

CRITICISM OF THE GREEN MOVEMENT: BETWEEN THE PARTIAL, THE HOLISTIC, AND THE PARTICULAR

Rommel Utungga Pasopati

Graduate Student of Driyarkara School of Philosophy Jakarta

E - m a i l : rommelpasopati@yahoo.com

A B S T R A C T

Green movement, known as environmentalism, accused modernism in supporting anthropocentrism to destroy nature. The environmental damage is excess of natural exploitation as result of human being's deed as subject to nature as object. Human, whom in modern context is considered eligible partially to be progressive, exploits natural resources through human-based democracy. This exploitation is contested by environmentalism which sees human and nature in a cosmological holistic unity; people should be responsible to nature than exploit it for own progress. Environmentalism criticizes modernism in radical or democratic way. While radical side sees nature as a metaphysical ideology, democratic side sees nature from human's view. Actions—from demonstrations, green politics, to sustainable development—still show separations between human and nature. There is an alternative beside partial-modern and holistic-environmentalism; that is particularity. Highlighting the particular means understanding minor stories in everyday life, emphasizing human's specific choices, and exposing possibility of human's attention to nature as seen in their contacts with natural damage. Its characteristics are appreciating uniqueness of every living creature, living together with natural life, rejecting any single ideological for human and nature, and looking at mutual relationships between human and nature. Not throwing rubbish to any place, recycling waste, and doing cleaning work together (*kerja bakti*) are even more meaningful for individuals rather than talking about green paradigm. In short, highlighting particularity of everyday life may show anthropocentric and ecocentric relations in deeper human and nature frameworks.

KEYWORDS: anthropocentrism, ecocentrism, environmentalism, modernism, particularity

INTRODUCTION

Essentially, ecological ideas rely on presuppositions of nature and how humans think about it. Human beings think about nature then they at once think ecologically. Humans then form the science of nature so that nature can be understood furthermore. Humans also keep nature standing on its own but humans can understand it as long as he interact with nature itself. In today's understanding, ecological matters not only deal with the science of nature but also how it is tied to human action which tends to exploit nature. This condition then compels ecological thought into a movement against modernism. The movement is a result of mistrust of a modern, mechanistic-inclined system. Environmentalism then becomes a counter-culture of the conformity shaped by modern life (del Mar, 2006: 85-86).

At this time, human and natural conditions are no longer neutral but in tension because nature is not as itself but subordination of human existence. Nature has been claimed by modern man through its autonomy and freedom. Ecology is no longer able to explain how humans exploit nature that impacts to its destruction. Environmentalism then emerged around 1980s through an eco-philosophy understanding about abstraction of natural conditions and actions in response to the ecological inability to stem the destruction of nature. This thought is such human freedom in the form of a romantic collective consciousness of nature (del Mar, 2006: 97-98). Along with cultural studies and social criticism, environmentalism radically continues to reject modern human presuppositions to nature. Nevertheless, the radical side is not entirely so because many environmental thinkers prefer a representative modern democratic path to save nature. This condition then creates a dilemma in environmentalism between rejecting the philosophical supposition of nature's human nature and accepting then improving nature via policy in modern democracy.

From the above explanation, there is a shift of perspective from duality to dualism of man and nature ecologically. Both human and nature want to stand on their own but both must face tendency of acquisition from one side to the other. On the one hand, modern man desires partiality on nature so that man can use and exploit it for his own sake. On the other hand, nature in fact is holistic with humans as one of its elements so that both nature and man are inseparable. The green movement is precisely within the debate between presupposition of man and nature especially in aspect of human language of nature. The question then is not how the natural way of speaking to man but how humans can hear the language of nature itself (Wall, 1999:9-10). Nevertheless, the green movement was not able to erode modernity until now. Environmentalism overemphasizes dualism of human and natural presuppositions without ever stating duality presupposition of their interactions. Environmentalism departs only from the destruction of nature

and promotes the preference of the natural rather than the human side. This is such an epistemological problem in environmentalism. Environmentalism that is subject to natural destruction tends to see absolute empirical truth while real nature of the holistic is about the sublime (Wall, 1999:11). The sublime is not trapped in determination so it is not easily understood if only through a single interpretation. Nature requires constant but various interpretations rather than the mere condition of its destruction. The construction of such thought is not real because man is the one who must interpret natural language because nature cannot speak and stand for itself.

Thus, could there be any alternative to dualism presupposition of man over nature? Could there be a side of duality besides the binary opposition of man and nature? Is it possible to bridge between partial-human perspective and holistic-nature view? This paper addresses this possibility by proposing an alternative view of particularity that highlights the interaction of human and nature in everyday life. Through particularity, such interaction does not merely reject modernity entirely or obey it via green democracy alone. The everyday life correlates the philosophical and the practical by highlighting minor narrations of man and nature. This paper consists of several sub-chapters; introduction, tensions of modernism and environmentalism, criticisms of the green movement, particular human and nature interactions, conclusions, and references.

Tensions Between Modernism and Environmentalism

The main tension of modernism and environmentalism is essentially between what is ethical to human and ethical to nature. For modernism, man is the center of the world so that everything happens for his own sake. As long as humans continue to live and to thrive, other things can be negated for its sake, including nature. Modernism is developing for the sake of human by doing exploitations of nature at this time which impact to its damage at once. Different from modernism, environmentalism holds that nature exists before human beings so that it is actually ethical without any human being's deed at all. As nature itself is already ethically placed in human thought, environmental ethics is not some kind of deontological duty ethic but an invitation from nature to humans to re-unite with it (Naess in del Mar, 2006:129-130). What is ethical for nature in fact negates human beings in their actions because as far as humanity exists, the destruction of nature also persists. Both modernism and environmentalism basically stand on two different things and distinguish one another.

Philosophically, modernism rests on anthropocentrism level of virtue of man in its actualization of rational, autonomous, and free subject. The rational side explains how humans can think about themselves directly with the world. The autonomous side demonstrates its ability to define itself through its

rationality (Hay, 2002: 314). As a result, the side of freedom is inherent as an entity that can be distant herself from the world and determine it all at once. These three sides form a subject that is not only silent but also develop progressively through knowledge or *logos* to the other side outside of itself. The advancement of human knowledge enables her to exist as individual and social beings without losing his essence. This is due to human subjectivity that stands within itself, claims the other side, and at the same time put herself away from the world. Humans can choose to unite with or put away to the world for its own sustainability. From that view, modernism forms humanity as far as it is partial and universal to the world. Man is indeed formed from the social construction of the world but it also enables her understanding of *logos*. Thus, as far as it is for *logos*, the world is an instrument for man. Through the advancement of *logos* reflected in technology, human shapes the world including nature according to his will.

Meanwhile, environmentalism holds that humans rationally understand nature as a place that binds human existence altogether (Armiero and Sedrez, 2014: 2-3). This thought then tends to rest on ecocentrism through virtue of nature as basis of its understanding. This view is proposed to negate the modern view of nature which is merely an object for human. Nature actually exists cosmologically wider than human hence cannot surely be claimed by *logos*. What is stated as cosmological comes before human, and is holistic over human involvement in nature. It is certainly different from partial, universal, and atomistic subjectivity because environmentalism views human as an integral part of nature. Human cannot be distant with nature and claims it at once because nature is actually about interconnectedness and interdependence (Armiero and Sedrez, 2014: 1-2).

Nature is quite condition and network than merely centralized ego of human as subject. Thus, before human determines herself as individual and social being, she is already being involved in natural conditions that precede her. If modernism sees the essence of human beings in the rationality, autonomy, and freedom of the subject, environmentalism is more likely to see that the ecological side of nature that firstly forms human dignity. This is due to intrinsic value of nature which basically has three characteristics as deemed necessary in deep ecology; a non-instrumental value form, valuable in its own category independent of others, and an independent form of objective value of nature (O'Neill in Pepper, 1996:50). Those three characteristics then tends to enable and make nature possible for man's understandings.

The above different modalities basically move towards environmentalism criticism of modernism that supports progressive human action and makes nature an instrument for human beings. This view of instrumentalism has in fact resulted in the destruction of nature while benefiting continuity of human existence (Beck in Hay, 202:317). This view then affects ethical responsibility of nature. Modernism holds that humans are tentatively responsible for nature

because humans are the center of the world and nature does exist only for human sustainability. Nature is also considered to have its own mechanism to recover itself without any human intervention. Environmentalism rejects that assumption by stating that human beings are absolutely responsible for nature because human beings have acted arbitrarily upon nature. Precisely because humans are part of nature, the damage to nature will also impact on human sustainability. Floods, landslides, and global warming are the impacts of human instrumentalism on nature. The criticism is also aimed at decision-making process in democracy that in fact tends to perpetuate exploitation of nature rather than to awaken human awareness about their intensive interactions with nature. Democracy is accused in supporting technocracies that technologically profit from exploitation of natural resources. However, environmentalism is considered to be dragged into the flow of democracy in the struggle for interests rather than expanding human participation in understanding of nature. Democracy, which is full of legitimacy of the institution, uses nature as a political instrument (Smith in Wissenburg and Levy, 2004:149-150). In other words, nature remains under the power of democracy and it will only be considered as far as human interests are concerned.

The advancement of environmentalism in democracy is caused by a crisis of participation related to the destruction of nature (Eckersley, 1992:8-11). Since the public began to highlight the destruction of nature around the 1960s, environmentalism began to involve itself in the democratic process to overcome the crisis. This view is widely challenged because it is considered 'reconciled' with modernism and mixing interactive participation with democratic representation. Those who disagreed then tend to be critical and even radical towards democracy. Therefore, against democracy, environmentalism branched off at two standpoints; radical and deliberative ones. Radically, democracy must be replaced by a more dynamic and friendly biocracy for the sake of nature. Humans must live not by instrumentalist technology but with holistic integrity in nature. Nature has provided everything but it does not mean humans can exploit it arbitrarily without any stopping. The human presupposition of reason, autonomy, and freedom must be aligned and inspired from the natural conditions. Deliberatively, environmentalists are aware that democracy is already too massive to be replaced, and the solution is to reconcile with the democratic system by accommodating the issue of natural improvement. Theoretically, the radical side of criticism of environmentalism from philosophy and cultural studies continues to move through postmodernism and its current critical interactions while the involvement in the democratic system refers to green politics based on green paradigm. Both of them negate each other because of differences between the philosophical-critical and the practical-political sides.

Criticism of the Green Movement

Green movement or environmentalism is not as easy as it can eliminate anthropocentric power in modernism. Modernism with its major principle of progress for human beings is still growing and destroying nature for its own benefit. Environmentalism itself is divided into the deliberative and the radical ones. Both then must face criticism ontologically, epistemologically, and ethically. Although both are based on criticisms of modernism, both remain based on dualism of binary opposition between man and nature. The dualism lies in three main things; one side justified and the other blamed, improvement on one side will directly fix the other, and removal on one side will automatically favor the other. Of these three, environmentalism is subject to criticism from modernism itself, eco-philosophy, cultural studies, to postmodernism. All of them question the critical side of environmentalism which in fact only shows binary oppositions; become one with or stay away from modernism.

The deliberative side of environmentalism remains grounded in the modern view as far as its active involvement in modernism is concerned. Through politics of green paradigm, democracy is regarded as an instrument for natural improvement through a policy adopted by the majority. This side is no different from the usual politics that compete others to achieve certain interest that is considered a final democratic decision. It is kind of weird that the natural destruction caused by the excesses of modern democracy would like to be fixed by another democratic mechanism. Similarly, this deliberative side does not reject modern *logos* as long as it does not destroy nature or progress is allowed as long as nature remains sustainable. It is absolutely too ideal for humans or nature. In fact, any advance in knowledge will surely sacrifice the existence of nature. The green policy then only does some kind of negotiation so that the damage of nature can be improved with the advancement of human knowledge. This is difficult to be done as how *logos* form human beings to be distant to nature while environmentalism relies on ecocentrism that requires full human involvement to nature. The ideal side in the ecocentric framework for environmentalism is in fact more utopian as green politics is increasingly drawn into the flow of modern democracy rather than opposing it as criticism. Environmentalism was also criticized as being not entirely anti-modern and often still relying on anthropocentrism as a way out of destruction of nature done by human beings.

Similarly, the green revolution that coincides with sustainable development within the framework of environmentalism still presumes human domination over nature. To the extent that humans are involved in nature, environmentalist seems could alter dominative side of human beings to a more accommodative one. In fact, the accommodation does exist and is increasingly massive lately but still by making nature as object for progressive

subject. Sustainable development, which involves ecocentric thought, is in fact measured through the concept of capital especially on economic calculations between economic growth and equity (Holland in Jamieson, 2001:396-397). From those economic sides, negotiations are conducted primarily in how to keep nature sustainable while humans can still get maximal benefit from it. Environmentalism then is trapped between the matter of economic growth and equity dilemma while at first nature was considered preceding both economic benefits. Nature is still understood in anthropocentric circle rather than being seen as itself. Human's perspective remain the one and the ultimate view for nature so that the ideal of elimination of natural exploitation is only considered as ideal without the real. The foundation of human being is worsened by extensions of the economic sides so that environmentalism indirectly still supports the expansions of capitalism to nature beings on behalf of the gain of human *logos*.

Moreover, the concept of environmental justice still relates to anthropocentric view so far. A logic that nature must be more highlighted than humans does not merely indicate the decline of human domination over nature. Justice that tends to be distributive, rather than participatory, is still considered necessary for the green movement. This kind of justice, however, is still limited to emissions transactions by presuming distinction between the developed-the industrialized and the dominant-the subordinate (Jamieson in Sandler and Pezzullo, 2007:90-91). The role of the state, in the Kyoto Protocol, the UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change), to REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), which is regarded as justice for nature only seeking cure for destruction of nature without ever touching human habits that mainly cause it. The destruction of nature is considered as political rather than ethical condition. To the extent that nature becomes corrupted, distributive justice merely tries to diminish it as a response to the outcome of human progress in knowledge. The outcome or result in this concept is the pre-existing human knowledge of nature as both 'entirely different nature from man' and 'man is part of nature' stated in binary opposition dualism (Jamieson in Sandler and Pezzullo, 2007:93-95). It only sees results rather than what kind of process that cause such damage.

Natural damage is only responded in emissions transactions that basically still depend on the economic capability of a country in protecting its environment. Industrialized countries are pushing third world countries to conserve their forest whereas the cause of such damage is advancement in technological progress of first world countries. This view remains very partial because natural damage is only considered as a result that needs to be treated without any need to eliminate the cause. Justice for nature is then only considered distributive, as linearly intended for world peace, whereas interaction between human and nature is in fact very complicated and even full

of dilemmas like in network. Today's participation exists only as dominance is intended in justice for nature whereas real participation is not formal and relies on process rather than result (Figueroa and Mills in Jamieson, 2001:427-428). Nature today is seen as a corrupted object needs to be paid attention by capable subject who could fix it.

The deliberative side of environmentalism, in fact, cannot fully relies on nature because humans are still considered the main subject that can either destroy or preserve the existence of nature. The epistemology of deliberative environmentalism is anthropocentric human beings rather than ecocentric ones. Environmentalism today is *the bastard of modernity*; the stepson of modernity who does not recognize his father but he realizes he is a child of the condition. Insofar as any environmentalism criticizes modernism, it cannot avoid the promises of modernism over the restoration of nature. The deliberative side of this view is not completely anti-modernism because it only introduces ecocentric logic to the anthropocentric world.

The radical or critical side of the green movement is not without weakness. Radical environmentalism rejects modernism but is also trapped in a single view of nature. The holistic side as the intrinsic value of nature is seen as an inviolable primary value or truth that never needs to be reviewed. The holistic side of nature forms environmentalism into an anti-human view. This view is too objective and value-free while holistic nature is a realm that is directly involved with humans (O'Neill in Pepper, 1996: 51). In other word, holistic nature has become an ideology for radical environmentalism. This ideology is a metaphysical reference to the green movement by purely accentuating nature and eliminating human existence. The concept that nature is holistic is shaped into a single value which is not in fact holistic at all. If nature as a holistic value enables all entities in it to remain alive, the holistic view as an ideology tries to eliminate other values that want to undermine the purity of nature. It is because holistic realm of ideology is the result of political discourse in environmentalism rather than its direct philosophical presuppositions (Milton, 1996:28). Nature actually did exist long before human existence both ontologically and ethically, but making it an epistemological absolute will only form such monolithic ideology. The monolithic side also means abolishing humans and favoring biotic and abiotic entities in the name of nature as an absolute truth.

Similarly, the empirical fact of natural destruction caused by human technology is absolutely ideological for radical environmentalism. Those empirical facts are not free values at all but presuppose the dualism of subject and object. The destruction of nature is still regarded as the object and the human being is the subject that destroys it. There is no logic other than this, then anthropocentrism will always be the point of criticism of radical environmentalism. Everything related to the destruction of nature will be linked to human act which is always considered as destructive. Human is only

seen as the evil to nature. The condition also reverses nature into subject for human. Only by returning to an ecological view can man be redirected to nature. Humans shaped by human autonomy in *gessellschaft* or social constructions are shifted into nature-based *gemeinschaft* or natural construction as a source of knowledge of all things (Tönnies in Pepper, 1996:59-61). Science that is distant from nature is turned into an absolute ecology so that progress is only stated in nature than human. In fact, the statement about nature constructing man is also a social construction because it is manifested by man himself. If so, the ideological view of the destruction of nature will not restore nature to its own essence. Nature is only a justification for the ideology of radical environmentalism.

Basically, environmentalism rests on the concept that nature existed before humanity. Nature has ethically established human long before this entity could freely and autonomously determines himself (Elliot in Jamieson, 2001:180). The side only states single direction without considering possibility of reverse direction or any interaction that may arise. Looking at only one side affecting the other side clearly shows ideological rather than open analysis. The holistic side of nature is not much different from the partial side of human as both remain an absolute value for ideology. How nature affects humans in one-way is intended by radical environmentalism to show the natural independence from human (Pepper, 1996:50). This view is clearly different from the holistic side itself which shows the complexity of interdependence rather than the simplicity of independence alone. In fact, nature is more meaningful when it influences and is influenced by humans in an inter-subjective relationship. Deliberative and radical environmentalism ignore such interactions by taking only one side either humans or nature. This polarization is considered paradigmatic rather than practical because both views presuppose the certainty of cause and effect which in fact is contrary to diversity and wholeness of life itself (Eckersley, 1992:55). Such presupposition does not enable or make possible all existing sides, but it tries to eliminate the other side for the sake of one only side.

Particular Human and Nature Interactions

From the above explanations, both modernism and green movement rely on the system as their presuppositions. Modernism sees man as a whole rather than individually so that modern system dictates humans as it is the system of man himself. The green movement on its deliberative side believes in the ability of the democratic system while its radical side sees nature as a holistic system. Aspects of the system above only rest on one side without regard to any wider interaction. Modernism sees nature only as an object to be exploited for the advancement of *logos* whereas environmentalism interprets humans as evil in its anthropocentric conditions. Likewise both thoughts show ideologies that

are not universal but part of the whole is intended for all things. The view sees nature only as far as 'exist' or 'does not exist' without any other possibility otherwise. This perspective also corresponds to distinguished concept of 'human' and 'non-human' which contains differences and distinctions that favor one side and lower the other (Hay, 2002:122-123). Modernism values partiality to distant human from nature while environmentalism presupposes holistic view to resist modern conditions. The problem is, both thoughts ignore the tension between human and nature in their interactions. The interaction between humans and nature is not as easy as the advancement of human knowledge or empirical damage to nature. Human interaction is not only stated in major stories but is also directly lived by man and nature in minor narrations.

Different from modernism and environmentalism, another alternative view is to highlight the particularity in everyday life. This particularity contains the partial and the holistic because they interact each other in life. The particular highlights minor stories as reflected in everyday life that are in fact undermined by modern life. This understanding explains how everyday life is much more liberating to human beings than just following the trends of modern life (de Certeau, 1984:68-69). The minor ones in human terms emphasize choices in human action over nature especially in full of commitment to nature and denial of modernism (Milton, 1996:27). Human is not a monolithic entity but varies in knowledge and choices so that one side alone can never explain all things. Individuals are also considered not absolute as a subject whom entirely dictated by modern *logos*. Individuals, who understand nature in everyday life, are 'possible' subjects rather than 'definitive' ones. Humans can never be entirely modern because they can be traditional or even beyond the existing binary opposition. Human is a subject that can choose therefore he can also open a broader understanding of nature. This understanding is not due to dictation of the partial or the holistic but because of the possibility of attention as a common sense directed at human's contact with the destruction of nature every day. The contact is not only empirically or rationally but also narratively and phenomenologically. Individuals actually understand themselves as subjects and their interactions with the destruction of nature are not major ideas but as part of their everyday minor narrations that may not involve many people but must involve themselves.

The particularity in everyday life is more likely to allow humans to move inside system as a strategy as well as outside system as tactic (de Certeau, 1984:100-101). This complexity enables individual as the creative subject for herself who is responsible to nature. Individuals in everyday life do not at once obey what is dictated by modernism or fully support the views of the green movement. It can be said that individuals in everyday life are able to concoct both views in each side of their own understandings. This statement is in line with everyday democracy; human beings are democratic by highlighting

minor aspects of everyday life (Melucci in Hay, 2002:312). The particularity of everyday life shows resistance to the absoluteness of modernism and environmentalism. It is precisely this resistance that enables a real change of human actions towards the natural conditions. Individuals may reject the certainty of exploitation of nature that is considered common and normal by modernism. These subjects are also conscious subjects who are aware of themselves in process and condition rather than constrained in a particular ideology. This resistant subjects are also against stigmas and stereotypes that any natural damage can only be fixed by systemic improvement. Individuals in everyday life can preserve and conserve nature without waiting for a systemic change. Individuals at once realize human obligation of nature and right of nature to live. Movements on not littering, recycling garbage, take care of own environment, planting TOGA (*Tanaman Obat Keluarga*), and collective work (*kerja bakti*) are more meaningful for individuals than political matters in green paradigm. Understanding of the meaning is what directly touches the habit of destroying nature. This is because natural destruction and its preservation is not a matter of dualism of structure and actor, but rather duality of both in interaction of individuals and societal habits. Such 'possible' interactions also reflect actions of individuals who live modernly but do not totally obey it. Compliance as well as disobedience is what enables a further understanding of the involvement of human and nature in interactive conditions.

Furthermore, particularity views human and nature as beings in everyday life rather than in a metaphysical idealized world. Every individual has his or her own experience of nature which cannot be reduced by only modernism or environmentalism. The direct contact between man and nature does indicate a paradox between conservation and natural destruction but precisely this is where the richness of human interaction and nature manifests. This phenomenological side is actually particular rather than partial or holistic. An experience does not show only the partial or the holistic but also both. From that experience, prolonging natural destruction may still exist but hopes on conservation for sustainability of nature is also possible.

The interaction between man and nature reflects cultural construction of human and nature interaction where both sides are at once influenced and influence each other (Milton, 1996:33-34). Eco-philosophy needs to see this condition as not fully affected by modernity but beyond it. This cultural condition is what modernism and environmentalism ignore by assuming one side may one-way affect the other. In fact, interaction of human and nature in everyday life appreciate every uniqueness of any living being. Everyday life is not matter of consumption which presupposes exploitation but also production that enables conservation. Human cannot be fully considered as destructive for nature because he also understands beauty as seen in nature. Similarly, nature is not always peaceful because some natural disasters are also holistic because those interfere human existence. There is nothing considered

as normal in everyday life because everything is contact between human experience and understanding. In addition, particularity enables appreciation of life with nature as part of common coexistence (de Certeau, 1984:94). Not all individuals understand what REDD is but each individual understands how trees may support life of biotic and abiotic entities. Similarly, destructive actions of water reservoirs in city which will make a negative impact on humans are different from traditional use of wells in rural areas that often have to surrender with less water during dry season. If modern life ensures nature only as an instrument for human beings, everyday life is the opposite because it reflects an understanding of direct involvement between human and nature. In other words, if modern life presupposes a single perspective which is assumed to be good for everything, everyday life is the opposite because the condition is full of diverse understandings lived by human and nature. Nature and humankind are actually involved in interactive relationships that may enable and make each other possible. One side cannot be separated from the other side like seen in philosophical holistic view. Highlighting only one side and negating the other will only reduce wide duality of human and natural interactions.

Particularity in everyday life is also a presupposition for environmental ethics discourse. As long as humans come into direct contact with nature, humans engage in a discourse with nature; human ecology is human behavior and human ecology is human society (Milton, 1996:37). That engagement is the basis for environmental ethics that transcends the definition of modernism and environmentalism. Logically, because of the direct contact, the destruction of nature must have an impact on humans. Hence, caring and human responsibility to nature is considered as possible. This ethic is a more tangible form of participation for environmental justice than what has been widely formulated through distributive justice. This side is the holistic side of nature, but not by making it one side that controls all things, in parallel interaction with humans. Thus, the human aspect is also important for the sustainability of nature because of the real involvement in acting at all times. Nature could not stand alone without humans and vice versa while both are still independent to each other. The basis of human action towards nature is actually formed by the conditions of its various inter-subjective choices with nature rather than by human thought or logos. Like in meta-ethics, human ethical action is not without cause but is reflected from the natural conditions that come into direct contact with human language. The ethical act of man to nature is not emotional, but possibility itself in becoming conditions, while interpreted from the experience of everyday life. Everyday life in its particular view does not require a massive change like the involvement of the green movement in democracy. This is because the change is already there stated in every intersection between human experience and understanding in everyday life. Particularity relies more on the human cultural awareness of his own experience with nature. This understanding emphasizes resistance but with an

ecological view that enables human beings to at once oppose modernity and understand holistic nature. Thus, anthropocentric conditions remain concerned by providing more opportunities for further interpretation of ecocentrism. In everyday life, the discourse of anthropocentrism and ecocentrism meets and shares in human and natural interaction.

C O N C L U S I O N

The tension between modernism and environmentalism is essentially related to systemic dualism. Modernism rests to be partial by simply prioritizing human subjectivity. Environmentalism also tends to be holistic by relying on the destruction of nature rather than other interactions of man and nature. Both perspectives only focus on one only side by negating the other. Modernism negates nature and environmentalism negates human beings. Such logic is still very metaphysical, closed, and often leads to radicalism. However, both modernism and environmentalism are still so instrumental that both will still show a dominance of one against the other.

The idea of a green movement that proposes presupposition of nature could not really shift the dominance of anthropocentrism so far. This is because the desired change through democracy ignores small things faced by individuals every day. Expectations of improvement are only stacked on the structure by ignoring the existence of the actor. Ecological view becomes a kind of ideology for environmentalism as the best value applied to all which actually erodes the uniqueness of human beings. One of necessary alternative is to bring up discourse on the particularity of everyday life so that resistance to destructive modernity can be maintained as a movement at the grassroots rather than waiting for change at elite or activist levels. Movement by not littering, recycling garbage, and joint work together (*kerja bakti*) are more meaningful for individuals rather than any green politics. Precisely, by highlighting the particularity of everyday life, the uniqueness of man and nature as well the interaction of anthropocentric and ecocentric conditions can be continually understood and lived in a deeper framework.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Armiero, Marco and Sedrez, Lise (eds.), 2014, *A History of Environmentalism: Local Struggles, Global Histories*. London: Bloomsbury.
- de Certeau, Michel, 1984, *Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Del Mar, David Peterson, 2006, *Environmentalism*, London: Pearson Education Limited. Eckersley, Robyn, 1992, *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Toward an Ecocentric Approach*, New York: UCL Press.

- Hay, Peter, 2002, *Main Currents in Western Environmental Thought*, Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Jamieson, Dale, 2001, *A Companion to Environmental Philosophy*, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Milton, Kay, 1996, *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory*, London: Routledge.
- Pepper, David, 1996, *Modern Environmentalism: An Introduction*, London: Routledge.
- Sandler, Ronald and Pezzullo, Phaedra C. (eds.), 2007, *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement*, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Wall, Derek, 1999, *Earth First! And the Anti-Roads Movement: Radical Environmentalism and Comparative Social Movements*, London: Routledge.
- Wissenburg, Marcel and Levy, Yoram (eds.), 2004, *Liberal Democracy and Environmentalism: The end of environmentalism?*, London: Routledge.