



ISSN: 2146-1961

Aktürk Çetin, B. (2022). Evaluation of Deep Ecology Movement Assumptions in Management of Environmental Crises, *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences (IJOESS)*, 13(48), 739-752.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijoess.3162>

Makale Türü (ArticleType): Review Article

EVALUATION OF DEEP ECOLOGY MOVEMENT ASSUMPTIONS IN MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CRISES

Banu AKTÜRK ÇETİN

Ph.D. Research Assistant, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara, Turkey, banu.akturk@hbv.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0002-9303-3244

Gönderim tarihi: 15.02.2022

Kabul tarihi: 13.05.2022

Yayın tarihi: 01.06.2022

ABSTRACT

Deep ecology is a philosophical thought that does not separate humans from the nature in which they live, that considers humans and nature as equal, and does not accept the superiority of humans over nature. It is also characterized as a movement with a high spiritual dimension, as it treats nature and humans as "one and whole". The aim of this study is what will be the perspective and effect of this philosophical thought, which has very sharp and clear lines in its view of human, nature, society, state, hierarchy and consumption, in the solution of environmental crises. For this purpose, it is important to try to examine the assumptions of deep ecology theoretically one by one. In this context, deep ecology treats nature and other living things in nature as pieces of a puzzle that complement each other rather than as servants in front of human beings, does not accept a hierarchical structure, emphasizes the fragmented state of power, and supports a pluralistic structure dominated by cultural and social diversity and cooperation. With the basic philosophy of protecting the diversity in nature, the prevailing opinion is that human beings should be content with what they can survive and definitely refuse to consume more than they need. It is underlined that the end of the road will lead to the search for new resources, based on the understanding that more consumption necessitates more production, that each production destroys the raw materials that exist in nature and consumes limited and finite resources. Thus the search for new resources is one of the most important factors of environmental destruction. It has been tried to examine how these views put forward by the deep ecology movement, which has very sharp lines, will have an effect on the cause or result of today's environmental crises, through the assumptions of this thought. It would not be a mistake to state that consumption and the perception of consumption are the main cause of today's environmental crises. It does not seem possible to eliminate environmental threats as long as the perception that sees human beings as a being for consumption by keeping them separate and superior to other living things in nature is not abandoned.

Keywords: Deep ecology, shallow ecology, environmental crises.

INTRODUCTION

Today, we are faced with a series of negative situations such as climate change, the ending of some resources, the extinction of many living species, and different diseases. Again, the most affected by these negativities caused by human beings with their own hands is the human being himself/herself. Humanity is endangering the existence and future of other living things in nature as well as its own generation. The perception of today's world, which considers the use of all kinds of resources in nature for the sake of their own interests as if they are unlimited and endless, and which acts with the logic of more consumption, reveals serious environmental crises. As long as the current consumption and perception towards consumption continues, it is inevitable that many environmental hazards will emerge in the near future.

Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess made the distinction between deep ecology and shallow ecology for the first time at the Conference on the Future of the Third World held in 1972, and he revealed the principles of the deep ecology movement with the article "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements: A Summery" which is published in 1973. Also, Naess made these principles more detailed in his work titled "The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects" dated 1986 and entered the literature as "Eponymist of Deep Ecology" (Önder, 2003: 147). Apart from Arne Naess, Gary Snyder, Bill Devall and George Sessions also contributed to deep ecology, and the studies of ecologists such as Aldo Leopold and Rachel Carson in the field of ecology paralleled the emergence of deep ecology (Yaylı & Çelik, 2011: 371; Özer, 2001: 70; Keleş et al., 2005: 105).

Snyder was influential in the development of ecocentric bioregionalism, Devall and Sessions discussed deep ecology in detail in their book *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*, dated 1985 (Önder, 2003: 148). The Land Ethic, which was put forward by Aldo Leopold in 1960, holds the opinion that nature has a value on its own and that people are responsible for nature, which is at the foundation of deep ecology thought (Keleş et al., 2005: 105). Even because of that, it is said that the first country where deep ecology developed in practice was the United States of America, contrary to what is known (Özer, 2001: 70). Carson, on the other hand, opened a debate on the reliability of producing technological solutions to environmental problems in her book *Silent Spring*, written in 1962 (Des Jardins, 2006: 27).

It is important that deep ecology considers human beings as equal just like other living things, and that the existence of every resource, species, and living thing in nature is valuable in itself and should be protected. Deep ecology is accepted as a philosophy and movement with radical views on human, nature, hierarchy, society, technology, consumption and many other issues. In our World today, the consumption phenomenon is one of the most discussed areas. With the impact of the development in communication and information technologies, consumption is being prioritized and encouraged. *By moving away from the idea that this is enough for me, it is tried to place the perception that more goods do not cause any harm.* This makes environmental destruction inevitable and poses environmental threats to all living things in the universe, especially humanity. That is why the impact of deep ecology philosophy and assumptions on today's

environmental threats is inevitably important. Therefore, emphasizing the assumptions of this philosophy constitutes the importance of this study. The aim of this study is to reveal the perspective and effect of deep ecology thought, which has very sharp lines and clear stance in its view of human, nature, society, state, hierarchy and consumption, in the solution of environmental threats. For this purpose, it is important to try to examine the assumptions of deep ecology theoretically one by one.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the point at which the assumptions of this philosophical thought will remain in the solution of environmental crises, after introducing the concept of deep ecology. Thus, firstly a shallow ecology-deep ecology distinction will be made and then the principles of this philosophical thought and whether it is a religious movement will be discussed. The study will be concluded by mentioning the assumptions of this thought one by one and making a general evaluation.

METHOD

After scanning the domestic and foreign sources that have come to the fore with his works on this subject, especially the studies of Arne Naess, who introduced the idea of deep ecology, the study was carried out by forming a general opinion on the philosophy of deep ecology. First of all, a general literature review has been made and the principles and assumptions of deep ecology thought has been tried to be interpreted. The articles in which the previous studies on this subject were discussed and tried to reach a conclusion are also included in the study.

The Distinction Between Shallow Ecology and Deep Ecology

Expressing the distinction between shallow ecology and deep ecology at the Future of the Third World Conference in 1972, Naess made a brief definition as "The fight against pollution and resource consumption" under the title of Shallow Ecology Movement in his article dated 1973. While he stated the purpose of shallow ecology as "The main goal is to improve the health and well-being of people living in developed countries", he also defined it as "conservationist-environmentalist" movement (Naess, 1995a: 151). This stated goal also shows that shallow ecology has an anthropocentric view of nature. (Capra, 1995: 20). The anthropocentric view is a view that distinguishes between human and nature and treats nature as an inanimate entity, stands up for that only humans have a moral value, and gives humans the power and right to dominate nature (Des Jardins, 2006: 46).

Deep ecology emerges at this stage, the point where the anthropocentric view of nature rejects the human-nature distinction.

Deep ecology does not separate humans from nature or anything else. The world is not an isolated group of objects, but rather a network of connected and dependent on each other facts (Capra, 1995: 20).

Table 1. Comparison of Deep Ecology and Shallow Ecology Assumptions

	SHALLOW ECOLOGY ASSUMPTIONS	DEEP ECOLOGY ASSUMPTIONS
1	Diversity in nature is a precious resource for us.	The diversity in nature is a valuable resource for itself.
2	It is non-logical to talk about values that are not for human beings.	Seeing value as human value is a statement of racial prejudice.
3	Plant species are valuable since they are used in agriculture and medicine for the benefit of humans.	Plant species must be protected because their value is in their essence.
4	Pollution must be stopped if it affects economic growth.	Stopping pollution is more important than economic development.
5	Population growth in developing societies endangers the ecological balance.	The increase in world population threatens the ecosystem, but the population and behavior of industrial and developed states are more dangerous.
6	"Source" means useful resources for people.	"Source" is the source for all life.
7	People cannot accept a large-scale regression in their living standards.	People should not settle for the regression in the standard of living of the overdeveloped nations, but the regression in the general quality of life.
8	Nature is cruel and it should be cruel.	Man is cruel, but it doesn't have to be.

(Tamkoç, 1994: 99)

Judging by the eight attributes in the table for shallow ecology and deep ecology, the main differences between the two ecology movements are; the infinite value attributed to human beings in shallow ecology, the importance of humans in the distinction between nature and human beings, and the fact that nature is kept in the background between nature and economy, which are considered oppositely by Deep Ecology. While shallow ecology is of the opinion that things that are not for human beings have no value and importance, deep ecology is of the opinion that everything in nature, including human beings, has a value in itself. Naturally, human beings are not in the center, just like animals and plants, they are only one of the threads of the web of life (Capra, 1995: 20). Deep ecology considers that everything has value (Yaylı & Çelik, 2011: 373). And its very existence gives it this value.

"Just as sneezing and coughing can disrupt anyone's daily life; pollution and depletion of resources may also cause to deterioration in the lifestyle of contemporary industrial societies. However, for Medicine, it would be a mistake not to focus solely on sneezing and coughing and to investigate the causes. In the same way, it would be a mistake for environmentalists to focus their attention solely on pollution and resource depletion and not examine their social and human causes." (Des Jardins, 2006: 402). Examination of this evaluation, in which Des Jardins tries to reveal the difference between shallow ecology and deep ecology in a more concrete way shows that these "social and humanistic reasons" that do not exist in the shallow ecology movement but exist in the deep ecology movement are addressed. In other words, we can characterize the difference as his moving from the point of view that environmental problems have deep philosophical causes.

Shallow Ecology has the belief that ecological crisis or problems can be solved with considering some human behavior, environmental laws, government policies, etc.; However, deep ecology is a radical movement and

believes that the ecological crisis or problem can be solved by changing the current economic, social and political structure (Demirer et al., 1997: 109). Although the existence of important political arguments can be seen when the deep ecology thought is read in detail; Since this idea emphasizes the change of the individual and society, it is not possible to say that it is a purely political program (Görmez, 2020: 83).

Principles of the Deep Ecology Movement

In his article "The Deep Ecological Movement Some Philosophical Aspects" he wrote in 1986, Arne Naess expressed eight principles that he agreed with George Sessions to express the points that the supporters of the deep ecology movement accept or in other words should accept. These are (Naess, 1995c: 77; Önder, 2003: 153, 154):

- The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on earth is valuable in itself, has intrinsic value. These values are independent of whether the non-human world is useful for human purposes.
- The richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values. This richness and diversity is also valuable in themselves.
- Except to meet their vital needs, people have no right to reduce this wealth and diversity.
- The flourishing of human life and cultures can only be possible by strongly reducing the human population. The flourishing of non-human life also requires a smaller human population.
- Currently, human intervention in the non-human world is excessive and the situation is rapidly deteriorating.
- Therefore, policies must change. Changing policies will affect fundamental economic, technological and ideological structures. The outcome of such a change would be deeply different from the current situation.
- The ideological change will be mainly in the direction of making the quality of life valuable (taking positions of intrinsic value) rather than aiming at an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a deep awareness of the difference between largeness and greatness.
- Those who agree with the above-mentioned issues are directly or indirectly responsible for trying to make the necessary changes.

The foundation of the deep ecology movement is based on these eight principles. Within the framework of these eight principles, movements such as different philosophies, religions and traditions can be included in the deep ecology movement (Eray Sarıtaş, 2020: 103).

Is Deep Ecology a Religious Movement?

When the deep ecology movement is evaluated within the framework of the eight principles that Naess and Sessions have agreed upon, it is seen that this movement is "normative" (Önder, 2003: 155), which is a movement that has the value of a rule and shows what should be. Although the principles that guide deep

ecology are partially based in scientific research, they are more philosophical than science-oriented. In a sense, this brings wisdom upfront (Önder, 2003: 155). As well as setting norms, rules, assumptions and value priorities; deep ecology also includes hypotheses about what is happening in the universe (Naess, 1995a: 154, 155). Naess, who used the concept of "Eco-philosophy" to express all these, separates deep ecology from the science of ecology with this concept. Within the framework of deep ecology thought, the metaphysical views of Capra and Bahro and Capra's assessment that the new ecological thought should be based on spirituality, bring this movement closer to spiritual ecology (Görmez, 2020: 83).

Deep ecology's beliefs and assumptions about the universe and life, its religious and philosophical approach to environmental problems do not turn this movement a religion. Deep ecology is earth-based wisdom. Beyond being just a movement to protect nature, it is a movement that has rules, assumptions, value judgments, and hypotheses about human existence on earth and explains the meaning of life (Önder, 2003: 156,157).

It is possible to say that deep ecology is a movement with a great spiritual extent. Because in essence, it is possible to define the existence of an ecological consciousness that nature and man are "one" and "whole", as well as a spiritual consciousness. But this perception is not enough to qualify the deep ecology movement as a religious movement. Because deep ecology, as Capra describes it, is an "earth-centered" movement, and its spiritual extent remains on the earth.

Examination of Deep Ecology Movement Assumptions

Arne Naess, in his article titled *"The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements a Summary"* published in 1973, made a distinction between shallow ecology and deep ecology, and tried to list the characteristics of the movement in seven items under the title of deep ecology movements. Considering the assumptions in the article that is mentioned, the place of "human", "nature", "society", "state", "hierarchy" and "consumption" phenomena can be set forth in the deep ecology movement.

'Human' in the Deep Ecology Movement

Contrary to shallow ecology, which is a conservation-environmental movement, deep ecology refers to a movement that embodies radical changes.

It is not possible to mention that deep ecology treats people separately and ascribes a different value to them. As a matter of fact, the main point that separates deep ecology from shallow ecology emerges from the perspective of human beings. Contrary to the view that considers humans as superior to nature and accepts nature as a servant to meet all kinds of needs of humans in the nature-human distinction, in deep ecology, human and nature are handled as "one", as "whole", without making a distinction between humans and nature (Pepper, 1999: 17). In the web of life on earth, human beings are only one of the threads, just like plants (Capra, 1995: 20).

Deep ecology is portrayed as "ecocentric" or "biocentric". That is, man is not separate from nature and not above it; on the contrary, it is located in nature (Önder, 2003: 151). According to this movement, it is not man who is seen as the center of the universe and all living things that must be protected, but the universe that must be defended against humanity (Kaya & Bıçkı, 2006: 241).

In order to understand the human perspective of deep ecology, another subject that needs to be examined is Naess's "Biospheric equality principle" (Naess, 1995a: 151, 152). As per this principle, all beings in nature have equal rights. The point that should be distinguished here is to understand the subtle difference between having equal rights and claiming that all species are equal. Taken by itself, this principle leads to the false conclusion that, by virtue of the principle of equality, human needs will never take precedence over the needs of non-human species. The main point here is the comparison of the needs that are not necessary for human life with the needs that are necessary for the life and existence of non-human species. Based on the point that the current technology is not worthy of human beings, on the contrary, it is polluting in the current mode of production and consumption, technology with a human face is being stood up for (Görmez, 2020: 81). Thus, the estrangement of people with the reason of technology will also be prevented.

Deep ecology places the main responsibility on humans in ensuring biospheric equality. Mutual killing and exploitation appear as a biological fact of life, but since this is one-sided; that is, because animals, trees, rocks cannot use humans to realize themselves; In the face of this situation, deep ecology advises people to limit themselves and lead a simple life (Önder, 2003: 163 quote from Luke, 1988: 81,82).

Of the eight principles that Naess and Sessions agreed upon, the fourth principle is that "The flourishing of human life and cultures is possible only by drastically reducing the human population. The flourishing of non-human life also requires a smaller human population". This point of view of deep ecology has been criticized with interpretations that it treats humans as flawed, faulty creatures and exhibits an anti-human approach (Bramwell, 1994: 161-163). However, it is possible to say that this principle does not aim to destroy people through illegitimate means, but rather emphasizes the necessity of people living together (Görmez, 2020: 83).

'Nature' in the Deep Ecology Movement

Deep ecology has an approach called ecocentric or biocentric. Nature and its diversity should be protected; but this diversity is not for man, but for the value in nature itself. In the ecocentric approach, it is imperative that the well-being of the non-human world is taken into account, as well as the well-being of humans (Önder, 2003: 150). Every species on earth, human and non-human, has its own intrinsic value, and these values are outside of human-oriented purposes and have a value of their own (Naess, 1995c: 68). Everything that exists in nature is a part of the ecosystem and the destruction of nature should be avoided in order to maintain the ecological balance (Görmez, 2020: 81).

In order to understand the perspective of deep ecology on nature, it is necessary to study what Naess's "Self-Realization Principle" is.

The principle of self-realization is a valid right for human and non-human beings and expresses the will of human and non-human species to develop their natural life style and capacities (Önder, 2003: 158). "Maximal diversity" and "maximal common life" are the norms that encountered in the implementation of this principle (Naess, 1995a: 152). The perception of nature is not in the form of the combination of independent objects, but in the form of a network of interdependent and interconnected phenomena (İmga, 2006: 87).

The process of self-realization reveals the concept of "identification". The identification of the human being mentioned by Naess refers to the attainment of the human self to the level of the universe as a whole. In this context, an ego is also attributed to nature, and it is in question that man sees himself in beings other than himself, that is, identification. The identification of humans with nature has an important role in the process of making humans protective against nature and maintaining it (Naess, 1995b: 230, 231). The perception of nature not as an "object" but as a "subject" with a self also emerges as a result of man's identification with nature (Önder, 2003: 161).

'Society' in the Deep Ecology Movement

According to deep ecology, the change in the level of individual consciousness will bring about social change. Each individual will change some of their behaviors, values, and even lifestyles in order to live in peace and cooperation with nature; thanks to this conscious change of action of a sufficient number of people, society will change (Pepper, 1999: 21).

Naess's principle of self-actualization includes the norms of maximal diversity and maximal common living space. The maximum diversity norm at issue includes cultural and social diversity and pluralism as well as ecological diversity. Naess argues that ecological diversity is a precursor to the diversity of cultures, economies, and endeavors (Naess, 1995a: 152).

It can be stated that Naess considered society is a tool for reaching the universe in the process of identification within the deep ecology movement. Because; "The process of identification, which begins with the circle of friends and the local community, follows a course that will cover humanity, life and ultimately the whole world. As the self's area of identification widens, the level of alienation decreases and the level of self-actualization rises" (Önder, 1996: 203, 204).

For Capra, who describes deep ecology as "a paradigm shift", the approach from rational to intuitive, from analysis to synthesis, from reductionism to holism; is also true for society, and there is a shift from expansionism to protection, from quantity to quality, from competition to cooperation and nonviolence (Capra, 1995: 24).

'State' in the Deep Ecology Movement

Deep Ecology adopts principles of autonomy and decentralization. Stating that the reduction in the number of hierarchical chain connections will make a decision stronger, Naess believes that the local region will also be

effective in ensuring the ecological balance. Local autonomy is a competence that strengthens mental efforts and materials owned, and it derives from this power of distribution. Pollution problems, including thermic pollution and the circulation of materials, lead us in this direction since they have the effect of increasing local autonomy (Naess, 1995a: 153, 154). While describing the "green society", Naess stated that a green society should be decentralized and governed by a grassroots democracy (Naess, 1994: 10). Both the domination of man over man and the domination between states bring along the domination of man over nature, and this naturally occurring hierarchical structure also brings ecological problems. Therefore, in advocating for the decentralization and fragmentation of power, they take the strengthening of the local and communal structure as the basis for participation and cooperation (Görmez, 2020: 81).

'Hierarchy' in the Deep Ecology Movement

Arne Naess, in his article written in 1973 and distinguishing shallow ecology and deep ecology, used the expression "anti-class posture" in the fourth item while listing the assumptions of deep ecology. Deep ecology was shaped from the shallow ecology movement, at the point where it rejected the understanding that considers people above nature. The deep ecology movement, which keeps humans in the same position among non-human species, has an attitude against classification and hierarchy in general. For instance; men have no domination over women, and the rich against the poor. This is based on the principle of "biospheric equivalence" in deep ecology. All beings in nature have equal rights (Naess, 1995a: 152).

However, it is necessary to recognize the distinction that biospheric equality is considered equal in principle, not absolute equality of all species. As a matter of fact, in practice, any organism in an ecosystem has to use another as food or shelter in order to survive. In other words, compulsory killings and use are in question (Önder, 2003: 162).

While describing the "green society", Naess emphasized that social hierarchy should be abolished in a green society and male domination should be ended (Naess, 1994: 10).

'Consumption' in the Deep Ecology Movement

The principle of preserving nature and diversity in nature, as a requirement of the ecocentric approach of the deep ecology movement, can be described as a principle aimed at limiting consumption.

In his article "The Deep Ecological Movement Some Philosophical Aspects" written in 1986, Arne Naess identified eight principles that he agreed with George Sessions to express the points that supporters of the deep ecology movement should accept. The third of these eight principles is as follows: "People have no right to reduce this wealth and diversity, except to meet their vital needs". This is another principle that demonstrates in the deep ecology movement, an understanding of limiting consumption is dominant. Thus, the "maximal diversity" norm, which is included in Naess's self-actualization principle, aims to maximize the diversity in nature.

According to the deep ecology movement, which supports mass production by stopping mass production; it is not possible to establish an ecological society as the exploitation of nature, people and countries will continue as long as the current mode of production and the consumption relations (Görmez, 2020: 80).

In accordance with the concept of biospheric equality, which claims that there is equality in principle between species; deep ecology which argues that human beings should minimize the intervention in the life and habitat of other living species and avoid unnecessary killing and use, rejects unnecessary consumption (Ünder, 1996: 203).

Can Deep Ecology Be Effective In Eliminating Environmental Threats?

According to a rumor, it is said that environmental problems started when Adam was exiled from heaven for eating the forbidden fruit. Because eating the forbidden fruit is said to be the first violation of the natural state. Of course, it is not realistic to take the starting point of environmental problems this far back, but it can be stated that there are three main breaking points at the beginning of environmental breakdown. The first of these is the transition from foraging to hunting. What happened in the transition to hunting? The woman, by nature and because of the necessities such as the birth process of a child and the need for care, was the party who had to stay at home and not developed hunting skills. The man, on the other hand, has turned into a being that has to hunt for his own survival and that of his household and needs to be stronger in order to hunt. Therefore, the process began with the domination of men over women. The domination of man over man also paved the way for people's domination of nature. As the second breaking point, it can be indicated as the urban revolution or the agricultural revolution. With the settled life of people, various structures have developed as a necessity of living in a community, and in a sense, the hierarchy between societies has begun. The third breaking point is the widespread use of communication and technology tools with the globalization process we live in today. Along with the technological development and the prevalence of communication tools, it is possible to be instantly informed about the events and lifestyles on the other side of the world. This situation has a consumption trigger feature. The desire to consume more has become one of the most important problems of today.

In the perspective brought by the Enlightenment thought, the understanding of "Discover nature, so that you can dominate" is dominant. Exploring nature is the right approach here, after all, you cannot make a plane without observing how a bird flies. But the idea of giving man the right to dominate nature is the beginning of trouble. At this point, human beings see themselves as a party that values themselves above nature and has the right to act as they wish with an unlimited and endless right in line with their own interests. This is the domination of man over nature and is considered the primary cause of environmental crises and threats. The process that started with the domination of people over people continued with the domination of states over states. In fact, the state phenomenon is shown among the causes of environmental crises because it requires a hierarchical structure by its nature.

With the globalization process in today's world, individuals are always thrown into a consumption race. It can be said that with the technological steps he/she has taken to improve his/her own situation, human beings have actually come under different domination. The domination of technology over people. Many people are under the captivity of social media without realizing it. As per data such as where people go, what they like, the search results they do in the search engine; advertisements suitable for people are shown and more consumption is always recommended. The fashion industry always serves to consume more. For example, wide-leg trousers, narrow-leg trousers, bell-bottom trousers, high waist trousers, low waist trousers... Again, if it is depicted according to fabric types, this distinction goes on and on. However, the aim was to cover the naked body. Again, very serious money is spent on hijab clothing nowadays. At this point, we come across the phenomenon of the change of means and ends with the effect of enlightenment thought or positivist thought.

Considering the above-mentioned processes on the axis of the assumptions of deep ecology thought, the definite perception of deep ecology is that man is not superior to nature, but that he is one and whole, which is contrary to the perception of today's man who believes that nature is in charge of serving himself. Today's people and societies act as the resources are unlimited and endless, beyond the fact that they see the right to use nature and other living things for their own benefit. However, these resources, which are limited in deep ecology thought, and nature with other living things in nature are valuable because of their very existence.

Just as the process started with the domination of people over people, the deep ecology movement, which has the idea that societies will change as a result of the increase in the level of consciousness of each person, can be effective in environmental crises. Although it contains a hierarchy due to its structure, the state mechanism is one of the best organizations that humanity has ever created. Since its first emergence, measures have been tried to be taken to break the despotic structure of the state that has developed over time. Local administrations are one of them. Today, we observe that states are trying to transfer more tasks, services, and resources to local governments with efforts that increase and decrease from time to time but continuously. Decentralization is also important in the deep ecology movement. The point of breaking up the hierarchy into small parts is important.

Consumption, more consumption paves the way for the destruction of natural resources. Each consumption requires the search for a new resource, which inevitably requires the destruction of the environment. Actions such as not throwing garbage on the ground, installing filters in chimneys, factories, etc. are necessary but not sufficient. In the management of today's environmental crises that we are facing, first of all, it is necessary to change the consumption perception we are in. If environmental measures are tried to be taken without changing the current consumption perception, it will only serve to waste time and resources. Therefore, with a philosophical perspective that includes radical transformations such as the deep ecology movement, it is important and indispensable for our future to completely change today's perceptions of human, nature, society, state, hierarchy, and consumption, if necessary.

CONCLUSION

There are also criticisms of the view of deep ecology that does not separate humans from nature and other living things in nature. There are criticisms that deep ecology is essentially 'anti-human-centered' (Pepper, 1999: 30), and that it does not trust the human and social value system (Bramwell, 1994: 163) because it treats humans as a being with flaws and defects. It is because of this inherent defect of man that the society, state, technology, religion, agriculture, hierarchy and consumption tools produced by him also constitute the source of the problems. Contrary to the claim that deep ecology considers nature and man as equal, the basis of the criticism of deep ecology is that it portrays man as a fundamentally flawed creature.

Again, according to Mellor, while the needs of the natural world were prioritized among the parts of the whole, one of which is human and the other natural world, an anti-humanist structure was exhibited by ignoring human needs (Mellor, 1993: 104-105). It is also claimed that the deep ecology movement is socio-economically and scientifically inexperienced because its worldview and values constantly change over time (Yaylı & Çelik, 2011: 376). Despite these criticisms, Önder, who considers that deep ecology is excessive and unfair to describe it as anti-human, states that what deep ecology opposes is a human-centered approach, and this does not mean disliking or being hostile to humans but it is an attempt to remind people of their limits in the universe (Önder, 2003: 169).

In consideration of today's communication and technological developments, it is clear that people are trying to be directed to consumption intensively. With the influence of the fashion industry, where it is not possible to keep up with the pace, people are channeled into consumption beyond their needs. The view that supports the consumption of people as much as the needs of the deep ecology thought is undoubtedly an appropriate initiative. Because increased consumption requires more and faster production. Each input in the production phase is a raw material found in nature. When we consider that the raw materials in nature will be depleted in time, it will be necessary to search for new resources over time, which paves the way for the exploitation of nature. With this thought, it would not be right to consider the perception of deep ecology to consume as much as you need as an anti-human approach. It is obvious that the harmony and balance in the universe has not been disturbed by animals or other creatures in nature, and that it is the human hand that disturbs this harmony.

Despite the borderless nature of environmental threats and crises, environmental problems are local issues that can be solved by local governments. Environmental crises can be solved more effectively and efficiently through local governments where decentralization is at the forefront rather than a central system dominated by a hierarchical structure. It can be stated that the idea of deep ecology, which rejects the hierarchy and defends the fragmented structure of power, maintains its functionality in this sense.

ETHICS DISCLAIMER

In this article, journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics rules, journal ethics rules were followed. Responsibility for all kinds of violations related to the article belongs to the author.

Author(s) Contribution Rate: The author's contribution rate to this article is 100%

REFERENCES

- Bramwell, A. (1994). *The Fading of the Greens: The Decline of Environmental Politics in the West*, Yale University Press.
- Capra, F. (1995). Deep Ecology a New Paradigm, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (Edited by George Sessions), Shambhala Publications, 19-25.
- Des Jardins J. R. (2006). *Çevre Etiği, [Environmental Ethics]*, (Translated by Ruşen Keleş), İmge Publishing House.
- Demirer, G., Torunoğlu, E., & Duran, M. (1997). Radikal Ekolojik Akımlar Üzerine Düşünceler, *Ve Kirlendi Dünya*, [Reflections on Radical Ecological Currents, And Dirty World], Editor: F. Başkaya, Öteki Publications.
- Eray Sarıtas, Ş. (2020). Yeni Paradigma Tartışmaları Ekseninde Derin Ekoloji, [Deep Ecology in the Context of New-Paradigm Debates], *Journal of Contemporary Local Governments*, Editor: Kemal Görmez, 29(3), 99-115.
- Görmez, K. (2020). *Çevre Sorunları, [Environmental Issues]*, 5th Edition, Nobel Publishing House.
- İmge, O. (2006). Deep Ecological Approach as a view excluding Dominant Paradigm to the Global Environmental Crisis. Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Social Sciences Institute 2(4), 84-97, <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/215648> 22.01.2022
- Kaya, Y., & Bıckı, D. (2006). The 'Sustainability' Argument and The Objection of 'Deep Ecology'. Journal of Gazi University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 8(3), 231-249. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/287551> 11.12.2021
- Keles, I., Ozkan Sancak, H., & Metin, H. (2005). *Çevre Kalkınma ve Etik, [Environmental Development and Ethics]*, Birlik Printing.
- Luke, T. (2003). The Dreams of Deep Ecology, *Telos*, 76, Summer 1988.
- Mellor, M. (1993). Breaking Borders: Toward a Feminist, Green Socialism [Sınırları Yıkma: Feminist, Yeşil Bir Sosyalizme Doğru], Ayrıntı Publishing.
- Naess, A. (1994). Fundamentals of Deep Ecology, *Deep Ecology*, (Compiled by Günseli Tamkoç, Ege Publishing.
- Naess, A. (1995a). The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements a Summery, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (Edited by George Sessions), Boston & London, Shambhala Publications, 151-156.
- Naess, A. (1995b). Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (Edited by George Sessions), Shambhala Publications, 225-239.
- Naess, A. (1995c). The Deep Ecological Movement Some Philosophical Aspects, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (Edited by George Sessions), Shambhala Publications, 64-84.

Önder, T. (2003). *Ekoloji, Toplum ve Siyaset*, [Ecology, Society and Politics], Odak Publishing.

Özer, M. A. (2001). Derin Ekoloji, [Deep Ecology], *Contemporary Local Governments*, 10(4), 61-79.

Pepper, D. (1999). *Modern Environmentalism: An Introduction*, Routledge.

Tamkoc, G. (1994). Derin Ekolojinin Genel Çizgileri, [General Lines of Deep Ecology, Deep Ecology], (Compiled by Günseli Tamkoç), Ege Publishing.

Ünder, H. (1996). [Çevre Felsefesi], *Environmental Philosophy*, Doruk Publishing.

Yaylı, H., & Celik, V. (2011). Çevre Sorunlarının Çözümü için Radikal Bir Öneri: Derin Ekoloji, [A Radical Proposal for the Solution of Environmental Problems: Deep Ecology], *Selcuk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 26/2011, 369-377.