The Incompatibility of Ecologism and Liberal Democracy:

a Defence of the Incompatibility of Ecologist and Liberal Principles and a Critique of Green Democratic Decision-making Procedures

Name: M. van den Berg

Student Number: s1337939

Program: MA Philosophy: Ethics and Politics

Academic year: 2018-2019

Supervisor: Dr. W. F. Kalf

Institute of Philosophy, Leiden University

The Incompatibility of Ecologism and Liberal Democracy: a Defence of the Incompatibility of Ecologist and Liberal
Principles and a Critique of Green Democratic Decision-making Procedures

Table of Contents

Introduction

Since the 1970s, green movements have been trying to get environmental issues on the political agenda in particular, humanity's role in environmental degradation. One of the fundamental concerns of the green movement is to maintain and restore environmental and ecological systems. Some argue for building a communal society that supports living in harmony with everyone's environment (Barry, 1999, 83). Others want to find ways to change our current political system by changing the obligations of citizenship (Wissenburg, 2004, 112).

Some of the various suggested courses of action, some are more realistic or desirable than others. The more communal methods of the green movement pose problems for interests such as individual freedom or democratic decision-making. Examining both the communal and individualistic green movements provides us with an understanding of the differences between the positions. Each position has a distinct set of necessary conditions for a green society that can be either reconciled with other sets of conditions or that are incompatible.

In this thesis I defend the claim that ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible ideologies. I define the ideologies of ecologism and liberal democracy. After I have presented the core principles of each political ideology, I present the argument of preconditions as the necessary link between liberalism and democracy. To support my claim I present two main arguments for the incompatibility of ecologism and liberal democracy. These are the conflicting principles of the ideologies and the problem of realising ecologist principles through democratic decision-making procedures. The core principles of each ideology can be tested on compatibility. I argue that at least two of these principles cannot support each other, or exist concurrently. The ideologies are incompatible on a normative and abstract level, because the core principles are in conflict and because concrete ecologist principles cannot be realised in a liberal democracy. To demonstrate that ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible, I argue that ecologist principles cannot be realised through the procedural means of the liberal democratic society, as they are too authoritarian to be implemented through democratic decision-making procedures. This means that the conflict of the authoritarian ecologist principles with the democratic principles remains unsolved, making the ideologies incompatible.

The outline of this thesis follows the structure of the explanations and definitions of the ideologies. In Chapter 1, the discourse of ecologism, I define the political ideology of

ecologism and its principles. Ecologism is different from general green values or environmentalism, as the core aspect of ecologism is the desire to redefine our relationship with nature. This means that ecologism requires radical, rather than managerial changes in our political and social life.

The fundamental nature of ecologism as compared to environmentalism arises from a set of six core principles. These are the 'limits to growth thesis', the 'principle of protection and conservation', the 'principle of justified use', the 'priority rule', the 'inherent value of nature', and 'anti-speciesism'.

In Chapter 2, liberal democracy and freedom, I define liberal democracy on the basis of four liberal principles, 'the consensus of the people', 'positive or negative liberty', 'the fundamental principle', and the 'connection between liberalism and democracy'. I argue that liberalism is necessarily tied to democracy on the basis of the argument of preconditions. Democracy relies on liberal preconditions for the justification of the states authority. Democratic states protect and serve the citizens and are held accountable for their actions by the self-government of the people.

I also argue that liberal theory is compatible with environmental protection, but that this protection requires the restriction of liberal freedom. I argue that there are three kinds of justified limitations of liberal freedom, which are the interests of other people, the interests of animals and the status of people as moral agents. These justified reasons are sufficient to restrict liberal freedom in terms of ecologist beliefs, like the status of animals and ecosystems as moral agents.

I examine the viability of liberal ecologism in both theory and practice. To determine whether being a liberal ecologist is possible, it was necessary to identify whether people can act as liberal ecologists. In other words, the principles that are theoretically possible must also be applicable in the real world. To this end, I investigate the realisation and implementation of ecologism in our current, liberal democracy. For compatibility between ecologism and liberal democracy, they need to have matching principles that can be implemented through democratic means. This elevates the discussion above the normative domain to give the evaluation a tangible aspect. One of the mismatches between the ideologies of ecologism and liberal democracy is the practical implementation. One possible problem for ecologism is its totalitarian character, which causes conflict with democracy. Overcoming this problem is therefore fundamental to the question of compatibility.

In Chapter 3, incompatibility of ecologism and liberal democracy, I discuss the problem of the realisation of ecologist principles through democratic decision-making procedure and show why this realisation fails. I argue that the three solutions provided in the literature

(political lawful persuasion, ecological paternalism and the rights discourse) cannot link ecologist principles and liberal democracy without giving up on their core ideals. Another issue with lawful these solutions is that they describe general green values instead of ecologist principles. The conflict of the incompatibility of ecologism and liberal democratic values lies in the democratic decision-making procedure.

If people were to live in a ecologist, liberal democracy, the realisation of ecologist principles would be implemented through the democratic way of decision-making. The conflict in this scenario is that the ecologist principles are too authoritarian in nature for a democratic system. The problem of the ecologist democratic decision-making procedure shows that a managerial approach to environmental degradation is possible, but that radical changes and authoritarian principles destruct the democratic decision-making procedure.

Even though I provide one argument that supports incompatibility in practice, I want to argue that the ideologies are incompatible on theoretical level as well. In the case that my argument is fallible, I have delivered another argument that supports the incompatibility. To argue that liberal democracy and ecologism are incompatible ideologies in theory, I needed to argue that my definitions of each ideology exclude each other. The next step was to test the compatibility of the six ecologist principles with the principles of liberalism. I conclude that the consensus of the people principle is in conflict with the priority rule principle and the inherent value of nature and other species.

Chapter 1 The discourse of ecologism

1.1 Methodology and terminology

My research provides philosophical arguments for the incompatibility. I present the definitions and arguments of environmental ethics and political philosophy. This methodology differs from the questions and answers about the problems of environmental degradation in other academic fields. Philosophical discussion is focussed on the humanitarian perspective of the environmental problem, rather than a technical or scientific perspective. (Hardin, as cited in Wissenburg, 2004, 56-75). I do not discuss a descriptive methodology to identify technological solutions or economic consequences of environmental degradation. The philosophical perspective on environmental problems discusses more than a managerial or technical approach. The sciences seek for explanations of phenomena, philosophy seeks for explanations and justifications about the things as they are and how things ought to be (Talisse, 2015, 23).

The discourse of environmental degradation is related to two fields of philosophy, environmental ethics and environmental political theory. The field of environmental ethics describes how we ought to treat the environment or how we value of the environment, either instrumentally or intrinsically. Environmental political theory provides a normative perspective on the role that political institutions play in the protection of the environment.

Many scientific fields that are concerned with environmental degradation and protection use the same terminology. Even though the terms In 'Political ecology: Where is the ecology?' Peter Walker analyses the differences between ecology in the fields of political ecology, biology, economics and the humanities (including philosophy). Even though they address the same issue, the question they raise, the solutions they provide and the terms they use are distinctly different items (Walker, 2002, 73). For example, political ecology refers to the to the economic consequences of environmental degradation, whereas biological ecology discusses the relationship between animal species and their environment and ecologism uses the term ecology to describe the relation between people, other species and the ecosystem (Walker, 2002, 73). Therefore, it is important to define the terminology I use.

I examine the problem of environmental degradation and protection in the context of ethics and political philosophy. I use the terminology that describes the position people inhabit opposite the natural world. The normative study of environmental ethics and environmental political theory provides a different perspective than political ecology. I do not discuss how politics influences climate change, but I focus on the consequences of environmental theories on political values and beliefs. Ecology and ecologism refer to the relationship between people and other species and their direct environment with its ecosystems.

1.2 Ecologism as political ideology

Within the field of ethics and political philosophy, I need to limit the scope of my research from the general green perspectives to the specific principles of ecologism. I start by explaining what positions ecologism and environmentalism take in the discourse of the green agenda. The green agenda is a term I use to describe the collection of all green ideologies, ranging from superficial or managerial adaptations to radical changes within society. Before going into the details of ecologism, I examine what constitutes a political ideology and if ecologism can be considered a political ideology.

I have already referred to environmentalism and ecologism as ideologies. I further argue that both movements are political ideologies, because they are ideologies that offer normative beliefs about social and political systems. Even though this thesis is only concerned with ecologism, the distinction between ecologism and environmentalism is necessary to understand which principles are or are not covered by each movement. According to Terence Ball and Richard Dagger, political ideologies attempt to influence the way people think and act by performing different functions in three different ways (Ball and Dagger, 2011, 5).

First, ideologies provide us with explanations and evaluations of the social and economic systems and conditions we encounter in political life. Secondly, they can provide us with a sense of belonging, in terms of our own identity or the identity of the community and social groups we belong to. Ball and Dagger call this function 'orientation', and say that ideologies can help us navigate the problems and structure of society (Ball and Dagger, 2011, 5). In Andrew Dobson's book *'Green Political Thought'*, he identifies this same function as the analytical description of society (Dobson, 2012 ,10). The third requirement for an political ideology is that the political program, that tells the environmentalist and the ecologist what to do. The grounds for this explanation of ideology lie in the claim that the three functions can to connect thought to action, and the claim that ideologies are not scientific theories. This is why I did not pursue the inquiry into political ecology, but the political ideology of ecologism.

Ball and Dagger argue that not all movements ending with -isms are necessarily political ideologies (Ball and Dagger, 2011, 7). So, are ecologism and environmentalism political ideologies? The standard view of the green movement is that both environmentalism and ecologism are ideologies and that typically, ecologism is seen as a more extreme form of environmentalism. This could mean that green politics are a spectrum or that a division exists between certain levels of green thought. Arne Naess distinguishes, for example, between shallow and deep ecology, which are different movements with different goals (Naess, 1973, 95). The difference between the two is that the more shallow or moderate views set goals for the improvement of the standard of well-being of people in well developed countries. The more extreme views argue for a more egalitarian system without exploitation of less developed states and of the environment itself. Ecologism is a deep ecology perspective, because the movement does not merely wish to improve the lives of a select group of people, but to involve all people by demanding social changes that benefit all groups without the further exploitation of nature and her resources.

1.3 Defining ecologism and environmentalism

The green movement in general promotes green values, but the different kinds of green political ideologies disagree about how to implement these values. These competing theories provide different perspectives on how to deal with environmental degradation. Andrew Dobson defines both ideologies, and explains how each ideology deals with environmental degradation.

Environmentalism argues for a managerial approach to environmental problems, secure in the belief that they can be solved without fundamental changes in present values or patterns of production and consumption, and [...] ecologism holds that a sustainable and fulfilling existence presupposes radical changes in our relationship with the non-human natural world, and in our mode of social and political life (Dobson, 2012, 10).

The different perspectives put different demands on our economic, political and social life. Ecologism is much more demanding than environmentalism, because ecologism believes in a thorough transformation of society, hence the emphasis on radical change in Dobson's definition. Environmentalists, in contrasts, argue that dangers to the environment can be tackled within the existing political, economic and cultural order (Harrison, 2003, 274).

The managerial nature of environmentalism allows for some progress in the protection of ecosystems, but because it is bound by the current political and cultural systems, its impact is limited. Consequently, environmentalism is compatible with liberal democracy; it does not challenge the current political system. While environmentalists may be able to achieve the realisation of some green principles through democratic decision-making procedures, they will not be able to address the underlying factors of environmental degradation without challenging the status quo. Ecologism is an extreme form of green radicalism and aims to overthrow the current materialistic industrialisation (Dobson, 2000, 13). Instead of a managerial approach, ecologism seeks to create a new social and economic order in which people can live in harmony with other species and the ecosystem.

An example of the managerial approach is discussed by Maarten Keulemans, who argues that the future consequences of environmental degradation will be restricted by technological advancements. He describes how miracles in policy and technology will help humanity overcome the obstacles of rising sea levels and desertification of fertile farmlands

(Keulemans, 2019). His suggestion relieves humanity of the consequences of environmental degradation, but it cannot stop the process of destruction of the ecosystem itself.

Environmentalism can provide a justified limitation on actions that relieve the symptoms of environmental degradation, but it cannot address the sources of this degradation, as it does not prohibit all political and social actions that damage the environment. It therefore cannot provide a real solution for people who are affected by the direct consequences of environmental changes, like floods or hurricanes (Meadows, 2006, 176/177). For example, the environmentalists would be willing to invest in air purification, but they would not tackle the underlying problem of air pollution by restricting exhaust gasses.

Ecologism on the other hand requires the political, cultural, and economic structures of our societies need to be changed to make real progress in environmental protection. These radical changes require people to put environmental interests first and rethink the economic and individual rights we currently have. One example manifests in bioregionalism, one of the possible societal structures that upholds ecologist principles. This utopian vision of ecologist has people living in small communities. These communities live in a pre-industrial state of technology and are in touch with the natural world. They govern themselves and can to defend the interests of other species and ecosystems through bottom-up cooperation, instead of the top-down policies that political institutions provide to the citizens in a liberal democracy. Such a society would require radical changes in the current political and social systems and demand far greater changes favour of environmental well-being than the environmentalist view, in which we relieve environmental damage while maintaining the lifestyle that we are used to, including luxuries.

1.4 Ecologist beliefs and principles

Allow me to recapitulate; the definition of ecologism is a political ideology that requires radical changes in humanity's attitude towards the relationship with the environment. This includes other species, like animals or non-human beings, and the ecosystems in which they live. At the foundation of ecologists plans for future action are principles about human nature and people's relationship with the environment. The six core principles of ecologism are the 'limits to growth' thesis, the 'principle of protection and conservation', the 'principle of justified use', the 'priority rule', the 'inherent value of nature', and 'anti-speciesism'.

The first core belief of ecologist ethics is the existence a natural limitation to economic growth. Economic growth depends on the number of natural resources, such as oil, that are

available to use. Many of these resources are available in limited quantities. Once depleted, our current living standard will become impracticable. 'There are truly limits to physical growth, and they have an enormous influence on the success of policies we choose to pursue our goals. And history does suggest that society has limited capacity for responding to those limits with wise, farsighted an altruistic measures that disadvantage important players in the short term (Meadows, Randers and Meadows, 2005, xvii).' Not only does society face a shortage of resources, but people are limited in their ability to deal with environmental problem, especially in the long run, if we continue to pursue short-term goals that do not alleviate the underlying roots of environmental problems.

The next three principles are: the principle of protection and conservation, the principle of justified use, and the priority rule (Achterberg, 1986, 95 - 96). The aim of these principles is to protect ecosystems and species from harm through human action. They also provide rules to solve conflicts between financial interests and protection of natural interests. The principle of protection states that in the case of degradation or extinction due to human intervention, it is humanity's duty to enact sufficient measures to protect the environment or animal species. The principle of justified use refers to human intervention in ecosystems and states that it is unjustified to harm the ecosystem or animals. The important implication of the principle of justified use is that we are only allowed to take as many resources as is responsible.

This principle resembles the Lockean provision of fair use of resources and justification of property. Achterberg's principle extends the foundation of the Lockean provision to animals species. The Lockean provision refers to Locke's claims in his Two Treatises of Government that people are allowed to take what they need from the natural environment (Tuckness, 2018). The only restriction on this principle is that they ought to leave enough resources available for the necessities of other people (Walden, 1979, 319). Achterberg claims that non-human populations depend on the well-being of ecosystems and that therefore, we have the obligation to refrain from taking their livelihood (Achterberg, 1986, 95).

This obligation results in having to choose what actions we can and cannot perform. The judgement of these decisions can be done through the ecologist belief of the priority rule which helps us to decide which actions to prefer over other actions that cause harm. If human intervention or production results in unjustified harm to the ecosystem, and we have the choice to act in a way that does not harm the ecosystem, we ought do so. Since this rule is a rather broad approach to tackling the problem, there could be reconsiderations and extra deliberation when it comes to more complicated cases. For example, either one patch of

land perfect for farming and one natural reserve needs to be used for farming. The priority rule shows that we need to choose the patch of farmland.

Another belief specific to ecologism is anti-speciesism, the egalitarian view between species of humans and non-humans, as well as certain aspects of the environment that should be free of human intervention (Achterberg, 1986, 85). This kind of egalitarianism is expressed in the anti-speciesist attitude, which claims that most humans have an unjustified preference for other humans over members of other species. The belief of anti-speciesism is also relevant for the principle of fair, because the fair use should also apply to other species that depend on the resources of ecosystems for their survival. Not only should we protect and care for the environment and refrain from damaging ecosystems, we should cater for a system in which other species have a right to living in a way that respects their natural integrity. This includes not yet existing conditions in which other beings have the right to autonomy. This right grants them freedom from intervention by humans, a life in relatively natural circumstances and improved living conditions.

Ecologism grants that nature possesses an intrinsic value. There are many biocentric beliefs and reasons across the ecologist perspective that aim to show that nature, species and ecosystems are in themselves valuable. It is not just our relationship or dependence on nature that compels us to care for the environment, but the fact that nature is, in and of itself, valuable and worthy of moral consideration. Biocentric beliefs include arguments for anti-speciesism. Ecologism is not only concerned with the wellbeing of human beings, but with the wellbeing of other species and ecosystems as well. The wellbeing of our planet is not seen as of instrumental value to humanity, but as a vital aspect of it.

1.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, the difference between ecologism and environmentalism revolves around the question of whether we need a radical change to escape the dangers of environmental degradation. Environmentalism not strong enough to provide long-lasting solutions to our environmental problems like ecologism can, because a managerial approach can only address consequences of environmental degradation through policy of technology. Ecologism on the other hand requires radical changes to tackle the underlying causes of degradation. Ecologism values nature and other species on the grounds of intrinsic rather than instrumental reasons and its principles require the protection of all non-human species and ecosystems instead of the protection of the human race alone.

Chapter 2: Liberal democracy and freedom

2.1 Definitions and liberal principles

As there are many descriptions and subgroups of liberalism, I define liberalism by identifying certain core principles. I define liberalism by four core principles: the consensus of the people, positive or negative liberty, the fundamental principle, and the connection between liberalism and democracy. John Rawls defines a liberal society as one in which individuals have access to wealth, rights and freedom. Everyone shares an interest in obtaining as much of these goods as possible (Rawls, 1999, 160). The context in which he published his definition is the thought experiment of the veil of ignorance, a situation in which equality and cooperation provide the agent with the best possible outcome. The idea that people have basic rights and equality is also found in democratic theory, however, other criteria are needed to define liberal theory and distinguish it from democratic theory.

A liberal society requires, at a minimum, the protection of citizens rights and the guarantee of political participation (Wissenburg, 1999, 112). In other words, his idea of liberal democracy includes a sense of citizenship, not just the protection of human rights. These rights include the liberal principles I stated above. These principles are necessary to enable citizens to use their citizenship to protect their rights. This includes protecting their own economic and social rights by making autonomous choices while keeping the well-being of others in mind. Citizenship enables citizens to participate in the political system and represent their interests.

Gerald Gaus argues for a different core aspect of liberalism and presents three principles instead of the Rawlsian goods. According to him, liberalism is defined by the consensus of the people, positive or negative liberty and the fundamental liberal principle. He argues that instead of access to wealth, rights, and freedom, the core principles of liberalism are determined through consensus of the people. Unlike the Rawlsian rights these rights depend on the input of the people, who decide which interests need protection, including economic, social and environmental rights.

'Liberalism must be restricted to a core set of political principles that are, or can be, the subject of consensus among all reasonable citizens. Rawls's notion of a purely political conception of liberalism

seems more austere than the traditional liberal political theories discussed above, being largely restricted to constitutional principles upholding basic civil liberties and the democratic process'(Gaus, Shane and Schmidt, 2018, paragraph 3.1).

I include the consensus of the people in my definition of liberalism, as it is up to the citizens in a democratic society to determine their interest and to prevent a top-down coerced limitations of freedom. It is thus up to the people to determine what liberal freedom and justified limitations ought to be, instead of merely providing liberal values to property and basic civil liberties. Liberalism is the basis for public in liberal democracies, because public participation and the representation of interests are needed for a responsive society. Responsiveness is a proper tool of implementing the consensus of the people. Especially liberal democratic societies are responsive by combining liberal and democratic values such as freedom of assembly and freedom of speech. In responsive societies citizens can to hold their government responsible for implementing policies that affect citizens, their well-being and their rights.

The second aspect of liberalism is liberty or liberal freedom. Liberal freedom can be described in two ways, positive liberty or negative liberty. Gaus states that negative liberty is being free from obstacles that prevent us from performing an action. According to Hobbes, such obstacles must be physical obstacles, but Berlin argues that negative liberty requires obstacles to be man-made and intentional (Gaus, 2000, 77-78). In the first case, a fallen tree that prevents someone from traveling on a particular road limits that person's freedom. Liberty in Berlin's sense, in contrast is not the absence of physical obstacles, but the absence of obstacles to possible choices (Gaus, 2000, 82). Freedom in terms of negative liberty depends on opportunities, because people are only free if they have the opportunity to act, regardless if that action is taken or not.

Positive liberty, in contrast, frames liberal freedom as autonomy. Freedom in terms of positive liberty means that people can make autonomous choices without the interference of obstacles. If someone is coerced in any way, by other people or their own personality traits or addiction, then they are not autonomous and unfree. Autonomy can be defined in different ways, but I think that two definitions combined provide a definition that fits the liberal democratic ideology. According to Beahr, political autonomy is a vital ingredient of a liberal democratic society, because political autonomy gives people the possibility to become co-authors of their own living-conditions (Baehr, 2018). I think that this political conception of

autonomy needs the addition of personal autonomy, as it can explain how people express their interests. This personal aspect is best described by Gaus, who understands the concept of autonomy as life to reason (Gaus, 2000, 85). This definition describes autonomy as the deliberate actions of a rational person, who critically responds to situations to the best of their understanding. I think this definition is most compatible with the political autonomy definition of Beahr, because the deliberate action and rational understanding of political life can be expressed through deliberate action. In other words, political participation like expressing one's belief or taking part in activism depends on the tools of rational understanding and deliberate action. So even though there are multiple ways of framing liberty and autonomy, I define liberty as positive liberty in terms of political autonomy of rational people.

The third aspect of liberalism, added by Gaus is the fundamental liberal principle. (Gaus, 1996, 162–166). This principle takes freedom to be the basic and necessary situation of citizens and therefore, all limitations to their freedom needs to be justified. Any government or group that wants to coerce others to limit freedom needs a justification to limit individual freedom. The fundamental liberal principle requires a justification for authority by the people who are affected. This situation can be seen as a form of state of nature in which people are by default equal and free.

The last core principle of liberalism is the connection between liberalism and democracy. Although there is some debate about whether this connection if necessary or merely exists in some societies, I think that any connection between liberalism and democracy exists because democracy requires liberal values to protect democratic procedures. Liberals must be democrats and democrats must be liberals. Liberals should be democrats because democracy is the precondition for the existence of liberal rights. Conversely, democrats should be liberals because democracy relies on liberal values for its justified use of authority. The state can be held accountable for its right to authority by citizens exercising their liberal rights like freedom of speech and assembly. Democracy is a responsive form of government and the government receives the right of enforcing its authority from its citizens.

Matthew Humphrey presents the argument from preconditions as the necessary link between liberalism and democracy:

'Democracy is self-binding, it must insist on certain preconditions for its own existence if it is to protect itself from self-destruction. This is what allows liberalism and democracy (despite the obvious tensions that have been felt acutely between liberals and democrats historically) to claim some

necessary connection. Arguably democracy requires the set of liberal political rights to freedom of speech, conscience, assembly and so on in order to persist (Humphrey, 2004, 95)'.

Democracy is the precondition for the existence of liberal rights. Democratic society relies on liberal rights, because to stop it from self-destructing democracy needs liberal rights to maintain its responsiveness to its citizens. Citizens need their liberal rights to participate in self-government. Democracy is ideally a political system in which politicians are driven by their civic duty. This form of government is presented as a necessary precondition for all other social and political goods, from freedom, fairness, equality, and justice to security, peace, and prosperity (Talisse, 2015, 127).

In his book 'Engaging Political Philosophy', Robert Talisse also argues that democracy and democratic citizenship are preconditions of liberalism. Democratic citizenship exists in those states that aspire to govern for the sake of its people. Unlike tyrannical or authoritarian states, who oppress and dominate their people, democratic governments serve their citizens by maintaining the social order (Talisse, 2015, 19). These citizens enjoy the protection of the state, but they also carry obligations towards the state. They have a duty to participate in democratic self-government (Talisse, 2015, 20). People collectively govern themselves and maintain or change the social order by making use of their freedom and equal position. Liberal principles can guarantee this form of government, because according to liberalism, the state exists to keep us out of each other's way while treating us as free equals and recognizing our autonomy. Talisse argues that: 'Liberalism proposes that political authority can be justified to free and morally equal autonomous individuals when it is exercised impartially and by institutions that are accountable' (Talisse, 2015, 40). Democratic society allows its citizens to be free and equal and justifies political authority by holding institutions accountable. Their function is to serve and protect citizens and their rights.

2.2 Why should liberal democrats want to be green?

Even though I stated that liberal rights do not apply to other species or the ecosystem, I believe that liberals have several reasons to support and implement visions of the green agenda. I split these questions into different chapters to organise my main argument. In this chapter, I discuss the question if liberal democrats can be green at all and whether there are any justified green reasons to limit liberal freedom. In Chapter 3 I discuss whether the ecologist and liberal principles can be compatible and whether ecologist principles can be implemented through democratic procedures.

Before examining the specifics, I establish that that liberal democrats are compatible with

the green agenda. There are two main arguments in the current literature that suggest liberal principles are compatible with green values, the financial feasibility of reducing climate change and the democratic right to be free from harm. A problem remains for green liberalism, however, because of the liberal position of neutrality and anthropocentric bias. This problem complicates the compatibility of green liberalism with democratic liberalism.

The first reason for the compatibility is the that we have the financial and political tools to provide green solutions to climate change. Even though ecologism argues that we need radical changes in our political and economic systems, it seems that we do have the tools within our current liberal democracy to deal with environmental degradation. Liberal values are compatible with a sustainable way of living that does not challenge the current political of liberal democracy. Liberals do not have to fear the radical changes that ecologist principles demand by accepting environmental responsibility.

It is reasonable to claim that we have the financial resources to reach goals of limiting environmental degradation. Caney, for example, provides a cost-benefit analysis that predicts it is possible to stabilise CO2 concentration with only 1% of the annual GDP, but the stabilisation of CO2 is not included in normal politics, merely the reduction of pollution and the introduction of a limit to the temperature increase (Caney, 2010, 115). This means we have the financial means available to incorporate managerial solutions within liberal democracies, but we lack the political interest to do so. Meadows agrees that the first thing we should be doing is lowering the pollution levels to stabilise CO2.

'Excessive pollution levels must be lowered, and emission rates reduced back to levels below what is sustainable, it may not be necessary to reduce population or capital or living starters. What must go down quickly are material and energy throughputs. In other words, the ecological footprint of humanity must be lowered. Fortunately, (in a perverse way) there is so much waste and inefficiency in the current global economy that there is tremendous potential for reducing the footprint while still maintaining or even raising the quality of life (Meadows, 2006, 177).'

Both Caney and Meadows argue that the costs of saving the environment are not inordinately high. The problem according to them is rather the distribution of the available resources. This issue is integral to liberal democracy, because it is in the interest of citizens to have access to a system that is sustainable and efficient. Even though change is needed to achieve the fair distribution of resources, I think most people agree that it is sensible to eliminate the dangers of environmental harm while still improving our standard of living. If liberal democracy, on the basis of the Lockean provision, includes the equal position of all

people and a necessary condition for liberalism is the access to wealth, goods and rights, then it is in the interests of all citizens to stabilise CO2 emissions and improve resource distribution.

The second argument for the link between green and liberal democratic ideology is presented by Michael Saward, who claims that there is a democratic right not to be harmed by certain environmental risks (Saward, 1996, 79). According to him, the core of democratic rule is that it needs to be a responsive process, in which the wishes and interests of the citizens need to be taken into account. The democratic process must however never to turn towards a tyrannical democracy. Saward says that a majority rule is not the right choice per se, and that there are situations in which questioning the majority rule is necessary or desirable. Liberalism treats all individuals as equals, and the needs of the many should not overrule the needs of minority groups. The rule of the majority is not always legitimate, especially when citizens need to protected against the tyrannical rule of the majority (Saward, 1996, 83). I think this is an important addition to the liberal principle of the consensus of the people, because we do not want to justify the tyranny of the majority. The interests of people, belonging to either majority or minority, can only be properly represented if they can represent their own interests. To protect the interests of citizens, the responsive process of democratic society requires political autonomy.

The next argument links citizen's personal interest in healthcare to the interests of the environment. This is an anthropocentric way to frame environmental issues, as it shows the harm that environmental degradation can do to the people's wellbeing. Saward argues that healthcare is an interest in need of protection. Environmental degradation and climate change pose a severe threat to people's wellbeing. It is therefore in their democratic interest to express green concerns in a democratic fashion. The problem with this argument is that it runs into a discussion on ecological paternalism. In some cases, governments decide that the democratic decision of the majority is unjustified and protects its citizens by going against the majority's wishes. The problem of ecological paternalism is different from the problem of the majority rule in a democratic system, because refers to large groups of citizens demanding something from other citizens, instead of governments deciding what is best for their citizens against majority preference.

I think the problem with the democratic right of environmental interests is that there is no fixed definition or truth about what society needs. I discuss the problem of ecological paternalism in Chapter 3, but for now I consider that it is undesirable to leave the decision confined to arbitrary definitions. The danger exists that we end up putting aside democratic

decision-procedures for the wrong reasons, as we might not like the outcome of the majority rule. Ecological paternalism forces a certain outcome without the consent of the people involved, but majority rule can end up harming the environment even further.

Another problem with accepting the tyrannical nature of the majority rule is that it does not correspond with liberal freedom. Liberal democrats can choose their own reasons for action, but cannot determine what is right for others. It is unjustified to externally coerce someone to vote for a party or impose methods of political participation on other citizens. Liberal freedom requires people to act autonomously and free from limitations This means that liberal greens can construct their own lifestyle in an ecological way, but that they cannot force others to do the same.

Despite these two reasons to accept that liberals can reasonably support green goals to solve environmental issues, one problem remains: the anthropocentric bias and their neutrality towards radical change. This is a problem for the compatibility between ecologist and liberal democratic goals and may also pose a threat to the compatibility between liberal democracy and the green agenda in general. Liberal greens are interested in changing their individual preferences without forcing green policies on others, but environmental issues have severe and universal consequences. This means that environmental issues do not just influence our lives, but the lives of other species and ecosystems as well. This is a strict idea of what society and individual life ought to look like in a green liberal state, which conflicts with the liberal value of positive liberty.

One of the philosophers who discusses the possibility of a green and liberal democratic state is Wissenburg, who wrote extensively on the issue and can provide key insights into the debate. In one contribution to the book *'Political Theory and the ecological Challenge'* by Andrew Dobson and Robyn Eckersley, he presents the challenges that green liberalism faces. He claims that compatibility is possible, but argues that to 'ensure that those problems will be addressed, classic liberalism has to accept limits to neutrality and rid itself of its anthropocentric bias' (Wissenburg, 2006, 31). He states that liberalism does not occupy a neutral position towards green values, but rather that liberalism still has a bias against green political thought if the green agenda demands more just adapting our individual preferences (Wissenburg, 2006, 23).

There are two justifications for limiting neutrality: the liberal theory of the good and the conception of reality as limiting the desirable. The liberal theory of the good is the foundation on which liberal society is built. The Rawlsian liberal values like wealth and rights are examples of this, because the idea that people want to maximise their wealth and rights

explains why humans want to cooperate and why liberty and equality are equally important to citizens (Wissenburg, 2006, 24).

Liberal neutrality is not absolute due to the limitations liberals allow to their vision of reality. Their conception of reality includes the limitation of desirable goods to provide a balance between ethical limitations and personal freedom. For example, liberals can agree with the ecologist principle of limits to growth and they agree that there is a finite amount of resources. This belief can invite liberals to participate in the radical changes that are necessary.

I do not agree with Wissenburg that there are any possible democratic solutions to our environmental problems that get rid of this anthropocentric bias. As I discuss in Chapter 3, it is exactly this anthropocentric bias that provides the possibilities of extending the rights discourse or the harm principle to animals and ecosystems. It is not a problem that liberal democracy is not neutral towards green values or has an anthropocentric bias, because the only negative consequence of this is that liberal democracy is not compatible with all ecologist principles. In other ways, liberals accept ecologist principles like the limits to growth, which means that they do not always exclude each other. The limitation of liberal neutrality balances out any conflict between the consensus of the people and limited freedom through cooperation and as long as liberalism allows for ethical limitations, it does not matter whether liberals choose to do so on biocentric or anthropocentric grounds.

2.3 Justified limitations of individual freedom

We have already seen that liberal democracy can be compatible with green values, for example the limits to growth principle. That is not to say that they automatically are compatible or that their all principles overlap, because the diverse and abstract goals of the ideologies are sometimes in conflict with one another. Liberalism wants to maximise individual freedom, but to implement solutions to the environmental problem, we need a society that is focussed on cooperation. However, liberal democracies limit personal freedom on many grounds if freedom conflicts with other interests, especially with the freedom of others. Citizens in a liberal democracy are free and equal as the status quo and any limitation or interference with this status quo needs to be justified. This leads to the question: When is reason sufficient to justify the restriction of liberal freedom in the case of the green agenda? I argue that there are three kinds of interests that justify the limitation of freedom: the interests of other people, the interests of animals and the status of moral agents.

The first justified reason to restrict freedom is because it is in the interest of other people to do so. The democratic right to be free of environmental harm formulated by Saward, is one example of such a restriction. Interests of people include living in a healthy environment, so it is justified to limit individual freedom to protect a healthy standard of living conditions. Restriction of freedom of grounds of interests formulates interests, but especially environmental interests, in anthropocentric ways. Instead of formulating rights based on the integrity of ecosystems, interests are framed to represent the necessity to live in a clean environment, have access to food and resources to have a sufficient standard of healthcare and life in general. If people have an interest to have access to something, then they can claim that access as a right.

According to Caney, 'Employing the normal kinds of argument for justifying rights shows that persons have a right not to suffer from dangerous climate change' (Caney, 2010, 114).' He argues that people can have justified reasons or interests to limit the freedom of other individuals and the state. He refers to the justified rights theory by Joseph Raz, who says that to claim that someone has a right means that person has interests that are sufficiently weighty that to impose obligations on others (Caney, 2010, 211). Caney holds that environmental degradation and climate change bring such extremely dangerous changes for the human condition that humanity's interest regarding a clean environment are sufficiently weighty. These include basic interests like being free from famine and unhealthy conditions as well as being able to support themselves with financial and political means. He concludes that it these interests are sufficiently weighty to justify imposing moral obligations onto the actions of others. The justified rights account could achieve the desired goal of stopping climate change and minimising the consequences of environmental degradation. Climate change and environmental degradation will endanger people and their basic rights. The basic need for protection against the consequences of environmental degradation is a justified limitation on the freedom of others.

However, the conclusion that moral restriction is justified does not necessarily support restriction of freedom on the basis of ecologist principles. The statement that restriction is justified does not tell us anything about what kind of restrictions are justified. They could be restrictions bases on ecologist principles, but they could just as likely have the managerial approach to environmental protection that environmentalism promotes. Once again encounter the problem that one of our requirements is not to just achieve environmentally friendly goals, but actually achieve those goals on the foundation of ecologist principles. To allow for the justification of ecologist restrictions of liberal freedom, we need to have a more concrete form of restriction.

The second reason to limit freedom is to respect the status of others as moral agents. Moral agents are responsible for their actions, motivation and deliberative thought processes. Moral patients on the other hand are not responsible for their actions and motivations, but their wellbeing is still of importance. Ecologism argues that humans, animal species and ecosystems ought to be treated as moral agents. The restrictions of liberal rights can be justified by the rights or moral status of other people, but ecologism extends this idea. The interests of other species and the ecosystem are sufficiently weighty to justify the restriction of people's actions.

In liberal theory, most rights and responsibilities refer to human agents and not to animal agents. Freedom of speech for example does not refer to animals, but the right to be free from harm could apply to both, but does not do so necessarily. Farm animals, for example, are exempted from this right to be free of harm, but the wellbeing pets and animals in zoos is taken into account. All animals in these cases are treated like moral patients instead of moral agents. We do not hold animals accountable for their actions, which means that they do not qualify for personhood or moral concern in the traditional sense (Rowlands, 2011, 1). This lack of accountability means that liberal democrats would not accept animals as moral subjects with liberal rights, however, some arguments state that animals can act morally.

Mark Rowlands that humans and animals act morally if they act upon certain sentiments and that there is no need for self-reflection, so animals can be moral subjects. This means that the agent (human or animal) does not have to subject those sentiments to moral scrutiny (Rowlands, 2011, 11). Similarly, Lucius Caviola, argues that it is not the deliberative capacity that determines whether people give others moral standing. There are several examples of humans who do not possess the cognitive abilities for moral scrutiny, yet those people are still considered to be moral agents (Cavioli, 2018, 2).

The difference between humans and other species in the moral standing debate is that one group is labeled as moral subjects when they act morally and the other is called moral agents. Note that in the case of these humans, we still talk of moral agents, not moral subjects. The preference for the uniqueness of human consciousness extremely strong and results in a biased preference with regards to determining the levels of consciousness of animal species. These levels of consciousness are not considered when determining moral value between less developed humans and high developed animal species.

2.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, liberal democracy is defined by several principles, such as the consensus of the people, positive liberty, the fundamental principle, and the connection between liberalism and democracy. Not only are democracy and liberalism tied together, but liberal democracy and the green agenda are compatible. For a liberal democrat to implement green principles, limitations on individual freedom are necessary. The fundamental principle demands that these limitations must be justified. In the case of the green agenda, there are three justified limitations: the interests of other people, the interests of certain animal species and the status of moral agent.

Chapter 3: Incompatibility of ecologism and liberal democracy

In this chapter, I present two arguments for the incompatibility of ecologism and liberal democracy: the democratic procedure problem and the incompatibility of ecologist and liberal principles.

If ecologism and liberal democracy are compatible in theory and in practice, then we should be able to conclude that ecologist principles and liberal principles are compatible and that it is possible to realise ecologist principles through the democratic decision-making procedures.

I discuss the democratic procedure problem, which poses the question about realising long-term environmental goals through a democratic decision-making procedure. This problem is the core conflict between green and liberal values and I think this problem arises very strongly when we discuss the compatibility of ecologism and liberal democracy. In the section 3.1, I explain what the problem is and how the available literature deals with this problem. Of the five answers in the literature, none are successful in combining ecologism and liberal democracy. If liberal democracy and ecologism are compatible, liberal democracy must subscribe to the ecologist principles. If the current literature on the democratic procedure problem cannot provide an answer to how it can do this, that would support my argument that ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible.

In section 3.2 I provide a second argument: the incompatibility of ecologist and liberal principles. The available literature has failed to show that ecologist principles can be implemented in sustainable democracies. Most philosophers, like Eckersley and Oranella

focus more on the green ideals rather than the ecologist principles. have provided three principles of liberal democracy and six core principles of ecologism. To examine the compatibility of these ideologies, I compare ecologist and liberal principles and see if they are in conflict or if they can be compatible. The core principles of consensus of the people is not compatible with the priority principle and the ecosystem's inherent worth. Therefore the political ideologies of ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible in theory.

3.1 The green democratic procedure problem

In her article 'Greening liberal democracy: the rights discourse revisited', Eckersley describes the problem of liberal green states. The problem is that it is impossible to realise ecologist principles through democratic decision-making procedures. According to Eckersley, the democratic decision-making procedure problem is:

'The apparent inability of western liberal democracies to provide long lasting resolutions to the ecological crises raises a question for greens that has long preoccupied democratic socialists: if democracy is a non-negotiable element of green political theory, then how might greens secure their political goal by means of a decision-making framework that is supposedly open ended?' (Eckersley, 1996, 212)

Note that Eckersley assumes that democracy is a non-negotiable element of green political theory, which includes ecologism. This limits the scope of ecologism from a totalitarian theory to a political ideology that argues for environmental protection, anti-speciesism and the guarantee of freedom and equality.

The literature gives four answers to the problem of implementing ecologism through democratic decision-making procedures. Eckersley provides two opposing solutions: lawful political persuasion and ecological paternalism. She argues that both options are insufficient to solve of the problem of green democratic procedure. Instead, she suggests that a human rights account can limit governmental power with the consent of its people. This argument is a good answer to the democratic procedure question for general green principles, but it does not extend to ecologist theory. The human rights account is too biased and too anthropocentric, which means its foundations cannot be acceptable for an ecologist, who demands the equality of people and natural species.

Lawful political persuasion provides an open ended system for decision-making. It enables people to persuade others to support ecologist principles and to convince others

that it is in people's best interest to be green liberal democrats. Lawful political persuasion could provide a political system in which people use their freedom to implement green policy (Eckersley, 1996, 212). The difference between lawful and unlawful is most apparent in the visions of organisations that fight for better treatment of animals. The lawful approach is to advocate for vegetarianism, better treatment of (farm) animals and the animal rights (Cordeiro-Rodrigues, 2016, 235). The problem, however, is that these types of activism do not provide sufficient positive results. For example, Luís Cordeiro-Rodrigues claims that social movements who campaign for animal welfare have existed since ancient Greece, but that in the last few decades meat consumption has almost quadrupled. Activism has not prevented speciesism or the genocidal character of modern bioindustry (Cordeiro-Rodrigues, 2016, 234/235).

On the other hand, many cases of animal activism involve civil disobedience. Animal activism can include violence and illegal activism and in those cases it considered to be a form of terrorism. For example the actions and protests of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) aim to provoke instead of informing others about animal injustice. The ALF activists sometimes steal animals from laboratories or farms in order to free them from the harm they are suffering. This organisation promotes its values of animal welfare in a way that endorses stealing, destruction and threats, which understandably antagonises many people who do not share their beliefs. They believe illegal action in morally justified and violent actions are desirable (Cordeiro-Rodrigues, 2016, 226). They argue that because lawful persuasion does not work, they have to free animals from harmful conditions in other ways. Although they destroy the instruments that harm animals as a last resort, ALF does not harm or kill people.

This standard liberal view of lawful political persuasion is green in its goals, but it cannot be the final answer to the democratic decision-making problem. Lawful political persuasion is a limited tool of realising green policy and there is no certainty in the outcome of the democratic process. Even if people are impressed by the green persuasion, they still would be free to choose other values. This leads to the problem that the ecologist priority rule always demands the best possible outcome for the environment, which lawful persuasion cannot guarantee. The lawful argument supports the incompatibility of ecologism and liberal democracy, because we are looking for a political system that guarantees green results.

The second possibility, ecological paternalism, is a form of paternalistic authority. The government decides on what is necessary and implements their solution. There is no form of self-government or collective decision-making involved. Even though people cannot exercise their political freedom, ecological paternalism provides radical change. If the government

wants to save the environment, they could force their citizens to act in ways that do not harm the environment. This would make this state a authoritarian or totalitarian state, in which the state fails to fulfil its civic duty. The restriction of citizen's rights and freedom is highly problematic, because the oppression could extend to issues other than environmental protection. Even if the idea is to protect citizens from their own possible faulty decision-making when it comes to environmental interests, the domination over free and equal citizens cannot be condoned.

Lawful political persuasion and ecological paternalism leave us without a satisfying answer to the realisation of ecologist principles. Instead, Eckersley proposes an account that covers the middle ground between lawful political persuasion and ecological paternalism. She suggests that if we consider the rights discourse can connect interests of ecologism and democracy on the level of principles. This involves switching from a cost-benefit analysis of environmental claims to understanding those claims as rights (Eckersley, 1996, 216). If the interests of the environment are taken as rights, they will be protected and therefore, fit in the ecologist discourse on the priority of environmental interests. The goal of Eckersley's new theory is to account for the political relationships of power and to critique the undemocratic aspects of liberal rights. Eckersley claims that:

'The rights discourse has served a treble duty for liberalism- moral, political and legal.That is, it has provided foundation for limited government by the consent of the people: it has provided a successful rhetorical device of the political recognition of a new rising class (the bourgeoisie) and a political challenge to the existing class (the aristocracy); and it has provided a legal institution by which certain forms of conduct, to be more precisely, certain social and economic relationships between people, have been sanctioned or penalised by the state." (Eckersley, 1996, 218 - 219)

Eckersley's proposal provides a legitimate answer to the tension between democratic decision-making and the realisation of the green agenda. With the consent of the people of a state, limitations are accepted on the basis of human rights. One example of how human rights can be extended to environmental issues is the right to a healthy environment, which subsumes all the human rights to food, non-discrimination, healthcare, property and private life into one overlapping right that also includes the environment. Marcos Oranella argues that:

The human right to a healthy environment brings together the environmental dimensions of civil, cultural, economic, political, and social rights, and protects the core elements of the natural

environment that enable a life of dignity. Diverse ecosystems and clean water, air, and soils are indispensable for human health and security. The right also protects the civic space for individuals to engage in dialogue on environmental policy. Without it, government policies often cater to the commercial interests of the powerful, not the public, and certainly not the politically disenfranchised (Oranella, 2018).

Although this is an anthropocentric reason to protect the environment, grounding environmental interests in human rights gives them a value that cannot be denied. However, there are some problems with this [human] rights discourse and its compatibility with ecologism. The foundation of a human right is its universality, but the universal foundation is a debated topic. If human rights are indeed universal rights, they are legitimate (Couto, 2010, 201). The reason why human rights are universal is because they apply to all people based on them being human.

The warning that human rights can become mask for values can also apply to the environmental rights. Just because we want to protect other species or the environment does not necessarily mean that they have rights. It is not a tool to apply to coerce others to refrain from acting. If we recall the reasons for limiting freedom, there needed to be justified grounds of moral standing to be able to speak of animals having rights. Even though I argue that certain animals can have interests and therefore rights, species other than humans cannot have human rights. The human rights discourse applies to humans base on them being human, not on the ground of having capacities such as consciousness or awareness of suffering. Therefore, even though animals can have interests and therefore rights, they cannot have human rights.

The fourth answer to the democratic procedure problem is to use nudging as a tool to implement green goals. If you remember, we have defined the principles of liberal democracy among other things as a responsive rule. The liberal democratic government ought to listen to the concerns of its citizens, regardless of the question if they are allowed to dispose of the majority rule in environmental issues. The problem with a majority rule is that people can make self-destructing choices. On the other hand, totalitarianism leaves citizens without the option of representing their own interests. It has already been decided which interests need protection and how they will be protected. Just like the rights discourse, nudging provides a middle way between paternalism and lawful political persuasion.

Nudging, which involves influencing people's subconscious decision-making processes (Hall, 2016, 4). A simple example of this practice is to present goods in a store in a way that

the more environmentally friendly options are most easy to buy. This decreases the changes that the harmful option is less likely to be chosen, but the choice is still up to the agent.

The concern regarding nudging is that governments can use this to manipulate the people towards a certain goal and treat them like objects. This would defeat the purpose of a responsive democratic system and result in problems of paternalistic government. Another problem of nudging is that the influence is external and that is exactly what we as liberal democrats want to avoid. If nudging is externally imposed and restricts freedom without the internal cause of action, then it does not comply with democratic freedom and equality. If we accept a form of nudging within liberal democracy, then socialistic nudging would also count as internal democracy that includes public participation. That would be absurd and would not provide a stable foundation for the compatibility of ecologist goals and liberal values.

3.2 Compatibility of liberal and ecologist principles

Even though green values can be implemented through democratic procedures, all five answers fall short of implementing ecologist values through democratic procedures. This means that ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible in terms of the democratic procedure problem. This practical incompatibility is supported by the claim that liberal democracy and ecologism are incompatible in theory.

As described earlier, the principles of ecologism are the limits to growth thesis, the principle of protection and conservation, the principle of justified use, the priority rule, the inherent value of nature and anti-speciesism. The principles of liberal democracy are the consensus of the people, positive or negative liberty, the fundamental principle and the connection between liberalism and democracy. To argue that ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible I do not need to compare every principle. We get theoretical incompatibility if one core principle from liberalism and one core principle from ecologism conflict. Some principles might actually overlap, as is proven in the case of the ecologist principle of limits to growth, which is also a principle accepted in in liberal theory. Even if some principles are compatible, the existence of conflict between others proves that the political ideologies are incompatible.

If at least two principles conflict with one another liberal democracy and ecologism are incompatible. All principles are necessary aspects of the ideologies, so they all must be compatible for the ideologies, we need more than the coincidental compatibility of one or two principles. I want to focus on the principles that express the question we are trying to answer in this chapter: can ecologist principles be implemented through democratic procedures in liberal societies? I want to argue that the principle of consensus is in conflict with most of the

ecologist principles and that therefore, we cannot guarantee ecologist action through the democratic procedures in liberal societies.

The liberal principle of consensus of the people conflicts with the ecologist principles of the priority rule and the inherent nature of the ecosystem and other species. These principles propose that we always need to choose the environmental interests above other interests such as economic or social interests. By saying that nature has intrinsic value, the discussion about the different kinds of value that nature holds is already determined and cut off from any input from the liberal anthropocentric reasoning. Both these principles are authoritarian in nature, as they require only one kind of response, whereas the liberal principle of consensus requires the exchange of ideas.

A problem arises, however, with the implementation of ecologist principles through democratic procedures, as there is a conflict between democratic and authoritarian rule. Ecologism needs to provide a solution to the problem of the degradation of the environment, regardless of the opinion of the citizens. In contrast, a democracy does not to provide the citizens with the best possible solution to a certain problem, but allows them to the right to act as they see fit.

Ellis refers to this conflict when she talks about restricting action in favour of honouring the intrinsic value that certain species can have and what we ought to do when they face extinction.

'Democracies may choose to ignore arguments for the intrinsic value of unique and irreplaceable species, for example, as well as arguments for the rights of non-human animals or for the interconnectedness of all being on the planet. The only values that democracies must in principle preserve are those that provide the conditions of possibility for democratic decision-making. To continue with the endangered species example, once we allow a species to go extinct, no further policy decision can be made about it. But since we cannot substitute our theoretical judgment about the policy for that of the demos, shouldn't we respect a people's determination that the species has less value to them than the value that would accrue to them without it? (Ellis, 2016, 6)'

She argues that democrats are always entitled to choose whatever option they want, regardless of the underlying principles, beliefs or reasons. This could lead to a situation in which experts suggest a certain line of action or recommend to act upon certain policy, but the citizens ignore that information. If it is true that the determination of a people may not be limited by environmental concerns or policies to ensure the enforcement of protection of ecosystems and species, liberal democracy cannot be compatible with ecologism.

Ecologism does have a certain belief about what the good life entails and what individuals, institutions and society as a whole must do to implement those goals. The central goal of ecologism is to take care of the environment. Many forms of ecologism are far-fetched and require not a mere change of consumer behaviour or the slight changes in making policies more green, but it asks us to evaluate what is truly necessary to live a healthy and prosperous life. The ecologist emphasises that in cases of conflict between economic or social interests and green interests, the green interest that should win, which indicates the authoritarian nature of green politics.

The problem is that setting ecologist priority may require a change in both political and social structures if our current system cannot provide solutions to the imperative green demands of ecologism. Ecologism, if properly followed through, demands a trade-off between interests which leave the liberal and democratic interests out of the equation. Several philosophers argue that ecologism may need to look beyond liberal democracy to reach its goals (Humphrey, 2001 and Dobson, 2000). Dobson says that ecologists are not concerned with democratic decision-making procedures. He says:

'But if getting the right thing done is more important than how it gets done, why should greens not endorse authoritarian means to green ends? At root, the core green concerns are consequentialist and this consequentialism is in tension with the proceduralism of democracy.' (Goodin, as cited in Dobson, 2000, 57).

He argues that it does not matter how we reach environmental protection, as long as we do. Saward argrees and states that we should sometimes sacrifice democracy in order to save ourselves from severe (environmental) harm (Saward, 1996, 84). Democratic decision-making procedures, however, fulfill a social and political function and protect the rights of citizens. The consequentialism of ecologism results in the focus on result instead of the procedure. To reach environmental protection, liberal rights have to be limited, but to sacrifice them all together means losing the system of liberal democracy. Living in a sustainable environment cannot guarantee people's wellbeing without social, economic and political rights. People ought to have access to environmental protection, freedom and equality and their human rights to live fulfilling lives. This conclusion only shows that it is impossible to find a solution that is ecologist and democratic at the same time. The principles of ecologism and liberal democracy are not compatible and the ideologies are therefore incompatible if they cannot solve the conflicts I have presented.

3.3 Future research

Even though ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible, the green agenda is not necessarily lost. Future research can determine what the best course of action is to implement green goals into our current political system or how we can adept that political system. Even if ecologism and liberalism are incompatible, there are other ways to realise the ecologist goals. I think the method that is most useful for the green liberal democrat is either to use lawful persuasion or to introduce environmental human rights. These methods both respect the consensus of the people without externally imposing green policy.

Dobson's stated that the ecologist is more concerned with reaching the goal of solving environmental issues than the negative side-effects of the available methods. Ecologists would achieve more results if they had non-democratic or paternalistic ways of forcing people to protect the environment. One mode by which there may be an 'end' to green politics, in this sense, is the extent to which liberal democracy itself is now taken as the only appropriate vehicle for delivering ecological goods, which may rule out in principle other forms of political agency in green politics (Humphrey, 2001 ,93)." Future research could go into the forms of environmental protection and the compatibility with government practices that also respect human rights. Such a society, for example, could protect human rights and environmental human rights on anthropocentric grounds. As we have seen in this thesis, Eckersley and Caney provide substantial theories that could reconcile green goals and democratic values grounded in anthropocentric reasons for protecting the environment.

Conclusion

In this thesis I argued that liberal democracy and ecologism are incompatible political ideologies. Ecologism argues for radical change to establish a sustainable and healthy relationship between humanity and nature. This radical position differs from the managerial approach of environmentalism to environmental degradation. The core principles of ecologism are the limits to growth thesis, the principle of protection and conservation, the principle of justified use, the priority rule, the inherent value of nature, and anti-speciesism. Liberalism is the egalitarian ideology that people citizens ought to have equal freedom and opportunities. Its core principles are: the consensus of the people, positive or negative liberty, the fundamental principle, and the connection between liberalism and democracy.

Ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible on two grounds: ecologist principles cannot be implemented through democratic decision-making procedures and ecologist and liberal principles are in conflict. The incompatibility extends to liberal democracy, because the argument of preconditions is a necessary connection between liberalism and democracy

Ecologism and liberal democracy are incompatible on two grounds: ecologist principles

Bibliography

Achterberg, W., (1986). *Partners in de natuur: een onderzoek naar de aard en de fundamenten van een ecologische ethiek,* Van Arkel: Utrecht

Akhtar, S., (2011), 'Animal Pail and Welfare: Can Pain Sometimes Be Worse for Them than for US?', *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Ethics*

Allen, C and Trestman, M., (2006) 'Animal consciousness' in The Blackwell Companion to Consciousness, John Wiley and Sons Ltd

Ball, T., and Dagger, R., (2011) *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal*, London: Pearson Education

Barry, J., (1996) 'Sustainability, Political Judgement and Citizenship: Connecting Green Politics and Democracy', in *Democracy and Green Political Thought: Sustainability, Rights and Citizenship*. London: Routledge

Barry, J., (1999). *Rethinking Green Politics: Nature, Virtue and Progress,* Sage: London

Bell, D, R,. (2005). 'Liberal environmental citizenship' in *Environmental Politics,* vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 179-194

Best, S. (2009) Manifesto for radical abolitionism: total deliberation by any means necessary on http://www.animalliberationfront.com/ALFront/Manifesto-TotalLib.htm

Blaikie, P. and Brookfield, H., (1987) *Land and Degradation and Society*, London: Methuen & Co Inc., London,

Brink, D., (2018). 'Mill's Moral and Political Philosophy', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

Brennan, A. and Yeuk-Sze, L., (2016) 'Environmental Ethics', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/ethics-environmental/>.

Brubaker, S,. (1972). 'Environment - An Elastic Limit to Growth' in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Vol. 69, No. 12, pp. 3834-3838

Caney, S., (2010). 'Human rights, climate change, and discounting' in *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 113-130

Carter, I., 'Positive and Negative Liberty', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/liberty-positive-negative/>.

Celikates, R. (2010). 'Civil Disobedience as a Practice of Civic Freedom' in *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 207-228

Cordeiro-Rodrigues, L., (2016). 'Is the Animal Liberation Front morally justified in engaging in violent and illegal activism towards animal farms? in *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 226-246,

Couto, R. A., (2010). *Political and Civic Leadership : A Reference Handbook*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications

Dobson, A., (2012). *Green Political Thought*, London: Routledge

Dobson, A, and Eckersley, R., (2006). *Political Theory and the ecological Challenge*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Doherty and de Geus, M., (1996). *Democracy and Green Political Thought: Sustainability, Rights and Citizenship*. London: Routledge.

Eckersley, R., (2004). *The Green state: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty*, Cambridge: MIT Press

Gaus, G., (2000). Negative and positive liberty in Political concepts and political theories, New York; Routledge

Gaus, G., Shane D. and Schmidtz, 'Liberalism', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2018 Edition)

Gaus, G., (1996). *Justificatory Liberalism: An Essay on Epistemology and Political Theory*. Oxford University Press.

Hall, C., (2016), 'Framing and Nudging for a Greener Future', *Oxford Handbook of Environmental Political Theory*

Humphrey, M., (2001). 'Reassessing Ecology and Political Theory' in *Environmental Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 1-6

Humphrey, M., (2004). 'Ecology, democracy and autonomy: A problem of wishful thinking' in *Routledge/ECPR Studies in European Political Science*, Vol. 34

Kaldis, B., (2013). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy and the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications

Keulemans, M., (5 april 2019). 'Het klimaat, vijftig jaar later: een min of meer hoopgevend bericht uit 2069' in *de Volkskrant*

Lidskog, R., (2005) Siting conflicts – democratic perspectives and political implications, in *Journal of Risk Research*, iss. 8, no. 3, pp. 187-206, DOI: 10.1080/1366987042000175489

McNeill, D., (2010). 'Ethics, politics, economics and the global environment' in *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, pp. 97-112

Meadows, D. H., [and others]. (1972). *The Limits to growth; a report for the Club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind*. New York: Universe Books

Meyer, J. M., (2011). 'We have never been liberal: the environmentalist turn to liberalism and the possibilities for social criticism' in *Environmental Politics*, vol. 20 nr. 3, pp. 356-373

Naess, A., (2008), 'The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement. A summary', in *Inquiry,* Vol. 16, pp. 95-100

Sarkar, S., (2016) 'Ecology', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/ecology/>.

Saward, M., (1996), 'Must Democrats be environmentalists?', in Doherty, Brain; de Geus, Marius (eds.), *Democracy and green political thought: sustainability, rights, and citizenship.*, London New York: Routledge, pp. 77–94

Sinnott-Armstrong, W., (2005), 'It's not my fault: global warming and individual moral obligations', *Perspectives on Climate Change,* Dordrecht: Springer

St. Clair, A., (2010). 'Global poverty and climate change: Towards the responsibility to protect' In *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 180-198

Rawls, J., (1971). *A theory of justice,* Cambridge, Mass; Belknap Press of Harvard University Press,

Rowlands, M., (2011), 'Animals that Act for Moral Reasons', *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Ethics*

Stephan, M.J. and Chenoweth, E., (2008). 'Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict in' *International Security,* Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 7-44

Stewart, H., (2010) 'The Limits of the Harm Principle' in Criminal Law and Philosophy, No. 4, pp. 17–35

Turner, P, N,. (2014). 'Harm' and Mill's Harm Principle' in *Ethics* No. 124, pp. 299–326

Tuckness, Alex, "Locke's Political Philosophy", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/locke-political/>.

Varner, G. E., (2002) In nature's interests? Interests, animal rights, and environmental ethics, Oxford/New York : Oxford University Press

Waldron, J., (1979). Enough and as Good Left for Others, *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 117, Pages 319–328

Walker, P. A., (2007, 06). Political ecology: Where is the politics? in *Progress in Human Geography,* Vol. 3*1*, No.3, 363-369

Wissenburg, M., (1998). *Green Liberalism*, London: Routledge

Wissenburg, M. and Levy, J., (2004) *Liberal Democracy and Environmentalism : The End of Environmentalism?* London: Routledge