PENTTI LINKOLA'S ECOFASCISM AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS: A RE-EVALUATION OF THE CONCEPT OF HUMANITY

Ahmad Rama Dony

Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada
Email: ahmadramadony@mail.ugm.ac.id

Septiana Dwiputri Maharani

Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada

Abstrak

Krisis lingkungan global telah menimbulkan tantangan yang mendesak bagi umat manusia untuk mempertimbangkan kembali hubungan mereka dengan alam. Pemikiran ekofasisme yang diusulkan oleh Pentti Linkola menarik perhatian karena menawarkan solusi yang kontroversial terhadap permasalahan lingkungan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi dan mengevaluasi kembali konsep kemanusiaan dalam kerangka pemikiran ekofasisme yang diajukan oleh Linkola, dengan menggunakan pendekatan tinjauan filsafat manusia. Metode penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan pisau analisis deskripsi, interpretasi, dan analisis kritis terhadap pandangan kemanusiaan Linkola. Penelitian ini mengidentifikasi perspektif filsafat manusia dalam pemikiran ekofasisme. Selain itu, penelitian ini juga mengeksplorasi implikasi dari penilaian kembali konsep kemanusiaan terhadap pola pikir dan tindakan manusia dalam mengatasi krisis lingkungan global. Dengan mengintegrasikan perspektif filsafat manusia, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memberikan pemahaman yang lebih mendalam mengenai hubungan yang kompleks antara ekofasisme, konsep kemanusiaan, dan tantangan lingkungan yang dihadapi umat manusia. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa salah satu cara dalam mengatasi krisis lingkungan yang ditawarkan oleh Linkola adalah penerapan pemerintahan fasisme dengan pertimbangan ekologis. Linkola menawarkan untuk melakukan pengaturan terhadap populasi manusia, pelarangan bahasa asing, pengontrolan obesitas dan tinggi badan, serta pembatasan penggunaan bahan bakar fosil. Linkola juga tegas menolak Hak

Asasi Manusia dan kebebasan individu karena menjadi penyebab kerusakan alam. Meskipun mengutamakan ekosistem di atas hak individu, pendekatan ini tidak dapat dengan mudah dibenarkan. Solusi efektif untuk tantangan lingkungan memerlukan pendekatan yang lebih holistik, termasuk peningkatan efisiensi sumber daya, adopsi teknologi ramah lingkungan, dan perubahan perilaku konsumsi yang berkelanjutan sehingga menjaga keseimbangan ekologis dengan menghormati hak asasi manusia.

Abstract

The global environmental crisis has posed an urgent challenge for humanity to reconsider its relationship with nature. The idea of ecofascism proposed by Pentti Linkola has attracted attention because it offers a controversial solution to environmental problems. This research explores and re-evaluates the concept of humanity within the framework of ecofascism proposed by Pentti Linkola, using a human philosophy review approach. This research uses a qualitative method with the analytical framework of description, interpretation, and critical analysis of Linkola's humanitarian views. This research identifies the perspective of human philosophy in ecofascism. In addition, this research also explores the implications of reassessing the concept of humanity on human mindset and actions in overcoming the global environmental crisis. By integrating human philosophy perspectives, this research aims to provide a deeper understanding of the complex relationship between ecofascism, the concept of humanity, and the environmental challenges facing humanity. This study's results show that one way to overcome the environmental crisis offered by Linkola is implementing a fascist government with ecological considerations. Linkola offers to regulate the human population, ban foreign languages, control obesity and height, and limit the use of fossil fuels. Linkola is also firm in rejecting human rights and individual freedoms as the cause of natural destruction. While prioritizing ecosystems over individual rights, this approach cannot be easily justified. Effective solutions to environmental challenges require a more holistic approach, including increased resource

efficiency, adoption of green technologies, and changes in sustainable consumption behavior, thus maintaining ecological balance while respecting human rights.

_____

INTRODUCTION

Environmental issues have become a focal point for many parties as various environmental crises impact the world. Climate change, biodiversity loss, and environmental pollution are increasingly urgent and complex problems (Moore & Roberts, 2022). The combustion of fossil fuels and uncontrolled deforestation increase greenhouse gas emissions, contributing to global warming, more extreme weather, and rising sea levels. Furthermore, excessive and illegal exploitation of natural resources triggers land degradation, loss of habitats, and declines in various species populations. All these have sparked widespread impacts, including threats to the sustainability of ecosystems, human life, and overall socio-economic well-being (deGuzman, 2019).

Entering the 21st century, environmental challenges have become more complex and pressing. Climate change leads to frequent and extreme natural disasters, damaging infrastructure, disrupting livelihoods, and causing significant economic losses. The loss of biodiversity threatens food security, ecosystem health, and overall ecological stability. Meanwhile, environmental pollution, such as air, water, and soil, significantly harms human health, causing respiratory diseases, skin problems, and even death. Approximately 92% of pollution-related deaths are reported in developing countries. Pollution of soil and water by toxic materials such as heavy metals is also unavoidable. The contamination of heavy metals has been found in both soil and water ecosystems throughout the globe. In Flint, Michigan in 2014, the source of water was changed from Lake Huron to Flint River because of the lead

pollution reported in the lake. The problem further contaminated the water source and in January 2016, in Karachi, Pakistan, about 89% of sampled drinking water was contaminated with lead exceeding the World Health Organization (WHO) recommended limit of 10 µg/l. In this context, the social, economic, and political changes to address global environmental challenges are increasingly urgent and complex (Arora et al., 2018).

The escalation of global environmental challenges reflects the urgent need for collaborative and holistic action from the entire global community. National and international initiatives aimed at climate change mitigation, conservation of natural resources, and pollution reduction should be encouraged and strengthened. Research and technology innovation also play a crucial role in developing sustainable and effective solutions to these environmental challenges. Additionally, public awareness and the importance of environmental education are conservation strategies that create synergistic spaces, facilitating opportunities for scientists, policymakers, community members, and other stakeholders to unite in a shared vision (Ardoin et al., 2020).

Over the past two decades, as awareness of environmental crises has increased, many vocal groups and even political parties have emerged to champion environmental causes. This environmental activism is often driven by concerns about the negative impacts of human activities on the natural environment and awareness of the need for swift and effective action to prevent further damage. These organizations and movements mobilize the public to participate in environmental awareness campaigns, direct actions, policy advocacy, and conservation efforts, sometimes even engaging in radical actions. One ideological response to concerns about the environmental crisis is ecofascism. Ecofascism brings a controversial and complex perspective into the modern discourse, attempting to address global environmental challenges in often considered controversial ways (Suryandari, 2022).

The idea of ecofascism has garnered attention for offering radical solutions to environmental crises, highlighting that

overpopulation and unsustainable consumption patterns are the primary causes of environmental degradation. One of the key figures associated with ecofascism is Pentti Linkola, an environmental activist who articulated several significant ideas in his work *Can Life Prevail?* According to Linkola, ecofascism is an ideology that emphasizes the need for drastic actions to address the environmental crisis. He believed the continuously increasing human population and consumptive lifestyles have inevitably led to environmental damage. Linkola argued that traditional conservation efforts are ineffective enough to tackle these issues and that radical measures are necessary to ameliorate the situation (Linkola, 2011).

Human philosophy offers a critical and analytical framework for evaluating humans' complex aspects and relationships with their surroundings. Humans become the measure of themselves and everything else and are valued simply because they are human (Sihotang, 2018). With the perspective provided by human philosophy, the rejection of the idea of humanity in Linkola's ecofascism can be reevaluated in the context of humanistic concepts, including its impact on human rights, human values, and views on the relationship between humans and nature.

Research on Pentti Linkola's ecofascism can be found in several existing literatures, though it remains relatively limited according to our search. A study by Protopapadakis titled *Environmental ethics and Linkola's ecofascism: An ethics beyond humanism* specifically examines the ethical aspects of Linkola's ecofascism. According to Protopapadakis, Linkola's ecofascism contradicts the goals and essence of morality and presents a flawed argument for environmental ethics (Protopapadakis, 2014).

Furthermore, Joakim Laaksonen, in his 2022 study titled *Holistisen ympäristöetiikan ekofasistiset tendenssit - Aldo Leopoldin & Pentti Linkolan holistiset näkemykset* (Ecofascist tendencies in holistic environmental ethics – The holistic views of Aldo Leopold & Pentti Linkola) explores the ecofascist tendencies within the context of holistic environmental ethics through the ideas of Aldo Leopold and

Pentti Linkola. Both figures focus on the interaction between humans and nature but offer differing viewpoints. In his work, Laaksonen (2022) attempts to identify ecofascist tendencies within the ecological thoughts of Leopold and Linkola using several indicators he has established.

In contrast to these two studies, the present research discusses the relationship between humans and nature through the lens of human philosophy, reassessing the concept of humanity in Linkola's ecofascism, examining its weaknesses, and reconsidering ecofascism as a proposed solution to global environmental degradation. This approach offers a fresh perspective in the academic discussion of human philosophy and environmental ethics, posing key questions about values, morality, and the ethical foundations underlying human-nature interactions while enriching academic discussions on ethical and moral responsibility in the context of the contemporary environmental crisis.

DISCUSSION

1. Human and Nature Relationships

Humans are social beings who cannot be detached from their relationships with themselves, their environment, and God. Adam Schaff wrote that an "individual, in a quite specific sense, is a function of social relations and social conditions" (Schacht, 1990). Ecologically, humans form an integral part of the Earth's ecosystem, depending on natural resources for their survival and well-being. However, human interactions with nature often result in negative impacts, such as environmental degradation and biodiversity loss. Nature is a space and time for humans to forge these relationships, but it is not a blank canvas for human use. Nature is factual; it triggers freedom and serves as a reminder of human limitations (Dewi, 2018).

The relationship between humans and nature cannot be only seen from a practical ethical perspective. Understanding this relationship also requires a deeper ontological analysis. The interaction between humans and nature involves questions about

how humans understand nature, interact with it, and how nature affects human existence. This perspective encourages viewing humans as part of nature, not as a separate and dominant entity (Keraf, 2010). Nature possesses a diversity and complexity that cannot be reduced to merely a mechanical object. In understanding this relationship, it is crucial to acknowledge that nature has intrinsic value independent of human interests. The sustainability and well-being of humans cannot be separated from the sustainability and well-being of nature.

Nature represents an enigma to humanity, and its concept can be understood through various perspectives such as nature as an object of science, a backdrop to human activities, or even the source of life itself. Humans are often captivated by the beauty and grandeur of nature but simultaneously, human behavior frequently harms it, creating a perplexing and reflective paradox. In an ontological context, fundamental questions about the role of humans in nature, the connection between human existence that precedes its essence and the natural environment, and the philosophical implications for human responsibility towards nature become crucial (Bruning, 1956).

The relationship between humans and nature can be viewed from several fundamental aspects. The first is the dependence of humans on nature. Humans fundamentally rely on nature for their survival. They utilize natural resources like water, soil, air, and biodiversity to meet basic needs like food, drinking water, and shelter. However, it is important to remember that human dependence on nature extends beyond the use of natural resources and includes reliance on the ecological functions provided by natural ecosystems. Additionally, human dependence on nature encompasses psychological well-being and human health linked to human interactions with nature.

Secondly, cultural interaction. Culture and traditions are integral to the human social structure that has evolved over thousands of years. In this context, cosmological views and spirituality reflected in culture and traditions have been

foundational for human understanding of their place in the universe. Cosmology, as the study of the structure and evolution of the universe, often becomes an integral part of the spiritual and philosophical belief systems adopted by societies. According to Ratzel, the development of human populations and their cultures is determined by natural conditions (Barlian & Iswandi U, 2021). Culture is the creation, organization, and processing of human values. Cultural realms can vary according to the type of values they encompass. Certain things gain value for humans from a biological, economic, or social perspective (Snijders, 2004). Cosmological views in culture and traditions encompass various aspects, ranging from myths about the creation of the universe to conceptions of a hierarchical structure or cosmos that includes the heavens, the earth, and the supernatural realm. In many religious and philosophical traditions, humans are often placed in a broader context as integral parts of an ordered universe governed by divine forces or specific cosmic principles.

In parallel with cosmological views, the concept of spirituality also plays a significant role in shaping human relationships with nature. Spirituality refers to the inner dimension of humans that seeks meaning and connection with something greater than oneself, often through spiritual or transcendental experiences. In many spiritual traditions, nature is often regarded as a manifestation of divine power or sacred creation, and humans are seen as an integral part of a complex web of life governed by spiritual laws. This perspective encourages a respectful and reverential approach to nature, promoting stewardship and a sense of responsibility toward preserving and honoring the natural world as a vital part of the spiritual fabric of life.

Thirdly, the economic factor. The economy is a complex system involving interactions among humans, capital, technology, and natural resources. This system governs the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services, affecting human relationships with nature. Here, natural resources become a crucial factor of production used to create economic value. In the

economic relationship between humans and nature, natural resources are often exploited to meet market demands. Excessive exploitation can lead to environmental damage, a decline in the quality of natural resources, and even future resource shortages. Therefore, the main challenge in the economic relationship between humans and nature is finding a balance between resource exploitation and environmental sustainability.

In traditional societies, nature is a determinative entity, causing humans to become objects subjected to natural forces. Therefore, within this framework, traditional communities tend to develop strategies and practices that continuously adapt to the dynamics of nature. The view of nature in this perspective is often metaphysical, with beliefs in abstract powers other than God (Muthmainnah et al., 2020). In modern societies, the relationship between humans and nature has undergone significant changes, with communities tending to adopt a positivistic approach that places humans as subjects who have control over reality. The dominant belief is that the power to regulate reality resides within humans, not dependent on natural forces. This view is reinforced in Western philosophical traditions, particularly since Cartesian thought, which embeds the understanding that the subject is the human who possesses internal consciousness, while nature is considered an object devoid of interiority and operates mechanically (Dewi, 2018). In Cartesian philosophy, reason is significant in determining the relationship between humans and their surroundings, especially between humans and nature. The consequence of this view is the belief that nature is no longer regarded as an entity with absolute and unshakeable characteristics but as something that humans can alter through technological advancements.

In the face of environmental complexity, humans must continuously develop a deeper understanding of natural dynamics and adapt to the changes. Efforts to balance human progress and environmental sustainability are becoming increasingly important. Although the environment can change with or without human

intervention, the influence of humans on nature has now reached a significantly elevated level. Human capabilities to alter ecosystems, reshape landscapes, and influence climate patterns have placed humans in a position of considerable responsibility. While manipulating nature may hold the potential for progress, it also carries serious consequences for ecological balance.

Although natural processes continue to unfold without human intervention, human actions such as deforestation, industrialization, and urban expansion are increasingly pushing the environment beyond its natural limits. The assumption that nature is a passive entity, merely waiting to be shaped by human will, is no longer accurate. On the contrary, human environmental changes can have permanent and irreversible impacts. The notion that nature is entirely under human control, without independent natural processes occurring, is increasingly being questioned. Ecosystems, upon which humans rely, are not simply objects of manipulation; they are complex systems that adapt to human forces.

Therefore, balancing human advancement and environmental sustainability becomes ethically important and necessary for human survival. Humans must recognize that, although they can manipulate nature, this power also carries the potential to damage ecosystems, which, in turn, could threaten the survival of humanity itself. Understanding the profound responsibility humans bear in altering the environment is crucial, not only for the preservation of biodiversity but also for ensuring the continued survival of all species, including humans.

2. Ethics and Human Interaction with the Environment

Theoretically, ethics has several general meanings. First, etymologically, ethics comes from the Greek word ethos (plural: *ta etha*), meaning "customs" or "habits." In this sense, ethics encompasses the concept of a good life and proper ways of living, whether for individuals or society. Ethics discusses the norms or rules that regulate human behavior in social interactions and the

environment. The habits that underlie ethics are often reinforced by the values, beliefs, and traditions that develop within a society (Bertens, 2007).

Ethics is often interpreted as a set of principles or moral values regulating human behavior towards fellow humans and the surrounding environment. However, the view that limits the application of ethics exclusively to humans has become the subject of increasingly intense debate. They are positioning humans merely as objects, which carries significant implications for attitudes toward and recognition of human dignity. Such positioning diminishes respect for humans' inherent dignity and worth universally, even leading to a tendency to treat humans as commodities (Sihotang, 2018). Not far from this, human behaviors that tend to have detrimental effects on their surroundings, including nature, need more attention. Ethics and human morality are important in determining human attitudes and responsibilities towards the universe.

Humans must preserve nature and the environment as part of their moral responsibility. They must feel accountable for the integrity of nature and its diverse processes to protect the value of life. Human ethical responsibility towards nature entails not only preserving nature's sustainability but also maintaining an awareness of nature's intrinsic value and respecting the moral rights of other living beings within human thought processes (Fahik, 2014). Thinking patterns often driven by short-term needs and selfish attitudes lead to environmental degradation that is deeply concerning and detrimental to future generations. Human dependence on nature in biological and cultural contexts creates an inseparable relationship between humans and the environment. Biologically, humans rely on nature to meet basic needs such as clean air, water, and food sources. However, this dependence also encompasses a cultural dimension, where nature is not only viewed as a resource to be exploited but also as a part of identity and a deeply ingrained cultural value system. In many traditional societies, nature is regarded as a sacred entity, respected and

preserved as part of social and spiritual sustainability. Thus, this cultural perspective significantly shapes human ethical awareness regarding their responsibility to preserve nature.

Furthermore, human dependence on nature also has an equally important economic dimension. Human economic activities, ranging from agriculture, fisheries, and forestry to energy, heavily depend on the continued ecological function of nature. The current economic systems in many countries often overlook the direct link between environmental degradation and long-term economic losses. Environmental degradation, such as deforestation, pollution, and climate change, directly impacts the sustainability of economic sectors reliant on nature, which, in turn, affects the social and economic well-being of societies.

According to Keraf (2010), there are three fundamental errors in how humans perceive nature. First, while humans as social beings are defined by their social communities, the view that exclusively regards humans as social entities often overlooks the equally important ecological aspects that determine their identity and existence. In this context, an ecological approach emphasizes the importance of considering the impact of human activities on ecosystems and biodiversity, as well as the need to build awareness of human dependence on natural balance. A deeper understanding of these connections demands a paradigm shift in how humans view their relationship with nature. Therefore, acknowledging the ecological aspect of human identity requires a fundamental paradigmatic shift in how humans understand and respond to environmental challenges.

Secondly, the concept of ethics has traditionally applied only to humans and not to other beings. Ethics is often defined as a set of principles or moral values that regulate human behavior towards one another and their surrounding environment. Historically, however, the concept of ethics has been limited to the human domain, with the belief that only humans possess the rational and moral capacities necessary to understand and adhere to ethical principles. This view implicitly overlooks non-human beings or the

natural environment as relevant moral subjects, thereby creating a sharp division between human ethical obligations and the treatment of non-human beings. However, this limited application of ethics to humans has become a subject of increasingly intense debate in environmental philosophy. Many environmental philosophers argue that the concept of ethics should be expanded to include all living beings and the entire natural environment. They emphasize that non-human beings possess intrinsic values and rights that ethics must respect and protect. Peter Singer, a prominent environmental philosopher, advocates against what is known as "speciesism," which is the unjust treatment of beings based on their species rather than their capacity for suffering. Singer (2009) asserts that the ethical consideration of animals must go beyond anthropocentric views and recognize that non-human animals, like humans, are capable of experiencing pleasure and pain. Therefore, ethics should not be limited to human beings alone but must extend to all sentient beings, acknowledging their interests and rights.

Thirdly, the anthropocentric worldview is reinforced by the Cartesian approach of modern science and technology. This approach is characterized by treating nature and living beings as separate and fragmented entities while ignoring the complex and dynamic relationships among them. The Cartesian approach in modern science and technology views nature as a machine that can be understood through analysis and deconstruction into simpler components. This mechanistic-reductionist approach often obscures the understanding of the complex interconnections and dependencies among humans, nature, and other living beings (Keraf, 2010).

Human behavior and ethical responsibility towards nature can be categorized into three models within environmental ethics theory: Shallow Environmental Ethics, Intermediate Environmental Ethics, and Deep Environmental Ethics (Silvan & Bennett, 1994). Shallow Environmental Ethics, or anthropocentrism, places humans at the center of the universe, leading to the neglect of the importance of the survival of other species and complex ecosystems for humans'

short-term interests and needs (Yuono, 2019). Anthropocentrism views that moral values and principles apply only to humans, and human needs hold the highest and most important value (Keraf, 2010). Anthropocentric thinking can be observed in various aspects, such as prioritizing significant economic gains. Pollution is often considered a necessary cost for economic progress without taking into account the long-term impacts on the environment and human welfare (Ali & Oliveira, 2018). Additionally, consumptive culture contributes to environmental damage through fossil fuels, non-biodegradable waste, and unsustainable exploitation. This anthropocentric ethics is characterized by a highly instrumental view, where the relationship between humans and nature is seen only from an instrumental perspective. Nature is regarded merely as a tool for human interests, and any concern for the environment is considered part of these human interests. This approach is considered one of the roots of the ongoing environmental crisis because it fosters greedy and rapacious attitudes and behaviors, where humans exploit natural resources without considering their sustainability, based on the belief that nature exists only for human benefit.

Intermediate Environmental Ethics or biocentrism opposes the anthropocentric view. In biocentrism, not only do humans possess intrinsic value, but nature also holds inherent worth independent of human interests. This theory values every form of life and every living being in the universe. All living entities have inherent value and deserve moral consideration and respect. Nature should be treated morally, regardless of whether it is of direct value to humans or not. One notable figure in biocentric ethics is Albert Schweitzer, a physician and philosopher who devoted many years to service in Africa. He believes life is sacred and must be defended by offering the deepest respect. For Schweitzer (1964), it is unethical to destroy life, and moral to yield to the impulse to assist life. Additionally, Deep Environmental Ethics, or ecocentrism, proposes a broader perspective. Ecocentrism encompasses a wider scope than biocentrism. Unlike biocentrism, which places intrinsic value solely

on biotic elements and life, ecocentrism applies ethics on the entire ecological community, including living beings and abiotic entities. One version of this theory is Deep Ecology, introduced by Arne Naess in 1973. Deep Ecology demands a new ethic that is not anthropocentric but centers on all living beings with efforts to address environmental issues. Humans are no longer the center of the moral world. Deep Ecology focuses on all species, including non-human species. In short, it concerns the entire biosphere. Therefore, the moral principles developed by Deep Ecology address the interests of the entire ecological community (Naess, 1989).

From the various theories and ethical perspectives that examine how humans should interact with nature, it becomes clear that collective awareness and shared responsibility are needed to shift paradigms and practices toward sustainability. This involves adopting ethical values that respect natural life, treating the environment responsibly, and promoting social justice in environmental conservation efforts. Thus, a transformation towards more sustainable behavior can be achieved by integrating ethical principles into individual and collective actions to preserve the environment.

3. Ecofascism: Radical Approach to Environmental Crisis

The environmental crisis represents a complex issue that has persisted for centuries. This crisis, encompassing a wide range and variety of forms, extends from local deforestation to soil erosion and declining food availability. Such crises often contribute to the transformation of political power balances. In medieval Europe, climate change may have led to malnutrition, making the Black Death extraordinarily devastating (NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, 1991).

In the modern era, the environmental crisis is often linked to the dynamics of capitalism. Capitalism tends to exploit natural resources destructively, creating tension between those who wish to preserve the environment and those who seek to benefit

economically from its exploitation. Decisions on addressing the environmental crisis frequently become a social contest, influenced by social class, race, gender, and other social differences. For some, this crisis appears as a social issue impacting the environment, while for others, it may be seen as a governance problem or even as a symbolic issue that necessitates systemic restructuring and encourages stakeholders to take unusual actions (Moore & Roberts, 2022).

Ecofascism can be understood from its two root words, "eco" and "fascism." The term "eco" refers to the environment or ecology, emphasizing the conservation of ecosystems, the balance of nature, and the protection of endangered species. Here, "eco" encompasses ecological thinking, highlighting the importance of maintaining harmony between humans and nature. On the other hand, "fascism" denotes a political form that seeks to revolutionize and reharmonize the nation state through expelling a radically separate "Other" by paramilitary means (Mann, 2004). Because it seeks to legitimize itself through a self-declared intimate connection with a homogeneous "people", it also requires a dense mass-associational society (Renton, 2020). This allows it to circumvent liberal democratic forms of legitimacy. Because its notion of the homogeneous people is totalizing, it seeks to recruit all of life, both in the sense of "private life" and the "natural world", into its project and thus develops a voluminous and highly normative nature politics (Mosse, 1981). Furthermore, according to Moore and Roberts (2022), fascism involves several key concepts, including the formation of independent mass associations, paramilitarism, state authoritarianism, and racial politics (Moore & Roberts, 2022).

Ecofascism is a term with a complex and troubled history. According to Bernhard Forchtner (2019), ecofascism is a contentious term seldom used in academic literature. When examining the usage of the term ecofascism, several events can be identified as part of its definition. Firstly, ecofascism has been used as a slander by opponents of right-wing environmental ideologies. Secondly, the term has been employed as a critique against the Deep Ecology

movement by proponents of social ecology like Murray Bookchin. In the 1980s, Bookchin used this term to describe a misanthropic trend emerging within Deep Ecology, an environmental philosophy that places equal value on human and natural worth, rejecting the idea that humans hold a special place in moral considerations. Furthermore, several incidents have broadened the understanding of ecofascism, such as the mosque attacks in Christchurch that killed 51 Muslims, the shooting of 23 people, mostly Latinos, in El Paso, and the rioters during the attack on the US Capitol on January 6, 2021. They declare themselves part of "ecofascism". Additionally, ecofascism is often associated with the alt-right, which posits a special connection between white identity and nature. The alt-right lacks a formal organization and encourages violence but is unable to prevent it when such violence begins to threaten its existence. It is the rise of right-wing terrorism that, in some cases, has given rise to the notion of right-wing natural politics, including ecofascism (Moore & Roberts, 2022).

Generally, ecofascism is an ideology that links environmental degradation to population growth, immigration, and industrialization processes. Some sources describe ecofascism as a combination of environmental activism and white supremacist ideology. This movement began to develop in the early 20th century and peaked in the 1970s, coinciding with the emergence of the modern environmental movement triggered by industrial advancements (Suryandari, 2022).

As the Earth's condition worsens due to the climate crisis, ecofascist ideas have resurfaced. In 1968, Paul Ehrlich published *The Population Bomb*, arguing that many environmental problems are caused by human overpopulation. As a solution, he proposed approaches like the eugenics practices popular during the Holocaust, such as sterilization. These approaches are considered inhumane and often harm marginalized groups.

Ecofascism continues to pose a threat today, as evidenced by the 2019 shooting in El Paso. The shooter expressed his hatred for immigrants, overpopulation, and environmental damage as his

motivations. A similar attack occurred in New Zealand the same year, where the perpetrator identified himself as an ecofascist and blamed high birth rates among immigrants. Ecofascism is often linked with racial issues, which should have long been eradicated.

In Linkola's view of ecofascism, as discussed in his book *Can Life Prevail?*, "fascism" tends to lean towards an aggressive policy orientation that involves strengthening power and control over individuals to achieve greater collective goals. Linkola advocates for implementing stringent policies to address the ecological crisis, including reducing the human population and restricting individual rights in the context of consumption and reproduction (Linkola, 2011). Linkola's ecofascism emphasizes its actions by promoting environmentalism rather than naturalism. This is because ecofascism's primary goal is to limit humans' negative impact on nature and ensure that human interactions with nature are controlled to prevent disruption of the ecological balance. Thus, "eco" in ecofascism tends more towards managing ecosystems through structured and firm policies, often involving state surveillance of human activities. Meanwhile, naturalism promotes principles of natural freedom and often avoids excessive human intervention. This can be seen as contrary to the control orientation found in ecofascism, which emphasizes state power and aggressive policies to manage human interactions with nature.

4. Human Rights or Environmental Sustainability

The term "human rights" is recognized in various kinds of literature, both foreign and Indonesian, by terms such as "natural rights," "human rights," "fundamental rights," or in Indonesian literature as "*hak kodrati*", "*hak-hak dasar manusia*", and "*hak asasi manusia*". The term "human rights" was officially used for the first time in the Charter of the United Nations (UN), signed in San Francisco in June 25, 1945, specifically in the Preamble, Chapter 1 (3), Chapter 13 (1-b), Chapter 55 (c), Chapter 62 (2), Chapter 68, and Chapter 76 (c) (Ashri, 2018).

Generally, human rights are a set of fundamental rights universally recognized as entitlements granted to every individual due to their existence as human beings, irrespective of time and circumstances (Flowers et al., 2000). These fundamental rights include, among others, the right to life, personal freedom, education, work, health, a healthy environment, consumer protection, practice religion and worship, equality before the law, and not to be enslaved (Riski, 2023). These rights are considered universal because they are an inseparable part of every person's humanity, regardless of differences such as skin color, gender, age, ethnicity, culture, religion, or spiritual beliefs. These rights are inherent and do not require recognition or grant from any specific organization or government. In other contexts, human rights instruments emphasize fundamental rights that cannot be diminished under any circumstances, including during war, states of emergency, or for reasons of public interest. Fundamental rights are untouchable by anyone and hold significant, essential, core, and foundational importance in life (Sepulveda et al., 2004). According to Davidson (2008), fundamental rights within human rights cannot be violated, with few exceptions. These include the right to life, the right to be free from torture and inhumane treatment, freedom from slavery, freedom of thought, and freedom of religion. These rights are considered non-derogable, meaning they must be upheld under all circumstances, reflecting their utmost importance in safeguarding human dignity and freedom.

In the ecological context of ecofascism, Linkola has opposed the concept of human rights. He believes that human rights unrealistically treat all humans equally. According to Linkola's perspective, not all humans have the same or equal value, and some human actions may be considered lower than animal behavior. For him, the concept of human rights ignores the existing hierarchy of values in nature, where some human actions, especially those that damage the environment, are considered lower than behaviors that maintain or preserve ecosystemic balance. Human rights also overlooks the reality that not all humans act responsibly towards

the environment or society. He believes that there are individuals whose actions harm nature and endanger the survival of other species. Therefore, they should be treated differently from those who act responsibly. In his writings, Linkola has explicitly stated:

my logic refuses to accept that the value and rights of a human individual might remain the same ever since the beginning of time, regardless of how many humans there are on the planet. It is quite clear to me that the net increase in humans is constantly lowering the value of existing individuals (and with six billion humans, not much individual value is left on average...) (Linkola, 2011)*.*

Linkola's approach to human rights reflects his extreme views on the necessity of radical actions to tackle environmental crises. For him, the main priority is protecting nature and maintaining ecosystemic balance, even if it means sacrificing individual human rights. Other controversial aspects include Linkola's statements about what he considers serious threats to life,

The worst enemy of life is too much life: the excess of human life (Linkola, 2011)*.*

According to Linkola, the greatest enemy to life on this planet is life itself, particularly in the form of human existence. In his ecofascist thinking, Linkola emphasizes that uncontrolled human population growth, along with greedy consumption of natural resources and environmentally destructive behaviors, have led to ecosystem degradation and serious environmental damage. For Linkola, humans are the most dangerous agents in disrupting natural balance, and their very existence poses the greatest threat to the survival of this planet. Within the context of humanity, Linkola's views reflect a deep disdain for humans, both majority and minority groups. To him, most humans live in ignorance and apathy towards the environment, while the minority live in luxury and excessive consumption, both having equally detrimental impacts on the

biosphere. Linkola believes that most humans are trapped in a relentless consumption cycle that harms nature, while the wealthy and powerful minority often exacerbate environmental problems through the exploitation of natural resources and pollution.

According to Linkola, the negative impacts caused by humans are not limited to damaging ecosystems and the environment but also include indirect destruction to fellow humans. Linkola believes that uncontrolled human behavior, including wars, conflicts, exploitations, and social injustices, plays a significant role in causing suffering and destruction (Haag, 2020). War activities, for example, substantially have the potential to eliminate an individual's basic right to life. Similarly, conflicts and social injustices are often closely linked to violations of fundamental human rights, including the right to justice and equality before the law.

If one seriously begins to ponder what kind of world might survive, he will soon realise that a tabula rasa is what is needed. We almost need to start from Adam and Eve again (Linkola, 2011).

In his extreme view, Linkola proposes a return to the era of Adam and Eve as a radical solution to the problems faced by humanity. For him, human life has reached such a low point that efforts at recovery or improvement are no longer adequate. Instead, he suggests that what humans can do is give "extra time" for nature to recover from the damage caused by destructive human behaviors. Linkola's opinion reflects his belief that the destructive nature of humans has reached a level that is beyond repair. Therefore, he advocates for giving space for nature to heal and rebalance the ecosystems disturbed by human activity. For Linkola, such radical measures may seem extreme but he considers them necessary to address the worsening environmental crisis faced by humans and this planet.

In another extreme perspective of Linkola, each new human birth is considered an additional burden on nature because this phenomenon causes increased pressure on already limited natural

resources. This view is closely related to environmental carrying capacity, which reflects nature's ability to provide necessary resources and absorb waste produced by a certain population. The cumulative effect caused by the increase in human population, including waste production and carbon emissions, contributes to environmental degradation and biodiversity loss. Moreover, increased interactions between humans and other species, along with global climate change triggered by human activities, further worsen the ecological condition of the planet. Therefore, we contend that Linkola's extreme views highlight the need for more careful consideration of the impact of human population growth on ecological balance and the sustainability of nature.

5. Linkola's Bid for Environmental Sustainability

In his book, Linkola expresses his dislike for the democratic system, individual freedom, and human rights in addressing environmental crises. Linkola believes that political systems and individual freedoms often encourage excessive consumption and unlimited economic growth, exacerbating environmental damage (Haag, 2020). Instead, Linkola tends to advocate for more authoritarian ideologies, such as fascism or socialism, which entail strict government control over individual behavior and rigorous regulation of the economy and natural resources (Linkola, 2011). Unlike other forms of ecoauthoritarianism, which might still retain democratic elements, the fascism proposed by Linkola integrates environmental concerns with a totalitarian governance style, often tinged with nationalism and xenophobia. This approach explicitly demonstrates the uniqueness of adopting radical solutions that are regulatory and extremely restrictive in human interactions with nature.

By contrast, for example, anarcho-primitivism is an ideology from the left wing of political ecology situated at the opposite end of the spectrum. Anarcho-primitivism advocates for a return to pre-industrial lifestyles and a total rejection of modern technology,

arguing that environmental damage is a direct consequence of the social structures of modern industry. Anarcho-primitivists argue that civilization (referred to by some members of the movement as the "megamachine" or "Leviathan") acts as the primary engine of alienation from nature and others. Thus, anarcho-primitivists seek to live in communities that are in harmony with nature and free from the rules of civilization (el-Ojeili & Taylor, 2020).

Although the ultimate goal of both ideologies for environmental protection is the same, their methods of achieving this goal are vastly different. Anarcho-primitivists support dismantling modern social structures and reject central forms of authority, while proponents of the fascism offered by Linkola support the use of absolute power to implement and maintain strict environmental policies.

If a fascist government were to occur, Linkola (2011), proposes several measures to address the environmental crisis. First, he suggests that each family should have only one child to help control population growth. This reflects Linkola's concerns about uncontrolled human population growth and its environmental impact. Secondly, Linkola also proposes controlling obesity and excessive height growth. This view is based on his belief that individuals who are obese or unusually tall tend to consume more natural resources than those of normal weight or height. According to Linkola, the excessive consumption of natural resources by obese or tall individual's burdens nature, which could worsen environmental issues. From this perspective, controlling obesity and height growth is important in reducing pressure on natural resources and maintaining ecological balance. Although the control of obesity and height may be seen as controversial actions, particularly in terms of government intervention in personal matters, Linkola argues that these are necessary steps to ensure environmental sustainability.

Linkola emphasizes the need for strict restrictions on the use of fossil fuels to protect the environment and encourage a transition to sustainable energy sources such as wind power. He argues that

electricity consumption should only be limited to essential needs to prevent excessive and unsustainable use. As a renewable energy source, wind power aligns with Linkola's concept of a society in harmony with nature, converting wind into electricity without producing harmful emissions. Furthermore, Linkola sees the need to ban foreign languages. The approach proposed by Linkola to ban the use of foreign languages to limit foreign relations and international transactions reflects his concern about the exploitation of the natural environment by countries and international economic entities. In this context, the fascism proposed by Linkola does not focus on the aggressive exploitation of natural resources as often seen in traditional fascism. Instead, the ecofascism he advocates highlights authoritarian policies in environmental stewardship. This clarification separates ecofascism from conventional fascism; Linkola's ecofascism places the integrity and sustainability of the environment above economic or military expansion that disregards ecological impacts.

Therefore, while traditional fascism may view natural resources as tools to enhance the military and economic power of the state, Linkola's version of ecofascism focuses on strict oversight and conservation of these resources as part of a moral commitment to environmental protection. This distinction underscores a crucial difference between the two approaches, with ecofascism offering a paradigm that aims to maintain ecological balance through decisive and authoritative actions.

Linkola strengthens his proposals by suggesting an extreme measure of relocating individuals responsible for the capitalist economic system to remote locations, such as mountain peaks, for re-education. This view reflects his belief that capitalism has been a primary cause of environmental damage, as the drive to maximize financial profits often leads to irresponsible exploitation of natural resources. Through the re-education process in remote areas, Linkola hopes that individuals responsible for destructive capitalist practices will have the opportunity to understand and internalize values of sustainability, ecological balance, and greater social

responsibility towards nature. Although this idea might be seen as a form of radical social punishment, Linkola believes that such drastic actions are necessary to change the mindsets and behaviors that have caused widespread environmental damage (Haag, 2020). Linkola's next argument focuses on the realm of education. He greatly emphasizes the need to enhance education about history and the environment. Linkola stresses the importance of increasing environmental education and practical sciences about life in nature within the educational curriculum. This perspective reflects his belief that a better understanding of the natural environment and skills in adapting to life in nature can help individuals build more harmonious relationships with nature. Environmental education would involve learning about ecology, conservation, natural resource management, and the impact of human activities on the environment. This could include studies on natural cycles, biodiversity, the importance of maintaining ecosystem balance, and environmentally friendly practices in daily life. Additionally, practical science education about life in nature would cover the skills and knowledge needed to survive and adapt to the natural environment. This might include survival skills, wilderness orientation, organic farming, the development and use of environmentally friendly technologies, and practices that promote sustainable relationships between humans and nature.

6. Re-evaluating the Humanitarian Concept of Ecofascism

Humans play a crucial role in the context of their environment. However, it is unavoidable that humans are physically weak creatures, continually dependent on other components (Barlian & Iswandi U, 2021). The ecofascist approach of Linkola has introduced a new dimension to contemporary environmental ethics while raising significant questions and controversies that touch upon human dignity and worth. Linkola's view, which prioritizes environmental sustainability over human rights, cannot be easily justified. Although Linkola's idea of the need for drastic measures

to protect ecosystems stems from a deep concern for the Earth's ecological conditions, this approach results in various social and ethical implications that cannot be overlooked.

Firstly, the extreme measures Linkola suggests, such as the drastic reduction of the human population, raise profound ethical questions. This approach sacrifices basic human rights for ecological purposes, such as the right to life and reproductive freedom. The right to life is recognized as a fundamental human right and protected by various international legal instruments, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. According to these principles, everyone has the right to life, liberty, and personal security. Linkola's view advocating drastic population reduction to maintain ecological balance contradicts these principles, as it disregards the intrinsic value of human life and the rights of each individual to live and thrive. Moreover, if ecofascism were implemented, questions arise about who would be deemed worthy of elimination. Or, why does Linkola not end his life as part of humanity? This moral dilemma reflects a conflict between long-term environmental needs and the sacrifice of human rights, potentially creating ethical conflicts within society.

Secondly, ecofascism can lead to polarization within society, dividing people based on their support for radical environmental policy actions. This deepens social conflicts and reduces opportunities for dialogue and consensus in addressing environmental issues. Such polarity can weaken the collective efforts needed to tackle environmental challenges effectively (Prinse, 2019).

Thirdly, the state's role in an ecofascist approach tends to be highly interventionist, expanding government authority to regulate private lives, especially concerning human interactions with nature (Haag, 2020). This raises the potential for abuse of power and diminishes public trust in governmental institutions while also creating tension between the need for environmental actions and the protection of civil rights.

Fourthly, ecofascism could transform environmental education into a tool for spreading ideology, emphasizing personal sacrifice for the greater environmental good. This approach might shape the perspectives of the younger generation, failing to consider the plurality and diversity of opinions in addressing environmental issues.

Thus, while Linkola's concerns about the negative impacts of population growth on the environment are justified, the proposed solutions are untenable as they sacrifice basic human rights, and the broader implications of Linkola's ecofascism also need consideration. Therefore, a more humane and inclusive approach is necessary to achieve sustainability goals without neglecting human dignity, such as increasing resource use efficiency, adopting environmentally friendly technologies, and changing consumption behaviors towards a more sustainable lifestyle (Panicker, 2024).

CONCLUSION

Current environmental challenges, ranging from extreme climate change to biodiversity loss and destructive pollution, require an urgent and coordinated response from the entire global community. Ecofascism introduces a perspective that delves into a complex and controversial world, attempting to address global environmental challenges in ways often considered controversial. Linkola, through his views on ecofascism, highlights the need for drastic actions and proposes radical solutions to address these environmental issues, including strict limitations on individual freedoms and harsh interventions in social life. While Linkola's intention to protect the environment is commendable, his approach is often controversial and considered to overstep human rights, making it difficult to justify.

A more balanced and holistic approach, emphasizing resource efficiency, adopting environmentally friendly technologies, and changing consumption behaviors, could offer a more ethical and practical way to tackle environmental problems. This approach maintains ecological balance while respecting human rights,

demonstrating that solutions to environmental issues do not have to exclude humanity. Instead, they can be achieved through a more holistic approach that includes improving resource use efficiency, adopting eco-friendly technologies, and shifting towards more sustainable lifestyles.

REFERENCES

Ali, S. H., & Oliveira, J. A. P. de. (2018). Pollution and economic development: An empirical research review. *Environmental Research Letters*, *13*(12), 123003. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaeea7

Ardoin, N. M., Bowers, A. W., & Gaillard, E. (2020). Environmental education outcomes for conservation: A systematic review. *Biological Conservation*, *241*, 108224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108224

Arora, N. K., Fatima, T., Mishra, I., Verma, M., Mishra, J., & Mishra, V. (2018). Environmental sustainability: Challenges and viable solutions. *Environmental Sustainability*, *1*(4), 309–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42398-018-00038-w

Ashri, M. (2018). *Hak asasi manusia: Filosofi, teori & instrumen dasar*. CV. Social Poliltic Genius (SIGn).

Barlian, E., & Iswandi U. (2021). *Ekologi manusia*. Deepublish.

Bertens, K. (2007). *Etika*. Gramedia.

Bruning, W. (1956). The fundamental types of present philosophic anthropology. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *17*(1), 114–121. https://doi.org/10.2307/2104692

Davidson, S. (2008). *Hak asasi manusia: Sejarah, teori, dan praktek dalam pergaulan internasional* (A. H. Pudjaatmaka, Trans.). Pustaka Utama Grafiti.

deGuzman, M. M. (2019). Complementarity at the African Court. In C. C. Jalloh, K. M. Clarke, & V. O. Nmehielle (Eds.), *The African Court of Justice and Human and Peoples' Rights in context* (1st ed., pp. 645–679). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108525343.024

Dewi, S. (2018). *Ekofenomenologi: Mengurai disekuilibrium relasi*

manusia dengan alam. CV Marjin Kiri.

el-Ojeili, C., & Taylor, D. (2020). "The future in the past": Anarcho-primitivism and the critique of civilization Today. *Rethinking Marxism*, *32*(2), 168–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2020.1727256

Fahik, G. A. (2014). *Etika tanggung jawab masa depan perspektif Hans Jonas* [Undergraduate, Universitas Katolik Widya Mandira]. http://repository.unwira.ac.id/9696/

Flowers, N., Marcia, B., Kristi Rudilius, P., & Tolman, J. (2000). *The human rights education book: Effective practices for learning, action, and change*. The Human Resource Center.

Forchtner, B. (2019). Eco-fascism: Justifications of terrorist violence in the Christchurch mosque shooting and the El Paso shooting. *OpenDemocracy*. https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/countering-radical-right/eco-fascism-justifications-terrorist-violence-christ church-mosque-shooting-and-el-paso-shooting/

Haag, C. A. (2020). *The later philosophy of Pentti Linkola*. Independently published.

Keraf, S. (2010). *Etika lingkungan hidup*. PT Kompas Media Nusantara.

Laaksonen, J. (2022). *Holistisen ympäristöetiikan ekofasistiset tendenssit—Aldo Leopoldin & Pentti Linkolan holistiset näkemykset*. https://trepo.tuni.fi/handle/10024/141325

Linkola, P. (2011). *Can life prevail?: A revolutionary approch to the environmental crisis*. Tammi Publisher.

Mann, M. (2004). *Fascists*. Cambridge University Press.

Moore, S., & Roberts, A. (2022). *The rise of ecofascism: Climate change and the far right*. Polity.

Mosse, G. L. (1981). *The crisis of German ideology: Intellectual origins of the Third Reich*. Schocken Books.

Muthmainnah, L., Mustansyir, R., & Tjahyadi, S. (2020). Meninjau ulang *sustainable development*: Kajian filosofis atas dilema pengelolaan lingkungan hidup di era post modern. *Jurnal Filsafat*, *30*(1), 23-45. https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.49109

Naess, A. (1989). *Ecology, community and lifestyle*. Cambridge University Press.

NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory. (1991, December 10). Radical climate changes may be cause of the plague. *NASA*. https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/radical-climate-changes-may-be-cause-of-the-plague/

Panicker, T. V. (2024). Adopting eco-friendly technologies for a sustainable environment. *Ecology, Environment and Conservation*, *30*(Suppl.), S322–S326. https://doi.org/10.53550/EEC.2024.v30i07s.057

Prinse, A. de. (2019). *Political polarization and the environment*. Wageningen University and Research.

Protopapadakis, E. D. (2014). Environmental ethics and Linkola's ecofascism: An ethics beyond humanism. *Frontiers of Philosophy in China*, *9*(4), 586–601.

Renton, D. (2020). *Fascism: History and theory*. Pluto Press.

Riski, N. (2023). Pentingnya perlindungan hak asasi manusia dalam sistem hukum kenegaraan. *Mandalika Law Journal*, *1*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.59613/mlj.v1i1.1542

Schacht, R. (1990). Philosophical anthropology: What, why and how. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *50*, 155–176. https://doi.org/10.2307/2108037

Schweitzer, A. (1964). *The ethics of reverence for life*. Christendom.

Sepulveda, M., Banning, V., & Genugten, V. (2004). *Human rights reference handbook* (3rd rev.). University for Peace. http://upeace.org

Sihotang, K. (2018). *Filsafat manusia* (rev. ed.). PT Kanisius.

Silvan, R., & Bennett, D. (1994). *The greening of ethics*. The White Horse Press.

Singer, P. (2009). *Animal liberation: The definitive classic of the animal movement*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics.

Snijders, A. (2004). *Antropologi filsafat: Manusia, paradoks dan seruan*. PT Kanisius.

Suryandari, R. (2022). Ekofasisme ala Pentti Linkola: Mencintai lingkungan secara radikal. *Universitas Gadjah Mada*.

https://pslh.ugm.ac.id/ekofasisme-ala-pentti-linkola-mencintai-lingkungan-secara-radikal/

Yuono, Y. R. (2019). Etika lingkungan: Melawan etika lingkungan antroposentris melalui interpretasi teologi penciptaan yang tepat sebagai landasan bagi pengelolaan-pelestarian lingkungan. *Fidei: Jurnal Teologi Sistematika dan Praktika*, 2(1), 183–203. https://doi.org/10.34081/fidei.v2i1.40