

A PROPOSAL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY: TOWARDS A DIVERGENT POLITICAL AND SPIRITUAL ‘REVOLUTION’

Nevio CRISTANTE*

Abstract

The purpose of this work is to provide the means for a better understanding of the new and multifaceted conceptualizations of environmental sustainability. The projection extends from insights gathered from a renewal of ancient cosmological views that have become prominent in contemporary political understandings, coupled with the similarities of the unique cultures of Indigenous Peoples, with their distinctive manners of perceiving the necessity of environmental sustainability. Indigenous Peoples have always sought to retain their cultural, economic, and political characteristics distinct from the dominant societies. Yet they are included as well within the UN in one the primary concerns generated by the “International Community,” as a motivating factor of global governance. The goal of environmental sustainability is within contemporary global governance. It is directed towards the present day through the use of concepts that have persisted in Indigenous histories for centuries. Contemporary understandings of global governance and the earthly-view of Indigenous Peoples strive together toward environmental sustainability.

Keywords: Environment, Nature, Politics, Religion, Spirituality, Cosmological, Global Governance, Economic Justice, Sacred Indigenous Dreamtime.

ÇEVRESEL SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİRLİK İÇİN BİR ÖNERİ: AYRIŞMIŞ SİYASİ VE RUHSAL BİR DEVRİME DOĞRU

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, yeni ve çok-yönlü çevresel sürdürülebilirlik kavramsallaştırmalarının daha iyi anlaşılabilmesini sağlamak için bir yol açmaktır. Buna ilişkin öngörü, temelini, yalnızca onlara özgü olacak şekilde çevresel sürdürülebilirliğin gerekliliğinin farkına varmış olan yerli halkların biricik kültürleriyle olan benzerlikleriyle çağdaş siyaset yaklaşımlarında hakim olan kadim kozmolojik görüşlerin yeniden canlanmasından edinilen bilgilerden almaktadır. Yerli halklar; kültürel, ekonomik ve siyasi özelliklerini egemen toplumlardan uzak tutarak her zaman kendi yaşam şekillerini sürdürmeye çabalamışlardır. Bununla birlikte küresel yönetimin teşvik edici bir etkisi olarak “Uluslararası Toplum”ca üretilen temel kaygılar dahilinde Birleşmiş Milletler’de yer almaktadırlar. Çevresel sürdürülebilirliğin hedefi, günümüz küresel yönetim kapsamında yer bulmaktadır. Günümüze yönelişi ise, yüzyıllar boyunca yerli halk hikayelerinde

* Assistant Prof. Ph.D., Istanbul University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey, nevio.cristante@istanbul.edu.tr

Araştırma Makalesi - Gönderim Tarihi: 6.10.2016 - Kabul Tarihi: 3.03.2017

süregelen kavramların kullanımı üzerinden gerçekleşmiştir. Çağdaş küresel yönetim yaklaşımları ve yerli halkların dünyevi bakışı, çevresel sürdürülebilirlik yönünde beraberce mücadele etmektedirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çevre, Doğa, Siyaset, Din, Tinselik, Kozmolojik, Küresel Yönetişim, Ekonomik Adalet, Kutsal Yerli “Rüyazaman”.

Introduction

This work will shed light on the necessity of a clearer understanding of Environmental Sustainability, which is reminiscent with the harmonious globalization of the world and the ever-growing concern for the natural environment of the planet. As such, the work will demonstrate the important ‘new’ contemporary political and spiritual principles that bypass the recognized fallacies or shortages in the modern political and religious worldviews. The standardized modern perspectives of politics and religion should be altered to reflect the necessities required for the continuation of life in the natural, hence environmental, world.

The methodology includes a general, comparative, and historical intermixture of related concepts to Environmental Sustainability from the ancient, modern, and contemporary periods of human history. From these periods, an analysis is made of common and opposing factors of politics and a renewed spirituality, among elements pertinent in an ancient-modern-contemporary historical comparison. It involves a qualitative intermingling of contemporary political conditions, involving criticism of those political elements labelled as modern, together with the environmental sustainability established by the diverse understandings of the human in relation to the natural environment by Indigenous Peoples. It is a part of their initiative to inform the rest of the world of the necessities required in forming a harmony amongst the necessities of the natural environment and human life. This direction is suitable since it is opposed to the limitations of environmental concern in modernity. The altered view of the human in relation to the natural environment is beyond the modern fallacy of “progress in history” through a re-imposition of ancient principles, which are in harmony with the contemporary reverence for the natural environment. These general similarities of this altered view can be discovered in the political-spirituality of Indigenous Peoples. The camaraderie of required political, cultural, and spiritual venues exist already in the beliefs and activities of Indigenous Peoples for centuries. It is from these venues that a proposal for environmental sustainability is directed. The overall purpose is to display a form of harmony amongst the contemporary political direction in global governance that both criticizes the modern political and religious fallacies, and also encompasses the spiritual-political incentives of Indigenous Peoples to sanctify and sustain the natural environment. The importance of environmental sustainability for global governance is becoming more essential, as it is a central issue in the international community of the United Nations. Environmental sustainability is a primary goal of the UN, which runs alongside its relation to human rights and humanitarian issues particularly in Indigenous Peoples.

This work will focus very generally on the contexts to approach these problems, and ponder into the obvious condition that the dominance of the modern groundwork of politics and standardized religion produce the continual environmental exploitation of natural resources at the price of not only the “state of nature,” but the state of the human. The present unsustainable path is also within the dominance and global spread of neo-liberalism, which is not far from the foundational premises of classical modern economics. The concentration for private economic advantage is at the expense of our global interdependence on a healthy ecological system. In the modern condition, the importance of the human on the earthly sphere of spirituality is either forgotten, or maliciously abused by the value of economic gains. To resolve this condition requires a detachment from the ontological, epistemological, and worldview of modernity. As such, it requires a means to antithetically reformulate these theoretical and educational foundations. In other words, it requires a ‘revolution’; but a revolution that is also beyond the modern framework in order to achieve a productive reconsideration of these essential human factors of politics and spirituality in relation to the natural environment; it involves a revolution of the concept itself, where its understanding and meaningful action overturns the typical modern conceptions. This work proposes an environmental sustainability conceived as a re-formulation from an ancient, cosmological worldview, drawing its similarities to the projected contemporary forms of global governance, and also incumbent in the Indigenous cultures, politics, and spirituality. It involves a mindset more in tune with the powers of the natural environment, in opposition to the modern pathway, consisting of a belief to control it.

An intermingling interchange is created out these unique political and spiritual-foundational features of Indigenous Peoples with the political thought and recommendations of Hannah Arendt. This feature stems from her engagement for a partial return to ancient lessons in ancient forms of politics that she wishes to impose on contemporary politics. Contemporary politics from the historical approach of Hannah Arendt involves elements largely forgotten in modern politics, such as the natural-environmental relation of the human to Earth coupled with the drive for immortality as basic foundational factors for a thriving political culture. It will continue by delving into the main topics of a renewed sense of politics and spirituality with references to many contemporary environmentally-friendly arguments, which generate principles for environmental sustainability.

The Need for An Alteration in Modern Politics

Most of the works studied within this text extend from a similar contemporary framework which criticizes modern propositions. The authors certainly have blended the views of the new boundaries required to enmesh a divergent sensibility of politics, and a contradictory understanding of religion or spirituality. They consist of investigations on the concept of environmental sustainability itself, the necessity for a “shift in the paradigm” of modern politics, its attachment to “global governance,” ethical-environmental claims that surpass Western traditional ethics, the impertinent “prominence of neo-liberalism,” and the criticism of dominant forms of capitalism. Their conclusive statements were studied carefully, and much has been gained from their views. But from them, the main argument arises, which has not been elucidated clearly upon, and which constitutes the

last sections of this article, that the Indigenous Peoples have had the necessary political and spiritual understandings to illuminate and promote environmental sustainability on a divergent contemporary-cosmological political and spiritual basis. A politico-spiritual system contrary to the frailties of the modern already exists. The general features of Indigenous Peoples involve the binding of contemporary elements that overturn the modern limitations in politics and spirituality.

Politics used to be an endeavour that distinguished the human, but modern politics is sliding towards inhumane, unnatural proceedings, where the common use of the term 'politics' comes into frequent questioning. The essential tie of human nature to politics in Plato and Aristotle is largely forgotten by the modern Western political view, even though they have been claimed as the roots of Western political thought. If anything, in modern political theory, the human is separated from the natural environment. This limited valuation of the natural environment extends from the free-market economic system created during the modern epoch, and especially to the recent dominance in neo-liberalism, "according to which the Earth and its natural capital are resources that should be exploited in the service of an ever-growing economy."¹ The environmental subsystem should no longer be conceived as infinite, since the environmental resources are finite. The "ever-growing" economy is painfully false. Therefore, neo-liberal politics "is *unapologetically anthropocentric*."² It is falsely erecting man over nature, therefore, ignoring concerns for the environment. Williston suggests as well, that this dominance is almost irreplaceable, since, unfortunately, "the economic mode of valuation is the only game in town."³ There is a need to reformulate economic considerations to override the dominance of neo-liberal capitalist values. What is required appears to be a revolution on the thought process and common understandings, since they are harmful misunderstandings that continue to deteriorate the necessities of a healthy environment.⁴

Contradictions are now easily discovered in the classical political theories of liberalism. Hobbes, a father of classical liberalism, reduced theory to only material and efficient causes, which were used in his reductive understanding of the 'politics' of the commonwealth, human nature, and the state of nature. With his famous quote of the state of nature – that it is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" – divided the human as an artificial being abstract from the nature of the environment. Instead of being political for the means of

¹ Byron Williston, "Economics and Ecology," in *Environmental Ethics: for Canadians*, Oxford University Press, 2012, p. 109.

² *Ibid*, p. 109.

³ *Ibid*, p. 109.

⁴ From "The Concept of Environmental Sustainability," Robert Goodland explains the "unsustainable" in this manner: "The scale of human economy has become unsustainable because it is living off inherited and finite capital (e.g. fossil fuels, fossil water); because we do not account for losses of natural capital (e.g. extinctions of species), nor do we admit the costs to environmental harm. The second reason for unsustainability is related to the first: government failure to admit that pollution and fast population growth are doing more harm than good" (Robert Goodland, "The Concept of Environmental Sustainability," in *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, Vol. 26, 1995, p. 13).

living a good life, Hobbes' plan was to have the citizens turn away from politics and turn toward the private. The paradox becomes massive under these contexts, since he reduced the spiritual faculty of the human being to nothing more than the passions of his depiction of the "state of nature." He therefore obliterates the spiritual faculty of the human by focusing on the construction of the artificial. As James Wiser notes, Hobbes has not only reduced politics, but also philosophy to the paradoxically-private 'pleasure' of economics: "Hobbes has removed the existential substance which grounded both the life of philosophy and the life of politics. What remains real for humanity therefore, is quite simply the life of pleasure – or in modern terms, economics."^{5 6}

The other father of classical liberalism, from the same century of Hobbes, was another Englishman, John Locke, who formed a 'political' organization that is still prominent today. Locke's view of humankind was similar to the disliking critical view of Hobbes; but this is inconsistent with his advocated "state of nature" of "peace and harmony." However, with his animated appeal to possessions and private property, he limited the "franchise to the propertied class," which, for many scholars, is considered an "ultimately unsatisfactory solution,"^{7 8} since it only undemocratically suspended a different vertical hierarchy formed, not by the monarch, but by economic power. As such, capitalism has never had certain essential democratic principles.

The title itself, "Neo-liberalism As Creative Destruction," of an article by David Harvey, clearly displays the destructiveness of the natural environment by neo-liberalism. The nation-states take this – no longer national, but global – neo-liberalism "in whatever way they can to benefit themselves" rather than, as is claimed, being "for everyone,

⁵ James, L. Wiser, "Thomas Hobbes," in *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order*, Prentice Hall, 1982, 185 – 208, p. 207.

⁶ I would also like to include the reductive, simplistic qualities of Adam Smith, which - ironically - have been heralded in the common consciousness. There are not only examples of the increasing continuity of failures in the free-market system, but - beyond a construction by an "invisible hand" not knowable to the general public - lies a formulation that controls us by "invisible" imperial factors of economic-imperial rule. This revelation displays that the so-called "free-market" system, from its beginnings, makes one question 'freedom', and has little contact with the major principles incorporated under the typical modern democratic order. The description of our economic system and its related 'democratic' neo-liberal order hides many important factors, which are made invisible. If anything, this is the true nature of the "invisible hand," not the simplistic, ironically individualist democratic claim of Adam Smith, which is only comprised in one paragraph of an over 400-page book. Yet, it is ironically taken as such a heightened justification for economic gain at any cost. Money made from speculations in the stock-market – or making money from nothing – disrupts any logic and worth in the advocated rational free-market system. This observation should have generated the argument that a new monetary system should be created.

⁷ Brian Nelson, "The Making of Leviathan," in, *The Making of the Modern State: A Theoretical Evolution*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2006, p. 72.

⁸ For Locke, as Wiser tells us, "society was created for preserving property" and "understood as God's property" (Wiser, "John Locke, in *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order*, Prentice Hall, 1982, p. 222).

everywhere.”⁹ Harvey reveals that neo-liberalism even subverts a truer form of democracy, even though neo-liberalism uses the praise of modern democracy in its propaganda, as he retorts: “the anti-democratic nature of neo-liberalism should be the main focus of political struggle.”¹⁰ In reality, the imperial drive of neo-liberalism actually robs a growing number of a worldwide population from freedom. Democracy should transform liberty outside the rhetoric of capitalism.

One effort to bring together the magnified capitalist economic system under the modern scientific rationale and sustainable concern for the environment is called the “sustained yield.” But, as Hal Salwasser states, this process of “sustained yield” includes “exploitation,” which is “often based on simplification of ecosystems with resulting loss of structural, compositional, and functional diversity.”¹¹ He concludes that “‘sustainable development’ can only succeed if we acknowledge that [the] choices, costs, benefits, and consequences for economic, social, and environmental health.”¹² (But we can see that, at times, the economy is so prevalent that it overrides our words to such an extent that we use it in even critical discourse, as the sentence is completed by the phrase that this acknowledgement “must be one internal to economic and political markets.”)¹³ Politics should not be regarded as markets. *That* should be the main point.) Economic gain and profit and the continuation of the current economic capitalist system is like a foundational sovereign ‘religion’ that hierarchically will not allow transgression. This hindsight conflicts with the often valued ‘neutral’ manner of conforming to tackle the problem through incorporating “economists,” within the “economic discourse.” Yet corruption and historical ignorance still underlies this process.

As Robert Nelson relates, “the key positions” in influential agencies, right up to the World Banks, use “economists” who “unfortunately can exert a significant influence on government decisions concerning a wide range of issues, including environmental and natural resource policies that have a major bearing in the sustainability debates.”¹⁴ As Auden Schendler remarks in his book *Getting Green Done: Hard Truths Form the Front Lines of the Sustainability Revolution*, the greenhouse gas used in “every job,” including his own, “was dirty, unhealthy, and grueling”;¹⁵ therefore, the reduction of greenhouse gases has to start immediately “to avoid a global climate disaster.”¹⁶ Climate change is certainly on the lists of environmental issues, but is not on government lists. Its

⁹ David Harvey, “Neo-Liberalism As Creative Destruction,” *Geografiska Annaler, Series B., Human Geography*, Vol. 88, No. 2, *Geography and Power of Geography* (2008), p. 146.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

¹¹ Hal Salwasser, “Sustainability Needs More Than Better Science,” in *Ecological Applications*, Vol. 3, No. 4, (Nov. 1993), p. 588

¹² Hal Salwasser, *op.cit.*, p. 589.

¹³ Hal Salwasser, *op.cit.*, p. 589.

¹⁴ Robert H. Nelson, “Sustainability, Efficiency, and God: Economic Values and Sustainability Debates,” *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, Vol. 26, 1995, p. 136.

¹⁵ Auden Schendler, “Trench Warfare, Not Surgery,” *Getting Green Done: Hard Truths From the Front Lines of the Sustainability Revolution*, Public Affairs, 2006, p. 3.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

immediate remedy is ignored due to the general cause of the destructive conditions that is in the current dominant politico-economic system. This system is not only persisting, but is 'globalizing' itself. Schendler states clearly, that "business is both the cause and victim of environmental decline."¹⁷ But monetary imperialism is so entrenched in the dominance of capitalist fanaticism that little is done to correct its destructive malaise.

Capitalist fundamentalists cannot escape the required belief in profit in the "double green world," by using propaganda to equate the greenness of a healthy environment in unison with the amount of green dollar bills. In reality, these are imaginary lies. In truth, the sustainable business goals are incredibly difficult to accomplish if this system and beliefs continue. On one side of the coin, it is possible to re-invent a new economic system that escapes the trap of the unscrupulous uses of the cost-benefit analysis, which is nowhere near reality when environmental damage is not ignored and included in the cost. The transition to environmental sustainability "imposes a time limit."¹⁸ One must perform quickly on a higher level of judiciary decisions to achieve environmental goals, even going far beyond the stated claim of 2050 for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, as we are leading to biophysical impossibilities.

As James Gustav Speth mentions, in *The Bridge at the Edge of World Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability*, that modern capitalism is "out of control."¹⁹ Many nations, especially the US, did not listen to the international protocols like the one given in Kyoto 1997. To do so, would "represent a departure from business as usual."²⁰ The incredible first concern of the US for harming the economy displays not freedom, but the extent of our economic determinism.

The dependence on the market is in complete contrast to the protection of the environment. The capitalist concentration on economic growth actually tears down the superficially-associated renditions of freedom, divides equality even further, and dismisses global governance based on contemporary notions of equity and justice, as new considerations for democratic principles. These are the extents of the challenge and the truer portrait of a required revolution, to overturn the common principles upon which most people base their superficial meanings of life. These contemporary principles outside liberal capitalism are the fundamental working arrangements to - as Speth states - "save the world, literally."²¹

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 3.

¹⁸ Robert Goodland, & Herman Daly, "Environmental Sustainability: Universal and Non-Negotiable," *Ecological Applications*, Vol. 6, No. 4, (Nov., 1996), p. 1004.

¹⁹ James Gustav Speth, "Modern Capitalism: Out of Control," in, *The Bridge at the Edge of World Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing From Crisis to Sustainability*, Yale University Press, 2008, p. 46.

²⁰ James Gustav Speth, "The Bridge at the Edge of the World," in, *The Bridge at the Edge of World Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing From Crisis to Sustainability*, Yale University Press, 2008, p. 236.

²¹ Ibid., p. 236.

These challenges to the Western foundations are inherent in global governance and the political cultures of Indigenous Peoples. There is a subfield called “non-dollar economics,” which is somewhat similar to the “gift economic culture” of Indigenous Peoples. As Robert Paehlke comments, it can “make the case that we could be twice as rich with half the material throughputs.”²² These essential economic factors that contradict capitalist goals are unfortunately almost silenced by their ensuing dominance. We are facing elements of irreparable damage to the environment, and there is just as little to combat this in our common modern designations, as in our typical politico-economic systemizations. But, the Indigenous “gift economic culture” in “sharing goods” steps out of economic dominance. There are theories within the UN that challenge this politico-economic dominance through the growing concern for environmental sustainability:

The rise of environmental consciousness, the need to husband resources more frugally and nurture our fragile ecosystems more tenderly as our common legacy for future generations, was another great social movement of the last century that contributed greatly to the greening of the agenda of international affairs.²³

The concerns for environmental sustainability obviously include a divergent sense of governance on global or international factors that go beyond the nation-state.

Global governance appears to be an ascent in the regeneration of forming a global public realm, pointing towards a re-configuring of some basic principles of politics, directly in the face of the dominance of an opposing modern realm of the privatization of economics, a modern ‘political’ feature that actually erases any archaic foundation for politics. The contemporary claim for equity and economic justice constantly undermines the values and principles of a larger part of capitalism. The non-dollar concept and the gift economic concept of Indigenous Peoples represent a challenge to the economics formed in such a manner, as being the monarchic entity to rule and control the people through behaviourism based on empirical principles. The environmental policy and a drastic divergent sense of economic justice are stepping-stones for politics in the international realm, a realm that today has only marginal influences of the political agendas in many nation-state governments. It reflects a measure of clash between the UN and nation-states, as human security for the UN is now considered as opposed to nation-state sovereignty, since more nation-states are turning towards unscrupulous means of maintaining and enforcing power, without public international considerations.

The transnational or cosmopolitan global theory of politics, incorporating a complex web of global relations, severely questions the general practices in nation-state centric governments. This contention is similar to the challenges enthralled in the relations of “modern” forms of government with Indigenous Peoples. The public discourse of the

²² Robert Paehlke, “Sustainability as a Bridging Concept,” *Conservation Biology*, Vol. 19, No. 1, February, 2005, p.36.

²³ Ramesh Thakur, “Conclusion: National Diplomacy and Global Governance,” *Global Governance and Diplomacy: Worlds Apart?* Palgrave MacMillan, 2008, p. 295.

ancient and indigenous “gift economic culture” is contending the opposing private, neo-liberal economic dialogue. It is incorporated in their shamanistic spirituality.

The Need of A Renewed ‘Spirituality’ Closely Tied to Altered Politics

The consideration of Indigenous spirituality involves a contemporary call for a re-constitution of politics. The term “spirituality” is chosen over religion, since the care for the environment is not a central feature in modern monotheistic religions. Generally speaking, the ‘new’ political spirituality displays similarities amongst the ancient and the contemporary worldviews, indicating the relations in relation to the environmental world. This contemporary worldview surpasses the modern through the utmost significance of environmental sustainability in global governance, and its proximity to the general spiritual and political cultures of Indigenous Peoples.

Encompassing the ‘new’ spirituality includes a re-constitution of the ancient and indigenous features, where elements conceived within nature - and therefore the natural environment - far exceed the typical reduction of the concept of nature in modernity. The ancient concept of the “common good” outstrips any worth of the primary modern political dependency on political party factionalism. For Plato and Aristotle, the politics of the “common good” was a distinct natural feature in the human. This venue is also and more significantly shared by the natural view of politics in the Roman Republic of antiquity.²⁴ The nature of politics was seen as a distinctive human feature that is tied closely to the natural environment. These essential political stances of the natural environment in antiquity are forgotten or tossed aside by modernity.

Spirituality has been significantly reduced in modern times. Concern for the natural environment prominent in ancient spirituality has been cast further aside in modernity. One of the main proponents labelled “modern” is the separation of Church and state. But, in full consideration of environmental sustainability, in a divergent political understanding, spirituality should not be divided from politics. For the Native peoples, spirituality is not divorced from their political, communal, confederate, cultural, and natural beliefs and practices.

Indigenous Peoples provide the basis for the required alternative form of spirituality that extends from their unique cultures, with distinctive ways of relating to other humans and the environment at large. They have retained cultural, divergent-economic, and political characteristics distinct from those dominant societies from which they were partially ostracized. But together, with the goals of global governance, their basic human rights are protected, and are willing to share in common with all of the other people in the world. They have always sought to maintain their ways of life, their rights to traditional lands

²⁴ The distinction of ancient republicanism of the Roman Republic was in the enacted primary goal to eradicate any top-down, vertical hierarchy of king-like or princely rule. It was replaced by the horizontal harmony of the three classes – the Consuls, the magistrates, and the Tribune of the People – creating a harmonious equalization of classes with the eradication of activities solely based on power. This anti-power direction was comprised in *auctoritas* – an authority for the common good, opposed to the vertical hierarchy of political forms of power.

made by official treaties, their territories, and the resources of the natural environment for centuries. The “international community,” a new wording shared by the UN, is a concept that has persisted through their histories for hundreds of years.

There are many examples of political and spiritual indigenous renderings from the past that should be returned to prominence. The greatest virtue placed in the “gift economic culture” – of sharing with others only on elements of necessary accumulation with respect for all things, with no concept of private property or individual wealth – should be spread internationally. It is something that still inspires the Indigenous peoples. But almost all of us know that the “white brothers” almost destroyed these required principles that represented a vital and meaningful human life not detached from the earth, but sanctified by it. These are the environmental sentiments and spiritual principles required for the persistence of another of their principles, “sustainability.”

As indicated earlier, Nature is subjugated in modern consciousness. No other concept has been so conceptually and spiritually minimized, from the ancient to the modern period, than Nature. The ancient sacredness of Nature, which exists in present-day aboriginal shamanistic spirituality, gets downgraded by modernism. Shamanism is similar to the foresight of ancient pagan religions. Max Oelschlaeger, a specialist in the recent topic of ecology, states that modernity, is an “irreverent culture,” and is completely diverse from the “existential situation” of the ancient. The ancient divergence to the modern is similar to the “disparity” that “pervades the fundamental ways of being modern and aboriginal.”²⁵

The aboriginal-indigenous peoples are akin to the ancient. Modernism is revealed as something to which we must be cured, and this curing element is found in aboriginal shamanism. The ancient worldview is cosmological, a cyclical view of history, and it still retained in present-day Indigenous peoples. It opposes the modern worldview. As Gianni Vattimo states, in his book, *The End of Modernity*, modern historicism “is opposed to the ancient way of thinking governed by a cyclical and naturalistic vision of the course of events in the world.”²⁶ And, as Mircea Eliade states in his book *The Myth of Eternal Return*, “THE REAPPEARANCE of cyclical theories in contemporary thought is pregnant with meaning,” when the “‘historistic’ solutions, from Hegel to Marx, [are] being implicitly called into question.”²⁷ The modern notion of “progress in history,” which encompasses the technological-abstract belief in human control over nature, is cast aside. If there is a “historistic” solution, it should be incorporated primarily under the Indigenous political culture.

With the summary of the article by Karl-Erik Sveiby, Indigenous leadership points toward the collectivization of “a finely-tuned balance that is neither authoritarian nor entirely

²⁵ Max Oelschlaeger, “The idea of wilderness: from paleolithic to neolithic culture,” in *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology*, Yale University Press, 1991, p. 20.

²⁶ Gianni Vattimo, “Introduction,” *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Postmodern Culture*, John Hopkins University Press, pp. 3 – 4.

²⁷ Mircea Eliade, “Chapter 4 “The Terrors of History, Section, “The Difficulties in History,” in, *The Myth of Eternal Return, Or, Cosmos and History*, Princeton University Press, 1954, p.147.

egalitarian.”²⁸ It involves a “horizontal positioning” and “therefore symmetric rather than asymmetric.” It is “the key component for maintaining the symmetry of mutual respect: it mediates both individual power and collective control” It is against the permanence of imperial rule, since “No one is in a permanent position.”²⁹ A chief, who was hosting a television program of the Native Film Awards of Canada, stated that “being a chief is not an elevation of power: a true chief must be submissive to his duty for the community.” If the job is fouled by personal ambition or personal power, his chieftainship will be lost.

Leadership relations are horizontal and symmetric, from which a distinctive asymmetry is coalesced. Native leadership is firmly opposed to the prominent, persistent, asymmetric power-ridden rule of the West, with its vertical, top-down, command-obey framework. The equal symmetry of Native peoples have an simultaneous distinctive authority, with a recognition of a plurality of identities: the distinctions of clans, of Elders, Chief, Prophets, nations, tribes, communities, confederacy, and a confederacy of confederacies, a universality of Indigenous Peoples, and all peoples, and so on. Even though there are difficulties of the effectiveness of entrenching indigenous values into the UN system, the permanence of their presence is desired, as being “one of the great beneficiaries of the UN human rights system,” and in their ability “bypass the state” by “avoiding the utilitarian realities of liberal democracies.”³⁰ In contrast to probable views, it is the UN that can further develop their standards and policies by being implemented in their councils through lessons in the leadership and experience of Indigenous communities that could be successful for the UN.³¹

In coalescing all of these principles of the Indigenous Peoples with contemporary European developments, one can fortunately turn to Hannah Arendt. This brief description of the collectivity of spiritual and communal or political aspects in Indigenous Peoples is somewhat synonymous with some of the concepts and principles mentioned by Arendt; and yet, they are not heavily stated or expanded upon in scholarly work. They easily could have been essential aspects that she, unfortunately, could not fulfill due to her untimely death. Much of her work is similar to the mutual unison of politics and an earthly spirituality as vital aspects. If anything, she productively could have learned from the native peoples, as some indigenous similarities can be drawn from her major political and spiritual necessities.

The Coalition of Arendt’s Foundational Political Principles with Indigenous Leadership.

In the prologue to her astonishing work, *The Human Condition*, she expounds on elements beyond the Christian who “have spoken of the earth as a vale of tears,” and

²⁸ Karl-Erik Sveiby, “Collective Leadership with power symmetry: Lessons from Aboriginal prehistory,” *Leadership*, 7(4) lea.sage pubcom, 2011, p. 396.

²⁹ Sveiby, *Ibid.*, p. 396.

³⁰ Megan Davis, “‘A Home at the United Nations’: Indigenous Peoples and International Advocacy,” *Governance and Diplomacy: Worlds Apart?* Palgrave MacMillan, 2008, p. 211.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

the philosophers, who “have looked upon their body as a prison of mind or soul.”³² For Arendt, this encompasses the derivative view expressed by the modern “mass sentiments and mass desires,” as it is “the even more fateful repudiation of an Earth who was the mother of all living creatures under the sky”^{33 34} In the introductory paragraph to Part V of *The Human Condition*, she uniquely values the combination of human plurality, equality, and distinction, which is generally similar to the recommendations of Indigenous communities: “Human plurality, the basic condition of both action and speech, has the two-fold character of equality and distinction.”³⁵ We have in indigenous peoples the same recognition of homogeneous equality, yet, simultaneously, the heterogeneous recognition of distinction; but done so horizontally to protect against hierarchic, vertical privilege. Indigenous leadership is collective, and therefore, symmetric, erasing any vestige of the top-down, asymmetric vertical hierarchy. Collective leadership is not a recent phenomenon for indigenous peoples, but it is an influential part of their ancient traditions. As Sveiby further analyses, the “Aboriginal law stories contain spiritual knowledge, cosmology, sustainable land management,” and, “even guidance for relations with foreign countries [international relations].”³⁶ The Australian Aborigines, for example, have created correspondence with contemporary scientists, who “are largely in agreement with their methods that had achieved ecological balance on the Australian continent as a whole.”³⁷

Both Arendt and Indigenous Peoples recognize the necessity for the international plurality of identities. The clan identity is more important than individual personality, as are the other important distinctions. Both see the necessity of productively making a plan for the future which ensures some degree of permanence and even some degree of the immortality of sustainability. To acquire this worldview requires a divergent transformation outside the modern Western ontological and epistemological premises by a return to the ancient, which still continues today in the leadership of native communities. This involves a reconfiguration of the cyclical view of history under an ancient cosmological worldview, a worldview that encompasses both heterogeneous novel particularities, and a consistent universal homogeneous essence.

Returning to *The Human Condition*, Arendt insightfully blends the necessities of forming a true public realm, including the factors of plurality, equality, and distinction.

³² Hannah Arendt, “Prologue,” *The Human Condition*, The University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 2.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³⁴ The concern for the sentiment towards the Earth is tantamount in this monumental work regarding the politics of the 20th century since, on her first page, Arendt reveals the incredible unearthly statement of one of Russia’s greatest scientists after the Sputnik, “an earth-born object,” successfully returned from the moon: “Mankind will not remain bound to the earth forever” (Arendt, *Ibid.*, p. 1). This amounts to the “modern world alienation,” where the main goal in *The Human Condition* is to “trace [it] back...to its origins” (Arendt, *Ibid.*, p. 6).

³⁵ Hannah Arendt, Chapter 4 “Action,” Section 24, “The Disclosure of the Agent in Speech and Action,” *The Human Condition*, The University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 175.

³⁶ Karl-Erik Sveiby, “Collective Leadership with power symmetry: Lessons from Aboriginal prehistory, *Leadership*, lea.sagepub.com, 2011, p. 387.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 387.

Within it, she brings together the essential requirements that she always recognized in forming not power, but authority; an authority as a political means of organization based on proportional equality and equally-recognized distinction that is opposed to power politics. The plurality of identities is a necessity for “the space of appearances which is the public realm,” where any “attempt to do away with plurality is always tantamount to the abolition of the public realm itself.”³⁸ In jumping to her recorded interview entitled “Thoughts on Politics and Revolution,” the plurality of public realms would be best suited for “federations,” or – if I may add – confederations of the most various kinds. In equality, each would sit and listen, in a public space, to each opinion, like the Native peoples sitting in a circle around a fire, discussing important decisions with spiritual prayers. Yet, after some time, they equally would recognize those participants that had distinction: “There, too, it would become clear which one of us is best suited to present our view before the next higher council, where in turn our views will be clarified through the influence of other views, revised, or proved wrong.”³⁹ In this act, “power would be constituted horizontally, not vertically”⁴⁰; in other words, one may say it involves a true authority, one to eliminate the vertical or hierarchic rise of a power class, or one individual over another. In this manner, Arendt is forming a divergent concept of the state, which even brings that terminology into question, since the modern state encompasses imperial power, and obliterates ancient authority. She finishes the interview by stating her hope that these elements would be “in the wake of the next revolution.”⁴¹ ⁴² Remarkably true revolutionary proceeding were made by the councils of the Hungarian Revolution, which superseded all other ‘revolutionaries’ and eliminated the separation and eventually downfall due to party factionalism. The horizontal plane of politics incorporates plurality, and communal equality, which exists with the simultaneous recognition of authorial distinction, breaking down party factionalism, where her diverse authorial commonality

³⁸ Hannah Arendt, Chapter 4 “Action,” Section 31, “The Traditional Substitution Of Making and Acting,” *The Human Condition*, The University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 220.

³⁹ Hannah Arendt, “Thoughts on Politics and Revolution: A Commentary,” *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace & Company, 1972, p. 233.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

⁴² Believe it or not, if anyone conceived a “revolution” based on a re-constituted antiquity, it was Machiavelli. He had little favour for what would be classified as modern revolutions. For him, most ‘revolutions’ were merely incessant destructions, with needless violence, and could easily form conditions worse than the cause of uproar: “No one should start a revolution in a city in the belief that later he can stop it at will or regulate it as he likes” (Machiavelli, Book III, “Florence From 1353 to 1414,” Chapter 10 in *The History of Florence*, 1965, pp. 1153 – 1155, p. 1154). As Arendt reports, his revolutionary spirit, “was in the institutions of Roman antiquity” (Arendt, Hannah, Chapter 1, subsection 3, “The Meaning of Revolution,” *On Revolution*, 1963, 11 – 48, pp. 29-30). Like the Indigenous worldview, a sacred beginning is a necessity for a revolution: “without the trust in a sacred beginning,” it would not be a “successful revolution” (Arendt, Hannah, Chapter 6, subsection 4, “The Revolutionary Tradition and Its Lost Treasure,” *On Revolution*, 1963, 207 – 273, p. 268). Arendt disentangles him from modern revolution since, “he was the first to think about the possibility of founding a permanent, lasting, enduring body politic” (Arendt, Hannah, subsection 3, Chapter 1, “The Meaning of Revolution,” *On Revolution*, 1963, 11 – 48, p. 26).

is somewhat similar to the communal political leadership of Indigenous Peoples.⁴³

In *On Revolution* as well, for a better understanding of revolution, Hannah Arendt returns to the original Latin meaning of revolution – *revolver* – which implies a return to the roots – of “revolving back to some pre-established point” (Arendt, 1963, 33). It is not a progressive advancement. It is opposed to the very modern conscientiousness of “progress in history.”⁴⁴ Her “eternal return,” or “eternal recurrence,” is stated only once in *The Human Condition* (1958) and it returns in her last work, *The Life of the Mind* (1978), where she states that, “The thought of ‘Eternal Return’ implies an unconditional denial of the modern rectilinear time concept and its progressive course; it is nothing less than an explicit reversion to the cyclical time concept of antiquity.”⁴⁶ It obliterates the negations of the modern progressive mindset to the point of acceptance of all there was, is, and will be. Although Arendt wrote these ideas circa 60 years ago, they are still relevant for not only today, but the future. A distinctive eternal return with immortal features is another concept where she can be linked to the Dreamtime of Indigenous Peoples.

⁴³ Basil Johnson, an ethnologist of the Ojibway Peoples, stated in this manner, the public-communal role of leadership in native communities: “In the exercise of leadership, a leader did not act upon his own initiative. In matters that concerned the community, he was expected to seek and rely upon the guidance of a council consisting of the leading men and women of the community. These were frequently the elders.” (Johnston, Basil, “Man’s World,” *Ojibway Heritage*, 1976, 59- 80, p. 63). In the ceremony, the leader who was chosen by usually the elders would make this statement: “You have made me a poor man,” since potential leaders “were reluctant to accept the position.” “Leadership is a burden... It was to ensure insofar as possible, excellence in leadership... Part of the training,” of “excellence in leadership,” was “fostering eloquence, wisdom, and generosity,” that would “inculcate in the tentative candidate a special deference to the principle that in government the well- being of the people superseded all other considerations” (Johnson, *Ibid.*, p. 63).

⁴⁴ Hannah Arendt, subsection 4, Chapter 1, “The Meaning of Revolution,” *On Revolution*, 1963, p. 33.

⁴⁵ The little term “progress in history” captures all of the particular flaws in the modern mental framework. Progress was considered an unlimited concept generating from the seventeenth century and used up ‘till today. Arendt calls it “the most cherished dogma of all men living in a scientifically oriented world” (Arendt, Hannah, Book I, Thinking, Section 1, Appearance, Chapter 3, “The reversal of metaphysical hierarchy: the value of the surface,” *The Life of the Mind*, 1978, 26 – 29, p. 26). Progress in history comes with the modern necessity of perpetual newness, that modern uncontrollable desire to make all things new, with the belief that all things new equal betterment. This displays the belief that, at every instant, the human, like a god, can transform almost all aspects of life. But, in reality, it produces an untenable, ironic condition, where this newness can entrap one’s consciousness in illusion. In effect, progress in history, subverts itself. Modern man is trapped in progress. But more importantly, this incessant desire for changing the nature of life comes from a weakness, a psychological problem, a spiritual problem that involves the non-acceptance of the present nature of human life on Earth. Progress in history should not only be seen as an educative problem, but also involves a psychological problem, and a spiritual denouncement, which should be rectified.

⁴⁶ Hannah Arendt, Book I, Thinking, Section I. Appearance, Chapter 3 “(True) being and (mere) appearance: two-world theory,” *The Life of the Mind*, 1978, p. 21.

Immortality is obviously and closely related to a form of eternal return, which is a core spiritual belief in the Indigenous Peoples.⁴⁷ For the native peoples, life is a “path without end.”⁴⁸ It involves the “cycle and perpetuity of life.”⁴⁹ The “cycle is complete with creation, destruction, and re-creation.”⁵⁰ This understanding of human life and all of its earthly forms, as having the potential of a cyclical immortality is common in the Indigenous Peoples’ mindset. For Arendt, immortality is required for the arrival of the public space: the healthy political arena formed by valorization of equality and distinction. For her, the most striking “testimony to the loss of the public realm in the modern age” comes about by “the almost complete loss of authentic concern with immortality”⁵¹ Under the modern mental framework, the aspiration to “earthly immortality” is usually thought of as “vanity.”⁵² Modernity also includes a “loss of the metaphysical concern for eternity.”⁵³ For the preservation of an active political and spiritual life, with “the possibility of immortality,” requires a return to the ancients, an eternal return, where a preserved immortality is considered a human possibility: “For the *polis* was for the Greeks as the *res publica* was for the Romans,” and the “space that protected against the futility of life and reserved for the relative permanence, if not [was] the immortality of mortals.”⁵⁴ There is no reason to believe that what occurred for the ancients, and is now occurring in Indigenous communities, cannot be incorporated into the contemporary existence for the rest of the world.

Conclusive Addendum: A Revolutionary Return to Sacred Indigenous “Dreaming”

This project was constructed through the view of the intermingling and expansion of worldviews, extending from a fruitful ancient cosmology with contemporary political thoughts and perspectives that are beginning to formulate a newer constitution of global governance. The necessity of incorporating environmental sustainability into our political system and spiritual mindset is extremely urgent. The degradation of Earth is at hand, therefore almost all of our principles and goals that are dominant in our modern political and religious contexts only further the continual destruction of essential environmental assets. Environmental sustainability is considered a prerequisite for social sustainability,

⁴⁷ Louise Samways elaborates in her article *Spirituality Without God*, that the indigenous spirituality is divided by the monotheistic stance of the West: “Indigenous ancestors ...have lived in deeply spiritual, in joyful lives full of purpose and meaning. Their spiritual understanding demanded a strong ethical lifestyle, but without God (Samways, *Spirituality Without God*, 2002, p. 3)...spirituality does not need religious belief. You don’t need religion to have meaning and purpose in your life. You don’t need religion to feel life’s spiritual dimension” (Samways, *Ibid.*, p. 4).

⁴⁸ Basil Johnson, “The Path Without End,” *Ojibway Heritage*, 1976, p. 94.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁵⁰ Basil Johnson, “The Vision of the Kitche Manitou,” *Ojibway Heritage*, 1976, p. 15.

⁵¹ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, subsection 7, “The Public Realm,” of Chapter II, “The Public and Private Realm,” The University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 55.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

with an astronomical distrust of typical economic sustainability. Environmental sustainability is a distinct concept, since it rises above the technological rhetoric of “substitutability” and “sustained yields,” since they are not freed from the modern reductionism into capitalistic-economic factors. The “natural capital” of environmental sustainability involves the maintenance of the natural environment itself, and is therefore exceeds the highest goal of income in “manufactured capital” and “human social capital,” since these modern-traditional economic patterns and activities are unsustainable.⁵⁵ Natural capital, a fundamental basis for life, is no longer falsely conceived as infinite; it is now *scarce*.⁵⁶ Simply speaking, environmental sustainability is the most essential concept for the preservation of human life, and all other forms of life within it. This new derivation is not included in the typical modern systems and infrastructures of politics or religion.

The bases of global governance are no longer synonymous but largely antonymous to the state-centric, sovereign, national governments. The pursuit in understanding the politics of environmental sustainability must delve into a re-constitutionality, breaking down the limited fallacies of traditionally modern political principles. These globalized environmentally-sustainable initiatives must be embraced in the transformations of power away from the private, neo-liberal economic dominance to the increased effects of the publically-oriented non-state actors such as NGOs, and activities administered by the UN and EU policies, who advocate original, environmentally-friendly public policies. This contemporary direction calls for politics to employ a corrective understanding of the human in relation to life on Earth. This fruitful understanding surpasses the reductive religious sentiments from the imaginary images of the “heaven above” separated from Earth. One may also include the surpassing of economic secularism as well, which is also separated from the earthly, environmental relations.

The prognostications from these limited and reductive modern views of human relations with the natural environment are conflicting: one comes from the erroneous modern historical perception of human relations with the natural world, reflected in the technological belief that the human can control nature, which only makes us “fated to play God.”⁵⁷ The other arises in the desire to almost completely erase our endeavours in the belief of being outside the natural world: “to scale back our effects on the planet, to remove our fingerprints from the biosphere as much as possible.”⁵⁸ Both of these views share a somewhat similar and erroneous belief that humanity can be divided from the world and the Earth within. These political and religious errors that have no consideration of the environmental planet have existed for the last four or five centuries, and that their mistakes are wreaking havoc.

⁵⁵ Robert Goodland & Herman Daly “Environmental Sustainability: Universal and Non-Negotiable, *Ecological Applications*, Vol. 26 (1995), p. 1005.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p.1005.

⁵⁷ Byron Williston, “Sustainability,” in *Environmental Ethics: for Canadians*, Oxford Press, 2012, p. 357.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 357.

It becomes significant that the required changes involve a peaceful revolution. The major principles of this peaceful revolution of incorporating environmental sustainability into politics and spirituality, with all of their affiliated subjects would first include: the highest concern for Mother Earth as the foundation for political arrangements; a re-composition of spirituality not divided but centered on earthly existence; a divergent ontological understanding of human agency, living in a naturally-dominant contemporary world; a global governance bypassing modern political values, with newly conceived cosmopolitan principles such as equality, equity, and justice; the disposition of a dissimilar economic platform, a non-dollar element in the economy favouring and rewarding of public, judicial, and political practices; and it is evident that almost all of these elements comprise a re-birth in ancient principles for the 21st century, a revolutionary Renaissance for our future. A 21st Century Renaissance would consist of politics based on the antiquity of Indigenous leadership and community, by engaging with a plurality of identities under not only nations or federations, but confederations with multi-localizations. This would reflect the multiple-interconnected and interdependent sites and preferences of multi-faceted, multi-lateral, polycentric forms of global governance. It is a form of governance based on the equity of equality and distinction, with the formations of numerous multi-lateral councils, all participating with the major global concern of the environment, overtaking any capitalist values and modern political fragmentations.

A true revolution requires an elimination of the related proponents of progress in history. Within this divergence, there is this sense of an cyclical understanding of history – as some variance of eternal return – with the possibility, through simultaneous recognition of plurality, equality, and distinction, of creating a true public political action, with virtuous words and deeds, in order to elevate the global concern for environmental degradation, and to establish respected ways to sustain it as best as possible. The immortal features of eternal return are similar to Indigenous Dreamtime. A dream is conceived as a distinctive vision that incorporates all of these significant aboriginal principles that outstrip the Western consciousness. It constitutes a true revolution on these major components – of politics and spirituality – as important ingredients for our lives, and all lives on Earth. And, it seems, there is no time to waste.

While considering the growing stress on the biocapacity of the Earth, we must, to a large extent, come close to eradicating the economic-political, neo-liberal dominance. Economists must include – not omit – the natural “externalities” from their cost-benefit analysis, with the reality that this web of life called nature performs incalculable services that are vital for all features within the necessitated health of the planet. This would be a truer form of economic justice. We must begin with a realization, as Robert Paehlke reports that “much of what humans have crafted in recent centuries depends on energy sources that are both finite and ecologically problematic.”⁵⁹ If our dominant hierarchic economic rule does not consider these additions, the Earth and the human world within it, will deteriorate. It becomes obvious that the repercussions of this extremely limited

⁵⁹ Robert Paehlke, “Sustainability as a Bridging Concept,” *Conservation Biology*, Vol. 19, No. 1, February, 2005, p. 36.

understanding of modern politics and spirituality can merely cause retrogression in these earthly-worldly attributes.

With the growth of modernity the Western world left no place for the archaic world of Indigenous Peoples to survive. But the archaic world is returning. As Robert Lawlor states in his wonderful book, *Voices of the First Day: Awakening in the Aboriginal Dreamtime*, “the pendulum must be about to start a return,”⁶⁰ a return towards the *internal* dreaming rather than the dominance of the technological *external* world. It brings about a call to expose another paragraph by Robert Lawlor that captures much of the arguments within this work, since it brings about a good description of the divergent ontological basis, which captures the power of the ancient cyclical, cosmological worldview, which many may claim as the safeguard to protect against the destructive tendencies of modernity. It forms a vital seed for developing a healthier education, and brings back meaning into life again, the current life of today, by Indigenous peoples:

As with all of life, the growth of humanity and culture begins with a germinating seed and returns to seed at the completion of the cycle. Life reborn from the death or dormancy of the seed never duplicates exactly a past formation; rather, it grows in the paradox of ever new possibilities held within an unchanging essence. It is a centrifugation into the mystery of that which is the same yet different, unchanging yet novel. The dance begins when the seed sheds its shell. The breaking of the encasement is a symbol of throwing off the accumulated encrustation of the previous cycle to reveal anew its essence. The Aboriginal culture symbolizes the eternal seed of human cycles⁶¹

Environmental sustainability should be on the preservation of care and virtue to the natural elements of life on Earth, which extends from the ancient cosmological and current indigenous “dreamings” of the sacredness of Nature for the potential of global public spaces, where people can truly act with the life-inspiring motivations of permanence and immortality that can be felt and experienced. This immortal recognition makes the human more in tune with the environment, and generates the possibility of living a more human life, outside of the modern technological dominance. It is life that is not divided from nature, but in close spiritual-cyclical reverence to the natural qualities of Mother Earth. All of these contemporary changes in ontology – changes in the “being” of a human being – have been maintained in the general archaic traditions of Indigenous Peoples, who have a political and spiritual basis largely opposed to the West, yet not outside the need for a universally-healthy environment and universal peace. Their teachings and their healings are for all. Environmental sustainability should be formed on these premises.

⁶⁰ Robert Lawlor, Section “The Dreaming Dies in the West,” in Chapter 4, “Colonization and the Destruction of the Dreaming,” *Voices of the First Day: Awakening in the Aboriginal Dreamtime*, Inner Traditions International, 1991, p. 59.

⁶¹ Robert Lawlor, “Introduction: Earth Dreaming,” 1 – 11, *Ibid.*, p. 9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arendt, Hannah. (1963). *On Revolution*, London: Penguin Classics.
- Arendt, Hannah. (1958). *The Human Condition*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, Hannah. (1978). *The Life of the Mind*, San Diego, New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Arendt, Hannah. (1972). "Thoughts on Politics and Revolution: A Commentary." In *Crisis of the Republic*, (pp. 199 – 233) San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Davis, Megan. (2008). "'A Home at the United Nations': Indigenous Peoples and International Advocacy." Andrew F. Cooper, Brian Hocking, William Maley (Eds.), *Global Governance and Diplomacy: Worlds Apart?*, (pp. 211 – 233), New York, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eliade, Mircea.(1954). "The Terror of History". In Willard R. Trask, (Trans.), *The Myth of Eternal Return, Or, Cosmos and History* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goodland, Robert & Daly, Herman. "Environmental Sustainability: Universal and Non-Negotiable," in *Ecological Applications*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Nov., 1996), pp. 1002– 1017.
- Goodland, Robert. "The Concept of Environmental Sustainability," in *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, Vol. 26 (1995), 1 – 24.
- Harvey, David. "Neo-liberalism As Creative Destruction," in *Geografiska Annaler, Series B., Human Geography, Vol. 88, No. 2, Geography and Power of Geography* (2008), pp. 145 – 158.
- Johnston, Basil. *Ojibway Heritage*, McClelland & Stewart, Toronto, 1976.
- Lawlor, Robert (1991). *Voices of the First Day: Awakening in the Aboriginal Dreamtime*. Rochester, Vermont: Inner Traditions International.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. (1989). "Book III: Florence From 1353 to 1414, Chapter 10, "The people take arms; the Guelfi flee. 1378." In A. Gilbert (Trans. &Ed.), *The History of Florence*, in *Machiavelli: The Chief Works And Others, Volume Three* (pp. 1153 – 1155). Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Nelson, Brian. (2006). "The Making of Leviathan." In *The Making of the Modern State: A Theoretical Evolution* (pp. 55 – 82). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Nelson, Robert .H. (1995). "Sustainability, Efficiency, and God: Economic Values a and Sustainability Debates," *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, Vol. 26, pp. 135-154.
- Oelschlaeger, Max. (1991). *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Paehlke, Robert. "Sustainability as a Bridging Concept," *Conservation Biology*, Vol. 19, No. 1, (February, 2005), pp. 36 – 39.
- Salwasser, Hal. 1993. "Sustainability Needs More Than Better Science," *Ecological Applications*, Vol. 3, No. 4, (Nov. 1993), pp. 587-589.
- Samways, Louise. (2002) *Spirituality Without God*. Toronto: Louise Samways.
- Schendler, Auden. "Trench Warfare, Not Surgery." In, *Getting Green Done: Hard Truths from the Front Lines of the Sustainability Revolution*, Public Affairs, New York, 2009, pp. 1 – 24.
- Schendler, Auden. "The Proximity of a Sustainable World," in *Getting Green Done: Hard Truths From the Front Lines of the Sustainability Revolution*, Public Affairs, New York, 2009, pp. 241 – 252.
- Speth, James Gustav. (2008). *The Bridge at the Edge of World Capitalism, the Environment, Crossing From Crisis to Sustainability*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Sveiby, Karl-Erik. "Collective Leadership with power symmetry: Lessons from Aboriginal prehistory," in, *Leadership*, 7(4) lea.sagepub.com, UK, 2011, pp. 385 – 414.
- Thakur, Ramesh. (2008). "Conclusion: National Diplomacy and Global Governance. In Andrew F. Cooper, Brian Hocking & William Maley(Eds.). *Global Governance and Diplomacy: Worlds Apart?* (pp. 288 -289).New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Vattimo, Gianni. (1990). "Introduction." In *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Postmodern Culture* (pp. 2 – 51) Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.
- Williston, Byron. (2012). "Economics and Ecology." In B. Williston (Ed.), *Environmental Ethics for Canadians* (pp. 108 – 132). Don Mills Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Williston, Byron. (2012) "Sustainability." In, *Environmental Ethics: for Canadians* (pp 357 – 385). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Wiser, James. L. (1982) "John Locke." In *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order* (pp. 209 – 228). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wiser, James. L. (1982). "Thomas Hobbes," in, *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order* (pp. 185 – 208). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.