Alienation and Nature in Environmental Philosophy

Many environmental scientists, scholars and activists characterize our situation as one of alienation from nature, but this notion can easily seem meaningless or irrational. In this book, Simon Hailwood critically analyses the idea of alienation from nature and argues that it can be a useful notion when understood pluralistically. He distinguishes different senses of alienation from nature pertaining to different environmental contexts and concerns, and draws upon a range of philosophical and environmental ideas and themes including pragmatism, eco-phenomenology, climate change, ecological justice, Marxism and critical theory. His novel perspective shows that different environmental concerns – both anthropocentric and nonanthropocentric – can dovetail, rather than compete, with each other, and that our alienation from nature need not be something to be regretted or overcome. His book will interest a broad readership in environmental philosophy and ethics, political philosophy, geography and environmental studies.
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It is usual at this point to say that none of the above bears any responsibility for what follows. And of course none of them would agree with all of it; some will disagree with most – if not all – of it. So I hereby absolve them. Having said that, they did at least encourage me to some extent. It is for the reader to decide whether they were right to do so.