is a synergistic interplay between planetary and personal well-being.

H3-Winning the Kritik

This kritik is won by arguing that the affirmative does not address the cornerstone of the environmental crisis – our psychological relationship with the environment — and that continuing to operate within the mainstream undermines that needed psychological relationship.

H3-Answering the Kritik

Like the others, the best way to attack this kritik is to defend environmental pragmatism or argue that a “holistic” approach to environmental philosophy is unlikely to succeed (Calicott, 1999).

H2-Bibliography

H3-Journals

CALL TO EARTH
ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS
ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT

H3-General

Attfield, Robin. (1994). ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY: PRINCIPLES AND PROSPECTS.

Attfield, Robin. (1994). PHILOSOPHY AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT.

Brennan, A. (1995). Ethics, Ecology, and Economics in Ecologists and Ethical Judgements. BIODIVERSITY AND CONSERVATION. V. 4

Brennan, A. (1995). THE ETHICS OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

Chaone Mallory (2001). ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT. 6:2, pp. 59-89.

Cramer, Phillip F. (1998). DEEP ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS: THE ROLE OF RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISM IN CRAFTING AMERICAN ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY.

Gare, Arran E. (1995). POSTMODERNISM AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS.

Klaver, Irene J. (1995). The Implicit Practice of Environmental Philosophy." In ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVISM, pp. 67-78.

Light, Andrew. (1997). SPACE, PLACE, AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS.

Manes, Christopher. (1988). Philosophy and the Environmental Task. ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS. V. 10, pp. 75-82.

Macauley, David. (1996). MINDING NATURE: THE PHILOSOPHERS OF ECOLOGY.

Naess, Arne. (1989). ECOLOGY, COMMUNITY AND LIFESTYLE.

Norton, Bryan. (1991). TOWARD UNITY AMONG ENVIRONMENTALISTS.

Rolston, Holmes. (1994). CONSERVING NATURAL VALUE.

Rolsten, Holmes. (1994b). Winning and Losing in Environmental Ethics. In ETHICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY.

Soule, Michael. (1995). REINVENTING NATURE? RESPONSES TO POSTMODERN DECONSTRUCTION.

Taylor, Paul. (1986). RESPECT FOR NATURE: A THEORY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS.

Vogel, Stephen. (2002). Environmental Philosophy after the End of Nature. ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS. Spring, pp. 23-30.

Vogel, Stephen. (1999). Nature as Origin and Difference; On Environmental Philosophy and Continental Thought.

Vogel, Steven. (1996). AGAINST NATURE: THE CONCEPT OF NATURE IN CRITICAL THEORY.

Zimmerman, Michael. (1997). Ecofascism: A Threat to American Environmentalism? In THE ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITY, edited by Roger S. Gottlieb, pp. 229-254.

Zimmerman, Michael. (1994). CONTESTING EARTH'S FUTURE: RADICAL ECOLOGY AND POSTMODERNITY.

Zimmerman, Michael E. (1994). CONTESTING EARTH'S FUTURE: RADICAL ECOLOGY AND POSTMODERNITY.

Zimmerman, Michael. (1994). CONTESTING EARTH'S FUTURE: RADICAL ECOLOGY AND POSTMODERNITY.

Wolfe, Cary. (1998). CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTS: POSTMODERN THEORY AND THE PRAGMATICS OF THE "OUTSIDE."

H3-General Answers

Anon. (1995). Should Environmentalism Be Radical? ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS. Winter, pp. 339-40.

Lewis, Martin. (1992). The Green Threat to Nature. HARPER'S MAGAZINE. November, pp. 26-9.

H3-Deconstruction

Frodeman, Robert. (1992). Radical Environmentalism and the Political Roots of Postmodernism: Differences That Make a Difference. ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS. Winter, pp. 307-19.

Holmes, Roston. (1997). Nature for Real: Is Nature a Social Construct? In D.J. Chappel, ed. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

H3-Social Ecology

Bookchin, Murray (1995). RE-ENCHANTING HUMANITY: A DEFENSE OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT AGAINST ANTI-HUMANISM.

Bookchin, Murray. (1993). The Transition to an Ecological Society. SOCIETY AND NATURE. Vol 1(3), pp. 92-105.

Bookchin, Murray & Foreman, Dave (1991). DEFENDING THE EARTH: A DIALOGUE BETWEEN MURRAY BOOKCHIN AND DAVE FOREMAN.

Bookchin, Murray (1990). THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL ECOLOGY.

Bookchin, Murray (1990). REMAKING SOCIETY.

Bookchin, Murray. (1990). What is Social Ecology? ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY: FROM ANIMAL RIGHTS TO RADICAL ECOLOGY. Ed. Michael E. Zimmerman.

Bookchin, Murray. (1988). As If People Mattered. THE NATION. October 10, p. 11.

Ramachandra, Guha (1994). SOCIAL ECOLOGY.

H3-Deep Ecology

H4-General

Aitchtey, Rodney. (1992). The Ways of Deep Ecology. CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. February, pp. 93-6.

Barnhill, David and Roger Gottlieb. (2001). DEEP ECOLOGY AND WORLD RELIGIONS.

Bookchin, Murray. Foreman, Dave. (1991). DEFENDING THE EARTH: A DIALOGUE BETWEEN MURRAY BOOKCHIN AND DAVE FOREMAN.

Bookchin, Murray. (1987). Social Ecology versus 'Deep Ecology. GREEN PERSPECTIVES. Summer, p. 1-14.

Bookchin, Murray and Dave Foreman. DEFENDING THE EARTH.

Devall, Bill. (1991). Deep Ecology and Radical Environmentalism. SOCIETY AND NATURAL RESOURCES. vol. 4, pp. 247-258.

Devall, Bill and George Sessions. (1985). DEEP ECOLOGY: LIVING AS IF NATURE MATTERED.

DiZerga, Gus. (1995). Empathy, Society, Nature, and Relational Self: Deep Ecology and Liberal Modernity. SOCIAL THEORY & PRACTICE. 21(2), pp. 239-69.

DiZerga, Gus. (1996). Deep Ecology and Liberalism: The Greener Implications of Evolutionary Liberal Theory. THE REVIEW OF POLITICS. Fall, pp. 699-734.

Drengson, Alan. (1995). THE DEEP ECOLOGY MOVEMENT: AN INTRODUCTORY ANTHOLOGY.

Goerner, Sally. (1994). The Physics of Evolution: From Chaos to Evolution and Deep Ecology. WORLD FUTURES. November 15, pp. 193-214.

Johns, David 1998. "The Relevance of Deep Ecology to the Third World: Some Preliminary Comments," in THE GREAT NEW WILDERNESS DEBATE, Callicott J. B. and Nelson, M. eds.

Fox, Warwick. (1989). The Deep Ecology-Ecofeminism Debate and Its Parallels." ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS. Spring, pp. 5-26.

Naess, A. (1989). ECOLOGY, COMMUNITY AND LIFESTYLE: OUTLINE OF AN ECOSOPHY.

Neumayer, Eric (1999). WEAK VERSUS STRONG SUSTAINABILITY: EXPLORING THE LIMITS OF TWO OPPOSING PARADIGMS.

Glasser, Harold. (1996). Naess's Deep Ecology Approach and Environmental Policy. *INQUIRY*. vol 39, pp. 157-187.

Sessions, George ed. (1995). *DEEP ECOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY*

van Wyck, Peter C. (1997). *PRIMITIVES IN THE WILDERNESS: DEEP ECOLOGY AND THE MISSING HUMAN SUBJECT*.

Zimmerman, Michael. (1997). Deep Ecology. In *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHENOMENOLOGY*, pp. 137-41.

Zimmerman, Michael E. Rethinking the Heidegger—Deep Ecology Relationship. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Fall, pp. 195-224.

Zimmerman, Michael. (1993). Heidegger, Buddhism, and Deep Ecology. In *THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO HEIDEGGER*, edited by Charles Guignon.

Zimmerman, Michael. (1987). Feminism, Deep Ecology, and Environmental Ethics. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Spring.

Zimmerman, Michael (1986). Implications of Heidegger's Thought for Deep Ecology." *THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN*. November, pp. 19-43.

Zimmerman, Michael. (1986). Philosophical Reflections on Reform vs. Deep Environmentalism. *THE TRUMPETER*. Fall.

Zimmerman, Michael E. Toward a Heideggerean *Ethos* for Radical Environmentalism. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Summer, pp. 99-132.

H4-Responses to Criticisms

Glasser, Harold. (1998). "Demystifying the Critiques of Deep Ecology In Zimmerman, Michael E., et.al., eds. *ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY: FROM ANIMAL RIGHTS TO RADICAL ECOLOGY*., pp. 212-224.

Glasser, Harold. (1997). On Warwick Fox's Assessment of Deep Ecology." *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Spring, pp. 69-85.

Sessions, George, (1995a). ed. *DEEP ECOLOGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: READINGS ON THE PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE OF THE NEW ENVIRONMENTALISM*.

H4-Eco-Feminism and Deep Ecology

Cheney, Jim. (1987). Eco-Feminism and Deep Ecology" *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Summer, pp. 115-45.

Fox, Warwick (1989). The Deep Ecology—Ecofeminism Debate and Its Parallels. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Spring, pp. 5-25.

Salleh, Ariel. (1992) The Ecofeminism/Deep Ecology Debate: A Reply to Patriarchal Reason." *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Fall, pp. 195-216.

H4-Answers to Link Turns

Devall, Bill. (1979). Reformist Environmentalism. *HUMBOLDT JOURNAL OF SOCIAL RELATIONS* 6:(2), pp. 129-58.

Devall, Bill. (1995b). "Earthday 25: A Retrospective of Reform Environmental Movements." *PHILOSOPHY IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD* 2 (4).

H4-Alternatives

Drengson, Alan. (1980). Shifting Paradigms: From the Technocratic to the Person-Planetary." *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. (3), pp. 221-40.

H4-Anthropocentrism

Hern, Warren M. (1993) Is Human Culture Carcinogenic for

Uncontrolled Population Growth and Ecological Destruction? *BIO-SCIENCE*. V. 43 (11), pp. 768-73.

Seed, John. (1988). Beyond Anthropocentrism." In *THINKING LIKE A MOUNTAIN: TOWARDS A COUNCIL OF ALL BEINGS*.

H4-Policy

Glasser, Harold. (1996). Naess's Deep Ecology Approach and Environmental Policy." *INQUIRY*. v. 39, pp. 157-87.

H4-Answers

Clark, John. (1996). How Deep is Deep Ecology? *INQUIRY: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY*. June, pp. 189-201.

Estling, Ralph. (1994). Deep Ecology or Deep Sanity? *SKEPTICAL INQUIRER*. Fall, pp. 539-40.

Ferry, Luc. (1995). . *THE NEW ECOLOGICAL ORDER*.

Johns, David. (1990). The Relevance of Deep Ecology to the Third World: Some Preliminary Comments. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Fall, pp. 233-52.

Katz, Eric, Andrew Light, and David Rothenberg. (2000). *BENEATH THE SURFACE: BENEATH THE SURFACE: CRITICAL ESSAYS ON DEEP ECOLOGY*.

Manes, Christopher. (1990). *GREEN RAGE: RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISM AND THE UNMAKING OF CIVILIZATION*.

H3-Ecofeminism

H4-General

Cheney, Jim. (1987). Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. 9 (2), pp. 115-45.

Cuomo, Chris.J. (2002). On Ecofeminist Philosophy. *ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT*, pp. 1-11.

Cuomo, Chris.J. (1994). Ecofeminism, Deep Ecology, and Human Population. In Karen J. Warren, ed. *ECOLOGICAL FEMINISM*.

Cuomo, Chris. (1998). *FEMINISM AND ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES: AN ETHIC OF FLOURISHING*.

Curtin, Deane. 1999. Recognizing Women's Environmental Expertise. In *CHINNAGOUNDER'S CHALLENGE: THE QUESTIONS OF ECOLOGICAL CITIZENSHIP*.

Dalmiya, Vrinda. (2002). Cows and Others: Toward Constructing Ecofeminist Selves. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Spring, pp. 23-30.

Davion, Victoria. (1994). Is Ecofeminism Feminist? In *ECOLOGICAL FEMINISM*.

Fox, Warwick. (1989). The Deep Ecology-Ecofeminism Debate and Its Parallels. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. V. 11 (1), pp. 5-26.

Gaard, Greta. 1997. Toward a Queer Ecofeminism, *HYPATIA*. 12 (1), pp. 114-37.

Glazebrook, Trish. (2002). Karen Warren's Ecofeminism. *ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT*. 7.2, pp. 12-26

Hawkins, Ronnie Zoe. 1998. Ecofeminism and Nonhumans: Continuity, Difference, Dualism, and Domination, *HYPATIA*. 13 (1), 158-97.

Kheel, Marti. 1990. Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology: Rethinking Identity and Difference. In *REWEAVING THE WORLD: THE EMERGENCE OF ECOFEMINISM*, eds. Irene Diamond and G. F. Orenstein.

Kheel, Marti. 1993. From Heroic to Holistic Ethics: The Ecofeminist Challenge. In *ECOFEMINISM: WOMEN, ANIMALS, NATURE*.

Greta Gaard. Matthews, Freya. 1994. Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology. In *ECOLOGY: KEY CONCEPTS IN CRITICAL THEORY*.

Mellor, Mary. (1997). *FEMINISM AND ECOLOGY*.

Naess, Arne. (1999). The Ecofeminism versus Deep Ecology Debate. In *PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUES: ARNE NAESS AND THE PROGRESS OF ECOPHILOSOPHY*.

Plumwood, Val. (1992). Feminism and Ecofeminism: Beyond the Dualistic Assumptions of Women, Men and Nature, *THE ECOLOGIST*. 22 (1), pp. 8-13.

Plumwood, Val. (1993). *FEMINISM AND THE MASTERY OF NATURE*.

Plumwood, Val. (1994). The Ecopolitics Debate And The Politics Of Nature. In Warren, ed. *ECOLOGICAL FEMINISM*.

Plumwood, Val. (1995). Has Democracy Failed Ecology? - An Ecofeminist Perspective, *ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS*. Winter, pp.134-68.

Plumwood, Val. (1991). Nature, Self and Gender: Feminism, Environmental Philosophy and the Critique of Rationalism, *HYPATIA*. 6 (1), pp. 3-27.

Plumwood, Val.(1992). *GENDER AND ECOLOGY: FEMINISM AND THE MASTERY OF NATURE*.

Quinby, Lee. (1990). Ecofeminism and the Politics of Resistance. In Diamond and Orenstein, eds. *REWEAVING THE WORLD*.

Salleh, Ariel Kay.(1992). The Ecofeminist/Deep Ecology Debate: A Reply to Patriarchal Reason, *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. 14 (3), pp. 195-216.

Slicer, Deborah.(1995). Is there an Ecofeminism—Deep Ecology ‘Debate’? *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. 17 (2), pp. 151-69.

Slicer, Deborah. (1993). Class, Race, and Gender Discourse in the Ecofeminism/Deep Ecology Debate, *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. 15 (3), pp. 225-44.

Sturgeon, Noël. (1997). *ECOFEMINIST NATURES-RACE, GENDER, FEMINIST THEORY AND POLITICAL ACTION*.

Twine, Richard. (2001) Ma(r)king Essence-Ecofeminism and Embodiment. *ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT*. V. 6.2, pp. 31-58.

Warren, Karen. 1999. Ecofeminist Philosophy and Deep Ecology. In *PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUES*.

Warren, J. Karen.1987. Feminism and Ecology: Making Connections. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. V. 9, (3), pp. 3-20.

Warren, J. Karen.(1993). A Philosophical Perspective on Ecofeminist Spiritualities. In *ECOFEMINISM AND THE SACRED*, edited by Carol Adams.

Warren, J. Karen (ed) (1996). *ECOLOGICAL FEMINIST PHILOSOPHIES*.

Warren, J. Karen (1997). Taking Empirical Data Seriously: An Ecofeminist Philosophical Perspective. In *ECOFEMINISM: WOMEN, CULTURE, NATURE*.

Warren, J. Karen. (2000). *ECOFEMINIST PHILOSOPHY: A WESTERN PERSPECTIVE ON WHAT IT IS AND WHY IT MATTERS*. If you have time to read only one negative source you should read this!

Warren, Karen J. and Jim Cheney.(1991). Ecofeminism and Ecosystem Ecology, *HYPATIA*. 6 (1), pp. 179-97.

Warren, Karen J. (2002) *ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT*. V. 7.2, pp.39-59.

H4-Answers

Biehl, Janet. (1987). It’s Deep, But is it Broad? An Eco-Feminist Looks at Deep Ecology, *KICK IT OVER*, Special Supplement, 2A.

Biehl, Janet. (1991). *RETHINKING ECOFEMINIST POLITICS*.

Callicott, Baird. (1993). The Search for an Environmental Ethic. In *MATTERS OF LIFE AND DEATH*.

Sterba, James. (2002). On the Possibility of Grounding a Defense of Ecofeminist Philosophy. *ETHICS & THE ENVIRONMENT*. v. 7.2, pp. 27-38.

H4-Western Science/Technology Links

Harding, Sandra.(1991). *WHOSE SCIENCE? WHOSE KNOWLEDGE?*

Harding, Sandra. (1998). *IS SCIENCE MULTICULTURAL? POSTCOLONIALISMS, FEMINISMS, AND EPISTEMOLOGIES*.

Heelan, Patrick.(1989). After Experiment: Realism and Research. *AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY*. 26 (4), 294-308.

Heelan, Patrick. (1997). Why a Hermeneutical Philosophy of the Natural Sciences? *MAN AND WORLD*. V. 30, pp. 271-98.

Heelan, Patrick. (1998). The Scope of Hermeneutics in Natural Science. *STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE*. V. 29 (2), pp. 273-98.

H3-Ecophenomenology

You may find some of the citations here useful for debating the Deep Ecology kritik as well.

Abram, David. “The Perceptual Implications of Gaia.” *THE ECOLOGIST* (15; 3)

Berleant, Arnold. (1997) *LIVING IN THE LANDSCAPE: TOWARD AN AESTHETICS OF ENVIRONMENT*.

Bernstein, J. M. (2000). Re-enchanting Nature. *JOURNAL OF THE BRITISH SOCIETY FOR PHENOMENOLOGY*. 31; 1, pp. 277-299.

Berthold-Bond, Daniel. (1994). Can there be a ‘Humanistic’ Ecology? A Debate between Hegel and Heidegger on the Meaning of Ecological Thinking.” *SOCIAL THEORY AND PRACTICE* 20 (3), pp. 279-309.

Braine, David. (1992). *THE HUMAN PERSON: ANIMAL AND SPIRIT*.

Brown, Charles. (1995). Anthropocentrism and Ecocentrism: The Quest for a New Worldview.” *THE MIDWEST QUARTERLY*. Winter, pp. 36-ff.

Brown, Charles. (1998). Humanism and the Voice of Nature: Challenges for a Universal Metaphilosophy. *DIALOGUE AND UNIVERSALISM* (8, no. 1-2)

Callicott, J. Baird, and Roger T. Ames, eds. (1989). *NATURE IN ASIAN TRADITIONS OF THOUGHT: ESSAYS IN ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY*.

Cave, George. (1982). Animals, Heidegger, and the Right to Life.” *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. V. 4, pp. 249-254.

Colony, Tracy. (1999). Dwelling in the Biosphere? Heidegger’s Critique of Humanism and Its Relevance for Ecological Thought. *INTERNATIONAL STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY* (31, 1), pp: 37-45.

Dauenhauer, Bernard P. (1977). “Heidegger, the Spokesman for the Dweller.” *SOUTHERN JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY* 15, pp. 189-199.

- Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Charles Spinosa.(1977). Highway Bridges and Feasts: Heidegger and Borgmann on How to Affirm Technology. *MAN AND WORLD*. (30, 2), pp. 159-177.
- Embree, Lester. (1999). An Environmental Phenomenological Examination of Electric Vehicle Technology. In *TECHNOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY*,
- Embree, Lester. (2000). The Non-Worldly Grounding of Environmentalism. *PONDICHERRY UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES*, v. 1, pp. 1-ff.
- Embree, Lester. (1995). Phenomenology of Action for Ecosystemic Health or How to Tend One's Own Garden. In *ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVISM*.
- Embree, Lester. (1997). Problems of the Value of Nature in Phenomenological Perspective or What to do about Snakes in the Grass. In *PHENOMENOLOGY OF VALUES AND VALUING*, edited by James G. Hart and Lester Embree.
- Foltz, Bruce V. (1995). *INHABITING THE EARTH: HEIDEGGER, ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS, AND THE METAPHYSICS OF NATURE*.
- Foltz, Bruce V. (1984). On Heidegger and the Interpretation of Environmental Crisis. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. V. (6, 4), pp. 323-342.
- Foltz, Bruce and Robert Frodeman. (1997). Inhabiting the Earth: Heidegger, Environmental Ethics, and the Metaphysics of Nature. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS* (19, no. 2)
- Fox, Warwick. (1990). *TOWARD A TRANSPERSONAL ECOLOGY: DEVELOPING NEW FOUNDATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTALISM*.
- Garrard, Greg. (1998). "Heidegger, Heaney and the Problem of Dwelling." In *WRITING THE ENVIRONMENT: ECOCRITICISM AND LITERATURE*, edited by Richard Kerridge and Neil Sammells.
- Godway, Eleanor M. (1998). The Being which Is Behind Us: Merleau-Ponty and the Question of Nature. *INTERNATIONAL STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY*. (30, no. 1), pp. 47-56.
- Grange, Joseph. (1985). Being, Feeling, and Environment." *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. V. 7, pp. 351-364.
- Hallman, Max. "Nietzsche's Environmental Ethics." *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Winter, pp. 99-125.
- Holden, Meg. (2001) Phenomenology Versus Pragmatism: Seeking a Restoration Environmental Ethic. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS* (23, 1), pp. 37-56.
- Holland, Nancy J. (1999). "Rethinking Ecology in the Western Philosophical Tradition: Heidegger and/on Aristotle." *CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY REVIEW*, v. 32, pp. 409-420.
- Howarth, Jane. (1995). "The Crisis of Ecology: A Phenomenological Perspective." *ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES*. (4, no. 1), pp. 17-30.
- Ihde, Don. (1997). Whole Earth Measurements: How Many Phenomenologists Does It Take to Detect a 'Greenhouse Effect'? *PHILOSOPHY TODAY*. V. 41, pp. 128-134.
- Jackson, Arthur F. (1996). Nature and Human Nature in an Existential Perspective." *CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY*. (18, no. 4-5), pp. 3-6.
- James, Simon P.(2000). Thing-Centered Holism in Buddhism, Heidegger, and Deep Ecology. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. (22, no. 4), pp. 359-376.
- James, Simon. (1996). The Phenomenology of Nostalgia. *TERRA NOVA*. December, pp. 6-14.
- James, Simon. (1997). Transcendental Experience, Everyday Philosophy. In *TRANSCENDENTAL PHILOSOPHY AND EVERYDAY EXPERIENCE*. Edited by Tom Rockmore and Vladimír Zeman, pp. 43-51.
- Langer, Monika. (1990). Merleau-Ponty and Deep Ecology. In *ONTOLOGY AND ALTERITY IN MERLEAU-PONTY*. Edited by Galen A. Johnson and Michael B. Smith, pp. 115-29.
- Lleelyn, John. (1989). Ontological Responsibility and the Poetics of Nature. *RESEARCH IN PHENOMENOLOGY*. V. 19 (1989), pp. 3-26.
- Marietta, Jr. (1988). Environmental Holism and Individuals. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Fall.
- Marietta, Jr.. (1982). Knowledge and Obligation in Environmental Ethics: A Phenomenological Approach." *Environmental Ethics*, Summer, pp. 153-162.
- Marietta, Jr. (1994). *FOR PEOPLE AND THE PLANET: HOLISM AND HUMANISM IN ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*.
- Marietta, Jr. (1994). "Phenomenology and Ecofeminism." In *PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE CULTURAL DISCIPLINES*, edited by Mano Daniel and Lester Embree. Dordrecht:
- Marangudakis, Manussos. (1998). Ecology as a Pseudo-Religion? *TELOS* v. 112, pp. 107-124.
- Maxcy, David J. (1994). Meaning in Nature: Rhetoric, Phenomenology, and the Question of Environmental Value. *PHILOSOPHY AND RHETORIC*. (27, no. 4), pp. 330-346.
- McWhorter, Ladelle, ed (1992). *HEIDEGGER AND THE EARTH: ESSAYS IN ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY*.
- Melle, Ulrich. (1995). "How Deep is Deep Enough? Ecological Modernization or Farewell to the World-City?" In *ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVISM*.
- Moran, Dermot. (1997). Towards a Philosophy of the Environment. In *EDUCATING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS*, edited by John Feehan,
- Nuyen, A. T. (1991). A Heideggerian Existential Ethics for the Human Environment." *JOURNAL OF VALUE INQUIRY*. pp: 359-366.
- Oddie, Richard. (2001).The Living Tissue: Environmental Phenomenology and Acoustic Ecology." *CALL TO EARTH* March.
- Peperzak, Adriaan. (1992). Levinas on Technology and Nature. *MAN AND WORLD*. V. 25, pp. 469-482.
- Rodick, David. (2001). Poetic Dwelling and Deep Ecology: Bill McKibben and Martin Heidegger on The End of Nature." *CALL TO EARTH*. March, pp. 21-22.
- Sakakibara, Tetsuya. (1998). The Relationship between Nature and Spirit in Husserl's Phenomenology Revisited. *CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY REVIEW*. (31, no. 3), pp. 255-272.
- Seamon, David, (1993). *DWELLING, SEEING, AND DESIGNING: TOWARD A PHENOMENOLOGICAL ECOLOGY*.
- Seamon, David and Robert Mugerauer, (1985). *DWELLING, PLACE, AND ENVIRONMENT: TOWARDS A PHENOMENOLOGY OF PERSON AND WORLD*.
- Seamon, David and Arthur Zajonc, eds. (1998). *GOETHE'S WAY OF SCIENCE: A PHENOMENOLOGY OF NATURE*.
- Taylor, Charles. (1992). Heidegger, Language, and Ecology. In *HEIDEGGER: A CRITICAL READER*,
- Thiele, Leslie Paul. (1995). Nature and Freedom: A Heideggerian Critique of Biocentric and Sociocentric Environmentalism. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. V. 17, pp. 171-90.
- Toadvine, Ted. (2001). Ecophenomenology in the New Millennium. In *THE REACH OF REFLECTION: ISSUES FOR PHENOMENOLOGY'S SECOND CENTURY*, edited by Stephen Galt

Crowell and Lester Embree.

Toadvine, Ted. (1999). Naturalizing Phenomenology. *PHILOSOPHY TODAY* 43, SPEP Supplement, pp. 124-131.

Ulanowicz, Robert E. (1986). *GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT: ECOSYSTEMS PHENOMENOLOGY*. New

Vogel, Lawrence. (1995). Does Environmental Ethics Need a Metaphysical Grounding? *HASTINGS CENTER REPORT*. 25, no. 7, pp. 30-39.

Westra, Laura. (1985). Let It Be: Heidegger and Future Generations. *ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS*. Winter, pp: 341-350.

H3-Ecopsychology

H4-Journals

JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

H4-General

Callicott, J. Baird. (1999). Holistic Environmental Ethics and the Problem of Ecofascism. *BEYOND THE LAND ETHIC: MORE ESSAYS IN ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY*.

Cohen, M.J. (1997). *RECONNECTING WITH NATURE: FINDING WELLNESS THROUGH RESTORING YOUR BOND WITH THE EARTH*.

Fisher, Andy. (1999). *RADICAL ECOPSYCHOLOGY: PSYCHOLOGY IN THE SERVICE OF LIFE*.

Gomes, M. (1998). Ecopsychology and Social Transformation: Introduction. *REVISION*. V. 20, 7.

Howard, G.S. (1997). *ECOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY: CREATING A MORE EARTH-FRIENDLY HUMAN NATURE*.

Roszak, T., Gomes, M.E. & Kanner, A.D. (1995). *ECOPSYCHOLOGY: RESTORING THE EARTH, HEALING THE MIND*.

Winter, D.D. (1996). *ECOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY: HEALING THE SPLIT BETWEEN PLANET AND SELF*.

(Stefan Bauschard is the Debate Coach at Boston College, author of Stefan's Topic Guide to the 2003-4 CX Debate Topic, and the President of PlanetDebate.com. His Topic Guide can be ordered from Debatehandbooks.com. His analysis is reprinted from the May Rostrum for the benefit of new debaters.)