Eco-refuges as Anarchist's Promised Land or the End of Dialectical Anarchism

Guido J. M. Verstraeten[1,2] and Willem W. Verstraeten[3,4]

[1] Satakunta University of Applied Sciences
Tiedepuisto 3, FI 28000 Pori, Suomi-Finland

[2] Antwerp University Association, Karel de Grote hogeschool,
Nationalestraat 5, 2000 Antwerp, Flanders

[3] Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute
PO Box 201, NL-3730 AE, De Bilt, the Netherlands

[4] Wageningen University
Droevendaalsesteeg 3a, 6708 PB, Wageningen, the Netherlands
Corresponding author's email: willem.verstraeten {at} knmi.nl

---

ABSTRACT—*Since the early Medieval Time people contested theological legitimation and rational discursive discours on authority as well as retreated to refuges to escape from any secular or ecclesiastical authority. Modern attempts formulated rational legitimation of authority in several ways: pragmatic authority by Monteigne, Bodin and Hobbes, or the contract authority of Locke and Rousseou. However, Enlightened Anarchism, first formulated in 1793 by the English philosopher William Godwin fulminated against all rational restrictions of human freedom and self-determination. However, we do not analyze anarchism by the 'what' and the 'why', but by looking for the best actual approach of Anarchist's 'Promised Land'. Furthermore, we follow the footsteps of Thoreau's Walden Pond experiment considered as a place of salvation and prototype of 19th century romantic's extreme individualism towards Leopold's ethics of the land. Indeed, Thoreau's and later Muir's concepts of refuges are tightly connected to territorial and temporal bio-regional constraints and imply an internally organized public area based on mutualism and Hannah Arendt's agape. From these ideas of refuges, Aldo Leopold formulated his Land-ethics that claimed integrity and autonomy of the 'Land'. His foundation is a prototype of the eco-centric free space version of eco-anarchism as formulated by Bookchin.*

In order to formulate a philosophical foundation of eco-anarchism we reject Newtonian homogeneous space-temporal conception, preceding the whole Modern discours about authority and state. On the contrary, we adopt the pluralistic Leibnizian space-time from which thinking-humans do not dissociate themselves, but participate as part of the rational infrastructure of eco-refuges. In eco-refuges, citizen belong to the civil society that stays in equilibrium with the landscape and all forms of biological life. Space is the boundary condition of human activity and determines how borders, environmental organization and institutes are sustained. Space has its proper essence of sustainability, unity and integrity. The individual feelings of security are embedded in a timelike tradition and evolution of the free space, while individual particular conceptions of space and time integrate into the social processes of identification with the refuge. Therefore, the creation of eco-refuges transforms the actual world of national authorities into a world of anarchistic democratic eco-regional homelands.

Keywords— Enlightened anarchism, Land-Ethics, eco-anarchism, eco-refuge, eco-regionalism

---

1. FROM PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM TO ECOLOGICAL THINKING ABOUT SPACE AND TIME

Recently, Jacob Blumenfeld et al. [1] claimed in the monograph 'The Anarchist Turn' innovative and fresh perspectives on anarchism and present it as a form of collective, truly democratic social organization. The authors argue that with the failure of both free markets and state socialism the time has come for an 'anarchist turn' in political philosophy. Furthermore, Alan John Simmons [2] analyzed the term 'anarchism' in all its aspects and started from the anarchist commitments of voluntarism, with great importance of individual autonomy, free choice and self-determination, but also egalitarianism. This means equal rights as well as equal opportunities and equal access to basic wants and needs. Finally, philosophical anarchism is committed to the central anarchist thesis of state illegitimacy.

Particularly, the latter is highly contested by Windeknecht [3] on arguments based on the three fundamental principles of philosophical anarchism: the strong correlativity of legitimacy rights and political obligations, the strict distinction between justified existence and legitimate authority; and the doctrine of personal consent, more precisely, its supporting assumptions about the natural freedom of individuals and the non-natural states into which individuals are born. According to Windeknecht, Simmons's claim that a state is always justified to enforce the law even in case of 'illegitimate and unjustified in existence' sounds odd.

Instead of analyzing what Anarchy could be today or why Anarchy as political and philosophical item appears in the world history, we return to the early days of Enlightened Anarchism. So we start from the English philosopher William Godwin who fulminated in 1793 against all legal restrictions of human freedom while the Enlightened Era had the ambition to make room for an open mind of an individual far away from the obscurity produced by religious superstition. Kymlicka´s concise concept of Enlightened Anarchism contains more elements of any form of anarchism: Enlighten Anarchism starts from the principles of individual freedom, furthermore it rejects any legitimation of hierarchy and particularly compelling man's obedience to others and the natural subordination amongst human beings. On the other hand, it accepts the public area as place of general virtue and happiness [4]. Particularly the fact that anarchists want to realize their claims in the physical space and on a real time is the very reason that this paper is examining and articulating the actual anarchistic homeland, what we call the 'Promised Land' of the anarchist.

In fact the above mentioned conceptions of philosophical anarchism analyze personal freedom, hierarchy and authority in terms of an a priori existing state without concern about the particularity of state's territory and state's history. Territory and history are reduced to a eternal scenic room in which the community is ordered according to rational idea's. As Blumenfeld [1], we turn the concept of anarchism up side down and territory and history are no longer just a scene but the cornerstones of a society of freedom, voluntarism and self-identification of all participants to this space-timelike frame. As there is no authority or hierarchy in space-time, it is not a matter of legitimating power, obedience and inequality, but a matter of participation of all to the public area under the strict boundary conditions of space and time.

Moreover, an interesting presentation of Anatole Lucet [5] about the Enlightened Anarchism of the German philosopher Gustav Landauer encouraged us to abandon the traditional dialectic way of thinking about Anarchism, particularly its Marxist conception. According to Landauer the anarchistic revolution does not start with violence against the actual public place and its organization but by killing in oneself any obstacle to the expression of the 'Spirit', meaning both the spirit of solidarity as well as the root to community in every individual.

In addition, the actual anarchistic space for human freedom looks quite different from the paradise of workers and peasants considered as the ultimate public place of civil virtue and happiness at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The Planet is faced dramatic ecological problems partly caused by political Capitalism as well as Communism, both the products of dialectic thinking in political and economical scope. Moreover, we also have to kill the obstacle in our mind to reconcile culture and nature, both parts of an intellectual dichotomy started in the Modern Times. Therefore, we analyze the places of anarchy in the time wherein they were created. Then, we situate the conception of Enlightened Anarchism within the Newtonian rational thinking about space and time as foundation of the philosophical concept of public area. Furthermore, we leave the Enlightenment dialecting thinking by adopting a complete different relation between subject and object based on the Leibnizian concept of space and time. As such we make room for an enlarged empathy, compassion and love to all participants of the ecological space, called the eco-refuge. Eventually we speculate about the consequences of the creation of eco-refuges for the political organization of the Planet.

2. FREEDOM, FREE PLACES AND REFUGES IN THE WILDERNESS

Some practical and pragmatic anarchism was still existing before the rational ideas of the Enlightenment Indeed, neither authority claims based on theological arguments, nor any rational discursive discours about sovereign power and exercise of power could prevent man's resistance against a hierarchically organized public area. But is it not remarkable that a feudal society wherein peasants were viewed as naturally subordinate to aristocrats, however, made room for free places, a public area where everybody temporally and even for ever was free of prosecution? Such a place was often under ecclesiastical protection, i.e. churchyards. Sometimes these places were really free from any external authority. These places of asylum were shelters to protect people from arbitrary authority of the sword and because man's integrity and freedom were the first concern at these places, free places can be considered as breeding ground for anarchism.

At the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century, these forms of practical anarchism faded away when rational discours about man's equality and legitimation of sovereign power arose together with the modern rational discours about space and time. All these attempts started from an original natural state of absolute individual freedom, but ended in shrinking this freedom by accepting the absolute power of the sovereign enforced at any time and at any place. Either privates restrict their freedom by submitting their quarrels to arbitration of the state embodied by the

sovereign – see Bodin and Monteigne [6] – or by fear for violence and destruction. As direct products of human nature, people adopt freely the absolute power of the state embodied by Hobbes' untouchable Leviathan in order to create peace and to be common [7]. The third way of legitimating power and hierarchy starts from Locke's hypothetical contract limiting human freedom by the boundary conditions of rationality and efficiency, both principles governing the whole space of the planet at any time [8].

But how to realize the 'Promised Land' of the anarchist with freedom, equality and voluntarism of all? Instead of the Medieval free places there are many former and recent experiments. Is it the Walden Pond area of the American philosopher Thoreau, a refuge in the woods, considered as a place of salvation and prototype of 19th century romantic's extreme individualism, created as a reaction against the utilitarian legitimation of political authority by Bentham [9]?

3. HOW DOES THE ´PROMISED LAND´ OF THE ANARCHIST LOOK LIKE?

To answer these questions we have to make the balance of the above mentioned historical introduction. At first glance we mention the complete rejection of the Aristotelian state by Enlighted Anarchism because the private has an ontological status that precedes the community or the state. Therefore anarchism touches the ideas of Althusius [10] where the public area is bringing together just a formal and informal collection of individuals at a particular place and at particular time [11]. It rejects the social contracts because they imply a hypothetical now and here that both make room for an empty space and time, a priori ordered by hierarchy. Though starting from equal opportunity or equal access to participate in such a public space, it is this hierarchy that causes forms of social repression (racism, sexism) and even of human domination of nature [12]. Indeed, starting from a worldwide accepted contract our world endowed with different ecosystems is just considered as a global empty container ready to be fulfilled with human activity and products, more than human beings can consume. Eventually, it denies the difference in cultural traditions, technical development and cultural preferences to live with the particular environment without dominating it.

The arguments for the above cited refuges in wilderness or in deserted parts of Capitals is not a rejection of authority but an alternative for individual emancipation that refuses the a-topic and meta-temporal character of the modern public area where any individual receives direct access to the public area of modern states [13] provided every private would be shaped according to the cultural, social, economical and even moral standards of the modern citizen. Furthermore, while Medieval (practical) Anarchism rejected a world of peasants and lords so does Enlightened Anarchism reject the Kantian Cosmopolitism that represents a worldwide domination of 'upstairs' Western civil virtue while subordinating the moral values of the 'downstairs' working class. Direct access to the public goods implied, indeed, the adoption of centralism, hierarchy and uniformity [14]. In our actual global world the former cosmopolitan concepts are exchanged by concepts such like economical global market, political new world order and cultural borderless societies.

Evanoff [15] characterizes the actual manifestation of the Enlightened World as the realization of the dominant development paradigm based on the myth of continued economic growth. It leads to an unsustainable world, social injustice and poverty for most people. The early anarchist, however, claimed freedom in a public area of civil virtue and happiness for all. Today, we cannot deny the non-human participants and the landscape as intrinsic part of the public area. So we claim that actual Enlighten Anarchistic option for particular places and times is the very reason why all contract theories are rejected and as a consequence, this particular space-time concept shed light on the deep practical and theoretical relationship between actual anarchism and the creation of public area's without a priori subordination of human beings and nature. In addition, Evanoff adopts the bioregional paradigm based on differences of culture, space, cultural traditions and the environment of non-human living beings and the landscape.

We want to go one step further and we look for a metaphysical foundation of space and time of the anarchist in the scope of an extended concept of the public area that includes all human, non-human participants and the landscape. So we set foot on the trail started by Thoreau and in our days evolved into ecophilosophy. Indeed, Thoreau's and later Muir's concepts of refuges are tightly connected to territorial and temporal bio-regional constraints [16].

4. FROM REFUGES TO LAND-ETHICS

The first coherent attempt to realize a sustainable public area that guarantees justice and wellness for the whole ecosystem is Aldo Leopold's A Sand County Almanac [17]. Leopold argued about the land. Land deserves moral consideration, land is the foundation of stability and space of interdependent participants. Not only the ecosystem with its different living species claims moral consideration, also the landscape claims moral considerations.

The land with all its participants needs moral considerations because they posses all intrinsic value. The reason is that in essence and in existence all participants are mutually connected. The land influences the existence of its guests, and the guests mutually influence each other. Humans living in Scandinavia are influenced by the land and the living species, and those men are different from the fisherman of Holland because the latter was since generations struggling against the

water in a climate that was more smooth than the Scandinavian. Unfortunately, Leopold did not articulate the intrinsic value of the whole ecosystem, neither the particularly of the non-human life. Leopold starts from the claim of integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. Human beings are not individuals but belong to this biotic community. He rejects any despotic human behavior with respect to the environment:

"...The land ethic changes the role of Homo sapiens from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it... and put the relation of man and land upside-down ... the land doesn't belong to us, we belong to the land..."

Anarchists pucker up one's brows because Leopold's land-ethics cannot be considered as a blueprint for anarchistic experiments. What about hierarchy, what about individual freedom within the land and what about the weak philosophical legitimations of human duties with respect to the land? Eventually, the complementary proposals of Baird Callicott who claimed a global ethical status of Land-ethics [18] and furthermore environmental consciousness *"... that spans national and cultural boundaries"* [19] send any Enlightened Anarchist flying. The former claim implies duties restricting individual freedom, the latter claims tacitly an invisible authority.

But adopting Norton's comment that Leopold's land-ethics must be considered as a practical remark on the locus of conservation management and not as a philosophical statement of ultimate values for all situates Leopold's claims in correct scope [20]. Indeed, Leopold made room for justice and wellness for all biotic life and for the particularity of landscape and the land. In consequence, he opened the iron cage of hierarchy between human beings and non-humans', he contested human domination and tacitly he abandoned the idea that human civil virtue evolved from contracts and terms that oppose the unique human intrinsic value against the dominated nature. Finally, Leopold's conception of public area matches greatly the Enlightened Anarchistic conception of any life: a particular place of free participants, happiness for all participants and a spontaneous civil virtue.

5. FROM LAND-ETHICS VIA ECO-ANARCHISM TO ECO-REGIONALISM

So we pass to anarchistic social eco-ethics, where the particularity of places and times is core matter. Most famous are the anarchistic environmental conceptions of Bookchin [21] and Sale [22]. Bookchin started from social liberalism which sees individuals in the context of the social relations they deal with others. Extension of the conception of 'others' to 'all what is other than myself' has something common to Leopold's extended ethics. Later he came to the idea of libertarian municipalism, the basis of local communities characterized by small scale, self-governed communities and mostly self-supporting and sustainable [23]. In fact Bookchin connects the anarchistic sighs for freedom, out of hierarchy and domination. The search for self-government and self-support match the new environmental claims to produce a sustainable community. Moreover, Sale [24] enforced the link between ecology and anarchism impressed by the fact that their is neither hierarchy nor domination in an stable ecosystem. The principles of balance, decentralisation, equilibrium, corporation, symbiosis, conservation and diversity in nature refer to the anarchist ideas of self-governance. Furthermore, McClaughry [25] claims the democratic ideas of those regional self-governing ecosystems because they realize the so called Jefferson democracy. This means a society preserving individual liberty, small-scale democracy, decentralization of economic and political power and care for the environment.

In Sale's definition such an area is distinguished by attributes of flora, fauna, water, climate, soil and land forms while human settlements and cultures have given rise to these attributes [26]. The scale of the area varies from towns or even town districts to complete area's with similar vegetation [27]. Authors such as Dodge [28] and Alexander [29] argue that this definition is not precise enough and that bioregionalism is rather a psychological response to a particular settlement or is just a cultural and ethical item instead of a scientific topic. Research for a more metaphysical status of the land of the anarchist endowed with care for nature and environment is straightforward. Furthermore, the following preliminary remark is substantial in our analysis: instead of the term bio-regionalism, widely accepted in literature, we prefer to use the term eco-regionalism to define the ensemble of refuges organized according to the principles of sustainability, social justice and wellness for all. Indeed, the public area does not take care for the living participants alone, also landscape and the land are objects of moral considerations.

6. ECO-REGIONALISM: FROM PARTICULAR TIMES AND PLACES TO HERMENEUTICS OF SUSTAINABLE ECO-REFUGES

Leopold failed in giving a metaphysical foundation of the land and consequently it is hard to attribute moral consideration to a vague moral subject. Moreover, at first glance one element must be added to Leopold's conception of the land. Indeed, integrity of the place means maintaining the dynamic equilibrium of the ecosystem in balance with new inputs of migration, climatic changes, unpredictable weather and human action. Consequently, we have to pass from static or synchronic integrity to dynamic or diachronic integrity [30]. We formulate the metaphysical foundation of the eco-refuge in five steps [31].

A first step in formulating a philosophical foundation of eco-anarchism is rejecting the Newtonian homogeneous space-temporal conception, preceding the whole Modern discours about authority and state. The Newtonian space-time concept starts from an absolute point zero of space and time. They are the creation of here and now instead of nowhere and never. The space-time is homogeneous and the thinking and moral subject is completely separated from the intelligible object. This conception is the prime condition for the rational metaphysics of DesCartes and the criticism of Kant, while both philosophers influenced deeply the intellectual life of the Enlightenment Era. Freedom, the establishment of hierarchy and its legitimation and even the ideas how to organize the planet politically and ethically was situated in the empty homogeneous container of the a priori ordered space and time. No room for alternative economic activity by lack of efficient use of the Earth's wealth, no room for cultural differences because alternative cultures and social relationship was subordinated to the Enlightened rationality and morality, no room for nature, God's gift to the whole mankind in order to transform it to economic surplus value. No room for individual freedom because it leads to irrational and inefficient government, instead a top down management of the public area. Eventually, by leaving the above mentioned traditional metaphysical subject-object relation behind us we do not step in the Hegelian or Marxist pitfall and adopt a conception of space and time that make room for a bottom up management of the public area.

Secondly, in consequence, we adopt the pluralistic Leibnizian space-time from which thinking humans do not dissociate themselves, but participate as part of the rational infrastructure of the particular place and at a particular time. The origin of space and time are both relative realities and their absence represents the non-existence of essence of all space-time-like participants, while their presence is the start for becoming. Particularly, human essence and in consequence human freedom depend on the complete ensemble of any possible spatial and temporal interaction. The essence of human beings and particularly his freedom do not precede space and time like in the Enlightened concept of Newton. Contrary, both evolve from the creation of a particular place and particular time.

Thirdly, we link these Leibnizian ontological basis for space and time to the phenomenological claim that the whole creates a new reality that exceeds the sum of the parts [32]. From this phenomenological principle Norberg-Schulz [33] identifies space as a room for human dwelling with the guarantee for organic unity and constancy. Space is the boundary condition of human activity and determines how borders, environmental organization and institutes are sustained. Space has its proper essence of sustainability, unity and integrity. Moreover, the space is the cos y place of security and protection [34]. It is the territory of time-like tradition and social identification. While the Enlightened world produces nearly identical nations as frozen timeless and spaceless relics of hypothetical contracts and tacit domination, this particular world is not substitutable as place of self-understanding and ethical care to all [35,36]. In Eco-refuges or the 'Eco-homeland' citizen belong to the civil society that stays in equilibrium with the landscape and all forms of biological life based on mutualism and Hannah Arendt's agape [37] in the political reality. This is the scene wherein the land appears as a ensemble of terms, according to which men and women are living together in absolute diversity and freedom of thinking, speaking and acting. This Eco-refuge or Eco-homeland' guarantees freedom in diversity.

The fourth step towards a metaphysical foundation of eco-.homelands consists by adopting Warwick Fox' concept of transpersonal self-identification [38]. That means that any subject reaches more self- understanding, the more he stands in mutual relationship with his environment, particularly with participants who are able to produce self reflective behavior. But by discovering his identity as self reflective being, he is faced to his power over non-reflective beings and landscapes. Care for those non-humans is a question of mastering human's power that gives more insight in human's propensities to create and to destroy. Compassion, love and empathy, three fundamental features characterizing any anarchistic aim for individual freedom, virtue and happiness, accompany Fox´ identification of the 'self ' beyond humanity. Morality is making the balance between these human powers and the more objects of moral care, the more insight in human's self-understanding and individual identity. Hence, moral care for all participants of the eco-refuge is the highway to self-understanding and individuality.

Finally, in order to assign moral consideration to the land we need the basic principles of the Enlightened Anarchism: Freedom of consciousness, freedom of speech and opportunity to make freely choices, eventually there is need for a organized society of judging subjects. The latter guaranties that ethical claims are generally accepted and fulfilled inside the homeland and universally recognized abroad. However, instead of the traditional dialectical way of thinking we adopt Gadamer´s hermeneutical approach [39]. Gadamer critics the Enlightenment because it reduces thinking to a non spatial situated and timeless activity of the isolated subject. Hermeneutics, however, starts from the prejudice of a particular place and time and consequently it starts from the essence of any thinking and moral subject in the Leibnizian worlds. Understanding is bringing the particular tradition on that place to the reality of the actual world in real time [40]. So we bring the whole anarchistic tradition into the actual space and time of the eco-refuge on a planet in a tremendous ecological state.

7. THE ECO-REFUGES AS MULTICULTURAL DEMOCRATIC HOMELAND

Are eco-refuges or eco-homelands rather valuable free spaces such like Christiania near Copenhagen, Denmark and

Rote Flora experiment in Hamburg, Germany? Or, on the other hand are they alternatives for the actual global world? Henri Lefebvre´s ´Critique of Everyday Life´ [41] situates in these utopian representations as social ruptured urban spaces and after space and representation of space the third step in dialectic thinking. Namely, the spaces of representations. Ali Jones [42] called these spaces as the new dialectical synthesis that combine imagination and practice into entirely new formulation of radical everyday life. As they call those free spaces also as utopian spaces that could not be, those spaces of representations are rooted into the classical Newtonian top down management with the spaces of representation in the ultimate marginal position of globalization.

The Eco-refuges, however, are also faced to a complex of problems to overrule: how to guarantee freedom despite the organization of the refuge in order to establish social justice? How can the refuge be sustainable and at the same time create wellness for all? What about the cross-cultural dialogue inside refuges and what about external relation with the world without? Bookchin [43] promoted the libertarian municipalism with direct democracy. What means direct democracy. Is the Landsgemeinde of Appenzell Innerhode a prototype of Bookchin's direct democracy? This partly Swiss Canton counts only 16000 people who come together on a big meadow. Decision making by majority against minority, however, can easily be organized by means of electronic voting. But is this majority rule not legitimating hierarchy and domination over all by a few and in consequence a slap in the face of every anarchist? Despite the need for governance, freedom is an incontestable condition for individual ethical behavior, sameness is the boundary condition of ruling moral care for humans, non-human life and the land. Hence, we need an other concept of democratic government in the Eco-refuge, we call it Eco-democracy. Eco-democracy means that the elected majority makes room for the claims of the minorities and that the minorities are not politically overruled by reducing any participant to a simple consumer of political goods delivered top down by the central government of super-states. Actually, eco-homeland is reflected by the multicultural character of any homeland. Though the participants can belong to very different cultural traditions, the common Eco-refuge has to produce a collective identity so that any participant feels home and every participant can identify the Eco-refuge as the constancy of place with the prime basis of sameness [44].

Within the mosaic of different cultural traditions there must be some convergence in order to support the wellness of the refuge and in order to realize the sustainability. This means, food, equipment, accommodation, public health are first order needs for all participants. But because local problems can be dealt with more effectively at the local level these activities must be adapted to the possibilities of the respective ecosystem. This means that agriculture does not produce for export, but at first stage for the local market. The actual political trend in Europe is, to the contrary, to organize food production from Brussels so that e.g. sugar cannot be produced by Finland anymore. Eco-regionalism, however, starts from self-support, and so does the Eco-refuge. Of course not all ecosystems are so fertile that they can afford a complete internal market. External cooperation around technical and restricted problems is the first option. The example of the Hutt River Principality - an enclave completely surrounded by West-Australia - proves after more than 50 years that eco-refuges can sustain though further globalization of the globe. Sometimes historical roots are enough to persist as eco-refuge as it is the case with Seborga. The coherence of this residue of the Medieval Time is strong enough to sustain its identity by the constancy of the place. Some nations considers themselves as eco-refuges such like Buthan and Montenegro. Besides, Iceland claims the total energy neutral status. For global problems, however like global warming the device is acting locally, interacting globally [45].

The Enlightened ideas would not make room spontaneously for Eco-regionalism and Eco-anarchistic refuges with alternative democracy. However, four incontestable facts prevent us from further Byzantine discussions to postpone substantial interventions considering managing prime matter, energy, food and emissions of pollutants: (1) planet's supply of prime matter is limited; (2) Earth's energy supply is shrinking dramatically; (3) air, water and earth pollutants are damaging harvest and affect the public health badly; (4) declining biodiversity is not only a matter of aesthetics or mental fulfillment but also a security box of genetic material for food and medical purposes. The actual dominant development paradigm of perpetual progress and global market economy and the supporting representative democracy failed to establish social justice and wellness for all and destroyed the sustainability of the planet. In consequence, the ideas of the Enlightment Era and its rationale clash with the frontiers of Earth's ecological sustainability.

8. CONCLUSIONS

We conclude that Enlightened Anarchism is enlarged with the concepts of sustainability and care for the environment. Therefore we need a shift from the Newtonian to the Leibnizian concept of space and time and the Enlightened Anarchism goes beyond the traditional dialectical way of thinking. Moreover, in the scope of the Leibnizian constructive space and time Enlightened Anarchism inspires the change from development domination paradigm to the eco-regionalism paradigm. Eventually, Eco-refuges are multicultural, small scale, sustainable, self-supported and replace the actual countries of the planet. These conclusions are quite different from Gary Chartier's epistemological defense of anarchism [46]. Instead of Carter's claims situating the foundation of anarchism in a constructed state-primacy balance [47], we proposed an ecological position of the Anarchist on Earth in real space and in real time of the Eco-refuges. The option for a planet of Eco-refuges seems a good alternative since the creation of eco-refuges transforms the actual world

of national authorities into a world of anarchistic democratic and sustainable eco-regional homelands. Finally, we hope that we do not have to wait for Huntington's clash of civilizations [48], because the Earth's ecological clash will be much worse. n

9. REFERENCES

[1] Blumenfeld, J., Bottici, Ch., Critchley, S. The Anarchist Turn. Plutopress, New York, 2013.

[2] Simmons, A. J. Philosophical Anarchism. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1344425 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1344425, February 16, 2009.

[3] Windeknecht, R. " Law Without Legitimacy or Justification? The FlawedFoundation of Philosophical Anarchism". Res Publica 18 (2): 173-188, 2002.

[4] Kymlicka, W. Contempory Political Philosophy: An Introduction. Second Edition,University Press Oxford, Oxford (UK), p 62, 2002.

[5] Lucet, A. Spirit and Community: Gustav Landauer´s criticism of materialism and violence. In press in the Conference Proceedings about Enlightened Anarchism, Rovaniemi, Finland, 11-14 September 2014.

[6] Glücksmann, A. Cynisme et Passion. Grasset, Paris, 1981.

[7] Hobbes, T. Leviathan (1651). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge (UK), 1988.

[8] Locke, J. Two Treatises of Government. London, Everyman's Library, 1978.

[9] Hay, P. Main Currents in Western Environmental Thought. Indiana University Press, Indianapolis, 2002.

[10] Althusius, J. Politica Methodice Digesta, 1609,3^{rd} ed. An abridges English edition of the third edition was published as The Politics of Johannes Althusius, edited by Frederick S. Carney, London: Eyre and Spottis woode, 1965, Politica, Indianapolis Liberty Fund, 1995.

[11] Woldring, H. E. S. Kernbegrippen in de Politieke Filosofie: een herwaardering, Bussum, p. 53-6 Coutinho, 2001.

[12] Evanoff, R. Bioregionalism and Global Ethics: A Transactional Approach to Achieving Ecological Sustainability, Social Justice and Human Well-being. Routledge, London, 2010.

[13] Taylor, Ch. Modern Social Imaginary. Duke University Press, Durham, and London, U.K, 2004.

[14] Strasser, S. De Burger voorbij: ethische politieke overwegingen, Ambo, Baarn, 1981.

[15] Evanoff, R. Bioregionalism and Global Ethics: A Transactional Approach to Achieving Ecological Sustainability, Social Justice and Human Well-being, chapter 1, 2010.

[16] Muir, J. Our National Parks, AMS Press, New York, 1970.

[17] Leopold, A . A Sand County Almanac. Oxford University Press, New York, p.224-5, 1949.

[18] Baird Callicott, J. "Toward a global environmental ethic". In Worldviews and ecology: Religion, philosophy, and the environment, ed. Mary Evelyn Tucker and John A. Grim: 30-8, Maryknoll: Orbis, 1994.

[19] Baird Callicott, J. Earth's insights: A multicultural survey of ecological ethics from the Mediterranean basis to the Australian outback. Berkeley:University of California Press, 1994.

[20] Norton, Bryan G. "Why I am not a nonanthropocentrist: Callicott and the failure of monistic inherentism". Environmental Ethics 17: 341-58, 1995.

[21] Bookchin, M.Post-scarcity anarchism. 3rd ed. Montréal:Black Rose, 2004.

[22] Sale, K. "Anarchy and ecology: A review essay". Social Anarchism 10: 14-23, 1985.

[23] Bookchin, M. "What is communalism?: The democratic dimension of anarchism". Green Perspectives 31: 1-6, 1994.

[24] Sale, K. Dwellers in the land: The Bioregional vision. 2nd ed. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000.

[25] McClaughry, J. The Institute of Liberty and Community. A working paper circulated by the New England Committee of Correspondence (Greens/Green Party USA, 1984.

[26] Sale, K. Dwellers in the land: The Bioregional vision.2nd ed. p.55 Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000.

[27] Sale, K. Dwellers in the land: The Bioregional vision.2nd ed. p.57Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000.

[28] Dodge, Jim. "Living by life: Some bioregional theory and practice". In Debating the earth: The environmental politics reader. 2nd ed., ed John S. Dryzek and David Schlosberg: 355-63: Oxford University Press, 2005.

[29] Alexander, D. "Bioregionalism: Science or Sensibility?" Environmental Ethics 12:161-73, 1990.

[30] Holland, A., O'Neill, J. "The integrity of nature: Organization of space in an inhabited cosmos". Nature and Culture 1: 1-9, 1996.

[31] Verstraeten, G. J. M., Verstraeten W. W. "From Particular Times and Spaces to Metaphysics of Leopold´s Ethics of the Land". Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies (ISSN: 2321 – 2799) Volume 02– Issue 01, February 2014.

[32] Seamon, D., "The Phenomenological Contribution to Environmental Psychology", Journal of Environmental Psychology, vol. 2, pp. 119-40, 1982.

[33] Norberg-Schulz, C., Genius Loci: towards a phenomenology of Architecture, Rizzoli, New York, 1980.

[34] Relph, E. Place and Placelessness, Pion, London, 1976.

[35] Cheney, J. "Postmodern Environmental Ethics: Ethics as Bioregional Narrative", Environmental Ethics, vol. 11, pp. 117-35, 1989.

[36] Jacobs, M. Sustainability and Socialism, Socialist and Resources Association, London 1995.

[37] Arendt, H. The Promise of Politics. (New York, Schocken Books, p.94 ,2005.

[38] Fox,W. Toward Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Instrumentalism, Shambhala publications, Boston, Massachusetts, 1990.

[39] Gadamer, H. G., Philosophical Hermeneutics, (translated by David E. Linge), University of California Press, 1977.

[40] Gadamer, H. G., Truth and Method, Sheed and Ward, Ltd Press, London, 1975.

[41] Lefebvre, H. Critique of everyday Life. Verso, 2002.

[42] Jones, A. " German Autonomie as a Ruptured Urban Space: Henri Lefebvre and The Autonomous Philosophy of Contradiction". To be published in the Conference Proceedings about Enlightened Anarchism, Rovaniemi, Finland, 11-14 September 2014.

[43] Bookchin, M. Social ecology and communalism, ed. Eirik Eiglad. Oakland: AK Press, 2007.

[44] Verstraeten, G. J. M., Verstraeten W. W. Mijn Thuisplek. Landethiek over geborgenheid en dreiging van ruimte-tijd en diversiteit. Damon, Budel, chapter 10, 2010.

[45] Evanoff, R. Bioregionalism and Global Ethics: A Transactional Approach to Achieving Ecological Sustainability, Social Justice and Human Well-being.chapter 14. Routledge, London, 2010.

[46] Chartier, Ch. In defense of the Anarchist. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies 29: 115-138, 2009.

[47] Carter, A.. "Anarchism, some theoretical foundations". Journal of political ideology.16 (3) 245 264, 2011.

[48] Huntington, S. P. Clash of Civilizations and the Remake of World Order, Simon & Schluster, New York, 1996.