



Deep Ecology: A Lifestyle of Arne Næss

Dr. Sunon Nandy

SACT – I, Surendranath Evening College, Email: Sunon84@gmail.com

Abstract: *Deep Ecology, a philosophical framework developed by Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss, emphasizes the intrinsic value of all living beings and promotes a holistic relationship between humans and nature. This article explores Deep Ecology not merely as an environmental philosophy but as a way of life grounded in simplicity, ecological balance, and ethical responsibility. Næss advocated for “self-realization” through identification with the natural world, encouraging individuals to transcend anthropocentric attitudes and embrace biocentric equality. His lifestyle reflected these principles through minimal consumption, respect for biodiversity, and active environmental engagement. The study highlights how Deep Ecology challenges modern consumerism and technological domination, urging a shift toward sustainable living practices. By examining Næss’s personal philosophy and its practical implications, the paper underscores the relevance of Deep Ecology in addressing contemporary ecological crises and fostering a deeper ethical commitment to environmental preservation.*

Keywords: *Deep Ecology, Arne Næss, Environmental Ethics, Sustainability, Biocentrism, Ecological Balance, Self-realization, Nature Conservation, Simple Living.*

Introduction: Deep Ecology Hearing the term ‘Deep Ecology’ makes one feel that deep thoughts are associated with this nature-centric ethics. To understand the depth of this type of ethics, it is necessary to know the meaning of Deep Ecology. Environmental Ethics or Ecosophy is a new, emerging concept in the world of philosophy. Environmental Ethics has brought a radical change to the traditional stream of philosophy. In the period after 1970, an unforgettable shift was observed through the writings of the American journal named ‘Environmental Ethics’. From 1972–73 to the present time, the person whose contribution is greatest toward ecosophical development is the Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss. For a long time, he attempted to transform various thoughts regarding ecosophy into a distinct ideology. Among those who shared the same line of thought alongside Arne Næss, notable figures include: Bill Devall, a sociologist at Humboldt State University. George Sessions, a philosopher at Sierra College of California. Devall and Sessions together gave importance to Næss’s philosophy, discussed it, and reshaped his thoughts in a new way. In February 1980, an Australian philosopher, John Passmore, stated the following to justify the thoughts of Næss, Devall, and Sessions: “It is now customary to divide the family of eco-philosophers that limited class of philosophers who take environmental problem seriously - into two genera, the ‘shallow’ and ‘deep’.

Reviewing the mainstream perspective of environmental ethics will make the discussion of deep ecology fruitful. Before discussing deep ecology, it is necessary to briefly discuss anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism. Anthropocentrism refers to the viewpoint that recognizes the intrinsic value of only

human beings or human existence. In this anthropocentrism, everything is judged keeping humans at the center. In the anthropocentric view, only those objects or subjects are considered good which can help human existence. Can express itself. In another way, it can be said that – objects or subjects that help human existence have positive value. For example, it can be said today that humans consider animals valuable because humans produce food, clothing, entertainment goods, and medicine by using animals. Those who believe in this anthropocentric view all believe that – no helpless animal should be killed, tortured, or caused pain without reason. But if using that animal can generate the maximum happiness for human society, then the act of killing or causing pain to that animal can be called justified. Mill, in his Utilitarianism, spoke of generating maximum happiness for the maximum number of people. Therefore, it can be said that Mill adopted this kind of anthropocentric viewpoint.

There is a need to properly understand the statement mentioned above. Specifically, we need to examine when we will call the suffering or killing of an animal justified, and when we will not call it justified. If causing suffering to an animal to produce the greatest happiness for the maximum number of people in human society is considered justified, then it can be said that—no individual's self-interest fulfillment through causing suffering to an animal can be called justified. Just like with animals, philosophers who believe in anthropocentrism (human-centeredness) establish the same view regarding trees and plants. Nature provides us with many necessary elements such as food and shelter. Therefore, nature is valuable to human society. In the anthropocentric viewpoint, it is assumed that—nature has no intrinsic or inherent value. Nature is called valuable only when it helps in fulfilling human self-interest. Vast open land is valuable to us because that land is useful for our sports, movement, and for getting open air. Additionally, we can build our shelters and practice agriculture on land. However, it is also true that a conflict can sometimes be observed within the concept of value provided by the anthropocentric viewpoint. For example—we cannot simultaneously preserve a tree for its beauty and convert it into timber for building our house. Similarly, if we want to convert a tree into timber, then the beauty of that tree cannot be preserved. Therefore, we need to think about how the value of any object or matter will be determined. Of course, the value of any object or matter is usually determined in relation to another object. But the question is, what will be the standard of this value determination method? When we determine the value of another object in relation to an object, why will we accept that object as the standard for determining the value of that item, and by what logic?

Non-Anthropocentrism: The concept of non-anthropocentrism is that all entities living within the environment have an equal right to live, develop, and realize their own inherent worth. In this value system, it is said that all living animals and entities residing within the environment are interconnected with one another. They are all special parts of a collective entity, possessing equal rights and intrinsic value. In the words of Næss: “Biographical equality as an intuition is true in principle, although in the process of living, all species use each other as food shelter etc.” For whom other animals are harmed is the result of biological needs of life, and many religious thoughts on Earth have attempted to engage in spiritual discussions surrounding these biological needs. Some animal liberationists have asked everyone to become vegetarian to resolve this issue. To reinforce this concept, Aldo Leopold stated—”humans are “Plain Citizens” of the biotic community, not lord and master over all other Species” Biocentric equality is inseparably linked with various types of self-realization. The meaning of the aforementioned statement is—if we harm nature, we are actually harming ourselves. There are no environmental boundaries within nature; everyone is deeply interconnected with one another. Yet, we tend to view all entities separately. Therefore, we ought to show respect to all human and non-human entities. When discussing biocentric ethics, the self-feeling that arises is that separate individuals and human resources all possess certain special needs that transcend food, water, and shelter. Those special needs are—love, recreation, artistic appreciation, and a sense of oneness with a particular special place or individual. Furthermore, spiritual development is necessary to become a complete human being. The unique way our special non-material needs are realized is probably distinct. In an industrial society, artificial needs are created among humans through advertising. As a result, the production of goods must be increased in society, and a mindset of luxury develops among humans. Consequently, our

ability to face reality diminishes, and these become obstacles on the path to spiritual development. Regarding this, it has been said— “Drawing from the minority tradition and from the wisdom of many who have offered the insight of interconnectedness, we recognize that deep ecologist can offer suggestions for gaining maturity and encouraging the processes of harmony with nature, but that there is no grand solution which is Guaranteed to save us from ourselves.”

At the beginning of the 1960s, Arne Næss read *Silent Spring* (1962), written by Rachel Carson. After reading that book, a new dimension was added to his thought process. Due to his teaching at the University of Oslo, Næss was engaged in work on ‘Semantics’ and ‘Philosophy of Science’. During this phase, he was formally inspired by Spinoza and Gandhiji. He spoke of oneness with the environment because this sense of oneness was his realization. He had a special affection for mountains. One of the main reasons behind his affection for environmental philosophy was his special relationship with the mountain named Hallingskarvet. In 1937, he built a cabin in a special spot on that mountain, named Tvergastein / Crossed Stones. He spent a decade at Tvergastein. At this time, he closely observed every change and characteristic from his surroundings. He argued that it is with deep concentration that every small tree, plant, and wildflower gives rise to a new perspective within various thoughts and writings. The foundation of his deep ecology philosophy was laid through all these living experiences.

In the context of discussing Arne Næss, it is necessary to say something about those by whom he was formally inspired. Rand Aldo Leopold is generally known to us as a famous environmentalist. He was engaged in work in the forests of the United States of America for a part of his life (Forest Service) (1909–1928). Leopold’s efforts led to the creation of the first national wilderness area (National Wilderness Area) in the United States in 1924. From 1933 to 1948, during this period, he taught at the University of Wisconsin. There, he came forward to make people aware of how wilderness areas can be saved or conserved. Later, to accomplish these works, he formed an organization named “Audubon Society” in 1935.

He actively participated in environmental movements and provided a great deal of inspiration to the activists. In 1949, Aldo Leopold felt that for our greater society, a new kind of environmental ethics was needed. The idea proposed by Leopold was appropriately implemented. With this realization coming twenty years later, Western society gained inspiration to create a new kind of environmental ethics from Hinduism and Buddhist philosophy, which are essentially part of the culture of the Asian continent. In 1920, Leopold was engaged in creating a logical and scientific policy. The topic of discussion of that policy was how to completely eradicate or eliminate the wolf species from the then United States. Among the arguments given in favor of eradicating wolves from the United States, the main argument was—wolves hunt deer. A problem arose for recreational hunters regarding deer. Because the deer population was gradually decreasing due to wolf hunting. The responsibility that was placed on them to fix it was to eliminate the wolves. Right around that time, one day Leopold went on a mountain excursion with his friends. They had guns with them, hoping to shoot instantly if they encountered a wolf. Just at the moment of taking lunch, they all sat down on a hill to rest. The river could be seen by looking down from the hill. Suddenly they noticed that a pack of wolves was running through the river bank area. They realized that the pack of wolves was chasing them. Immediately, with absolute attention, they aimed their guns at the wolf pack and fired. At that moment, an old female wolf was shot and collapsed on the river bank. Leopold went near the fallen wolf and stood there, watching how she was slowly moving towards death. He stared blankly into the eyes of the wolf. Later, in a text titled ‘Thinking Like a Mountain’, he wrote: ‘There was something new to me in those eyes, something known only to her and to the mountain.’

At one time, he used to think that the fewer wolves there were, the more deer there would be. When there are no wolves, that field will belong only to the hunters—meaning humans. But after the death of this wolf, he could realize through a new feeling that the perspective based on which he had spent his life so far was not correct; that perspective is not supported by the wolf pack or the mountain itself. Although it will not be

difficult to understand that—a wolf does not support any matter. But does it make any sense to say that a mountain supports something? That is, does the question of support or non-support by an inanimate, unconscious, inert object even arise? Did Leopold gather this kind of experience in his life? By ‘Mountain’, he wanted to mean the environment or ecosystem where the incident took place—just as there are deer, wolves, etc., there are also soil, water, and other inanimate entities, all of which he accepted as a living entity. He realized that the ecosystem has an inherent power, which helps to prove his half-expressed reductionist view or presents wrong. He felt that the ecosystem has a life of its own, roots, history, and its own future. To gain this experience, he compared the ecosystem to a living entity, stating that the ecosystem is respectable and valuable for its own sake. This is an extraordinary event, due to which his perspective toward nature underwent a radical change.

It is notable that any experience can radically change human character and perspective. Humans gather experiences and, relying on them, direct or modify the path of their life’s journey. In reality, different individuals view the same object or subject from different perspectives, resulting in everyone having distinct experiences about a single subject. Leopold saw something new in the eyes of the wolf, which brought a radical change to his lifestyle and perspective. Based on this experience, in his written text “Land Ethics”, he tried to explain that—humans are not the most powerful beings. No, even though humans can show dominance over nature, it has a boundary. Even if humans can control nature up to a certain point, nature finishes it. He could not control human behavior, yet he wanted to say in a different way—humans are ordinary living beings, members of the biotic community.

He repeatedly said one thing— “A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.” Arne Næss placed great emphasis on this type of experience. The master key to this experience was Gestalt or a holistic perspective. Analyzing Leopold’s experience shows that there is no mention of any isolated entity there. In the aforementioned doctrine, it is accepted that there is a special relationship among all entities because all these entities are nodes within an expanded web.

When someone truly gains a deep experience, they build a far-reaching relationship of oneness by deeply feeling that experience. This relationship of oneness develops through empathy, which helps establish a good relationship with non-human entities as well. This oneness helps expand the maturity of the entity. As a result, it can understand that every entity is interconnected with all other entities. Therefore, if one entity is destroyed, all other entities will be destroyed. Human society establishes a sympathetic attitude toward nature, not for the elevation of human society, but to keep them alive. Humans can understand that all other types of gross and subtle entities are integral parts of a collective ecosystem. Næss termed this state as the process of self-realization. Næss called this kind of transformed entity the ‘Ecological Self’.



Each entity is a node of the web of entities.

All entities emerge and express themselves as intrinsically valuable, without any economic or utilitarian value to human society. Human centering creates an obstacle to self-realization because they do not believe in granting equal value to non-human entities. As a new ethic, human and non-human entities are considered fundamentally equal. Some ecocentric perspectives clash with anthropocentric (human-centered) perspectives. In the anthropocentric perspective, it is said—only human entities are intrinsically valuable, and non-human entities have value only in the context of human necessity. But Næss’s perspective is

different. In his realization, new information about the relationship between the knower and the known can be found through deep experience and deep inquiry, for the sake of clarifying fundamental beliefs, and deep inquiry helps transform these beliefs into lifestyle decisions and actions. Special attention needs to be given to the task of transforming beliefs into actions. Based on action, deep ecology can be distinguished from other environmental ethics. For these actions, deep ecology can be called a grassroots movement rather than placing it under the scope of philosophy. Through deep inquiry, a person can decorate their life's perspective anew, and this perspective will help that person choose a lifestyle. When a person, by questioning society, determines the ecocentric perspective as the main mantra of their life, then that person cannot accept the pre-determined conditions of society's structure. If one focuses deeply on Western history, it can be seen how the anthropocentric perspective is being expressed through science, economics, and philosophy. How the stream of globalization is flowing across the world in contemporary times, and how human society, culture, and nature or environment are moving towards destruction through an unhindered market economy, is easily understandable.

Arne Næss first used the term “Deep Ecology” in 1972. He tried to show through this term that—nature or the environment is situated at a place characterized by intrinsic value. In the context of discussing “Deep Ecology” or deep environmental ethics, Næss said—the doctrine named “Shallow Ecology” views nature or the environment through human utility. Næss and other environmentalists say that mutual harmony exists among all things on Earth, and Næss's statement on this was - “Those who have experienced such a transformation of consciousness (experiencing what is sometimes called one's “ecology self” in these movements) view the self not as separate from a superior to all else, but rather as a small part of entire cosmos.”

Most deep ecologists identify their perspective as ‘Ecocentrism’ or ‘Biocentrism’. According to them, humans are disrupting the balance of nature, resulting in the destruction of the lives of all other living entities. They shed light on the anthropocentric (human-centered) perspective, which determines the value of nature solely based on human utility. The foundation of the anthropocentric attitude lies in Western religion and philosophy. Quite a few deep ecologists have said—if the human race wants to survive, it must become restrained. They say that if humans take the core components for their sustenance from the environment and live in oneness with it, only then will the environment be granted its own dignity. The thoughts and ideas of deep ecologists are not entirely new; these ideas can be found in many religious practices. References to environmental ethics can be found in the religious teachings of the Asian continent—such as Taoism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. It can also be said that as an independent philosophy and a movement, the scope of deep ecology is far-reaching. Heading (Development of Deep Ecology)

The doctrine named “Deep Ecology” was established as a new environmental theory in 1973 by Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss. According to Arne Næss, the subject of discussion in any ‘Ecological Science’ consists of factual events and logic. That is, he wanted to mean that—whenever ‘Ecological Science’ discusses nature or the ecosystem, and whatever conclusions other Ecologists arrive at through it, those methods or fundamental subjects rely on factual events and logic. They make Ecological decisions based purely on logic. Ecologists never raise any ethical questions, nor do they want to bring their methods under the purview of morality. They have no concern regarding how humans should live or how they should lead their lives. To understand ethical questions regarding ‘Ecology’ or how we should live in our lives, what is needed is ‘Ecological Wisdom’

In order to reach the stage of ecological wisdom through “Deep Ecology” or deep environmental ethics, Arne Næss emphasized ‘Deep Experience’, deep inquiry, and deep commitment. This experience helps in creating or understanding an interconnected system where everything is mutually dependent. Arne Næss termed this interconnected system as ‘Ecosophy’. In the words of Arne Næss— “Ecosophy: an evolving but consistent philosophy of being thinking and acting in the world, that embodies ecological wisdom and harmony.”

He rejected the idea that the value of an object or entity is entirely context-dependent. A context-dependent value is one where the value of an object or entity is determined in relation to another object (Marx). For example—the value of a tree is determined based on its utility. A Sal tree has high utility, whereas a Krishnachura (Royal Poinciana) tree does not have that same level of utility. Because the valuable goods or materials that can be made from a Sal tree cannot be made from a Krishnachura tree. Therefore, the value of a Sal tree is determined in the context of other trees and its utility. Marx established an independent theory regarding the value of an object or entity. As an independent entity, humans perform various types of work through the application of logic; hence, in comparison to all other living beings, the human entity is placed at a higher position. That is, because the human entity has the ability to control all living beings through the application of logic and intellect, humans are designated as superior and powerful. They are considered more valuable compared to other animals. Arne Næss, however, believed in establishing the universal right to survival for all types of existing entities, which results in no independent species having a greater right to survive than any other species, nor can such an ownership claim be morally recognized. Regarding the aforementioned metaphysical concept, Fox claimed that— human entities and all other entities are— “Aspects of a Single unfolding reality.”

A central idea expressed by Aldo Leopold in his famous work *A Sand County Almanac* (1949) is that human beings should regard themselves as ordinary members of the Biotic Community. In this respect, the ideas of Deep Ecology and Leopold’s Land Ethic are very similar. Deep Ecology also supports the fundamental principle of Leopold’s Land Ethic:

“A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.”

According to Deep Ecology, human beings should abandon their attitude of domination over nature and their narrow, self-centered outlook regarding nature and the environment. To maintain ecological balance, it is necessary to adopt ways of life and patterns of action that are environmentally responsible. Deep Ecologists emphasize putting these principles into practice in everyday life.

However, this perspective differs from some other environmental theories. Although many people today advocate modifying moral rules and social policies in response to changing circumstances, they argue that such changes often contribute to environmental degradation. Therefore, they call for the revision of those moral principles and social practices that are harmful to the environment. They maintain that many existing values and policies should be transformed so that people become more conscious of the importance of environmental balance and protection.

Basic Principles of Deep Ecology

1. Human and non-human beings living on Earth have the right to live and flourish. They possess intrinsic value (value in themselves), and this value is independent of their usefulness to humans.
2. The richness and diversity of life contribute to the realization of these values and therefore possess intrinsic worth.
3. Human beings have no right to reduce or destroy this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.
4. For the flourishing of human life and culture, a substantial reduction in the human population is desirable. The flourishing of non-human life also requires a decrease and control of human population.
5. At present, human interference in the non-human world has become excessive, and this situation is steadily worsening.

6. Therefore, significant changes are required not only in ideology and values but also in economic, technological, and political structures. Such transformation is essential for creating a sustainable and ecologically balanced society.
7. Fundamental change must be directed toward improving the quality of life. Such improvement should not be measured merely by an increasingly higher standard of living. One must be aware of the difference between “Big” and “Great.”

Ecophilosophy

Ecophilosophy refers to understanding environmental problems and discussing them through a philosophical approach. In ecophilosophy, various basic philosophical concepts are used to understand the position of human beings within nature. It has two practical aspects.

The first aspect involves the use of a profound ecological philosophy that helps us understand the fundamental concepts of ecology and the interrelationships among them.

The second aspect concerns social and political life. Here, the prevailing ideas and institutions that are considered harmful to the environment are critically examined, and movements are organized to bring about change.

Deep ecologists have developed several guiding principles. It is said that those who believe environmental problems can be solved only through technological measures do not fully appreciate the depth of ecological thinking. Deep ecology teaches us to view ourselves not from a narrow, self-centered perspective but from a broader perspective that recognizes our place within the larger ecological whole.

According to this view, many of the ideas and values that dominate modern civilization need to be critically evaluated and, where necessary, revised. The aim is to establish a way of life that is environmentally responsible and ecologically sustainable.

The two fundamental principles that have been widely discussed in deep ecology and that have influenced contemporary environmental philosophy are presented below.

1) Unity

2) Diversity

English Translation of the Paragraph:

If people work together to bring about change in society or in a group, then a common objective among them is desirable. However, this does not mean that differences in their opinions, lifestyles, or perspectives should be reduced. An environmental movement becomes stronger when it embraces diversity.

The principles of the movement have developed from various traditions and different viewpoints about the world. It is said that environmentalism contains many fundamental values, and the more these values are connected with philosophical, scientific, and religious understandings, the more comprehensive and meaningful the movement becomes.

The philosophical aspect of ecophilosophy has been especially developed by researchers in the Western world. As a result, different branches of deep ecology have emerged. One such branch is known as Ecosophy, a philosophical approach associated with deep ecology.

The most important point to Naess is that when humans learn to use familiar intelligence and reason purposefully, only then can they arrive at that ultimate conclusion. In this regard, Naess believes that even if

someone reasonably rejects what he has advocated to the teachers, it will not cause any difficulty in reaching his conclusion. Here, the conclusion or goal is to create a philosophy for oneself, in one's own way, which is fully supported by one's own understanding and intellect. Reaching any other conclusion that resembles Naess's will not make that individual's effort unsuccessful. While some philosophers believe they have solved all existential problems related to all kinds of crises, others think they have proven that all the aforementioned problems are unsolvable. However, Naess has said that every individual should take some time to present or explain their own perspective. He has accepted various different points of view, even though mutually contradictory explanations are probabilistic and coherent, and in this case, this difference acts as an obstacle to conveying the same concept to others. In his book *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* (1989), among the issues Naess discussed, Ecosophy T is particularly noteworthy, and within that Ecosophy T, certain distinct terms have been used, which are discussed below.

a) Milieu/Environment: The two words Milieu / Environment are synonymous and co-extensive. These two words basically originate from a Norwegian word Miljø. Just as the Norwegian word is used in a broad sense in its own language, the word 'environment' has been adopted here in its familiar sense. These concepts are essential for understanding Naess's deep ecology. Environmental problems mean the destruction of what is around us and the ruin of those among whom we directly live. Here, it is not just talking about biological nature or environment. In this context, Naess sheds light on our broader entity. According to Naess, among these concepts, nature and life are complex issues. The word nature (Nature) appears in different contexts in English and Scandinavian languages, and the qualitative value of these meanings explains our significance. Naess did not want to give any standard of living here; rather, he believed that each individual should acquire the ability to make their own decisions in the world through an Ecosophy. At first, we look at the world as a whole, then our awareness about the internal connections of the world increases. As a result, a sudden new realization enlightens us. In a moment, we can see a change; suddenly, we can recognize everything anew. It is an experience that inspires us through true knowledge in a moment. The purpose of his book *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* was to encourage inquiry among humans as an immediate multi-faceted generalization, through which a radical transformation of the individual is possible.

b) Self Realisation : To realize the relationship between our species and the Earth, the specific type of helper or point-switch that is needed can have many underlying purposes. Among these various purposes, the core tone is that everyone becomes interconnected with nature through the principle of internal relationships in nature. Naess's core concept is 'Self Realization', by which he means—"all beings are fundamentally one"—even though everyone's individual needs and perspectives are different. Self-realization does not mean self-centeredness. Naess has used a capital 'S' here in Self Realization, but he has also mentioned that during the realization of the big Self, the destruction of our small self, meaning the individual being, does not occur. The diversity of different individual beings and differences in thought processes will persist, but they will all be connected to a larger whole in one way or another. Regarding this, it has been said— 'We cannot simply split into units, pursuing our own goals. This is why Naess requires the concept of a greater self'.

We cannot directly split into separate units where each of us is moving toward our own individual goals. This is why Naess introduced the concept of a greater Self. If a person can truly expand their existence to include other individuals, other species, and nature, then altruism becomes unnecessary. This has been viewed as a conscious expansion, through which our capacity for self-realization increases; in self-realization, we become part of the expanded existence of others. The term 'Self Realising' is used in the Norwegian language as 'Selv-Realisering'. No one can suddenly reach the ultimate limit of self-realization. In Naess's words, reaching the ultimate limit of Self Realization means the self-realization of the entire living world — "Just as no one in certain. A Buddhist tradition ever reaches nirvana, as the rest of the world must be pulled along to get there. It is only a process, a way to live one's life" ⁴¹. Here, Naess has viewed the concept of self-realization as a guide that shows us the direction to move forward. It helps us see all our actions as part of a larger whole, but this is an endless journey. Here, comparing it with Buddhist thought, he

says—attaining Nirvana is not that easy of a task because to reach Nirvana, an individual must lift and carry everything from the external world along with them. Similarly, this is a way for an individual to lead their life. The concept acts as a form of guideline or direction for moving forward. Through this, we are able to view our own actions as part of a larger Gestalt or whole.

Here Naess says that just like non-violence, ‘self-realization’ is a vague word or term, which points to a direction centered around the soul or individual self, moving toward which maintains morality. When Arne Naess introduces his doctrine using the standard of ‘Self Realisation’, many questions arise. We are told that this realization will not be limited only to a restricted existence, but rather it will try to internalize a sense of all-encompassing existence. This existence or ‘Self’ expands from each individual entity to eventually include all living beings. Naess speaks of a specific kind of relational thinking here. According to him, no isolation is stable. An individual, a species, or an environmental problem is connected to other surrounding matters. When an understanding or thought about something arises within us, we see it expressed knowingly or convey it to others; but until that subject becomes a matter of another’s realization, it does not gain collective importance. Any word finds its ultimate meaning only through its value and acceptable explanation. This is the practical outcome of the realization of ‘Ecosophical Ontology’. To understand the meaning of a concept, if it is used in a specific context, it is also necessary to have an understanding of other concepts. That is, we can recognize a whole in a unified way and as a single web of life, when the knowledge of internal relations between them operates actively. The perception that becomes understandable to us in this manner is called ‘Gestalt’. This word is taken directly from Gestalt psychology and seems to naturally influence us. Presenting oneself within this living reality is a natural characteristic; in this case, our belief grows that the form or identity of any object is formed by its relationships.

c) **Derivation** : The process of our dynamics is what Arne Naess has viewed as integrated through Derivation. In this case, he acknowledges the concept of Logical Derivation. He believes that through logic/reasoning, the self-realization of all beings is possible. Naess wants to see how we can justify and connect the process of all our beliefs with our fundamental, initial self-realization. Here, he uses pure logic. Naess believes that within every relationship, we are eager to see the reflection of a larger framework. When a specific realization is complete, we get a glimpse of the entire whole.

d) **Identification**: The experiential dynamic process expresses itself through identification, which is called Identifisering in the Norwegian language. We discover that a part of nature is also a part of us. There is no isolated entity. If we deny interconnected entities, then the path to our self-realization becomes blocked. In the case of specific environmental conflicts, the source of the kind of ecological thinking that can be strongly applied is a type of self-realization.

We will shed light on the important needs of the ecosystem. If we are attentive to the needs of other animals just as we are to humans, then there will be no conflict of interest. This is the primary tool for advancing an individual’s self-realization and for achieving the completeness of life. When our true development occurs, the concept called ‘environment’ becomes unnecessary. Because through love, we can recognize our interconnected existence, which in reality is not indescribable. In this context, including everything else as a part of us does not mean that our existence will somehow be erased. Since we share similarities with other parts of nature, consequently, this oneness is natural. The value of nature does not depend on our evaluation. Because according to Naess, nature possesses intrinsic value (Intrinsic Value of Nature).

e) **Intrinsic Value**: The meaning of ‘Intrinsic Value’ is inherent value or independent value. The question is, if we are connected with nature, then what exists separately or independently from us? The value we attribute to nature is not as independent from us as they are in themselves. An independent entity deserves respect simply by virtue of its own worthiness. We can be certain about their qualitative value without any thought about their functional utility, just as a friend considers another friend valuable without thinking about their utility.

f) Depth: Wittgenstein said that ordinary thinking is a lot like swimming on the surface. A philosopher's job is to enter into the depths of problems and situations to resolve them, and to investigate the connections and sources of various events.

Philosophical Ecology is deep ecology in this sense. Naess first used this term in 1970. Subsequently, various insights occurred with its help—such as adopting a comprehensive perspective from ecology to reach a state of ultimate protest, through which the deepest sources of a theory are blossomed in an instant. Here, depth refers to that distance which is essential for a truth-seeking individual to cross in order to find the root clue of any problem. In this case, the problem must never be kept confined within any limit or boundary. A relatively easily understandable solution should not be accepted because, in that case, going deep to touch the center will not happen. Along with going deep, an individual thinks not only about their own species but rather about all living beings and about the Earth. This Earth or planet is above us, more fundamental than us, and it is deeper than any isolated special species.

Bibliography

- Attfeld, Robin, *The Ethics of Environmental Concern*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998.
- Chakraborty, Nirmalya Narayan [Ed.], *Different Aspect of Environmental Concern*, Rabindra Bharati University Press, Kolkata, 2001.
- Devall, Bill, and Sessions, George, “Deep Ecology”, Louis P. Pojman [Ed.], *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, London, 1994.
- Harding, Stephan, “What is Deep Ecology”.www.schumachercollege.org.uk/learning.../what-is-deep-ecology. cited on 23/06/09.
- Leopold, Aldo, “*Land Ethics*”, James E, White (Ed.),*Contemporary Moral Problems*, (7th Eds.), Wadsworth, U.S.A, 2003.
- Naess, Arne, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*,(Rothenberg, David, Trans. and Ed.), Cambridge University Press, UK, 1989.
- Watson, Richard, “A Critique of Anti- Anthropocentric Biocentrism”, Louis P. Pojman [Ed.], *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, London, 1994.

Citation: Nandy. Dr. S., (2026) “Deep Ecology: A Lifestyle of Arne Næss”, *Bharati International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Development (BIJMRD)*, Vol-4, Issue-05, May-2026.