

Arne Næss and the idea of an ontological thickness of the local

Jacques Chatué¹, Alida Flore Moguem Guipossi²

¹(Department of Philosophy, Psychology and Sociology/ Professor-University of Dschang, Cameroon)

²(Department of Philosophy, Psychology and Sociology / Doctorate Student-University of Dschang, Cameroon)

ABSTRACT : *The urgency of the ecological crisis popularized since 1970 has been the occasion of a growing interest in ontology. With the Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss, ontology will benefit from an epistemological argumentation which constitutes the very crucible of his thought. From his point of view, ontology occupies a central place in the resolution of the climatic phenomenon, since the destruction of nature that we are experiencing in this century is the result of the deformation of our perception of the world and of ourselves in her bosom. Hence an ontology defect. However, the place constitutes a dimension of the human. This article questions the relevance of a thickness of the ontology of the local.*

Keywords -ontology, epistemology, place, human, thickness, local

RESUME: *L'urgence de la crise écologique, popularisée depuis 1970, a été l'occasion d'un intérêt croissant pour l'ontologie. Avec le philosophe norvégien Arne Næss, l'ontologie va bénéficier d'une argumentation épistémologique, qui constitue le creuset même de sa pensée. De son point de vue, l'ontologie occupe une place centrale dans la résolution du problème climatique, puisque la destruction de la nature est le fait de la déformation de notre perception du monde et de nous-mêmes. Ceci justifie-t-il que l'on fasse du « lieu » une dimension ontologique de l'humain ? Le présent article questionne la pertinence d'une épaisseur ontologique du local.*

Mots Clés : Ontologie, Épistémologie, lieu, humain, épaisseur, local

I. INTRODUCTION

From the etymological point of view, the expression “ecology” was born from the association of two Greek words “ οἶκος ” and “ λόγος ” which respectively mean “house” and “speech”, “science” or “knowledge”. It can therefore be understood, literally, as a science of the inhabited. In other words, ecology is a set of considerations affecting a so-called environmental crisis and which can be broken down into a crisis of biodiversity, pollution, global warming. Faced with this problem, which is both important and urgent, Arne Næss proposes an “in-depth” approach based on a diagnosis which highlights an ontological type of causality, namely the self-representation of man in exteriority with respect to nature. It then seems appropriate to him to condition all ethics by an ontological detour which would make it possible to re-establish the relationship in interiority of each man with nature which would present itself as a dimension of himself. This would result in a correlation of each with that portion of nature which both belongs to him emotionally and constitutes him ontologically. Hence the central idea around which pivots his theory and his ecological practice: it is the idea of an ontological thickness of the local. Isn't it therefore illusory to envisage a nature that is for everyone both their primary belonging and their fundamental being? Can we, in the era of globalization whose consequence is nomadism, the constant and massive transgression of regional and national borders, assign everyone to the ecological defense of their own region? How, under these conditions, can we glimpse the practical possibility of a universalist ecological commitment?

II. THE IDEA OF THE LOCAL BEYOND ITS GEOGRAPHICAL AND ECONOMIC REDUCTIONS.

Space appears *a priori* as a constitutive or even essential element of human existence. However, this notion is full of ambiguity because its definition can extend to several fields. Indeed, we all find ourselves at one time or another in a contingent manner in a given space and at a specific time. Among the Greeks, especially in Hesiod, universal space refers to *chaos*. From the Greek *chaskeinor chanein*, to designate the idea of emptiness or ditch, terror or dread. The spatial environment conditions our existence to the point where man seems “thrown into the world” according to the terminology of Søren Kierkegaard to submit to the whim of space and time. Thus, space and time arise as reliable and indispensable frameworks which condition the

accomplishment, better the well-being of man. Literally, space is synonymous with “place” or “location”. In a second sense it designates everything that is beyond the atmosphere, we then speak of “atmospheric space”. However, on a philosophical level, space is neither an object nor a thing, but the set of conditions which allow things to have positions, figures and forms. It is in this sense that Kant affirms that: “space is not an empirical concept which has been drawn from external experience” (I. Kant, 1994, p.55). This is the *a priori form* of sensibility, the function by which objects are present to us. Today this expression has been enriched to the point where we now speak of “political space”, of “geographical space”, of “economic space” and even of terroir etc. “Political space” commonly designates frameworks of struggle, of competition with a view to obtaining power. We apprehend it in a varied term, “Yesterday Agora, Gymnasium, Synagogue or Mosque, the public space is first given as an antonym of the courtyard space. One submits there to the need to sharpen one's intelligence and even the whole of one's being by confronting them with this being which surpasses it: the city or the community, God or rationality(J.Chatué, 2021, p.40). These are spaces created by men, marked by the presence of the contradictory ideological movements that unfold there. Here, men enter into opposition by their idea. The “geographical space” for its part comes from natural data such as the river, the river. These are established spaces. When they are constituted, they become a geopolitical and geostrategic space. The “geopolitical space” is the place of exchanges between States, driven by their interests. While the “geostrategic space” promotes control, a strategic ascendancy of one Nation over another. Thus, beyond this specificity we will present the space in its geographical and economic aspects, we will present its ecological implication

2.1. THE GEOGRAPHICAL REDUCTION OF THE PREMISES

Geography is commonly recognized as the science of space. Before the systematization of the latter, the expressions that were most prominent were: *region*, *territory*, *gender of life* and the *landscape*. These expressions were introduced by Paul Vidal de la Blache at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. Here space is apprehended as the study of concrete physical territories around the lines of force defined by the homogeneity of natural landscapes. In addition, let us specify that there are three great moments in the history of geography: the first moment is centered on the description of the earth and the determination of the laws. This is called paleo-geography, the main figure here is Jacques Lévy. He says of classical geography that it: “is typically anchored in a conception of space that is both absolute and positional”; in other words, the physical space taken with its geographical conditions and the second moment is marked by the advent of regional, scientific and classical geography with Paul Vidal de la Blache as a major figure. Here, space is considered in terms of regional territory associated with the study of landscapes. We are in the years 1870 and 1970-1984. The third moment of this science refers to the study of space as an environment, living environment of interrelation and action between man and his environment.

2.2. THE LOCAL AS AN ECONOMIC SPACE

The world has now become a space of communication and exchange where everything circulates: goods and even more so people to the point where the world is designated in terms of “global village” according to the terminology of Marshall McLuhan. In the global village, the emphasis is on the economic dimension where transactions take place between States, individuals and multinational firms. It is the economy that guides the type of discourse that is held there and the rules are dictated by the World Trade Organization (WTO).

2.3. LOCAL AS TERROIR

Formerly taken in the sense of “country” and territory, “terroir” refers to the smallest portion of territory. Rouvellac defines it as: “the smallest taxonomic unit, homogeneous from all points of view, and mappable on a large scale”(Rouvellac, 2005). Giving it a precise and concise definition is difficult. However, two main meanings are retained: in agronomy and in geography. The first defines the terroir as: “all the lands of a region considered from the point of view of their agricultural aptitudes and providing one or more characteristic products” while the second defines it as: “province, countryside considered as the refuge habits, typically rural or regional taste. Thus, the idea of terroir highlights a multiple frame of reference: a plot of land for the agronomist, an object of study for the economic and social sciences,

III. THE ONTOLOGICAL INKING OF LOCALIST ANTHROPOLOGY

It must be said that when we evoke the ontological inking of anthropology in the Næssian perspective, it is a question of proceeding with a reversal of the traditional consideration of “anthropology” which has long focused on the human individual in the contempt/by evicting (from) the nature that has been set aside or even desubstantiated. To this end, it is important to redefine the status of the “me” *self*, the “ego” *myself* and the “self” which until now remains mixed and ambiguous within philosophy, psychology, social psychology, and modern psychotherapy and yet plays a central role in our representation of ourselves, the world around us and even nature as an environment.

3.1. ONTOLOGY ACCORDING TO ARNE NÆSS (AUTHOR'S ARGUMENT IN RELATION TO LOCAL ONTOLOGY)

Arne Næss wants to rehabilitate the ontological link between man and nature. For him, understanding his relationship to nature goes through ontology, and the latter is inseparable from "identification" which in itself is: Basically, a process of love, because in love those who love lose part of their identity for the benefit of a greater identity [...], it is not a question of ensuring that everything becomes part of ourselves, to the point of dissolving our own existence . If we can identify with these parts of nature, it is precisely because they have a status equal to ours: they are relatively independent of ourselves and our evaluation of them. This is what Næss calls “*naturenegevenverdi*”: the intrinsic value of nature (N. Arne, 2013, p.35)

Thus, to change our relationship with nature, we must reconsider our place within it, what we are and what it is. He wants to recast ontology within the framework of deep ecology because he believes that the ecological crisis is first internal, that is to say mental, before being external, in other words physical, through its manifestations. When we are satisfied with what is perceptible, with the "being" of nature, we remain limited. This is why he insists on the personal experience of the world, in order to convert this hostile relationship into a compassionate, benevolent, sentimental, peaceful and harmonious relationship for a common well-being. His philosophy is posed to all as an invitation or even a challenge to question our ways of living, as Næss himself specifies:

Ethics or morals don't interest me. What interests me is how we experience the world [...]. If ecology can be called deep, it is because it is based on our fundamental beliefs, and not only because it is linked to our ethical convictions. Ethics is a consequence of how we experience the world. If you put words on this experience, then it becomes a philosophy or a religion (Ibid., p.47)

We should not rush to judge it quickly, because it would be mistaken to give a quick conclusion to the above statement. Because the latter does not reject ethics. It must be understood that ethics is not first but complements and reinforces morality, it is the consequence of our experience, our experiences of the world and our interactions with the environment, therefore, it becomes "ecosophy". i.e. wisdom, lifestyle and art of living. Ethics and ontology are two poles of the same axis, they maintain a relationship that is both vertical and horizontal. Arne Næss places ontology upstream and ethics downstream. From now on, (deep) ecology is posed at the same time as a historical, intellectual, cultural and social issue calling into question the values established by modernity, it invites us to do an introspection of it and a reassessment of so-called cultures. "not modern". She also wants to redefine the identity of man within the local and global ecosystem.

Our realization necessarily passes through that of others with whom we share the same condition of existence. David Rothenberg speaking of Næss 's thesis on Self-Realization tells us that “ [...] self-realization must not be limited to the realization of our small egos, insofar as the “me” which is in question asks to be understood in its relationship with a much broader "Self", which, while starting from ourselves, extends infinitely beyond us to include the whole” (Ibid., pp.27-28). In other words, when I act, I must be able to go beyond the “me”, my singularity to project the consequences of my actions on a global scale; I must be able to go beyond the “me” or my “ego” in order to take into account the extended “Self”; since all beings have an intrinsic dignity and want to realize themselves.

The implications at the ecosophical level would like us to take into account the feeling of other conditions of existence, their diversity, their evolution, their place, their importance by identifying with them when we take action. Arne Næss clearly underlines that: "the deep ecology movement is in line with Spinozist ethics, taking an additional step in that it calls for the development of a deep identification of individuals with all forms of life”(Ibid., p.148). Its deep ecology struggles as a priority for the rehabilitation of the ontological link between man and nature in order to implement an inclusive ethics. It is in this perspective that he recalls that

The ecosophist must think deeply and also “feel” what he really wants, not only from a personal perspective, but also socially and ecosophically. The question here is not only to draw the consequences of any commonly shared view, but to clarify attitudes and to explain what it is to "find oneself", not in a situation of isolation, but in deep connection with all that surrounds us (Ibid., p.142).

Love for the living therefore pushes us to focus our attention beyond our individuality, our interests, thus breaking with selfishness and alienation. This is why Arne Næss reiterates:

We need environmental ethics, but when people feel that they unselfishly give up, or even sacrifice, their self-interests to show love for nature, this is probably, in the long run, a treacherous basis for conservation. Through identification, they may come to see that their own interests are served by conservation, through genuine self-love, the love of widened and deepened self (N. Arne, 2008, p.85).

Consequently, well-being strictly speaking can only be partial in this perspective, especially when it only considers strictly human individuality.

Næss affirms: “we must conceive the vital needs of ecosystems and other species as our own needs. This cancels any conflict of interest and allows us to achieve self-realization and fulfillment” (N. Arne, 2013, p. 35).

Indeed, it is about recognizing the intrinsic value of other species and treating them with loving respect. For the Norwegian philosopher,

The process of identification is a process of love, because in love those who love lose part of their identity in favor of a greater identity. But, at the same time, it's not about making everything part of ourselves, to the point of dissolving our own existence. If we can identify with these parts of nature, it is precisely because they have a status equal to ours: they are relatively independent of ourselves and our evaluation of them. This is what Næss calls "natureegenverdi": the intrinsic value of nature. (Ibid., p.35)

Consequently, the attitude which consists in: "being content to cast a glance at nature, in passing, is a very curious way of acting. We only truly experience an environment when we do something in it, when we live in it, when we meditate in it and when we act in it" (Ibid., p.115), therefore "the concept of nature, which is relevant here, implies that nature is not only the instrument for the achievement of personal ends, but that it is independent and requires our unconditional attention" (Idem). Concrete men who share an intimate emotional experience with nature are not always well understood when they decry the loss of *gestalts* by those who have no experience with nature and who manifest "a growing sense of meaninglessness felt »¹. These are people to whom the ecosophist recommends to follow "a therapy of environment (*milieu therapy*) and a therapy of nature (*nature therapy*), strong in the conviction that environments have untapped resources offering the opportunity to carry out a good and meaningful life"², which has nothing to do with modern Western rationality which perceives nature only from a utilitarian point of view. The Lapps of the Norwegian Arctic are the perfect illustration of this through their appropriation of their living environment.

The environmental fight is inseparable from reason and emotions. When the environmentalist defends nature it is because he is convinced of the defended cause. His radicalism, his motivation and his commitment may appear to some to be irrationality. However, behaving in this way is "ignoring(r) thereby, that the reality which we spontaneously experience links the emotional and the rational within indivisible totalities: the *gestalts* "³. Experience allows us to better understand and interpret reality. Gestalt theory shows that we are in a system of complex relationships that seeks the fulfillment of each partial system, and therefore mutually influences each other. It is in this sense that Arne Næss declares:

Relational thinking has ecosophical value because it helps to undermine the belief that organisms or people can be separated from their environment is an awkward expression because an organism is an interaction. Organisms and their environment are not two things. If we plunged a mouse into absolute vacuum, it would no longer be a mouse. Organisms presuppose their environment⁴.

Stéphane Dunand tells us about three reasons given by Arne Næss why ontology occupies a central place in "deep ecology":

First answer. The cause of the evils we want to avoid is, in part, a deficient ontology. We do not know the existence of what is to be protected or promoted, or we do not understand its nature. Moreover, we live according to technologies, lifestyles, modes of organization, etc., which are blind in this regard and lead to our blindness. The ecological assumptions that lead to the ecological crisis are incorrect, linked to incomplete or mutilated experiences of reality.

Second answer. One cannot act without desire. Yet it is the content of our experience that provokes the desire to care about it or to make it grow: we want to protect this wetland because it is beautiful or because a rich life unfolds there. Its beauty or richness determines our desire. Our desire to act therefore depends, at least in part, on our ontology: when we see the beauty of the landscape, our experience assumes the existence of this beauty which, because it is seen, causes our desire to preserve it. Some will say that beauty is only *subjective*, while Næss will hold it objective. This is where ontology in the second sense comes in: we have to defend this hypothesis of the objectivity of values by a systematic work, to maintain that beauty is real and that the value of beauty surpasses the rest. It is the things themselves that incite us to protect them and blindness or ontological poor vision have consequences: it is therefore necessary to determine what there is *to* experience. Having a correct ontology plays a determining role in the justification of our actions.

¹Same. These are people who have socially succeeded in their lives, who show indifference to symbols. And who tend to see things as means to ends.

²Same.

³Ibid., p.116.

⁴Arne Næss quoted by Pommier, E., "self-realization through the prism of the philosophy of nature of Arne Næss", in Alter, revue de phénoménologie [Online], Vol. 226, uploaded in 2019. <http://journals.openedition.org/alter/613>.

Third answer. It is a question of clearly understanding the effects that we want to avoid and, as we will see, Næss insists on the fact that we are probably losing more than we think: we risk losing our income, agricultural spaces, species, health, but we can also lose a part of ourselves and the possibility of a good, joyful life, of which most often we do not suspect the existence. (N. Arne, S. Dunand, 2017, pp.205-206)

This means that the evils that we experience today are for the most part caused by the absence, even the lack of ontology which keeps us in mental blindness, limits our sight to the "narrow self". Our relationship to the world, our experience of nature is limited, vague and poor. And, superficial ecology continues to fuel this mindset.

The absence or lack of experiences makes our views partial and pushes us to quickly condemn nature. Arne Næss criticizes even ecologists who have a limited overview and are quick to use "shameful language! i.e." "extreme", "destitute", "difficult", "marginal", "poor", "stressful", "disadvantaged", "harsh" and even "hostile" to describe the climatic conditions of the Arctic (ibid.,21) regions like Norway and other areas where they have no real experience. "Nothing could be further from the truth!" (idem), according to the Norwegian philosopher and mountaineer when we have a good experience of nature, of the "place" because, through his own experience of these environments, he gives us to understand that: "when we stay there for a certain time, you realize that Tvergastein is bursting with life" (idem). He also tells us how his experience of the place and his love for the mountain, which far from being hostile and harsh, came to represent for him "a paternal, benevolent and protective figure, and even like a divine being." » (Idem see p.156 of my thesis "Universalism maintained in the ecological thought of Arne Næss"). The ecological consciousness of the latter gradually developed from intimate contact with his nature.

Sometimes we develop the ecological self without realizing it. But the fact of spending our whole life in a place, the relationships forged, the activities that we have carried out there, however simple they may have been, have an undeniable place in the constitution of our person, that is to say our consciousness as a feeling of unity that we feel towards this place; and our personality taken as the set of innate and acquired characteristics, which model our way of being and acting, thereby giving us an identity. What André Lalande designates as: the set of ways of feeling and reacting that distinguishes one individual from another. In other words, the subject develops an anthropological identity, a social identity and a cultural identity as he modifies nature to meet his vital needs by means of agriculture, hunting, etc. Arne Næss to further illustrate and mark the difference of awareness of the "ecological self" in urban centers and peripheries and to signify the role of "place" in the construction of "self-esteem" evokes the situation of the Inuit from the Norwegian Arctic who lived in the mountains and were forced to leave to be relocated because the central government had to build a hydroelectric dam. In doing so, the behavior of the Lapps who, following this state of affairs, saw their identity stolen, their being dispossessed gives us a great lesson. "Charged for an illegal demonstration by the river, a Laplander told the court that this river was "part of him" (N. Arne and S. Dunand, 2017, p.94). This beautiful example presented to us by Arne Næss gives us to understand once again that the relationship of "self" and "place" (local) or to the world is a relationship of interdependence which is not lived only in externally but also internally. The Lapp's answer is loaded with meaning and shows that the Lapps have deeply identified with their locality to the point where they feel diminished and dispossessed in their being, deprived of a part of their being.

Arne Næss deplors the fact that on both sides of the world the environment is devastated for profit, and with the approval of local governments under the passive gaze of natives who are afraid to oppose and to protest, because: "resignation prevailed (because of the commonly accepted formula according to which) "One does not stop progress". However, contrary (Ibid., p. 96. Slightly modified) to this commonly accepted idea the Norwegian philosopher believes that:

If we realize after honest reflection that we feel threatened in our deepest personality, it makes (will) make us stronger. And in this case, it is more convincing to say that we are defending a vital interest, and not just something external to us. We perform an act of self-defense. And defending the most basic human rights is vital self-defense" (idem. Slightly modified).

This means that our environment is part of our rights, duties and priorities to the point where when we defend this space, we defend ourselves at the same time. Nature has an intrinsic value independent of the utilitarian and aesthetic value it represents for us humans. The ecosophy of Næss thus bears the concern for harmony between man and his fellows, on the one hand, and for harmony between man and the surrounding nature and all the things that exist in the universe, on the other hand.

3.2. ECOLOGY "T"

In deep ecology, feeling is highly valued whereas what we call objectification (*verdinglichung*, reification) is largely devalued [...], plants and animals pursue interests by seeking to realize

their potentialities. It is only by interacting with these beings that we can study them. We cannot rely on our impulses of the moment, however important they are in general (Ibid., p.93)

To this end, saving our planet is a priority, it is in our interests and those of our alters with whom we live. Arne Næss reiterates his call by emphasizing the challenge that compels us: "one of the challenges of our time is to save our planet from an ecological disaster even greater than it already is, which would not only harm the personal interests of humans as well as non-humans, and would reduce the possibility of a joyful existence for all" (N. Arne, 2017, p.93). It is essential for us to define an ethical standard that should guide our ecological actions and behaviors. However Næss recalls that:

People should not have the impression that to show their love for nature, they must, out of generosity, give up their interests and sometimes even sacrifice them. This would probably be (he says) a very hypocritical starting point for founding the protection of nature. By identifying with nature, and by showing genuine self-love, the love of a broader and deeper self, they could on the contrary realize that the protection of nature. (Ibid., p.92)

We understand that we must take cognizance of our interests and those of all living beings, since we are in an internal relationship within the ecosphere because: "the maxim of ecology "everything is linked" applies to the self and to the relationships it has with other living beings, ecosystems, the ecosphere, the earth and all its long history" (Ibid., p.94)

The contact or better our experiences play a primordial role in the development of our "ecological self". Our experience, the walks, the daily life led to this place are unique moments that forge our personality and influence our way of apprehending the place as well as the lifestyle that we lead there. For Arne Næss, this place is "Tvergastein" (This is the place where the Easter and summer holiday house is located, in the countryside in Ustaoset, a small village about 8 kilometers from the mythical mountain where my sense of place developed. In the archives, Tvergastein appears as the name of the hut located at a place called Tvergastein. From a geographical point of view, the place designates the cabin and its immediate environment, that is to say about fifty feet in all directions from the walls of the cabin. But one could defend a broader conception of this place, consider it as a broader gestalt of this place, consider it as a more important gestalt, and include Lake Tvergasteintjernet in it [...]. From Tvergastein, you can observe and admire the mountains and glaciers that surround the immense Hardangerfjord. Ibid., p.11.), this place with which he identifies and from which he keeps marvelous memories. This place where was born his love for nature, the mountains of "Hallingskarvet (which he describes as) fantastic and majestic (which) has fascinated him since the age of 5" (Idem), and which he will continue to frequent even as an adult, to climb during his hikes. He acknowledges the truth that:

Few people identify with a place like Tvergastein, and few people would be willing to. But (we also need to understand that) the process by which a person identifies with a place, by which they develop a sense of belonging to that place, allows us to understand some of the forces that are at work in the recognition and election of a place or rather in the recognition and election of a place as place (Ibid., p.10).

For this attachment to be consummated, the subject must have had a certain number of experiences, above all charged with positive emotions and memories at this place, that he agrees to enter into a form of communication with his environment to let indifference and hostility be softened and moderated. We see that his identification with the place here is very deep, to the point where he comes to personify the mountain by attributing human adjectives to it. His love for nature is so intense that he builds a cabin there, withdrawn in the forest in order to be able to admire, dialogue and listen to nature, to speak to it without hindrance.

3.3. THE ISSUES OF THE AUTHOR'S ONTOLOGICAL PRESCRIPTIONS

Indeed, in the thought of the wise Norwegian, the "idea of depth" occupies an essential, even fundamental place. It gives itself to be seen and understood at the same time in a triple dimension as a factor of ontologization, localization and radicalization.

Ontology is a dimension of humanity. It refers to the idea that the relationship of man to his world is not experienced externally; it is more of a constitutive and inseparable relationship. The idea that all beings are inseparable is found in Spinoza and Buddha. What is primary is the "relationship" between nature and man, there is no hierarchy. It is a relationship of interdependence and not one-sided or unilateral dependence. Both are complementary.

Localization refers to the idea that the environment is grasped centrifugally. It is defined in relation to a "home" with which one is supposed to interact or better is supposed to interact in an effective way. It is a question of loving one's land prior to any attachment to the distant. This is why in my "I", in my identity, there is the other, which is nature, our environment which is our friend. Arne Næss indeed exemplifies his terroir: *Tvergastein*, the "ecosophy T" the element to better understand it is "decentralization". If, in reality, everyone is attached to their land, then we will all be attached to nature, which is our real "home". We approach the space here in terms of personal space, the territory in terms of "terroir" (1 st sense: Land considered in relation to cultivation (agriculture). 2 nd meaning: Country of origin, country where one lives where one has lived (extended

meaning). 3rd sense : communal territory. Here it is the second meaning that we will consider the most.). “Ecosophy T” thus translates the very affective mark of his living environment, his attachment to his “home”. Everyone is responsible for his nature, his region; ecological responsibility is first regional before being universal. Because if everyone can defend their space, their local, they can defend the global or the universal. Ecological radicalism, is required to replace the superficiality of the currently dominant offer: green energy, ecological agriculture, universal declaration, state institutionalization, media or school pedagogy: Arne Næss thinks that all of this is superficial. This is why, he thinks that ecology must be inscribed in an ontological relationship which makes it possible to envisage a broad ethics, that is to say an ontology of the relationship or the relationship between man and nature. In other words, a broad altruism, extended to nature now recognized as our *alter ego*. For the Norwegian thinker, there is an interdependence between man and nature in which nature appears as our friend and even more, a part of us. That's why we have to protect her jealously. Thus, the environmental ethics of "deep ecology" is essentially " a re-examination of the way we perceive and understand the world" (N. Arne, 2013, p.46).

However, one wonders about the conditions of practical possibility of a universal ecological commitment?

IV. CRITIQUE OF NÆSSIAN ONTOLOGY

If the Norwegian philosopher has the merit of bringing ecological concern to its incandescent point, it must be said that “deep ecology” will be the victim of virulent criticism.

4.1. THE HORIZONTALISM OF NÆSSIAN ONTOLOGY

As we have seen Arne Næss is credited with having engaged the ecological question in a double register: that of the practice, the militancy in the field, and that of the theory, of the reform of ontology. The relationship to nature highlights a vocation to defend the environment as if one were defending oneself. The ecoethics of Arne Næss insists on the privilege of an ontology and a praxeology of the local, and the same time, the purposes assigned to this ecoethics want to be absolutely global. We saw the wise Norwegian on several fronts, chaining himself on the rock at Mardalfosen to oppose the construction of a dam, actively fighting alongside Greenpeace, of which he was one of the active figures. He was an active member of Earth First, a militant organization that tackles construction machinery to prevent deforestation, he has also been seen alongside the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). This commitment earned him numerous distinctions, including: the Peter Gynt Award in 2004 for having contributed to the influence of Norway on the international scene. The Mahatma Gandhi Prize for Non-violence and Peace, to name but a few.

Arne Næss is, as we can see, in search of true ecological efficiency, claiming both scientific truth and ethical sincerity, translated by the determined passage from theory to practice. His transformative "deep ecology" is intended as a challenge to us humans, to question ourselves on the foundations of our current concerns, to seek within us reasons that convince us of the importance of the environment in order to define the main transformations to be carried out in our different societies to succeed in building a better, sustainable world for the well-being of all. Thus, Arne Næss affirms: “the value of deep ecology can only be measured by the yardstick of the changes it has been able to inspire. It has transformed the modes of organization of demonstrations in favor of the environment: a nature which has value in itself justifies that we preserve it for itself” (N. Arne, 2009, p. 189). This is the case, for example, of the organization Earth First in the United States, which directs its non-violent actions against the timber industries and the forest office with a view to protecting species.

It's well understood, deep ecology marks the step towards the universalization of ecological responsibility. By carrying the idea of a centrifugal ecology that starts from the local to gradually extend to the global, from the center to the periphery, from the inside to the outside. Then, Arne Næss takes a nostalgic and romantic look at nature that invites us to look at nature as a partner, but in his approach, he gives everything to ontology. Beyond the romantic gaze, one can take a gaze of interaction although without any link of ontological proximity. However, we can identify a major deficit, because the sentimental reference is not the only reason likely to make us love a land. At The Romantic Attachment of Man to the Land we propose a laborious solidarity attachment, the attachment to the land must go beyond romanticism. We love land not only because we occupy it, but also because it bears our interests, that is to say the subsoil. Consequently, attachment to the land must be strategic with reference to economic issues, particularly mining. Ecology thus calls for a whole land policy through which it joins the economy. The latter being the strategic defense of the sovereign interests of the State. The economy therefore should not row against the current of ecology. Thus, the challenge for Africans is to move from an economy of “subjection” to “subjection” which makes us centers of initiative. It is important to call for a rewriting of the law of international contracts: their content, what must be kept, what must be removed.

4.2. LUC FERRY'S INTRASPECIES RESPONSE

Luc Ferry is one of the main critics of “deep ecology”. He suspects in the Norwegian philosopher he denounce the primacy of the interspecies relationship over the intraspecies, one and sees this thought as a threat

to humanism and democracy. Ferry criticizes Arne Næss for being anti-humanist and accuses him of wanting to confine man to a hierarchical and cosmological order: that of "nature". This attempt, according to him, is reductionist and devalues man for the benefit of the biosphere. Attributing rights, equal or not to animals, giving them an "intrinsic value" leads to denying human beings the exclusive status of "subject of law", which means being capable of law, "being for the law". He is joined in this idea by Jean-Christophe Rufin, who accuses "Deep ecology of "green totalitarianism". The rise of radicalist movements inspired by "deep ecology" will push Marcel Gauchet to accuse them of showing hatred for humans when he says: "the love that ecologists have for nature hides a hatred of men. By blurring the distinction between man and nature which is the basis of modernity, ecology would carry the seeds of an anti-humanism..." (A. Boutard, 2010). These radical movements are distinguished by extremist militancy. Among the latter, we can mention: the *Earth First movement*, which has the earth as icon, friendly people who live in the woods like Robin Hood, a movement of which Arne Næss himself was a member; we also have the "*Font pour la Liberation Animale*", in English "*Animal Liberation Front*" (ALF), and the "*Front pour la Liberation de la Terre*", both recognized under the name of Vegan. The principle of ALF is that animals must be freed from places where humans make them suffer, (farms, laboratories), and brought to places where they can live their natural life free from suffering, impose economic fines on those who profit from the misery of animals, highlight the horrors they suffer behind locked doors and carry out non-violent actions and animal liberation and take all precautions to not endanger no human and non-human animals (J. Perrin, 2007, p.11). We also have the *Movement for the Voluntary Extinction of Humanity*, which advocates that the progressive extinction of humanity by the voluntary abandonment of reproduction will allow the biosphere to regain good health. For this movement, the problems linked to the lack of living space and the shortages of natural resources would find a solution if the human population were small and less dense. As another movement, we can add *the Church of Euthanasia*, *Church of Euthanasia* recognized by the State of Delaware and the American federal administration since 1995. With at its head a woman pastor named Chris Korda, their leitmotif is: "save the planet" and "destroy yourself". A single commandment: you shall not procreate; and four pillars: suicide, abortion, cannibalism and sodomy (Idem) All of these trends claim "deep ecology". It goes without saying that this extremist, barbaric and antihuman vision of ecology truly deviates from the vision of ecology as perceived and advocated by Arne Næss. It should also be noted that our author was one of the figureheads of *Green Peace* (Greenpeace was born in 1971 in Canada in Vancouver, a border town with the United States which welcomed many young people fleeing conscription: its objective was to denounce, in the manner of the Quakers, the American nuclear tests which polluted the territorial waters. Canadians and threatened the areas inhabited by the natives), an organization known for its actions in the defense of the environment.

V. CONCLUSION

We started from the question thus formulated: is it not illusory to envisage a nature which is for each person both his primary belonging and his fundamental being? nature is our common home and relational ontology poses as a challenge to conformist thought and militates in favor of a reassessment of the border which induces humans to realize that their survival and that of posterity depends on that of its host the earth, conversely. This amounts to saying that it is an ethic that fits in the long term and in the global or universal. With Arne Næss, it starts from the center that is to say from the local, to reach the global, through a double and theoretical and practical dimension of the ecological struggle. Though it gives a dead end on the strategic dimension concerning strategic meaning, on eventual importance although not minor of the inter-state frontiers.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Chatué., *Cogitamus strategies: Essay on the concept of reticularity*. (Heritage Editions, Yaoundé, 2021)
- [2] I. Kant., *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. A. Tremasaygues and B. Pacaud, (© Presses Universitaires de France), 1994, Libraries of Contemporary Philosophy 108, boulevard Saint-Germain, 75006 Paris.
- [3] N. Arne, *Towards Deep Ecology* (Editions Wildproject2009).
- [3] N. Arne, Alan Drengson, Bill Devall - *The Ecology of Wisdom*, (Editions Counterpoint, 2008).
- [4] N. Arne, *Ecology, community and lifestyle*, (Editions Dehors2013).
- [5] N. Arne, *Self-realization, Spinoza, Buddhism and deep ecology*, followed by " *The experience of the world* " by Stéphane Dunand, Trad. Pierre Madelin. (Wildproject, 2017).
- [6] E.Pommier, "self-realization through the prism of the philosophy of nature of Arne Næss", in *Alter*, revue de phénoménologie [Online], Vol. 226, uploaded 2019. <http://journals.openedition.org/alter/613>
- [7] W. Fox, "approaching Deep ecology: A, Response to Richard Sylvan's Critique of Deep Ecology...", Hobart, university of Tasmania Environmental Studies Occasional paper 20, 1986, cf. introduction to the american preface to *ecology, community and lifestyle*.
- [8] Aurélien, Boutard, "Ecology: the great controversies", February 2010, Millénaires, the Prospective Resource Center of Greater Lyon.

- [9] " *Ecology and Christianity*", report of the meeting debate of June 13, 2007, organized by the association X-Environnement at the house of X from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., preparation and organization by Jérôme Perrin.