

REVISION OF GREEN ANARCHISM
NOTES, POSSIBILITIES

L 2. More in power ?

00993

DIAGRAMS

Continuous matrix of authority relations

Methods	carrot ←	→ stick
Back-up		
Transparent ↑	possibly BENIGN	Pacifist opposition
↓ opaque	Enlightenment opposition	(Liberal opposition)

CONT
ESTED

THEORY
OF PR+HCE
also on
+ PHIL+HIL

What can philosophy do?

Well done, it can reveal alternatives, superior
structures, organisations, ways of life.

It does not have to live with the given, playing an
onlooker role justifying a status quo, though it has
too often been its role.

It can help in removing rubbish - esp. religious
nonsense, political quarter-truths, genuine arguments.

It can supply new visions, new ways of looking at things.

It can offer ethical systems, which are attached to
environments, and which can, help orientated, offer
a perspective of improvement and constant upon behaviour.

PREFACE.

INTRODUCING DEEP-GREEN THEORY
cool deep

This text is written in deep anger, ^{anger} not just at what humans have done to so much of the face of the Earth, but still more at what they continue to do.

Much of the Earth is now a mess. ^{Much of this is} Mess is due to humans, some humans. Worse, much of the Earth's environment continues to be destroyed or seriously degraded. Again the main direct or indirect cause is human activity. Humans continue to foul, degrade, or destroy not only their own habitats but the environments of most other forms of life as well.

That did not need to happen. It does not have to go on happening. There were paths not taken. There were significant options not even properly considered. In some cases, there still are such options, not being seriously considered, not being taken.¹

That should be changed. But present socio-political arrangements, throughout ^{the} entire complex of ^{now} states that covers the Earth, depend upon, are premised upon, features that lead to precisely such destructions and degradations. For many states such results are both occurring in their own territories, and spilling over into those of others. Present socio-political arrangements accordingly have to be changed, changed radically. But here we encounter an evident obstacle. It is unlikely that those in power, or with privilege, will go quietly, will let their class subside from its materially advantages ^{ou} position, or wither away environmentally. An appropriate revolution may be needed in certain key places to affect due changes. But that is a very controversial idea.

There is no need to recite yet again the litany of environmental disasters that have occurred or the even more calamitous ^{quashed up, some} stack that are already activated. Almost every day there is something new or still news. Another oil spill, wiping out the lives of ^{thousands of} present habitats of birds and fish. Through deforestation, ^{massive} landslides here, flooding there. More whales taken, by the Japanese, Ozone holes grow. And so it goes on, with much more in store. But now nearly every sizeable introductory textbook in biology or geography includes a large and largely depressing section on environmental "problems" (at least too some of the devastation and depredation is at last seen as constituting a "problem"). So do many other books; an excellent easy ^{-tech} ^{now} ^{update} introduction is *Earthscope*. And more and more popular periodicals and newspapers ^{update} on environmental disasters and problems, or run feature articles. ^{With} new threats to the collective human future the environment has become highly fashionable. Now, with some appreciation of the inconvenience to business and businessmen of a nuclear winter, runaway greenhouse, or like catastrophe, even cautious conservatives are beginning

^{update}
¹ The intellectual who does most to bring this out, the arbitrariness even of present institutional arrangements, is no doubt ~~facult~~.

ENV. ETHICS

[I am a minor philosopher writing in the late twentieth century.] It is already known that ^{the} present high-energy industrial ~~practices~~ practices of the dominant world culture cannot persist, though most humans (including many intellectuals) have not faced up to the facts. Among the salient facts not taken aboard are these:

- There are limits to the resilience, absorptive capacity and adaptability of ecological systems - including the Earth's biosphere as a whole.
- Present ~~dominant~~ ^{industrial} practices of consumption, waste discharge, and energy use are ecologically unsustainable, because biospheric limits will be exceeded.
- Unless present practices are substantially modified ^{by deliberate} social ~~and~~ planning and action, they will come to an ~~end~~ ^{end in any case}, a much earlier end, through damage, perhaps irreversible, to the Earth's biosphere.
- There is no adequate effort to make requisite adjustments.

Philosophers, while ^{usually} not actively promoting persistence with present ^{entirely} unsustainable practices, in the fashion of growth economists and high-tech engineers, do not oppose ~~them~~ these practices, but ^{mostly} go ^{uncritically} ^{along with them}. Virtually none are engaged in the vital task of devising and planning ^{requisite criticism of the practices and ideologies themselves} new sustainable social arrangements and societal systems, a task which calls for a substantial philosophical inputs (in the traditional ~~understanding~~ ^{understanding of philosophy}).

Philosophers fiddle while the Earth begins to burn.

Most in the ^{dominant} Anglo-American philosophical paradigm persist in jousting with fashionable ~~to~~ analytic trivia. A striking recent example of such trivia is Kogler's juggle about Pierre, a person who, while committing no logical error, holds contradictory beliefs. (Pierre arrives in this allegedly puzzling, but patently irresolvable, situation, by sincerely asserting both "London is jolly" and "London is not pretty".) This piece of degenerate trivia, presented by a major American philosopher of the current period, has generated a ~~great~~ ^{great} ^{many} ^{serious} papers and a remarkably large ~~to~~ academic literature.

neo-Malthusian

Survival.
forbushouse
beginning.

x

Explain theoretical
preliminaries for
practical activities

Relevance of theory - values
Attitude.

Certainly instructors not difficult to see what is right ...

Prof p 2!

Mainly range of possibilities - from doing nothing, most likely change with a few technical points, or
nothing decent ^{to keeping}

pp 5

~~or said~~
~~nothing done very little about this~~
~~particular (those who have like Wren are~~
~~often restricted by the professionals).~~

On the contrary, mostly they have encouraged
under construction date with.

to recognise that there may be ^{some} problems, that ^a major nuclear exchange will have among its plausible efforts, the greatest biological and physical disruptions of this planet in the last 65 million years'. But the apparent fact is that the very course we ^{set upon} are on, without any further catastrophe, without a nuclear exchange, will cause the greatest biological disruption of the planet in the last 65 million years. It is enough to ^{extrapolate} ~~extrapolate~~ and compare data for species loss.

It is now a relatively easy matter to ^{chronicle, in a rough and ready way,} the considerable array of environmental problems and outrages that we so far know something about. It is another, much more difficult, matter to do something worthwhile about them.

While many environmental problems may now be sufficiently clear, and stark, how to react to them, what to do, what practice and theory to pursue are seldom so clear. [Nor is there any very grave difficulty about some of what needs to be done in order to avert or reduce some of the worst problems, and some of the major disasters in store. What is lacking is sufficient motivation, or opportunity among main power brokers ^{lack of} (political will, ^{because of} political blockages, etc.)]

This text aims to develop the assemble requisite theory and indicate resultant practices which will lead to relevant change. But ~~finely at value theory, not ensuing political theory.~~ ^{concentrates}

There is much theoretical work to be accomplished, both critical and constructive. Critical work criticizing present and prevailing assumptions and practices, and the acclaimed justification and alleged reasonableness of these practices. Constructive activity outlining alternative structures, alternative idea-^{systems} ~~cyclicism~~, alternative practices and way of reaching them from where we are. The present exercise aims to be a part of that endeavors. It is a philosophical, theoretical book. ^{It says comparatively little about the} It concentrates on the theory, especially the ^{value} ~~value~~ theory, of environmentalism. ^{While it offers a} ~~pure~~ ^{frame} work for environmental action, it says little directly on such action. ^{These are} ~~no~~ ^{or} practical details ^{and} ~~and~~ recipes for saving a forest from destructive logging interests, for example, ^{ways to proceed} ~~about that~~ ^{are} ~~are~~ forever become increasingly appreciated. What is still lacking is the wider ^{just} ~~polifactory~~ ^{just} structure which explains and justifies opposition and resistance.

The run of environmental ethics text do little of what is required. They contain insufficient criticism, little analysis of depth, no vision or elaboration of alternatives. They are so sweetly, eminently "reasonable", fiddling while environmental Rome burns. Too many seek "blame" with development ^{blame} ~~and~~ all that sort of crap. Or, where they would shake present predatory arrangements, it is only in one respect, and that not getting ^{anywhere near the} to bottom of the troubles, ^{namely} ~~ready~~ meat eating. For, while some problems ^{few} ~~work~~ ^{will} be ~~put~~ ^{reduced} through (and other general^{ted} thereby), it is evident that the rape of most of the Earth could construe space in a vegetarian way.

Environmental ethics texts ^{in particular contain little fire and} have no anger, no outrage at what is being done to the Earth. Put crudely, they lack guts. Indeed some suggest that things are proceeding rather well, ^{of} as if not so well, ^{quite} as well as could be expected. (If the latter it ^{says} says very little for managing humans competent ^{as} as managers/organisers). All is *very far* from well. There is cause not merely for concern, but for deep anger. (Such anger may be un-American.) /or if

The dominant way, ^srecoursism, ^cif not successfully opposed, will ultimately destroy the ecosphere and then humans among other species (9)

Intellectuals, philosophers especially, lately economists even more, ^{have a goal} deal to answer for, socially and environmentally. They encouraged ^{UNSW} permit of present damaging practices; they proceeded to provide the intellectual and attitudinal underpinnings that helped motivate, and continued to justify the practices. /pursuit

Nor, with the evidence of environmental crisis so manifest, have things changed much. Most intellectuals continue as if nothing had happened apart from the beneficial advancement of science and technology. Most economists continue to produce or ^{on} participate upon various growth (or maximal equilibrium) ^{indicators} professionals. Most philosophers - most are Anglo-American in background - continue in their hopeless efforts to prop up or impose upon what is fundamentally and ^{old} flawed, ^{basically} Humean empiricism (thus recently in the on-going display of Humean fashions, evolutionary epistemology, belief as reduced to desire, causal reductions, etc). Most have said, or done, very little about the ^{parous} environmental situations; those who have, like Naess, are often ridiculed by the comfortable ^{shallow} professionals. /shallow

This book tries to retell, in a more organised and coherent way what deep-green theory, an environmental theory that has emerged in a sporadic and scattered way over the last couple of decades, is all about. But not everything is told; only the predominantly ethical ^{TS} past. Later parts of this series on deep-green theory will cover political and economics theory and social theory more generally. /points

² Until a century ago philosophy and economics were not separate disciplines. The significant economists were almost invariably philosophers (records may be the one main ^{exception} exception).

ON ELEMENTS OF DEEP-GREEN THEORY

Richard Sylvan, Eco-logical Organization, Bundaberg
RMB683, Australia 2621

I am committed to a green pluralism, and to deep-green theory within that span. I want to re-explain certain central elements of that theory (for details see publications in the Green Series, RISS, Australian National University, esp. Environmental Philosophy, Three Essays and Down Greenies).

Deep-green theory — though independent of, and in outline rather than, deep ecology — may be seen as a variant upon ^{the better-known} deep ecology, a variant which removes the ecopunk terrorism and installs some photovogelish backbone and muscle. Deep-green theory itself, which loop-wise includes a pluralistic theme (in turn part of deep pluralism), has a value core. It is through that core that the remainder of the ethical theory is explained and justified: obligations and prohibitions, rights and rots, etc., the deontic theory. It is in terms of that core also, that moral dilemmas, due for instance to incompatible obligations, are resolved, when they have to be.

Values are sometimes intrinsic, inevitably so, and attach to natural items often among other things. Indeed some natural items have more value than some humans, so this preservation comes first. Values are independent of values; in particular, they have nothing essentially to do with humans as other sentient creatures, which may however discern them. They are appreciated by reflection upon emotional presentation, i.e. that is a main method, analogous to reflective sense perception, of verification — which is independent of meaning, itself supplied remarkably.

INTRODUCING DEEP-GREEN THEORY

Deep-green theory aims eventually to supply a comprehensive alternative environmental philosophy. While it stands on its own, it is alternative because it stands in radical ideological opposition to dominant ways, nowadays predominantly industrial. It offers a philosophy both in the contemporary narrower sense, and in the older sense of an intellectually informed and critical way of life. That philosophy is centred on an ethical theory (upon which this issue concentrates), which is in form centred upon a value theory. But ^{such an} the ethic ^{issues}, in a fashion broadly ^{more} associated since Aristotle, in a politics and ^{theory of} political economy. But the output of the value theory in fact reaches much further, into practical decision making in a range of environmentally impacting areas such as fishing, forestry and agriculture. The value theory is also intertwined with philosophical issues which are often considered more fundamental, those of ^{metaphysics} and epistemology. Indeed there is no part of philosophy that remains untouched. Therein lies part of the claim to comprehensiveness.

The particular form of deep-green theory elaborated is by no means independent of (acclaimed) advances recently made elsewhere in philosophy (^{in deep theory} those in object-theory, and ⁱⁿ relevant and paraconsistent logics especially). But though the theory given is influenced and sometimes in fact shaped through these developments, deep-green theory ~~more generally~~ ^{be reformulated} can avoid them. ^{for instance,} (The type of theory given could easily enough be recast in a more classical Platonistic form - undoubtedly a much less plausible form.) Nor will these background advances intrude, it is hoped, in the given elaboration of deep-green theory; the background will remain, fairly directly in the background, and not come to dominate proceedings or ^{have} ^{know} proceedings depend upon special new controversial features of it. Where more technical ^{or details} agreements are required, they will be relegated to appendices. ^{So too will} ^{some} ^{interesting} ^{side-tracks} ^{or details}

1. As to deep theory.

Appendix. Expanding upon deep theory.

Deep-green theory is the environmental branch of a much larger affair, deep theory. There is a point, in fact a real expository need, to place deep-green theory in the larger setting of deep theory. For deep theory influences several of the choices made in deciding upon the way deep-green theory goes, the shape it takes. Although the influence will become evident, particularly with the intertwining of truth and value that ^{occurs}, it is worth giving an example. Too much of the Anglo-American discussion of intrinsic value and of obligations to future generations is taken up with - hung up upon - ontological questions, about universal items in the first case, and as how there can be obligations regarding future items which do not (yet)

exist in "suitable" determinate form in the second. Deep object-theory slices straight through these issues, removing the problem-generating ontological assumptions.

Deep theory is a grander theory lying in the background, which significantly influences the philosophical approach taken in deep-green theory, as well as being influenced by it. There is no reason why that grand backdrop should remain hidden; there is no hidden agenda. The background theory, of which deep-green theory is a part, is called simply *deep theory*. For it represents the confluence of several deep positions with deep-green theory: deep pluralism, depth relevant theory, deep item-theory, and so on. As a theoretical endeavor, deep theory aims to pull together, into a unified coherent theory these various deep positions. It thus draws together and integrates as well, several other interrelated efforts (on dialethism, process theory, anakyrie, etc.) With deep theory I aim to supply eventually a fairly comprehensive philosophical package. I used to imagine that with moderate comprehensiveness as regards present philosophical problems would come a certain completeness; but I've come to think that a total philosophy is an illusion, like pots of gold at the ends of some rainbows, or like rainbows themselves.

Deep theory is no doubt a presumptuous title (there are worse about, e.g. 'total philosophy', 'ecosophy'). ^{it is little excuse that} ~~Not~~ it is altogether satisfactory, given the problems and obscurities, ^{soon} to be encountered, ^{it} lacking in the notion of depth. My main excuse is that I did not exactly choose the title myself, but had it thrust upon me: problematic, presumptuous, ^{still} it looks ^{ed} to good to refuse. It emerged from a terminological confluence of several ^{begins} areas in which I'd ^{had long} been struggling to assemble ^{improv} a ^{ies: most notably,} deep-green theory (itself a union of green thought, or environmental philosophy, with a revised deep ecology), deep relevant theory, deep pluralism (which deepened radical pluralism), and deep item-theory (which deepens object-theory).

To give a picture of deep theory, it suffices for present purposes to indicate some main features of deep positions, some of their integrating interrelations, and some of their revolutionary potential. Deep theory overturns or subverts very much of what has been assumed or presupposed in Western philosophy, and particularly in Enlightened contemporary philosophy.

For example, it overturns the following widespread assumptions:-

- the Ontological Assumption, ^{according to which} that truth, and also, meaning, are functions of reference, and thereby presuppose existence. On the contrary, according to (deep) item theory, we can perfectly well talk and think truly about items that do not exist, ^{a variety of other items, not only} and also about items that are not individual, but are complex, ^{and even} but perhaps, indeterminate wholes, and finally what items are impossible. ^{even} Therewith repudiated also then is an occasionally favoured full-back from ^{act} onticism, namely possibilism, which assumes

actualism

- the Possibilist Reduction, of everything that counts in discourse to possible individuals, *According to*
possibilism there are no other genuine subjects, all else can be analysed (or thrown) away.

Bound up with possibilism are

- the assumptions of modalism, of the correctness of classical logic, and of the absolute requirement of consistency. Under more throughgoing transconsistency (or paraconsistency) these connected assumptions are one and all repudiated. The transconsistent connection assumes an important role in the straightforward treatment of moral and other dilemmas, in showing for example how an agent may coherently operate under inconsistent obligations or with incompatible needs.

Important special cases of modalism are such theories as that

- entailment is strict implication (or its metalinguistic analogical) and that conditionality amounts to a modal function of material implication¹. The rejection of such themes and their *s* courses is part of what motivates deep relevant logic.

While the parts of deep theory are integrated and are intended to be materially reinforcing, nothing prevents their fairly independent elaborations. The *moderate* holism conceded does not exclude separation or analysis. In particular, deep-green theory is amenable to independent development and analysis.

DEEP PLURALISM

Metaphysics ✓

Politics

DEEP GREEN THEORY

• humanism

chop 4

DEEP RELEVANT THEORY

DEEP ITEM-THOORY

{ cuts deep into
prevailing logical theory
dialectical logic, logic?

1

Material implication is the implication defined in terms of truth-functions thus: A materially implies B iff not ~~last~~ A and not B, or equivalently, iff either not A or B. Strict implication is the necessitation of material obligatory i.e. A strictly implies B iff necessarily A materially implies B, or equivalently, iff it is not possible that not A and not B.

both

/implication

Often nowadays, it is presumed that
no argument is required to justify the state, an outrageous
presumption but a little reflection on its enormous role
reveals. For example, it is simply asserted that
it is undoubtedly going ...

P.H.
p325
+ 154/
chive.

Not only is an iron state presumed; the state
is to have an ever larger role than at present, in
'promoting civic virtues among the population'!

" P.H. has cut himself off from ~~the~~ ^{an} ~~un~~ ^{un} ~~swayed~~ ^{unswayed} standard ~~rather~~ ^{rather} ~~poor~~ ^{poor}
judging the state, my ~~without~~ ^{without} ~~thing~~ ^{thing}.

Anti contact, historical argument
against State

Key datum:

In many places indigenous peoples are
significant worse off after advent of State.