

Eco-Consciousness and Environmental Ethics
in Eoin Colfer's *Artemis Fowl*

Pia Vanhala
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
Master's Thesis
March 2015

Tampereen yliopisto
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö
Englantilainen filologia

VANHALA, PIA: Eco-Consciousness and Environmental Ethics in Eoin Colfer's *Artemis Fowl*

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 83 sivua + lähdeluettelo 4 sivua

Maaliskuu 2015

Tutkielmani tarkastelee ekokriittisesti Eoin Colferin *Artemis Fowl* -kirjasarjan ensimmäistä osaa. Ekokritiikki tutkii lukijan, teoksen ja maailman yhteyttä ympäristöfilosofian ja ekologian kautta. Perinteisesti sekä kirjallisuus että kirjallisuustiede ovat keskittyneet sosiaalisen kanssakäymisen tasoihin, jolloin luonto on jäänyt täysin näkymättömiin tai korkeintaan näyttäytynyt taustalla tunnelmanluojana. Erityishuomioni kiinnittyy *Artemis Fowlin* (2001) luontokuvaukseen, ympäristökäsityksiin ja etiikkaan sekä siihen, miten ne mahdollisesti vaikuttavat lukijaan ja yhteiskuntaan.

Tutkimusteorian perustaksi valitsin ympäristöfilosofian ja ekokritiikin kärkinimien Lawrence Buellin ja Arne Naessin tärkeimmät julkaisut. Analysoin niiden perusteella ensinnäkin kuinka perusteellisesti luonto ja sen eettinen arvo esitetään romaanissa. Toiseksi tarkastelen, minkälaisia maailmankuvia ja ympäristöpolitiikkaa romaanissa esiintyy ja suhtautuvatko ne myönteisesti esimerkiksi luonnon monimuotoisuuden säilymiseen.

Ekokritiikki alkoi dokumentaarisen kirjallisuuden tarkastelusta, mutta myös populaarikulttuuri ja kaunokirjallisuus ovat tärkeitä tiedon ja asenteiden välittäjiä joita kannattaa tutkia kriittisesti. Ympäristökriisi pahenee jatkuvasti, ja kaikki mahdolliset keinot on otettava käyttöön jotta voidaan taata kelvollinen elinympäristö mahdollisimman monille sekä välttyä konflikteilta. Ympäristöliike tarvitsee laajaa asenteiden muutosta voimistuakseen entisestään, ja tämä tutkielma valottaa *Artemis Fowlin* arvoa ympäristöasenteiden muokkaajana. Niin yleinen kuin henkilökohtainenkin ympäristöfilosofinen pohdinta on hyödyllistä ja rikastuttavaa.

Avainsanat: ekokritiikki, Eoin Colfer, etiikka, ympäristöpolitiikka, luontokuvaus

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Ecocriticism in general.....	7
3. Lawrence Buell’s criteria for environmental writing.....	14
3.1. History within the environment	16
3.2. Environment as a process.....	19
3.3. Value and rights of the nonhuman world.....	20
3.4. Human accountability for the environment	22
4. Deep ecology.....	23
4.1. Eight principles	28
4.2. Economy, politics and techno-industrial society	32
4.3. Ontology and Self-realisation	48
4.4. Responsibility to induce change	64
5. Shallow ecology: problems and benefits	77
6. Conclusions.....	82
Works Cited	84

1. Introduction

This thesis examines Irish author Eoin Colfer's novel for children and young adults, *Artemis Fowl* (2001, AF from now on), from an ecocritical standpoint by combining environmental theories and literary analysis. As a bestseller, the novel has been read by a considerable amount of people and therefore it is a point of interest how different themes are presented to its readers. This thesis takes an environmental viewpoint which strongly indicates an ethical perspective in order to evaluate the level and possible effects of the "greenness" of the novel.

Environmentalists and ecocritics frequently illustrate how the Earth is facing an environmental crisis (Johnson 2009, 8). Others see the crisis as a matter of decades or even a century of environmental decline (Murphy 2009, viii). This crisis seems to have intensified since 2007 and many environmental elements near a point of depletion "beyond which they may not recover" (Mazur 2010, 1). Natural sciences constantly present proof of unprecedented changes in nature which are caused by or aggravated by human actions. Whether it is a worry for the survival and well-being of humans or a more comprehensive concern for the ecosphere, there is a wide consensus that the ongoing irreversible loss of diversity is a weighty problem for life on Earth.

The environmental movement makes normative claims about the state of affairs (Garrard 2012, 6), founded on the belief that it is morally wrong for people to cause irreversible changes in nature and the large-scale destruction of habitats and species must be brought to an end. Thus ecocritical analysis is doused in politics as well, similar to feminist and Marxist criticism (Garrard 2012, 3). Ecological philosophies, or *ecophilosophies*, study culture to criticise "the root causes of environmental degradation" and to formulate alternative views and ways of understanding the world and existence. Ecophilosophies create an ethical and conceptual foundation for "right relations with the earth". (Glotfelty 1996, xxi) Even though environmentalism can still be regarded as a young social, political and philosophical movement, a number of contradictory ecophilosophies have already emerged to offer various political possibilities (Garrard 2012, 18).

Ecocriticism can also be found in universities, research papers, magazines and books on literary theory, and the field of ecocritical research keeps expanding: “there really is no place where ecocritics cannot or should not tread” (Ingram et al. 2007, 8). Johnson (2009, 7) agrees with Peter Barry that ecocriticism has no single generic mode and that ecocritics need to read literature “from an ecocentric point of view; apply ecological issues to the representation of the natural world” and “show appreciation for ethical positions toward nonhuman nature”. These are also among the purposes of this thesis.

Artemis Fowl, the first in a series of eight novels, combines action with fantasy and science fiction in a way that impedes attempts to classify the genre exhaustively. The age twelve of the eponymous main character points to children’s or young adults’ literature as does the sometimes adolescent humour of the narration, although I do not see it targeted exclusively to children. Celia Keenan notes that the novel combines genres for humorous and playful effect, including detective story and thriller elements that originally have nothing to do with children’s literature. When the novel was first published, it provoked “hostile critical reception” and protests that such “cynical” stories should not be published for children. (2004, 257–8) However, as a multilayered bestseller it has appealed to a wide array of readers. The main character, Artemis Fowl II, is a boy genius who descends from an old line of Irish criminal masterminds. With his father missing or dead and mother having developed a serious mental illness as a result, he takes on a mission of restoring the family fortune by finding and exploiting a race of technologically advanced magical fairies that live underground in secret from humans. Some of the fairies live close to the surface and others have settled near the Earth’s core. Artemis lives with his bodyguard Butler and Butler’s sister Juliet, both trained in martial arts and maintaining the house. There is also Artemis’s mother who has confined herself in her room, never coming out.

The race of fairies is divided to a motley group of sub-races. Two of the major characters, Holly Short and Commander Root are elves, about one meter tall but tough and intelligent. Police officer Captain Holly Short is the first female in the respected Reconnaissance squad “LEPrecon, an

elite branch of the Lower Elements Police” (AF 33). The reconnaissance or Recon responds to any threats to the fairy nation and is mainly in charge of security and defence in the subterranean fairy nation. Their technological genius Foaly is a paranoid centaur whose innovations have kept the fairies a step ahead of the humans. Through the eyes of these main characters, other sub-races are portrayed thus: stupid, violent and evil like goblins and trolls; sprites who are air-headed and smug because they are the only fairies who can fly; pixies who are frail, vain and intelligent; and dwarves who have developed through evolution to work in mining, generally not to be trusted to behave. Even as trolls are dangerous for everyone and dwarves and goblins are engaged in a gang war, the fairies manage to live together, united under the common goal of staying hidden and safe from the humans.

The story is set at the beginning of the 21st century with a definite emphasis on modern technology, adventure and magical fantasy beings. The fictional fairy race covers more than half of the book. The sentience and language skills of most sub-races as well as their human-like customs relate them to humans so much that they can be interpreted as humans for the purpose of this thesis. At the same time they are contrasted with humans through their technological and implied ethical superiority, as well as a few distinct physical characteristics such as height, alien skin colours and pointy ears, as elves and other similar races are often depicted in mythic fictions.

While *Artemis Fowl* displays a clear interest in environmental issues, this thesis is concerned with the type(s) and different levels of said interest. The novel’s environmental merits and shortcomings will be compared with the criteria for environmental writing by Lawrence Buell as well as Arne Naess’s theory of deep ecology, the Ecosophy T -version especially, and finally briefly with shallow ecology. Buell’s criteria are widely known and cited, whereas Naess is said to be the “guru” and founding father of the radical philosophy of deep ecology (Garrard 2012, 23). His *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, which is the main material for this thesis, has been widely read and was published in five editions in Norway already by 1975 (Naess 1989, 210). These different viewpoints offer a sufficiently broad perspective for analysing the novel including fairly general

criteria, more and less radical critical theories, as well as different points of view in their call for environmental awareness and actions. All these combined will provide an ample insight to the novel's usefulness as a consciousness-raising cultural object.

Garrard warns that the above mentioned theories “are likely to have limited utility outside North America and Europe, where animals, climate and ‘the environment’, for example, will be understood in very different ways” (2012, 203). Despite ecophilosophy's global interest in societies and ecosystems, the terms and theories might not be understood in the same way in South America or Asia, for example. *Artemis Fowl* has the same constriction as the human characters are Irish and the main fairy characters are of European descent and, according to Celia Keenan, to some extent based on traditional Irish fairies with pots of gold, healing powers and ability to control time and human minds (2004, 260). This thesis will mostly restrict to rich Western countries and culture, especially that of Norway, the British Isles and the United States. The main focus of this thesis besides Naess is on ecocriticism in general, and self-evidently on English literature.

Very little has been written about *Artemis Fowl* previously, but it is included in numerous listings of books of interest. Most of the previous studies focus on Irish folklore and fairies in general, stylistics and genre, or technology. Often *Artemis Fowl* is only a small part of these studies, or their subjects are so far removed from the subject of this thesis as to be regarded unhelpful. One exception is an article by Celia Keenan which analyses the artistic merits of the first three novels in the series. Another instance of a serious angle of approach is an essay by Dominik Becher which considers evil in literature, and places *Artemis Fowl* among contemporary anti-villains for young readers. However he slightly exaggerates in trying to make Artemis seem evil and calamitous in the extreme. Some research has been written on the importance of environmental issues in children's literature. The first book-long study, *Wild Things: Children's Culture and Ecocriticism*, was published in 2004. Its editors conclude that it is important for children to experience nature and read about it in order to become mature human beings. They conclude that whereas nature may be dangerous at times, so too “can our evasion and denial of it”. (Dobrin & Kidd 2004, 2–3)

This thesis examines *Artemis Fowl* first in the light of Lawrence Buell's criteria for environmental literature to decipher the general visibility of the environment in the novel, and then turns to Arne Naess's ecological philosophy of deep and shallow ecology. First the field of ecocriticism is defined and the analysis on *Artemis Fowl's* environmental awareness will be presented following that.

2. Ecocriticism in general

Ecocriticism first appeared as a term in 1978 in William Rueckert's essay "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism" (Glotfelty 1996, xx) and became popular in 1989 when Cheryl Glotfelty suggested vocabulary for environmental criticism in a meeting of the Western Literature Association (Dobrin & Kidd 2004, 3). Glotfelty's widely acknowledged basic definition of ecocriticism highlights the study of the relationship between texts and physical environment from an environmentally conscious perspective (Glotfelty 1996, xviii). Throughout the history of literary criticism, the focus has mainly been in the relations between writers, texts and "the world", which has been confined to meaning human society and social relationships. The pastoral genre makes a slight exception to this by contrasting the urban environment with (an often romanticised) countryside. Ecocriticism looks to the ecosphere as the world to be examined (Glotfelty 1996, xix), broadening the study to the survival and thriving of beings and habitats of the surrounding physical environment.

Ecocriticism is unlike most literary disciplines in that it states definite ideas about the world based on scientific and personal evidence (Johnson 2009, 8). Even as ecocritics remain suspicious of the objectivity of the field of science and deny it being free of values, they support their cultural analysis with the science of ecology (Garrard 2012, 10). Ecocritics not only believe they can know reality more or less as it is, but aim to induce positive change by evaluating, guiding and acting in public. This is done with a myriad of theories and methods since ecocriticism remains an eclectic field of literary study to date, which is both a richness and a possible hindrance to the organisation of the field (Oppermann 2006, 107).

There is a question as to what exactly is *nature* or *environment* and whether or not humans are a part of it, or somehow apart. Terry Eagleton (2003, 7) notes that nature is “a slippery term, gliding between fact (how it is with something) and value (how it should be). It shares this ambiguity with the word ‘culture’, which some see as the opposite of Nature”. Many ecocritics and ecologists claim that nature should not be defined in opposition to people because humans are in an intimate relationship to and inseparable from their surroundings. Ecology shows that the relationships between entities are an essential part of the entities themselves (Naess 1989, 36). But if nature encompasses everything, including humans and man-made structures, why use the word at all? Nature can also be an abstraction and is from that point of view merely a cultural illusion. People have had a tendency to mirror ethical values into nature, sometimes finding it harmonious and moral, at other times chaotic and dangerous (Garrard 2012, 68). Greg Garrard points out that even if nature is always in part a cultural construction, it also exists physically and as the distant origin of our discourse (2012, 10). In this thesis *nature* will be used to describe actual physical areas in a “natural” state, that is, largely unspoilt by human activity. In addition there are abstract meanings and mental images associated with nature, making the term multilayered and non-specific. This is the way it is still widely used and best understood by most readers and writers.

Environment differs from nature in being a place which environs something, most often living beings. It is also a process in constant change (Ingram et al. 2007, 1). Humans in themselves are an environment for many living beings, especially bacteria, and in addition we are a part of an environment for many other species. In this paper *environment* is considered to be that space where the entity or group in question resides and interacts in; this is not necessarily human all of the time. Many ecophilosophers see the world as a process that never stops and which we are an inseparable and insignificant part of, and which is also a part of us (Naess 1989, 56; Garrard 2012, 32). This thesis, and arguably the novel examined too, suggests that humans are *not* the unequivocally most important part of the world, but on many levels still among the most eminent species and aspects that are to be studied, as it is the human consciousness that does the studying (Garrard 2012, 112).

It would still be difficult today in novels and literary criticism to focus primarily on something other than social interaction between humans, but ecocriticism and fantasy novels take a definite step away from focusing *solely* on it. In this, *Artemis Fowl* bears some notable similarities to H.P. Lovecraft's style by taking a step away from the human society towards supernatural species and the frightening unknown, which make the human life seem small in comparison. The supernatural is manifested in an alien race and Artemis's mother's insane delusions where she sees horrifying creatures that others cannot see. However, the most terrifying aspects of Lovecraftian horror are absent in *Artemis Fowl* which reaches equilibrium rather than insanity in the end.

Further interests include *intrinsic value* which means that something is important in its own right, as it is. It can be seen as an end, or in Kantian terminology, an end-in-itself (Korsgaard 2005, 84). "It is commonly agreed that something's possession of intrinsic value generates a prima facie direct moral duty on the part of moral agents to protect it or at least refrain from damaging it" (Brennan & Lo 2011). The important question is who or what has intrinsic value. What has *extrinsic value*, that is, value as means of achieving something more important, and in what situation? Can the value be independent from someone doing the valuation? Is the value only theoretical or should it be applied to actions as well? Are the values and morals derived logically or intuitively, a part of the world or merely found within our cultures? These questions are answered in differing ways among ecophilosophies and offer different perspectives for this study.

Many perceive consciousness-raising as the most important duty of ecocritically minded people. Glen A. Love, one of the first consciously active ecocritics, in his book *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology, and the Environment* (2003) asks everyone interested in environmental affairs to link their enthusiasm with their work and everyday life. Environmental issues should be studied in many forms and from various perspectives, preferably with an interdisciplinary viewpoint. This creates more knowledge and understanding that can be utilised by professionals from different fields of study and give rise to fruitful cooperation. (Love 2003, 3–7) Robert Kern asserts that all kinds of literature retain ecocritical interest: "Although it is clear that

some texts are more environmentally responsive... ecocriticism becomes most interesting and useful, it seems to me, when it aims to recover the environmental character or orientation of works whose conscious or foregrounded interests lie elsewhere” (2003, 260). Richard Kerridge sums up: “Most of all, ecocriticism seeks to evaluate texts and ideas in terms of their coherence and usefulness as responses to environmental crisis” (1998, 5).

Barry Commoner’s first law of ecology, “everything is connected to everything else”, encourages examining literature among other cultural phenomena, as literature is an important part of interacting and communicating ideas. Ecology has always been important to ecocritics and ecophilosophers, which means people who combine philosophical methods with ecological concepts such as complexity and symbiosis. (Naess 1989, 3 & 36) At a later date, evolutionary biology and evolutionary psychology have become of interest as well (Fromm 2004). Cheryll Glotfelty (1996, xxi) feels that ecology should be conjoined with history, philosophy, psychology and other humanities to provide rich insights into this wide discipline. Loretta Johnson adds theology and ecological economics to the list of important subjects for ecocritical studies (2009, 7). Arne Naess hoped that ecophilosophy would continue to develop a deep ecological philosophy leading to an international deep ecology movement including various professional people and others devoted to establishing greener policies (1989, 4).

Christian tropes present a challenge for ecocriticism, as they vary in style and content (Garrard 2012, 202). Naess points out that the Bible continues to affect the understanding of the place of humans in the ecosystems, irrespective of people’s religious standing. The various attitudes presented in the Bible are “[r]adically different” (1989, 183). One difficulty is that Christian mythology presents the Creation as too simple and coherent – far removed from more recent understanding of evolution and ecological processes that place humans as a single animal species among others. (Garrard 2012, 202) Naess, however, sees some good in the commandments of taking care of the nature which God had created and declared good even before creating the first humans, Adam and Eve. However, nature is far more complex than a field or garden for humans to

understand and “govern”. (1989, 184–5) Undeniably Christian tropes are deeply rooted in our culture (Garrard 2012, 202) and can also help ecophilosophers. For Naess, it is “difficult to decide how influential such nuances of interpretation have been” (1989, 186) one way or the other. The Bible and especially the New Testament, however, focus mainly on the spiritual aspects of the Holy Trinity and mankind, drawing attention to “the world” in the old social meaning and tradition of interpreting literature. It is my view that the natural world does not receive adequate attention and weight in the most well-known and influential passages of the Bible.

Niles Eldredge reflects on the Bible and other stories of who we are and where we came from, that arose from the agricultural “ecological revolution” and tell of dominion. These stories still remain in our collective consciousness although they “have outlived their usefulness” (1995, 99). People continue to rely on their local environments yet are increasingly unable to see their importance, becoming a dysfunctional part of their environment. A new story is needed, a story that tells more realistically who we are and how we would better function in the world. (Eldredge 1995, 123 & 166)

The ecocritical interest and activity has gradually grown to a lively discipline. First in 1992 there was a group of unorganised people with an interest in environmental issues who formed a professional organization ASLE (the Association for the Study of Literature and Environment), which dominates academic ecocriticism today. Together with a new journal *ISLE (Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment)* these avenues united nature writers, critics and academics and helped produce joint vocabulary, overviews and new studies that can now be accessed by anyone interested in ecocriticism. (Fromm 2004; Garrard 2012, 4)

Diversity is a value shared by all ecophilosophies, whereas anthropocentrism is often seen as the greatest problem which threatens diversity by encouraging the exploitation of nature. Ecocriticism asserts that the dominant Western human-centric values are responsible for much of the destruction of nature and takes a stand against them: something must change (Brennan & Lo 2011). Whereas some ecophilosophers maintain that people cannot be anything other than

anthropocentric, “others argue for the need to become, at least intellectually if not instinctively, ecocentric or biocentric” (Murphy 2009, 93) in order to live more harmoniously with the world. Will the change come from existing values and morals or will a new deep green ethics start over from a completely fresh perspective? How exactly do we go about changing society? In answering these questions ecocriticism has a clear political aspect to it, even if the methods and goals vary (Johnson 2009, 8). Val Plumwood clarifies that the problem is not in the separation of human and natural as such, but in the placing of the former as the absolute master over the latter (quoted in Garrard 2012, 28–9). Especially ecofeminism identifies the dualistic logic of domination as the root problem wherein male, spirit and rationality are artificially promoted and contrasted with female, emotion and nature, justifying the exploitation of the latter (Garrard 2012, 26). Ecocriticism usually disagrees with the ideology which places non-human nature as inferior to human, considering it an outdated view (Johnson 2009, 8).

Especially in the industrialised countries our economical, techno-industrial and political systems lead to a short-term, abstract and narrow view of the world which has led to wide and long-term environmental problems. These problems include ever increasing and partly irreversible environmental deterioration caused by human habits and ways of thinking that are not easily broken. (Naess 1989, 23) Not all is lost yet as policies have slowly changed and may change further. Even if we are on a “catastrophic course” now, catastrophe might not occur: “The situation is critical because we do not know *whether* the course will be promptly and radically changed” (Naess 1989, 27). For example, one of the classics of environmental writing and a starting point of long-range modern ecological movement, Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* (1962), is especially concerned with pesticides and had a major impact on environmental consciousness and activism. As a result the use of pesticides has been reduced and the expected environmental devastation – the death of all birds – did not happen. Naess points out that when it comes to environmental issues, the consequences of our actions are often unpredictable as the partially unseen relations are interconnected in unexpected ways. However, there is a widening understanding that we have

reached many limits to growth already (Naess 1989, 153), and that immense changes are necessary as soon as possible to avoid further environmental disasters (Naess 1989, 111 & 210). There is also an ever wider comprehension that we are wasting time (Naess 1989, 44), not yet doing enough.

In addition, people are aware of environmental problems and there is a wide consensus in many industrial countries of the necessity of reaching an ecologically sustainable lifestyle (Garrard 2012, 21–2). Patrick D. Murphy discusses how environmental issues have become “common plot devices and setting” in detective fiction, fantasy, science fiction and even romance. While it is well known that science fiction and fantasy have for long contained environmental themes, it is the scale and number of such themes that still come as a surprise to many. In addition, critics should pay attention to “the commercial and the popular in terms of the significance of their wide readership and the seriousness with which many of the authors... take up the education of readers” on many serious environmental issues (Murphy 2009, 55 & 86–7). Political parties and industry must pay attention to environment, even if it is in part only for the sake of appearances and for commercial “greenwashing”. Green politics are usually widely supported only after other aspects of life are in good order and there is no fear of losing any material privileges. (Garrard 2012, 21–2)

Naess discusses Norway as representative of the rich industrial countries when he recalls that by the 1980s it was no longer “in” to be “ecologically minded”. I believe the environmental interest is in constant flux between countries and social groups, media representation and so on, often declining with economical low tides. Such depressing developments may lead to people losing faith or interest in the green movement. Naess discusses how many have also reached a limit to how much they can process negative environmental news, leading to a refusal to listen or to take action. Unfortunately people feel they know enough or too much already, which leads to further passivity. (Naess 1989, 210) These are difficult problems to solve for environmentalists in all fields.

Despite the “remarkable degree of consensus” concerning environmental threats among scientists, some claim that there is no crisis or it will soon enough be solved with new technology or free market laws: more population means more work force and more people to come up with

technological advancements to solve any problems (Garrard 2012, 18–23). The idea of global warming caused by humans has been questioned along with the ability of humans to cause lasting damage to planet Earth. These viewpoints are narrow and damaging to ecology and evolutionary processes. The fact remains that people cannot know how their actions will affect environments in the long run, and the smallest of changes for the worse can turn out to be far-reaching and irreversible. Thus great care and restraint is constantly needed to monitor our own behaviour. (Naess 1989, 27 & 175) The fact that we are *capable* of planning ahead, observing the needs of others and restrict ourselves may implicate a *moral duty* to do so (Naess 1989, 170). Many people believe it does, and politics may change more in that direction in time.

3. Lawrence Buell's criteria for environmental writing

Lawrence Buell must be considered as one of the most influential ecocritics publishing at present. He is universally respected among his peers. Harold Fromm describes him thus: Buell is “probably one of the most learned of the Americanists now dominating the academic scene”, mastering and alluding to culture both high and popular. Even as Fromm dislikes Buell’s broad and meandering presentation of the history of environmental writing and minute detail on Henry Thoreau in *The Environmental Imagination* (1995), he cannot deny the awe and respect Buell’s deep knowledge of American culture inspires. Besides, Buell possesses “an excellence of judgment and a scrupulous, rare sort of sanity and self-awareness”, which for Fromm’s taste sometimes goes too far. (Fromm 2009, 85–7)

Buell’s main focus is to amend the “crisis of imagination” including personal and social, political and artistic aspects which is causing the environmental crisis. He suggests that people need to imagine the relationship between nature and humanity in new and better ways. (Buell 1995, 2) If there is to be a “global civilization”, ecocriticism is needed as an ethically responsible political instrument in reaching it (Azzarello 2012, 58).

Buell’s *The Environmental Imagination* is hailed as one of the most important books on ecocriticism and is widely cited, even as it has been criticised. Some wish to include more to

ecocriticism than pastoral and wilderness writing, while others have disliked the call for mimesis, claiming that the imitation of the real world is both impossible and a second-rate aspect of literature (see, for example, Werner 2013, 48). Others have promoted mimesis and referentiality as one of the main tasks of environmental writing and ecocriticism. Buell himself has responded exhaustively to these arguments in *The Future of Environmental Criticism* (2005).

Buell promotes investigating “literature’s capacity for articulating the nonhuman environment” (1995, 10). He presents four reasonable criteria for “environmentally oriented” writing (Buell 1995, 7–8) which I have named “history within the environment”, “environment as a process”, “value and rights of the nonhuman world” and “human accountability to the environment”. Buell’s criteria are fairly general and he refers to them as a “rough checklist”, and they shall be interpreted broadly here as well. He concludes that very few texts do not show these criteria at all, but equally few texts show all of them clearly. Buell expected them to be found more likely in “so-called nonfictional works” (1995, 7–8) such as nature writing which usually combines scientific facts, personal experience and philosophical reflections on natural phenomena. More recently many have called for the study of fictional works as well, in order to better understand the popular culture and how people in general understand environmental issues (see, for example, Murphy 2009). Despite the widespread acceptance of Buell’s wisdom and the legitimacy of these criteria, few have ventured to apply them to studying texts’ environmentalism: among these few are Graham Huggan defending eco-travel writing (2009, 53), Mark Allister studying spiritual geography as a process of healing grief and sorrow (2001, 8) and Donna Potts regarding the works of the Irish poet Michael Longley (2011, 15 & 77).

If these four rules are not evident in a text, it needs to be examined how and why they fail. In the following chapters Buell’s theoretical frame will give a strong initial idea of how eco-conscious or environmentally aware *Artemis Fowl* is as a novel.

3.1. History within the environment

Buell's theory expects the text to show the non-human environment as more than a mere "framing device". This means that there has to be a sense of human history, and in the case of this thesis fairy history, included within the history of the physical environment which can be seen as "a presence" within the text (Buell 1995, 7). Naess states that "[o]ur indifference to the environment of life has meant that it is ordinarily experienced merely as a grey background" (1989, 175). It takes an effort to pay attention to inanimate objects, inarticulate life forms or distant events that do not directly concern people in the moment, which therefore often remain ignored (Naess 1989, 174).

In *Artemis Fowl*, much of the non-human nature is mere scenery or passageway that is travelled through to reach a more important social destination. There are a few exceptions however. Already at the beginning of the novel, there are brief mentions of the Vietnamese Ho Chi Minh City's political history and a back alley that is in the process of falling into decay. Cities can also hold intricate ecosystems, but they are not described further in the novel. The fairy activity is also "known to cause avalanches in the Alps" (AF 193) and the Giant's Causeway in Ireland's coast was supposedly formed by magical battle among fairies. Snow and the Alps attract the fairies whenever they have a chance to fly over them and LEP officers have a long tradition of "knocking the snowcap from the highest alp" (AF 67).

The Fowl Manor, a medieval castle that is one of the main settings in the novel, has been built in phases through the centuries using different materials and styles. Earlier phases have taken the immediate environment into account, considering location and safety. The manor has expanded from above a secure bed of limestone to softer, more vulnerable ground. The ground qualities are even further detailed later on in the novel. The walls surrounding the place are also depicted in some detail twice along the novel, more accurately than would have been necessary for a mere backdrop. Cellar steps are introduced, more than "a century old too by the smell" of them, and "[s]teps like that creaked as soon as you looked at them" (AF 175). Further interest falls in the great stairway of the hall. "And what a stairway. Stained oak, with the intricate carvings generally

associated with either the eighteenth century or the obscenely rich... In this case, probably both” (AF 177–8). The paintings of Fowl ancestors on the walls hint at family history and rootedness in place. The Fowl Manor is filled with history, rendering it into more than a mere framing device.

The Earth is riddled with volcanic activity, and the dwarf “Mulch followed a loamy vein through a volcanic fold in the rock” (AF 173). As he eats his way through the ground under the Fowl Manor, the reader is offered detailed descriptions of what the earth consists of and what happens to it when a dwarf goes through. “Nice consistency, not too many loose stones. Plenty of insect life too” (AF 173). The subterranean tunnels of the fairy nation are another major setting and receive closer attention as well. Haven City was built in the tunnels a long time ago and is described as an ever-growing metropolis deep underground, and some notions of its history are given. The fairies are forced to move there in large numbers as human technology evolves and they proceed studying the underground areas closer to the Earth’s surface. The metropolis has grown overpopulated and can no longer comfortably accommodate all the fairies living there. The tunnels have been slightly altered to serve the fairy nation’s needs of travelling to other fairy cities and above ground. Tunnels and caves closer to surface have been abandoned and any sign of fairy presence hidden due to the growing population and activity of humans, but some technology and built environment has been left behind. A continuous progress of urbanisation has led to more traffic technology built on the floor, walls and ceilings of the tunnels and caves near the largest fairy city, Haven.

Other tunnels created by Earth’s magma flows are portrayed with some detail through several pages. In the beginning of the novel fairy officer Holly Short travels from the large subterranean city Haven towards the surface of the earth using a magma flare as a means of transportation, by getting a boost for her flying ship from the eruption. The detailed effects of the formidable force of nature receive attention: the sound, wind and half-melted rocks for example. Holly’s awe of the potentially lethal force is fortified with a sense of urgency and utter concentration upon its effects.

The subterranean world is more than a mere framing device as the distant environment is brought close to the reader and experienced through fairy eyes.

The fairies unanimously agree that the human race is a menace that is progressing in an ever worsening direction, especially by polluting the environment. After *Homo sapiens* evolved to a certain level, sometime after the invention of Egyptian hieroglyphs, the numerous races of fairies hid themselves several kilometres underground to avoid conflict. The fairies call humans “Mud People” because humans used to live in huts made of mud, as some still do. Holly contemplates the evils of men through humorous indignation (AF 50):

Unlike fairies, who could produce only a single child every twenty years, Mud People bred like rodents... Holly could taste traces of pollutants. The Mud People destroyed everything they came into contact with. Of course they didn't live in the mud any more. Not in [Italy], at least...

Holly shuddered. Imagine going to the toilet inside your own house. Disgusting! The only good thing about going to the toilet was the minerals being returned to the earth, but the Mud People had even managed to botch that up... If anyone had told her a hundred years ago that humans would be taking the fertile out of fertilizer, she would have told them to get some air holes drilled in their skull.

Here the environmental criticism and sense of human history are most visible and touching several environmental problems at once. These remarks show some critique on Colfer's part on population growth, and an ability to combine ecological knowledge with humour in his writing. Such notions might raise some critical thoughts in the reader's mind, which is the main goal of environmental writing. Similar outbursts occur on more occasions by various characters along the narration, but even so environmental issues are not the priority of the novel. They are forgotten altogether for considerable lengths.

Besides human and fairy reproduction and evolution, there is a mention of a species of frog that was bred “as a joke” some years previously and has “multiplied to an epidemic” through the subterranean city and tunnels (AF 33). This is not human or fairy history as such, but it can be seen as an allusion to the genetic manipulations done by humans, and is therefore a relevant point for ecocritical analysis. It can be interpreted as a warning of the environmental hazard of genetic manipulation as the fairies find the frog to be a menace due to its behaviour and uncontrolled

introduction to their home environment. This is analogous to many species that were introduced by humans to new areas where their populations increased uncontrollably, such as the European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) and poisonous toad (*Bufo marinus*) released into Australian natural environments and causing irreversible changes.

A sense of environment and their respect for it is given in the fairy names that all have to do with natural elements, such as Root, Holly, Foaly, Cumulus and Argon, although this is more a case of environment penetrating into the society than society's history within environment. To sum up, *Artemis Fowl* presents a tolerable attitude towards the human and fairy history in natural and built environment, which at several occasions exceeds being a mere framing device. Natural history and fairy/human history are clearly linked from time to time and commented upon critically.

3.2. Environment as a process

Buell states that there has to be at least some implicit sense “of the environment as a process” instead of “a constant or a given” (1995, 8) which is the fundamental law of ecology: everything in the natural world is connected to everything else, and in a state of continuous change instead of stability (Commoner 1974, 29). There are mentions of ecological processes and development in addition to the aforementioned evolution and gene manipulation: “The ground was soft... Half a millenium’s bad drainage from the medieval walls had transformed the foundations into a virtual bog” (AF 270). Another instance considers a muddy back alley with bottles sinking into the mud and a rusting fire escape.

Evolution and historical process are mentioned more than once in the novel. The fairies have several theories as to where they developed from: whether they are related to flying dinosaurs, humans or something else. The fairy race’s love of flying, wings on one species of fairies and shoulder plates possibly point to pterodactyls (AF 68), unless it is merely Holly’s wishful thinking, as she is not willing to identify with the humans she despises. In addition, “[d]warf feet are designed for spadework, not for the delicate intricacies of ballet dancing or balancing on wooden steps” (AF 175).

The fairies are intimately tied to Earth through an energy force they call magic. It requires interaction with nature, as it is powered by planting an oak nut away from the tree and giving thanks to nature. This symbolical ritual of natural processes defies the world as a constant or a given. The fairy magic has also changed through evolution so that different fairy sub-races possess different magical abilities.

Most fairies also have great respect for their environment: there is understanding of time and progress spiced with awe. The fairies have been, however, living underground and almost separate from humans and the surface for millennia. The only thing that is progressing within the novel's time frame is their technology and urbanisation. In conclusion there is a definite underlying sense of environmental processes and inevitable change in *Artemis Fowl*. Then again there is also a sense of species and individuals isolated from each other and their natural environments instead of the preferred interconnectedness.

3.3. Value and rights of the nonhuman world

Buell also demands that the human interest must not be the only legitimate interest of the text, but the nonhuman world must have its own value and rights as well (1995, 7). The environmental consciousness affects the perceiving self and raises the question “of the validity of the self as the primary focalizing device for both writer and reader”. This has the potential to affect the reader and make them wonder whether the self is as interesting to study as tradition would have us think, or whether the story would be more interesting if told by an animal, landscape or a tree. In order to encourage such thinking, “environmental writing has to be able to imagine nonhuman agents as bona fide partners”. Some writers have attempted this, for example Edward Abbey in *Desert Solitaire* (1968) and William Blake in his poems. (Buell 1995, 179 & 182–3)

In *Artemis Fowl*, a step away from human thinking and thinking of the self is taken through the fairies. They are not quite human, and such othering is a powerful tool of evoking thoughts outside the traditional social sphere. Ira Wells explains the ways environmental narration broadens thinking from the character: it “strives to bend itself toward natural settings or to blur the neat

distinctions between character and setting” (2013, 70). Artemis is in part a product of his history and surroundings, and the fairies have such an intimate relationship with nature through their magic that such blurring is very real in *Artemis Fowl*, even if there are no straightforward bona fide partners in animals or landscapes.

As for the value of nature, Artemis hardly sees even his fellow humans having value beyond extrinsic value, with the possible exception of his parents. He does not seem to care about the environment or any living thing besides himself, and it is stated he is willing to exploit anyone to reach his own goals. Yet as ruthless as he can be in pursuing his own financial benefit, he does not applaud cruelty. When he captures Holly Short, he “hadn’t expected the fairy to appear so... human. Until now, they had merely been quarry. Animals to be hunted. But now, seeing one like this, in obvious discomfort, it changed things” (AF 113), although not radically. In addition, “Artemis Fowl did not like whalers” (AF 113) and chooses a Japanese whaler as a site of explosion. There are very few mentions besides this of humans caring about the environment in the novel. Only Juliet has definite opinions about environmental issues with a worry for endangered species and an interest in garden plants.

The fairies are notably different. They grieve for every dolphin injured and every whale killed. Fairy captain Holly Short will not harm anything unless it is the only way to preserve her own race or herself, and many others share her views. There are exceptions among the fairies as well, however. For the dwarf Mulch any of the wildlife he encounters only holds extrinsic value. Insects are nutritious and it is “useful to know where the local wildlife hung out”, (AF 174) as he kills a rabbit as a means to escape his prison sentence. He does not kill for fun at least, as is seen when he kills a spider instinctively: “‘Sorry, little friend,’ he said to the grey smear. ‘I’m a bit on the jittery side.’” (AF 175) Mulch and Artemis are named criminals, indicating indirectly that they are morally in the wrong. I say indirectly because for the most part they are humorous and “cool”, and it is possible for the reader to identify with them. It is not uncommon to present anti-villains as protagonists and role models in contemporary popular media (Becher 2013, 165).

Holly and other fairies show a lot of respect for open and fresh air, the grandeur of mountains, magic feeling of the moon and oak tree, and the brief company of dolphins. These have intrinsic value and are not to be destroyed. These experiences are mostly out of reach to the fairies. Meanwhile Artemis does his best to avoid any environmental impacts such as hot air and mud. He prefers to stay indoors as much as possible, manipulating his immediate environment which is most often built environment, and people around him to his own will.

Buell dislikes the anthropocentrism in Keats's "Ode to a Nightingale", as the bird is merely a reflection of human feelings (1995, 7). The same can be said of much of the representation of natural phenomena in *Artemis Fowl*. Whereas Holly greatly appreciates natural environments and the dolphin she meets, they remain more a reflection and an inspiration of her own feelings of moral superiority over humans. It does not lead to actions for the good of the environment. As a positive note, humans are directly criticised for their environmental misdeeds.

The fairies had to decide centuries or millennia ago whether or not they want to fight the human race for a right to live above ground, and they decided not to fight. The fairies seem to regret this decision from time to time, but they cannot or dare not do anything about it anymore as humans outnumber the fairies considerably. Whether it is a question of inability to oppose humans and environmental degradation, or a real choice, the fairies allow the humans to live and evolve. They see every animal and individual as having intrinsic value, if only by leaving them alone. Nothing is killed or injured lightly. However, neither the fairies nor humans will actively defend the rights of others to survive and thrive, except for when Holly defends the lives of others who are in danger nearby. I conclude that there is a sufficient amount of reflection on nature's value and rights in *Artemis Fowl*, granted that the human side of it is unfavourable to nature.

3.4. Human accountability for the environment

The text must ethically take a stand that humans are accountable to the environment for their actions (Buell 1995, 7). The fairies certainly see it that way and are not afraid to state it. They also hold themselves accountable to their underground environment nor would they harm the above ground

ecosphere either, developing technology that has nearly perfect green energy sources and low emissions, and perfect recycling. The humans as a collective whole are accused of spoiling nearly every natural environment, so the text itself takes a clear stand. The human characters pay little attention to the state of their environments, however. Only Juliet makes it clear that she would not kill dolphins nor would she tolerate others doing it while preparing a meal of organic vegetables. Besides this, there is an implicit feeling that whaling is to be condemned, as stated earlier.

At first Artemis is perfectly happy to exploit a sentient being, but is shaken by the humanity of Holly Short whom he has kidnapped, and also the fact that she is a female. For a moment he regrets his extortion plans, but after a brief consideration decides that his plan is more important than Holly's personal rights. Artemis holds Holly a captive and lies to her in a cruel manner in order to break her spirit, here also feeling some remorse. Only at the end of the novel does he admit he may have been in the wrong for endangering others, even as he celebrates the success of his mission. We do not learn much of Artemis's attitude towards the rest of nature. His standard of living is high, his carbon footprint is sizeable and his lifestyle indefensible with frequent flights and expensive equipment. The servants follow their master's every command nearly without question.

I conclude that the fairies respect nature whereas the humans mostly do not as the novel criticises human ways through the eyes of the fairies. On the one hand, the fairies present a tolerable view on all four criteria at least implicitly. This is to be counted as a positive factor in the novel. On the other hand, the humans of the novel are nearly indifferent or at worst violent towards the nonhuman world.

4. Deep ecology

Arne Naess (1912–2009) was a Norwegian philosopher who presented the theories of deep and shallow ecology to make suggestions as to what should be done about the environmental crisis. Deep ecology as a term was first introduced in an article "The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement: A summary" written by Arne Naess and published in 1973 (Naess 1989, 27). His contribution to the field of environmental ethics is held to be major (see, for example, Brennan

& Lo 2011 and Garrard 2012, 23), including thirty books and about four hundred published articles.

He was a major cultural character as well:

In a Norwegian survey of young people (preteen to twenty years old), an overwhelming majority said that the person they would most like to talk with was Arne Naess. In Norway, Naess is a hero and national treasure. He is well-known for his social activism, writings, talks, textbooks, climbing, practical jokes, and other exploits. (Drengson, introduction in Naess 2008, 4–5)

Both the Institute for Deep Ecology and The Foundation for Deep Ecology were inspired by his work, as well as the online journal *The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy*. In addition *Inquiry*, an interdisciplinary journal for the humanities and social sciences, was founded by him (ibid., 5–6).

Naess supported three global phenomena in special: the peace movement, social justice movement and environmental justice movement, all of which he was an active participant:

At the end of the twentieth century, we saw a convergence of three areas of self-destructiveness: the self-destructiveness of war, the self-destructiveness of exploitation and suppression among humans, and the self-destructiveness of suppression of nonhuman beings and of the degradation of life conditions in general. The movement to eradicate wars has a long history as a global movement. The movement against abject poverty and cruel exploitation and domination is younger. The third movement is quite young. These are the great movements that require intense participation on the grassroots level far into this new century. (2008, 99)

Deep ecology is of specific importance because the environmental crisis worsens non-linearly unlike the injustices the other movements struggle. All movements are needed and ought to cooperate, but the environmental crisis is the most urgent problem. (Naess 2008, 100)

Naess draws from the science of ecology, and points out that several influential philosophies have leaned on different sciences: Plato on geometry, Aristotle on biology and the Indian philosopher Pānini on grammar. However, no science should be considered universal or ultimate. (Naess 1989, 39) The greatest question and inspiration for ecological philosophy is the centrality of biology in today's world: "three fields of biological research infringe upon the future of *Homo sapiens* in a dramatic way which concerns us all – biological warfare, genetic engineering, and ecology. These fields cry out for evaluative thinking: what do we want and how can it be realised?" (Naess 1989, 35–6) The biological research in itself does not include ethical evaluation, so it falls on biologists and ecophilosophers to make value statements (Naess 1989, 24). Karl Kroeber asks

ecocritics to consider “recent biological research to make humanistic studies more socially responsible” in order to stop political conflicts from wrecking the society (1994, 1). No one science or political group can change the world alone.

Among ecophilosophies, deep ecology is a radical and to some extent utopian ideology. Depth here points to the scale considered when trying to answer environmental threats (Naess 1989, 12). This includes timescale, extent of the area and the number of species considered: merely our own race and society in isolation will not do. Naess admits it would take significant changes in politics and worldviews to reach such wide-scale thinking among the populace at whole, none of which are likely to happen soon. (Naess 1989, 24 & 93) Some deep ecology philosophers, such as Earth First! co-founder Dave Foreman, can be accused of misanthropy, but Naess is one of those who see a place and value for humans as well – even if it will significantly differ from the present situation. (Garrard 2012, 25)

Garrard presents deep ecology as the most influential radical position outside academic circles, inspiring activists in organisations such as Earth First! and Sea Shepherds. (2012, 23) Influence is what Naess often stresses: “[T]he aim of supporters of the deep ecology movement is not a slight reform of our present society, but a substantial reorientation of our whole civilisation” (1989, 45). Deep ecology presents an alternate view of reality by revealing false concepts of the world, such as growth ideology and anthropocentrism. This helps analysing subjects outside our own point of view by taking into consideration other species, ecosystems or even the whole universe. In such a light it becomes possible and desirable to criticise parts or whole of our civilisation (Naess 1989, 4).

Deep changes can be intimidating, and not all can see the importance of natural diversity. This has led to vehement and untruthful attacks against the environmental movement and deep ecology, which through their appealing rhetoric have received wide attention. For example, Murray Bookchin’s article “Social Ecology versus Deep Ecology: A Challenge for the Ecology Movement” from 1987 is “one of the more analytically weak and theoretically inept efforts in the literature of

environmental philosophy” (Clark 2010, 21). Fellow social ecologist John Clark laments how it is the “most widely reprinted [text] representing the position of social ecology” (2010, 21), creating a false impression of social ecology and Arne Naess’s philosophy.

Naess defends the right of humans to pursue their vital needs (Garrard 2012, 25), although there can be great differences in interpretation of what is vital, differing from person to person and taking into account varying environments (Naess 1989, 30). The greatest problem of Naess’s deep ecology is that it is in part highly theoretical philosophy, difficult to understand and far removed from the language used by politicians and other planners. This makes it less practical for political discussions (Naess 1989, 12) and difficult to grasp for people who have not studied philosophy. Even though Naess often refrains from going to the most difficult aspects of theoretical philosophy in *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, and the book’s translator and editor worked with Naess to clarify and make the text “flow smoothly”, his writing at points remains complicated and nebulous. Naess bases many of his arguments on his own values and beliefs, and admits that not all readers are supposed to agree with him on every point but instead base their values on their own beliefs and experiences. (Naess 1989, 37)

Some of the major characteristics of deep ecology are long-term thinking and *biospheric egalitarianism*. This means that everything around us in the ecosphere has intrinsic value in principle: nothing should be harmed unless it is to satisfy our vital needs (Naess 1989, 29). This is similar to Buell’s demand of the value and rights of the nonhuman world. Obviously as a race to live and survive, humans have to modify their environment as do all the other beings and forces of nature, but the consequences should be carefully weighed up (Naess 1989, 97–8). One should consider how diversity of life and evolution for example can thrive now and in a million years to come (Naess 1989, 112), with the principle that everything has an “equal right to live and blossom”. This is an intuitively clear value axiom to the supporters of deep ecology. (Naess 1989, 28)

William Golding and James Lovelock formed the Gaia hypothesis used by some deep ecologists and ecofeminists today to change the view of the Earth as a “technologically and

economically enframed globe”. Instead it should be appreciated more as a living organism and a “self-regulating system”. (Garrard 2012, 199) While dynamic climate changes and millions of species keep Gaia “alive and stable”, it is also hard to predict as it remains beyond human control and understanding. Even though Kate Rawles points out that “the ethical consequences of Gaia are not at all clear-cut” (Garrard 2012, 200–1), Naess agrees that the Gaia hypothesis has great value as it lets people think of the planet as “at once vulnerable and vast, enduring and evolving” (1989, 138). He continues:

What has Mother Earth done to stay alive and keep evolution going! She has got more friends than ever – people who gladly would pay higher taxes and whatever else is needed to support efforts to conserve what there is still of wilderness and areas in general, big and undisturbed enough to let mammalian and other evolution continue. (Naess 1989, 138)

Many agree that Gaia itself cannot be destroyed by humans, but people are making it highly inconvenient for themselves and other forms of life to live in. According to Garrard, the mission and promise of ecocriticism is to introduce better metaphors that are “less anthropocentric” that work alongside the new technologies, policies and ethical revaluations. (2012, 205)

More people need to acquaint themselves with deep ecology before significant changes can take place: indeed as many as possible. Naess supports a variety of methods for consciousness-raising as some people are neither for nor against deep ecology, and they could be more easily swayed towards deeper attitudes by writers who are not radically deep green. (1989, 153). Buell (1995, 86) and Murphy (2009, 33) are among the ecocritics who encourage paying attention to the text’s referentiality (Oppermann 2006, 104), the way literature can make the reader think critically about the real world outside the text. All kinds of communication methods are to be harnessed for the benefit of the deep green movement. Therefore *Artemis Fowl* ought to be hailed for any of its deeper aspects, which shall be analysed next.

The following main part of the analysis is based on a specific version of deep ecological philosophy, namely Arne Naess’s personal view which he calls “Ecosophy T”, where “ecosophy” denotes a personal view of ecological philosophy and “T” points to a certain point in time, that is to say, the time of writing it down. Personal philosophies are in a constant state of change as people

learn more about the surrounding reality and its relations. Ecosophy T was described by Naess originally in 1974 in *Økologi, samfunn, og livsstil*, a book translated and revised by David Rothenberg in 1989 as *Ecology, community and lifestyle*. The English edition is “based on the Norwegian, with many sections revised and rewritten by Professor Naess” and Rothenberg himself, clarifying and bringing the text up to date (Naess 1989, xii). The analysis is rounded up with the latest collection of Naess’s articles and other ecophilosophical authors of note. I will discuss how deeply ecological the world view of *Artemis Fowl* is. What can be found in the novel that agrees with Naess’s ecological philosophy and what is lacking?

4.1. Eight principles

In 1984, Naess with the aid of other deep ecology philosophers summarised eight principles common to most deep ecology movement sympathisers, regardless of their cultural background. These are shared basic values which can and should be formulated differently by different individuals and groups based on their individual characteristics. There are as many versions present and needed as there are deep ecologists (Naess 2008, 31), but the basic principles are as follows (Naess 2008, 28):

1. All living beings have intrinsic value.
2. The richness and diversity of life has intrinsic value.
3. Except to satisfy vital needs, humans do not have the right to reduce this diversity and richness.
4. It would be better for humans if there were fewer of them, and much better for other living creatures.
5. Today the extent and nature of human interference in the various ecosystems is not sustainable, and the lack of sustainability is rising.
6. Decisive improvement requires considerable changes: social, economic, technological, and ideological.
7. An ideological change would essentially entail seeking a better quality of life rather than a raised standard of living.
8. Those who accept the aforementioned points are responsible for trying to contribute directly or indirectly to the necessary changes.

Greg Garrard points out two of these principles as the most noteworthy: the intrinsic value of all beings and the necessity of decreasing the human population around the world (2012, 23–4).

Understanding ecology and conditions of life on Earth inspires a personal philosophical worldview,

an *ecosophy*, which then leads to the individual's acceptance of these principles (Naess 1989, 38). They are “a means to guide our process of deep questioning about what needs to be done to create a better world” (Schroll 2010, 46). I will now proceed to consider and compare these principles with *Artemis Fowl's* world.

As stated earlier, one of the most fundamental principles is the intrinsic value of both human and non-human life, and its right to “flourish”. The non-human life has value “independent of the usefulness” it holds for humans. Besides human and non-human life forms, “life” for Naess encompasses ecosystems, rivers and cultures for example, which together form the “living earth”. (1989, 29) That is why Naess prefers “biosphere” to “ecosphere” in order to include the context of life on Earth to the concept. With a few rare exceptions, the fairies in *Artemis Fowl* respect all life and the ecosphere itself. They refrain from harming any living thing unless they expressly have to in order to survive, so in this sense they grant intrinsic value to all life; nor would they destroy cultures or rivers.

However, the fairies have a clear hierarchy for different races, roughly based on size and intelligence. It would seem that from a fairy point of view anything bigger than a rabbit has intrinsic value to a certain point, only to be violated for the vital needs of fairies. There are exceptions, such as the race of goblins which is “stupid” by nature and also criminal, and a single troll which is described as a violent beast led by basic instincts. These fairy races are willing to harm others and are not treated the same way as others. Otherwise most of the fairies are vegetarian or eat only insects and fish. These diets are not specifically explained, but it is indicated that eating bigger animals is wrong. This could be accounted for by the scarcity and distance of larger animals from the fairies, the reluctance to raise animals underground or the view that so called “higher animals” (according to size or sentience) have intrinsic value and are not to be eaten while there are other options. Garrard names larger species often found in nature documentaries as “charismatic megafauna” (2012, 175) and Naess mentions evolution, biology, consciousness and other perceived

characteristics that have been a basis for organising species in hierarchical systems. Naess rejects all such hierarchy on the basis of intrinsic value and the equal right to live. (1989, 29, 167–8 & 202)

In order for life to flourish, there needs to be richness and diversity of life forms (Naess 1989, 29). There needs to be plenty of different species and enough individuals within liveable habitats to constitute a rich and diverse living nature. Naess stresses evolution as well: everything in nature has evolutionary intrinsic value. (1989, 29) These are values for the fairies as well, but not so much as to cause action. It is clear to the fairies that humans lessen diversity and richness by destroying liveable habitats. In addition, there are very few fairies compared to humans, which threatens their own richness and diversity by an imminent threat of extinction. These are not intrinsic values for Artemis at all. He aims at exploiting anything that has monetary value, reducing everything and everyone outside his family to things with mere extrinsic value. The fairies at least grieve for the loss of habitats and the suffering and extinction of species.

The next general but grounding rule is that humans are not allowed to reduce the richness and diversity of life “except to satisfy vital needs” (Naess 1989, 29). This strict rule is a response to the unending historical list of human rights that are harmful for the environment and which call for a norm of what humans “have no right to do” (Naess 1989, 30). Even if there is a wide range of *possible* needs between individuals, it is certain that the humans in *Artemis Fowl*, as in the real world, exploit nature beyond the satisfaction of mere vital needs. Artemis sees it as his right to misuse others because he is intelligent enough to do so. Initially his own needs are the only ones that matter. Only in time does he admit that hurting and deceiving others is not the right and moral thing to do. The evidence in the novel points that the fairies usually do not exploit, or at least have managed to invent technology that reduces their environmental impact considerably. They do not satisfy their trivial wants at the expense of others.

Among deep ecologist thinkers, there is a consensus that the “[p]resent human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening” (Naess 1989, 29). The deep ecological movement is especially characterised by the consideration of evolutionary

timescale and large systems (Naess 1989, 46), similar to Buell's thinking. At present people destroy the prerequisites for continued evolution for the foreseeable future, both in short and long term, and that is why the fight to preserve environments should continue still. (Naess 1989, 30 & 46) Even as the fairies see the destruction, they will only preserve themselves as long as possible and curse the humans quietly, feeling powerless to stop them. However, it is commendable that the novel takes such straightforward notice of the environmental crisis.

Naess states further that even with a substantially decreased human population, a rich variety of human cultures can continue to flourish and develop. But in order to flourish, the non-human life absolutely *requires* a diminished human population. (1989, 29) If the populace in poor countries multiplies, environmental destruction such as deforestation will exacerbate; if the economic growth of rich countries continues rapidly, more waste and greenhouse gasses will emerge (Garrard 2012, 24). Naess believes it to be unlikely that the billions of people alive today could change their lifestyle radically and quickly enough to enable the flourishing of other species, and therefore the population must swiftly decrease: "the probability of a deep enough change in economics and technology is too small to take into account" (1989, 31). One recent study shows that even a pandemic, World War III or global one-child policy would not reduce the population by the year 2100 (Bradshaw & Brook, 2014), although demographics and its effects remain hard to predict. Overpopulation will be discussed in greater depth later.

Naess warns that "the rate of extinction of species will be greater than in any other period of Earth history", and considerably so (1989, 31; 2008, 113). There are assessments that point this is already happening due to loss of habitats and continued human population growth (see, for example, McKee 2003, Leakey & Lewin 1995 and Myers & Simon 1994). There is a real threat of the sixth extinction wave, also known as holocene extinction, which is caused mostly or entirely by human activity. Dave Foreman declares it has been going on for forty thousand years ever since Stone Age when humans began to spread across the world. Hunting and agriculture were damaging

enough, and the extinction rate was later aggravated by European colonisation and global industrial civilisation. (Foreman 2004, 12 & 26–8)

The remaining principles have to do with the responsibility of changing present ideologies and policies including economy and technology. These wide themes contain aspects from the other principles as well and will be discussed in depth in the following chapters.

4.2. Economy, politics and techno-industrial society

In addition to individuals, the deep ecology movement touches every major contemporary economic, political and philosophical problem (Naess 1989, 32). There are several significant false concepts that are to be challenged with alternative world views (Naess 1989, 29). Since 1970 there has been worry and discussion about limiting techno-economic growth on a global scale (Buell 1996, 3), and there is still a prevalent but mistaken dialogue which claims that “technological progress” is inevitable and unstoppable. This has obstructed unlike anything else “candid speaking” and “personal engagement in the ecological movement”. (Naess 1989, 72) Undeniably technology is a part of human development and lives, and therefore quite natural. However, ecophilosophies demand more responsible ways of developing and distributing technologies.

Economics, that is the science of economy, is among aspects of culture that create values, and values also have an effect on culture (Naess 1989, 24). What people value is highly dependent on how they understand the world. Naess criticises our *economy of exponential growth* and the *ideology of production and consumption*, which are not ecologically sustainable (1989, 25 & 104). The most often criticised aspect of globalisation is globally operating multinational companies that create a homogenous global culture, and we who are responsible for this culture have begun to slowly question our ways, our replies “almost unanimously negative”. (Naess 1989, 23 & 111) *Artemis Fowl* also offers negative replies against environmental degradation and some of its causes, taking a part in the dialogue and resonating with its readers.

In order to keep the economy exponentially growing, things must be constantly produced and there has to be demand for the products as well (Naess 1989, 25). This is helped by the idealisation

of a *standard of living*: “the necessities, comforts, and luxuries enjoyed or aspired to by an individual or group” (“Standard of Living”, def. 1). The present system places value on scarcity and commodity value. Economical scarcity arises from unlimited wants of people and limited resources including capital, labour and natural resources. Simplifying, the rarer a commodity is, the more monetary value it has, regardless of its usefulness. “There is prestige in vast consumption and waste, to mention only two of many relevant factors”. (Naess 1989, 31) This ideology of production and consumption appears in firmly established attitudes and habits within industrial nations and partly in the developing countries as well (Naess 1989, 87–8). The actual needs, wishes and goals of the society are forgotten in favour of the exponentially increasing “needs and demands” of the market, as if the market was a living entity with a will of its own. This is done “in all existing industrial states, but perhaps most clearly in the rich Western countries”. (Naess 1989, 25, 33 & 94) People in the industrial countries are made a part of a system where some parts of the world experience well-being for a short time through something that is called “material progress” (Naess 1989, 25).

Arne Naess rejects such ideas based on philosophy. He points out that the great philosophies throughout history, such as Aristotelianism, Confucianism and Buddhism, only recognise economic relations as a fragment of social relationships, but insufficient for creating norms for individuals, societies or states. (1989, 87) Economics as a science lost much of its moral philosophy for a time, until environmental concerns among other factors brought some norms back into the analysis (Naess 1989, 105). Instead of measuring success by the average standard of living, it ought to be done by observing life quality, especially that of the underprivileged groups. Instead of wealth and material, *quality of life* is measured by the happiness and content felt by people. (Naess 1989, 25 & 116)

The material prerequisites are said to improve life or be the basis for a “good life”, but little attention is given to whether or not life is actually experienced as good. (Naess 1989, 24–5) Materials and money can be accurately measured, calculated and therefore studied scientifically,

which makes them persuasive and easy to understand for the policy-makers. Large multinational firms also use their power as pressure groups to ensure the economy has a good basis for continued exponential growth, which adds to the environmental degradation. (Naess 1989, 126) Naess hopes that people would become more aware that the material standard of living is not the same as quality of life, as it brings stress and other health issues (1989, 95), not to mention long term consequences for natural diversity. The ecosophies of individuals actually have the tendency to turn towards the richness of ends achieved by simplicity of means, whereas techno-industrial economy promotes ever more complicated solutions for simple or non-existent problems (Naess 1989, 33). This is what some of the most vehement opponents of the environmental movement fail to appreciate. For example, writer Robert Bidinotto distorts the respect for environment to mean apologist impoverishment of human life, denying all happiness and fulfilment. He bases his individualistic philosophy on America's early Enlightenment period (Bidinotto 2003), when people had to scrape their living from the natural environment and there was still enough space for few enough people to make a meagre living without a great threat of environmental crisis.

Buell discusses the lifestyle of voluntary simplicity, the most well known example being Thoreau's *Walden*. Thoreau's experiment of living a disciplined life in solitude, self-sufficiently and without material wants was to him more deeply satisfying than the demands of modern life, and ideally this way of life wakes a sense of oneness with the environment. This strict loneliness and seclusion is not what deep ecology calls for, however, as it is more a "bourgeois (sub)urbanite anxiety" of whether or not one can survive a sudden reduction of social and material support. (Buell 1995, 145 & 149) Deep ecology is more in favour of a satisfying and complete lifestyle born out of respect, love and sense of solidarity with nature's richness. In 1981, Duane Elgin published *Voluntary Simplicity* depicting a chosen lifestyle which dates back to nineteenth-century religious movements. He suggests it needs to be brought closer to everyday life as "a response to consumerism, industrialization, and the concomitant destruction of the earth" – an idea risen in more recent decades. Elgin and Cecile Andrews promote personal choices for "scaling down"

without losing “joy, entertainment, and pleasure”. (Murphy 2009, 18) In 1997 Andrews described Elgin’s formulation of voluntary simplicity as a way of reaching a life of inner joy without the stress and obsession of materialism (Murphy 2009, 27), exactly what Naess hopes.

Naess suggests that the detrimental value-neutral growth is to be replaced with *equilibrium*, where living together with other living beings is more important than exploiting or killing them. Instead of the questionable demands of urban techno-industrial economy, meaningful life can and should be found in nature. (Naess 1989, 24) Most of the fairies in *Artemis Fowl* would like nothing better than to be free to go above ground and enjoy natural environments, but they cannot do it. The fairies live in a near emergency state, always afraid of being discovered. That is one of the reasons they do not have as much progress in life quality as deep ecology would prefer. There is very little suffering mentioned, however, except with those who fight each other or have too much stress from their jobs, or have committed crimes and deserted their society. The fairies have a deep-seated longing for varied natural environments, but they are denied such pleasures. For the fairies, no amount of material affluence will ever replace the joy of living above ground within unspoilt natural habitats.

The unyielding present economic activity leads to misuse of the planet. Naess states that our ideologies must change along with our actions: production and consumption must change hand in hand with “the economic machinery” (1989, 25 & 129). Eoin Colfer in *Artemis Fowl* does not pinpoint economy as being a key environmental problem, but instead points to the stupidity and violent disposition of the human race. Naess agrees that humans have had a tendency to be cruel and violent, but rejects the idea that there is a genetic programming that binds us “to torture, torment and exploit one another for all eternity” (1989, 169).

Artemis himself follows modern economics, ignoring human and fairy needs for “market value”, or in his case the ransom money for the fairy officer Holly Short. The fairies see to their own vital needs, and happiness and safety to some degree. The fairy nation has its basic economic needs fulfilled, as well as much extra. There are plenty of luxurious inventions available, but the

main characters do not seem to covet them. Their immediate concern is safety, which consumes their time and thoughts. There seems to be only one fairy evident who suffers from poverty, and that is because she has been drinking too much alcohol. Human economy is distanced through the dwarf Mulch's eyes when he finds a safe filled with "[j]ust human currency. Nothing of value" (AF 181).

Naess expressly states that the quality of life in a society is to be defined by the quality of life of its members, keeping in mind the differences between personal objectives and sources of positive emotions. "Others have other norms of perfection: to get rich and admired; to base actions on generosity or love; to be just; to carry out one's duties to the best of one's ability; to sacrifice oneself completely for something". (Naess 1989, 83–4) All of these motives can be found in the novel, however generosity and love are less dominant than riches and admiration. Naess criticises the average industrial lifestyle and condemns especially the lifestyle of economic elites. The "fashionable lifestyle" marketed in for example *Time magazine* could not be universalised without catastrophic consequences for the environment and "most kinds of living beings". (Naess 1989, 155) With this in mind, it would be better for Colfer to criticise the lifestyle of Artemis Fowl and his enormous mansion, newest technology, cars, flights and clothes instead of complementing their magnificence implicitly and explicitly. Then again, Artemis is presented as unique and his family history as one of the very few: a criminal family that has acquired its wealth through illegal means. It is also implicitly and explicitly emphasised that his life is not entirely happy. It might also be better for readers to merely read about materially luxurious life than aspire to live it themselves.

The standard of living does not go before quality of life in fairy society, but it clearly does in human. Artemis's life quality does not seem very great, even as he succeeds in monetary affairs and maintains an uncommonly high standard of living. At the end of the novel Artemis gives up some of his newly obtained wealth to cure her mother from her mental illness. Even the novel itself speculates whether this was done unselfishly, to avoid social workers or for the fear of his father's reaction should he return. Artemis might also be avoiding fairy retribution by doing something

undeniably humane. Nevertheless, it is as a step away from materialism. It constitutes to Artemis's well-being, as it lessens the agitation caused by his mother's condition.

In our modern world, new technology is constantly developed, and it is generally felt that the more complicated and expensive the technology, the better (Naess 1989, 95). Not all technology is harmful, of course, and there is a theory of technogenesis that human species has evolved in close communion with tools and "technics" (Hayles 2012, 10). However, it is the way techno-economy is venerated that causes problems in society and environment. It is widely assumed that individuals and societies ought to adjust to every new technical improvement or "breakthrough" as soon as possible, as if it were "autonomous" and "natural", which it historically speaking is not (Naess 1989, 93). This leads to centralisation, big markets and impersonal relations, forcing people to seek ever-increasing incomes at the expense of life quality (Naess 1989, 92). Even though the fairies do not create more complicated and expensive technology for its own sake, they have some of the consequences of techno-industrial economy. They live in centralised cities with large institutions, big markets and impersonal relations, aspiring for increasing income if career advancement is interpreted as automatically higher wages. However, small is not always and automatically beautiful, Naess states and warns against any absolutisms (1989, 143), which concurs with the content that Holly feels living in the overcrowded metropolis of Haven.

In Naess's time as well as today, there is a firm "faith in the technocracy". It is a mistaken belief that progress itself is led and should be led technocratically in our society by administrative and technical experts, and that everything can be solved with new technology. (Naess 1989, 71–2) Undeniably, technology is an important part of our society, and "should be taken more seriously, not less, because of its importance for ultimate ends" (Naess 1989, 33), despite the difficulties and dangers it also presents:

The essential ingredients for a technocracy are present when the individual and the organisations in which the individual functions become more occupied with means than with ends, and more occupied with subordinate end (building) than fundamental ones (homes)... Although the intrinsic values are ostensibly still the central themes, the procurement of effective means is the principal occupation. (Naess 1989, 97)

Even though the fairy technology is but little supervised and taken mostly for granted, they have managed to keep their technology as a servant for their ultimate ends. They do not venerate economical growth or complicated technology for its own sake, nor do most of them sacrifice their time for the means. Even if the novel does not admit a fairy technocracy, there are a few symptoms of technological progress for its own sake visible: budget sometimes goes before personal safety, and safety of the society goes before absolute happiness and the ensuring of evolutionary progress. Artemis has uniting his family as the ultimate motivation, but he loses himself in procuring the means, namely money. For a novel, this is understandable, as an exciting story requires interesting plots of getting through difficulties to the desired end.

The fairy head engineer Foaly is a technical mastermind, and his technology has kept the fairies hidden and safe from the humans, which is important for the species. He leads the progress and maintenance of the fairy technology with a large budget. Machines have been an important part of fairy life for a long time, and their highly advanced technology is the pride of the fairy nation. This kind of celebration of technological solutions goes somewhat against Naess's Ecosophy T that would rather see everyone living closely together with more progress in life quality (1989, 72). However, as far as the technology helps the fairies achieve their cultural goals of peace, survival and happiness it is acceptable to deep ecology (Naess 1989, 31). All this aside, Colfer uses fantastical technology for narrative excitement and glorifies it indefatigably, both the fairy and the newest human technology, altogether without criticism. In *Artemis Fowl* electronic devices, machines and gadgets receive the thorough and appreciative attention that Naess and Buell would hope nature, environment and ecology to receive.

Deep ecology prefers simple and local technology which is easy to make and maintain. (Naess 1989, 95). In *Artemis Fowl* Commander Root keeps a critical eye over Foaly's inventions so that they remain practical and useful, although they are never simple. Unfortunately there are no such overseers in our modern world leading to the creation of countless useless gadgets and complications. "[A]dvanced technology' should be seen as *technology which advances the basic*

goals of each culture, not anything more complicated or difficult for its own sake” (Naess 1989, 97). This at least is dominant in *Artemis Fowl*.

Whereas standard of living depends on “the goods and goodies” that are widely accepted socially for defining the “good life”, quality of life is instead dependant on personal experience and preference. If the standard of living receives too much attention and weight, it “leads soon to the inordinate attention to the budget”, and the actual well-being of people is forgotten (Naess 1989, 88). In *Artemis Fowl*, the latest “goods and goodies” are not coveted merely for social pressure but for actual use and the reaching of ultimate goals. The human technology used by Artemis and Butler helps them in their own endeavours that they find the most important in life. The fairies produce technology mostly for their own protection, to defend themselves against any who threaten their secret way of living. However, their economy does not allow safe equipment to be installed everywhere, and money is not found for all the necessary improvements “until we have us a fatality” (Naess 1989, 45). Some of the fairy police’s equipments “were junk when they were new” (Naess 1989, 52). Amidst an atmosphere of high respect for life among the fairies, such economical hindrances to safety have the potential of evoking criticism towards economy in the reader. Fairy techno-economical society seems perfectly green on the surface, but the same budget problems trouble the fairies even if they only have practical reasons for wanting the best, not because it is luxury.

An economy of growth, scarcity and consumption is also hinted at when fairy civilians as well as criminals can afford the latest equipment whereas the military police cannot: “Every spoilt kid in Haven had a Hummingbird for their wilderness holidays, and here were the LEP with wings that were junk when they were new” (AF 52). Also large wage differences are in place, as fairy experts have high salaries and being famous is something to aspire to as it gives riches. One of the fairies has decided to become a criminal, stealing from humans: “quite a lucrative above-ground memorabilia business” (AF 162). Thus the fairy economy shows signs of uncontrollability and scarcity similar to rich countries’ economy. Despite their brilliant minds, the fairies are still caught

up in the same trap as the industrial nations of humans. *Artemis Fowl* does not offer any solutions for the situation, instead presenting it as natural and unavoidable.

Some powerful consumer pressure in the fairy nation has to do with tourism and tours above ground, as the fairies crowd in shuttle bases to get above ground. Tourism is one of the major industries among fairies, and it can be considered very ecological due to their green transportation. Food industries seem to be very down to earth as well, since they do not eat anything fancy or prestigious: only what they crave or need, not for status. Fairy society seems healthier than ours on average, but the criminal gangs, alcohol addict and thieves are treated harshly among fairies as well. The world and morals in *Artemis Fowl* are largely based on present Western values of society, industrial technology and economy. Even the fairies, though they consider themselves extremely far removed from humans, have nearly identical economic and social systems humans. Their society is affected by technological progress and economy which is based on scarcity (of money, if not of energy or material) the same as ours. They work in the public sector and as entrepreneurs, paying taxes that are used by a central organisation, which results in a lack of resources for the police department.

Most of the fairies enjoy nature and experience varied delights, feeling an urgent pull towards the full moon and natural environments. However, many of them are urbanised and perfectly adapted to a techno-industrial mega-society as well. There is very little other life in the subterranean tunnels and caves where the fairies have their cities, but they enjoy meeting animals above ground. Artemis is different, possessing a seemingly supernatural skill of avoiding anything natural, even when he is travelling through hard terrain or extreme weather. He and all his associates also embrace the techno-industrial society to the fullest. Only Butler's sister Juliet expresses any great love for nature in her daily life, and even that is for a flower bush in the Fowl Manor's garden. Holly Short seems to be enjoying the simple things in life with only a small trace of materialism: she only hopes to get the best possible equipment so that she might succeed in her work.

Another problem with modern society is that policies are prescribed from above, from a distant centre that is preoccupied with efficiency and growth: politics seem to follow economy closely. The political terms are short and so are the interests of the politicians, as any long-term views are potentially dangerous to their careers. (Naess 1989, 145) “The [deep ecology] movement is long-term, politics are short-term. Nature is no pressure group, politicians yield only to pressures”. (Naess 1989, 33) Presently, what Naess calls “ego-realisation”, an individualistic way of thinking, predominates in Western industrial states. There seems to be an “ultimate and extensive incompatibility of the interests of different individuals” (1989, 85), which does not have to remain the norm forever. The fairy nation seems highly united under ultimate norms and goals, whereas the humans fend for themselves or at best work in small groups.

Deep green politics bears in mind that a million years is a short time in the perspective of life on Earth (Naess 1989, 137). *Artemis Fowl* mentions evolutionary timescale and implicitly other points of long-term thinking, as described earlier. In the fairy nation, policies are dictated from a highly political fairy Council. Fairies obtain a Council seat through personal accomplishments, often in military field, but it remains unclear how long a seat is occupied or how often they are changed. It would seem however that the Council can make long-term decisions and is responsible for much of the fairy society. The reader gets a closer look at one opportunistic fairy politician, Cudgeon, who takes over the situation when Commander Root’s concern for his officer’s life prevents the hostage situation to be solved quickly through violence. Cudgeon’s priorities are to secure a place in the Council by making the difficult hostage situation disappear as quickly as possible without the loss of ransom money, which is what *Artemis Fowl* is after. The fairies are described to be very fond of their gold. The Council does finally give a permission to kill Holly Short among the humans and other life forms found in the Fowl Manor to ensure the secrecy of the fairy race. Cudgeon cold-bloodedly using a troll as a decoy and a lethal weapon is too much for the Council, though, especially when that plan fails to solve the situation. When it comes to human politics in the novel, they are not at all discussed besides the fact that money is power.

As pointed out earlier, humans are the first species on Earth who can willingly limit their numbers, and should do it to preserve richness and diversity of other life forms (Naess 1989, 23). The correct amount of people can be debated, and the means of getting to a smaller population ought to be soft, such as through information about the seriousness of the current situation. Many detest the idea of decreased population for fear of violent and inhuman methods, so there must be careful consideration of policy. (Garrard 2012, 21 & 107; Naess 1989, 140–1) Naess predicts some of the difficulties that will rise for a short time (2008, 281):

I hold that a decrease in consumption and a slow decrease in population will not necessarily result in a decrease in the quality of life. There will be a transition period, during which some people living according to the slogan “Enough is never enough” will have difficulties. But provided the downscaling is effectuated with a strong sense of justice, major uprisings may not occur.

Even if there is a wide consensus that population must be stabilised and even greatly reduced, politicians cannot yet openly discuss it for fear of losing voters, but Naess hopes they would admit their concern as private persons at least (1989, 156). More open dialogue is needed, and *Artemis Fowl* does mention population growth on several occasions. None of the main characters show any interest in becoming parents, nor do they have many siblings. *Artemis Fowl* does not applaud big families, but instead frowns upon the breeding of humans in general, as noted earlier.

Deep ecology prefers local communities in which people know each other, have direct democracy, are self-reliant and have little difference in income and wealth (Naess 1989, 144). Naess stresses the importance of self-determination, local community and the slogan “think globally, act locally” (Naess 1989, 33). Grass root action between nations is needed to create deep changes. The fairies think both locally and globally but will not act easily, and certainly not together with others. They think of ecological values in their everyday life, such as what food to eat and how to commute. Local community and global thinking go hand in hand, but locality is not a great concern to the fairy police force that the novel focuses on. There are very few non-governmental organisations present, and Artemis has little and less to do with any communities. Naess points out that leading a local life requires continuity between generations (1989, 145) to create a bond to the

dynamic surroundings. Living in one place helps people understand how the locality functions and what special natural features there are. This is where Artemis has a better situation than the fairies, his family having lived in the same spot for centuries, a very long time from a human child's perspective. The reader does not know what previous fairy generations have done and where they have lived, but there is a busy migration to large cities. Holly has lost her mother, and no other fairy even mentions their family. The only fairy ancestor mentioned is a king who lived thousands of years ago.

In addition, the fairy city Haven is too overpopulated for direct democracy and Holly does not know anyone she meets on the streets. The technological novelties of the fairies seem to be designed by a single person, centaur Foaly, whose genius is often emphasised and who knows he is irreplaceable, having created nearly all the technological defences of the fairy nation. The means of crafting technological inventions is not discussed in the novel, such as where the materials come from and whether there are large factories or small local workshops. Even though Artemis has intimate knowledge about most of the people he meets there is no apparent democracy or local economic self-reliance. His acquaintances consist of family members and employees, whereas others can be investigated beforehand and used for his purposes.

Social ecologists and eco-Marxists despise the individualism and pervasive mysticism of deep ecologists, claiming that it takes the attention away from actual political situations. According to them, it is not only anthropocentrism, the human exploitation and alienation from nature that is at fault. They blame the specific ways that humans exploit each other as the root of the problem. (Garrard 2012, 31) Naess pays special attention to the equality and equilibrium between humans, having been a part of the social justice movement, understanding that people must be content among themselves before they have time and energy to consider nature. Unfair social economics plays a significant part in creating chaos both in the environment and among humans. Whereas Naess is criticised for forgetting individual difficulties and intra-species exploitation, he criticises some Marxists-Leninists that the rich industrial countries they most often discuss are globally

mostly upper-class already. It is the class differences between species that are to be combated with new ideologies. (Naess 1989, 138) Naess as well as social ecology and eco-Marxism see scarcity as a techno-economical means of capital. It creates artificial needs and monetary value, ignoring real needs. There is a clear consensus that the political structure of society needs changing (Garrard 2012, 31). Naess proposes ecoeducation which “requires a new politics, green politics, a politics that does not systematically favour” people who concentrate on rare commodities (2008, 63). He instead promotes the understanding and appreciation for things that there are enough of (2008, 62). Holly appreciates thermal energy that offers as much hot water as is ever needed and the fairies are pleased with the near infinite energy provided by their nuclear batteries. These are not realistic sources of joy for present societies though.

At present centralisation is the trend and individuals are limited in their freedom of choice. Hence deep ecology calls for decentralisation without pressuring. (Naess 1989, 142) Mulch takes the freedom to choose for himself, even if there is the pressure that because he is a dwarf, he should become a miner. When he leaves, he leaves the whole society behind and becomes a criminal, so it is still not very encouraging. Holly’s unique road is more encouraging as she is the first female LEP police officer, guarding her race in a centralised police force but also breaking regulations when she makes difficult moral choices. Still, since she is acting as an autonomous person instead of a “mere functionary”, Naess would agree with her actions (see 1989, 148). He lauds individual, local and direct decision making, but in *Artemis Fowl* characters get into trouble if they are caught acting against centralised rules. At least some get unofficial plaudits for their moral actions after reprimands.

Patrick Murphy also calls for freedom of choice in transgressing national boundaries and economic regulations. He promotes literature that represents “cultural, political, and economic formations that ignore, repudiate, or consistently transgress national boundaries” as there are groups of people whose culture and way of life was established before the borders. (Murphy 2009, 39–40) *Artemis Fowl* is teeming with characters, families and races that have little to no respect for borders.

Artemis's family history consists of international criminal activity, always motivated by economy and considered culture by now, whereas the fairies are well aware that they pre-existed the humans and keep travelling according to their own needs both among human nations and fairy cities.

Some differences between the two races include the fairy community's values. They have a high respect for life (although hierarchically according to military rank, race and sometimes even gender) and seem broadly united under mutual objectives, such as staying hidden from humans for fear of a devastating interspecies war. Their political system is somewhat different and based on merit as a military leader, possibly due to the fairy race's wish to remain safe no matter the cost. This does not promote local political power, which Naess's ecophilosophy would prefer, but instead leads to centralisation and an atmosphere of readiness for violent self-defence. No one dies in the novel despite several life-threatening situations, possibly because it is in part a children's book. Expressions of readiness to torture and kill are ever present in the narration, however. The writer has described his novels as "Die Hard with fairies" (Colfer 2014), which is a fairly comprehensive summation of the moral climate of *Artemis Fowl* when it comes to the use of violence.

It is important to think of life beyond the current state of Earth's ecosphere according to Naess, because it helps people to think about the world and life in it with a broader perspective. This in turn helps people to embrace greener politics. (Naess 1989, 193). In this light *Artemis Fowl* is especially relevant as it expands the possibilities and tickles readers' imaginations through the alien race and evolution for example. "Nothing is only political, and nothing is not at all political". Everything we do and think is politically relevant, and the reflection on and pronunciation of actions and thoughts strengthen the ecological movement. (Naess 1989, 130) Colfer's novel is therefore politically relevant, even if only by making readers more aware of the problems, and possibly more sympathetic to solving them. The fairies in the novel do not make themselves felt in the above-ground political life or in any other way. This, however, cannot be held strictly against them as according to Naess everyone has in practice greater obligation to that which is closest (1989, 170).

The fairies have solved the environmental issues by having nearly everlasting energy sources that are almost perfectly green and safe. They are also capable of recycling everything they produce without any mention of environmental destruction. Judging by their critique toward humans who destroy “everything they come in contact with” (AF 50), they would rather protect the environment. This does not erase the fact that *Artemis Fowl* frequently glorifies “advanced” technology and maintains the ideology of economic growth and production. The fairies even have a stock market (see Colfer 2011, 97). The insufficient funding of the fairy police and beggars and urchins in the streets of Ho Chi Minh City may be meant as criticism of the current system. Nevertheless, *Artemis Fowl* must be considered as a half-hearted protest on the current techno-industrial culture from the point of view of radical deep green philosophy.

Naess offers one reason for not condemning technology too harshly (1989, 155):

In politics tactics are important... If we work within existing parties, we must use a terminology that encourages the voters to listen. For instance, it is not good to write and talk as if one is against industry in general. Our point of view should be that we should support ‘industry’, and then point out that ‘industry’ has historically been something very different from what is going on at the moment – *big* industry.

In this, Colfer’s novel is likely easier to approach as there are many underlying systems of society that are familiar to the reader. Colfer does not write against industry as such, only the pollution and endangered species it leads to. However, he does not criticise big industry either, which must be considered unfortunate from the point of view of deep ecology, even in the light that one novel cannot be expected to focus on every possible environmental problem.

Although the deep ecological philosophy does not fit into current politics, there is still hope for the future. In politics, there is no need to agree on some definite utopia, as any great changes are unlikely to happen quickly. People should aspire to greener lines in politics with small steps, considering what they could be and how it could be achieved. “Green is dynamic and comparative, never absolute or idealistic”. (Naess 1989, 160–1) From this point of view *Artemis Fowl* can be analysed in the comparative light, and be fairly satisfied with the findings. It is definitely greener than one might expect, taking a visible and even vigorous stand on a few green matters. Even if

several more environmentally oriented fictional novels have been written at least since W.H. Hudson's *A Crystal Age* from 1887 (Stableford 2004, 101), any new addition is welcome.

In 1987, the United Nations agreed on a global green agenda:

In a major victory for the global ecology movement, the World Commission for Environment and Development announced clearly that sustainable development unconditionally requires ecological sustainability. The consequences of this admission are far-reaching because ecological sustainability requires significant economic, technological, social, political, and cultural changes in most or all countries. (Naess 2008, 295)

Naess notes that these green cultural aspects “are all pillars of support for the richness and diversity of life” (1989, 34). The novel itself is part of a change in attitudes to a degree. It is not consistently deeply ecological in its presentation of technological industry, economical growth or political system, but it takes a few major steps towards that direction. Fairy technology is green, their economics do not harm the environment, and although their community life is not as local and green as it could be, their population policy is green either by choice or natural causes. In addition, they support green peace in not killing humans, even if green peace might ultimately benefit from it. Artemis has no green technology to be seen, nor does he fit in any of the other categories. His political views remain mostly unknown, his community life is very restricted but not at all green, nor does he believe in green peace while abducting Holly.

Artemis Fowl is rather radically green in some ways, but a great deal of the harmful industrial ideology remains. If the fairies are as intellectually matured as they sometimes seem, they should be able to tackle the challenges of economy and politics. Living underground and isolated, it should be easy to establish a substantially different system. The reasons why the fairy race is unable to create an even better utopian world include their greed for gold and the emergency state of their living. Arne Naess would hope for the good of all and the standard of living to meet some day, eradicating the need to exploit one another. People should co-operate around the globe. (Naess 1989, 31, 137–8 & 151) There is no such peaceful coexistence to be expected in the world of *Artemis Fowl*.

4.3. Ontology and Self-realisation

Values and actions are based on ontology: the way people understand reality and the world. For ecophilosophers, the world begins in the science of ecology. Naess uses it as meaning “the interdisciplinary scientific study of the living conditions of organisms in interaction with each other and with the surroundings, organic as well as inorganic”. (1989, 36) Unfortunately the sciences of ecology, chemistry and physics measure change without considering the value of any given change. This is why ecophilosophy needs to add value evaluations to decision making and promote new ultimate goals for the society to work for. Naess states that we need greater amounts of people who appreciate equilibrium more than economical growth, a society where people would rather live together with other life forms than exploit or kill them. (Naess 1989, 24)

Whereas ecophilosophy starts from humanity’s relation to nature, the modern world view is based for the most part on the modern scientific world view, anthropocentrism and various dualisms (I–you and human–nature for example). The solution presented is a change from the present human-centred system to a nature-centred system of values, which constitutes a major part of the radicalism in deep ecology and “bring[s] it into opposition with almost the entirety of Western philosophy and religion” (Garrard 2012, 24). Dualisms and human-centred systems as such are not problematic, however. What causes the environmental crisis is that anthropocentrism and androcentrism are derived from alienation, differentiation, dependency and an “underlying model of mastery” evident in the dominant Euro-American culture which sees humans superior to nature. (Garrard 2012, 27–8) Aristotle and Descartes are examples of the long history of the mastery model: “Aristotle, in a notorious passage in the *Politics* justifying slavery, links together the dualisms arising from human domination of nature, male domination over females, the master’s domination over the slave and reason’s domination of the body and emotions” (Plumwood 1993, 46). Descartes is credited as the foremost founder of modern philosophy, still a philosopher of interest. He considered the mind and body to be separate, with mind controlling the body but body

also having often undesirable effects on the mind. These ideas are still a part of the cultural heritage in Western countries, influencing policies and societies.

For ecophilosophers, Garrard (2012, 68) names the Scientific Revolution to be a “crucial point in the fall from grace” for Western Europeans. René Descartes, Francis Bacon and Isaac Newton are among the foremost who described the universe as a great machine (Garrard 2012, 68). Bacon’s scientific method laid the foundation for natural sciences and empiricism, drawing further attention to reality as something that can be reliably measured. Newton was one of the key figures in the Scientific Revolution, changing the way people understood society and nature. Garrard proposes that the idea of the universe as a machine represents for deep ecologists and ecofeminists in particular “the decisive blow to the organic universe inhabited by our ancestors” (Garrard 2012, 68).

He continues:

If... Palaeolithic people venerated a fecund Magna Mother or Great Mother figure, these men were to complete the process of her annihilation begun by the dominance of the male Judaeo-Christian sky god. In place of the Earth as nurturing mother, natural philosophers posited a universe reducible to an assemblage of parts functioning according to regular laws that men could, in principle, know in their entirety. (Garrard 2012, 68–9)

In *Artemis Fowl*, fairies have a Mother Earth and Artemis has a reducible universe and aspirations that fly high, if not a sky god as such. Whereas since later antiquity the spirit was glorified and all things material seen as a hindrance to the intellectual life, *Artemis Fowl* depicts Holly and Foaly as fairies who take care of their bodies with nourishing food and moisturiser whereas Artemis is a human who disregards his body as much as he can. The novel indicates in several places that strong physique goes together with good morals, and losing oneself in intellectual schemes goes with bad morals.

Naess describes how at the end of the Middle Ages, the power of religion begun to fade. Science, new technology and the rise of capitalism lessened the faith people had in the mystical and the supernatural. “We relaxed our striving upwards, *but without a return to a relatively harmonious attitude to nature... Nature came to be interpreted as both slave and raw material*”. (Naess 1989, 191) Naess could not disagree more with such a worldview. His ecophilosophy takes a long step

away from “the contemporary near monopoly of the so-called scientific world-view”, defending instead the spontaneous and rich experiencing of nature and stating it is that which constitutes to the “concrete contents” of the world. (Naess 1989, 35) This is the phenomenological outlook, which differs from the Cartesian analysis which sees the world as objects that act upon each other. Phenomenology is the philosophical study of experience and consciousness founded in the early 20th century. It basically strives to systematically study consciousness and experiences. Naess stresses that it is possible for anyone to develop “a sensitivity for qualities” which helps experiencing nature in a joyfully meaningful way (1989, 51). Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s (1908–1961) phenomenology in particular has inspired ecocritics to underline the joy and pleasure that can be experienced in interaction with natural phenomena (Garrard 2012, 36). Merleau-Ponty founded his philosophy on prominent phenomenologists Heidegger and Edmund Husserl, stating that perception allows people to understand the world and engage in it. The reality can only be experienced as long as it can be perceived, but it must be real in order to be perceived, always preceding and exceeding the experience. Human body, consciousness and the world interact and intertwine. (Toadvine 2008, 18–20) The real joy and pleasure that can be experienced from the environment and interacting with it contrasts the Puritan self-denial often falsely attributed to environmentalism (Garrard 2012, 36).

Tim Hayward also criticises modern science because analytical methods are reductionist, and rob the natural world “its integrity, wholeness and interconnectedness” (1995, 16). Naess laments how many people “only look at” nature, which does not constitute experiencing it wholly. Instead one should act in nature, meditate and even live in it. (Naess 1989, 63) Naess shares Tim Hayward’s criticism on scientific world-view, noting that things which can be clearly quantified and measured have the most importance, especially in public decision-making (1989, 127). In order to accurately quantify something, it has to be separated from the whole and studied on its own. That fragment then becomes abstract and somewhat pointless. For the deep ecology movement, the world is much

more than that which can be accurately measured with natural sciences. (Naess 1989, 61) Pueblo Indian Gregory Cajete offers his remarks to the debate (1994, 12–3):

The philosophical perspective received in modern non-Indian school courses, that the world is an inanimate mass of matter arranged by chance into a set of shapes and energy patterns, is a matter of belief, not experience, and is the polar opposite of the traditional Indian belief. Indian educators thus face the question of whether they will move the substance of education away from this essentially meaningless proposition toward the more realistic Indian model that sees the world as an intimate relationship of living things.

Both beliefs have their place in life, but the model of intimate relationships offers a more harmonious and sustainable world for more living beings.

In *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, Naess offers the basis of a new ontology, where humans are inseparable from nature. Those who subscribe to such ontology will find it impossible to hurt nature, “as this would mean injuring an integral part of ourselves”. (Naess 1989, 2) The fairies feel this way about the whole world and it is also proved through their interactive magic. Naess offers an example that touches many pet owners, pointing that the well-being of the pet can be more important than what happens to an unfamiliar neighbour. “One can desire well-being for an animal or a plant just as naturally as one can for a person... One can, without hypocrisy, *desire something which is for the benefit of other living beings* – and one normally obtains great rich satisfaction from it”. (Naess 1989, 168) When people learn to identify with animals or plants, their intrinsic value is easily understood (Naess 1989, 11–12):

[T]hey possess a certain independence from us and our valuing... The value is not so much independent from us as independent from our valuation – be it material or aesthetic in nature... [E]ntities in nature are things to be respected for their own sakes, simply because they are there and near to us. Like friends – we should never use them only as a means to something else. To do so is superficial, seeing only surface interactions. It is intuitively obvious to see the own-ness, intrinsicity, *egenskap* (own-shape, quality) of nature and of friends, but one can easily forget it in daily interaction. We tend to lose friends if we act that way too long. The same could happen with nature.

The fairies do not use nature as a means, nor is their deep appreciation limited *merely* to “looking at” nature, although their time spent in rich natural environments is very limited. On the rare occasions they can visit above-ground nature they show great amounts of sensitivity, understanding, exhilaration and fondness towards natural phenomena. They frequently fly over natural monuments

and sea, communicate with animals and breathe the multi-scented air. Fairies get their powers through interaction with nature, by planting an oak acorn from an ancient tree to a faraway place. The humans show very little consciousness or fondness towards nature, and would rather stay away from natural forces altogether. Artemis stays inside so much that he is pale as a vampire, thus likened to an unnatural and evil creature. His bodyguard goes where his master goes without exception, so it can be assumed he does not visit outdoors much, either. Artemis's mother never leaves her room and there is no evidence that Juliet would ever venture beyond the garden.

Holly moves between doing something in nature and merely looking at it. She inhales fresh night air, enjoys and shivers while consciously experiencing nature. She summons dolphins for her own pleasure, and even if the dolphins enjoy the situation as well to unknown extent, Holly also looks at them as passive objects of human pollution. She smiles condescendingly to the dolphins even as she is despairing of their skin condition caused by pollution, but she does not identify with the animals further. It is a passing meeting on the way to more important social happenings.

Admittedly, personal ontology is only a point of view, which can be deeply problematic. Yet it is of a "great potential value for energetic environmentalism" that opposes the contemporary views which have already been proven not only problematic, but destructive. (Naess 1989, 35) The world does not circle around any human or even all humans, as it would do according to the human-centric view. People would not exist, nor would continue to exist without the sun, water and food that the world provides. Naess notes that the border between an individual and their environment is blurred at best: people continuously consume various things and affect their surroundings in innumerable ways (Naess 1989, 61). New scientific research shows that people are not alone even within themselves. For example, a significant amount of the human body consists of bacteria that originated outside human bodies, and recent studies also suggest that much of the human DNA has come from viruses (see, for example, Garrard 2012, 205 and Margulis 1998, 6). Accordingly, deep ecology treats a person as "a relational junction within the total field", acting among its environment with and through others. Growing and maturing as a person leads to identification with

more and more relations in that personal junction (Naess 1989, 56) until the relations become part of the person; this is similar to the acknowledging of nature as an important part of reality that Lawrence Buell demands.

Scientists have to prove anew that animals are feeling beings with varying degree of consciousness of the surrounding world and themselves, but despite numerous recent studies and the experience of pet owners and farmers, only slowly has the common opinion turned against animal testing, cattle breeding and fur-production. Garrard explains how many animal rights critics oppose René Descartes (1596–1650) who “‘hyperseparated’ reason from emotion and mind from body, and claimed that animals were effectively complex machines”. Women, young people, disabled and non-whites were seen as less rational, and accordingly less human. (Garrard 2012, 147–8) This ideology has been steadily questioned leading to the rights of women and minorities, and the next natural extenuation would be to grant rights and value to the non-human world as Naess, Buell and countless others have hoped.

Even the animal rights activists focus on certain animals that evoke most attention and positive feelings in people. Naess explains how some people rank living beings “according to their relative intrinsic value”, based on consciousness, soul, the ability to reason, size and so forth. Naess replies to these criteria that none of them have been “substantially justified”, and continues: “[t]hey may appear to be reasonable at first glance, but they fade after reflection and confrontation with the basic intuitions of the unity of life and the right to live and blossom”. (1989, 167) There is plenty of evidence that only big animals get frequent attention and rights in *Artemis Fowl*. The same applies to larger environmental wholes such as mountains, oceans and ancient oaks.¹ Those with a “soul” and intelligence get precedence within both races. The fairies are smaller so Artemis feels he can do as he pleases with them, but when he sees how human and female Holly is his mind starts to change.

¹ Artemis considers ancient oaks to be at least 100 years old. Over 300 years would be more scientifically accurate, and even that would be considerably less than a fairy’s life expectancy.

Confrontations between people often develop from differing ontology. Naess gives an example of how a conservationist sees and experiences different wholes than a developer. Whereas one sees nature and a dynamic forest, the other sees quantities of trees to be utilised: “*The difference between the antagonists is one rather of ontology than of ethics*”. (Naess 1989, 66) Artemis and the fairies he encounters have clearly differing ontologies. As clever as Artemis is, his worldview is still immature and self-centred. The solution would be to change Artemis’s ontology upside down, but then we would not have an adventure novel at all.

Naess presents the phenomenological theory of *gestalt* thinking as a basis for re-connecting with the natural world. It is a holistic ontology that entails a deeper understanding of relationships between things, which automatically results in respect and awe of life. (Naess 1989, 67) Gestalt research begun in the psychology of perception before it was included in ontology (Naess 1989, 58). Environments have more meanings than can be measured with hard sciences; human experience and emotions are as real as the material objects and even more real than abstract scientific ideas. When emotions are combined with objects, they are what there “really is”. This gestalt thinking or “mythical thinking” is practiced in everyday life to make sense of surroundings and reality. (Naess 1989, 57 & 61) Several indigenous cultures base their world view and lives on gestalt thinking, appreciating nature and their harmonious place in it. As Dickerson et al. elaborate, “myths articulate the primordial, elemental, and foundational truths by which a culture defines reality and its origin and place within it” (2006, 3). The fairy mythology is encompassed in their Book and natural magic which bear similarity with cultures more “in touch” with nature. The reader can take a part of it with them after reading *Artemis Fowl*. Alan Drengson (introduction in Naess 2008, 14) summarises the cause and need of gestalt thinking:

Because of the diversity of languages, cultures, and personal experiences, it is not only possible but necessary to have great *pluralism*; reality admits to many characterizations and levels of description. Each of us and our cultures are part of a larger context that itself has many complex and rich facets and is part of a larger whole... [G]estalt ontology... recognizes and honors individual nuances of feeling, thought, and experience.

The sentiments of deep ecologists are “often interpreted as irrational, as ‘mere’ emotional reaction[s] to the rationality of a modern Western society”, whereas in fact rationality does not constitute the whole of reality, only an abstract idea of it (Naess 1989, 63). In *Artemis Fowl* the veneration of nature is not depicted as merely or even primarily emotional. The fairies have strong links to nature through magic and rational thinking, as well as the constitutional laws found in their Book. They live in intellectual harmony with other living beings and the rest of reality. Then again Artemis is determined to fight against all and everything. He does not need to struggle against nature as he can insulate himself from all environments at will. It is not a good thing by any means, as a greater sense of interrelatedness is required instead of further alienation.

Further importance of gestalt relations lies in the fact that they could lessen the social costs of centralisation, urbanisation and the constant requirement for greater efficiency if people were to adapt to a new world-view of living together (Naess 1989, 63). Naess points out the importance of a strong gestalt, the geographical sense of belonging. Our surroundings become “a part of that which is ours”. (Naess 1989, 61) Murphy agrees on what Gregory Cajete calls a geopsyche, a context of natural environment that becomes part of a person’s identity (2009, 11). Holly would much rather live above ground, regardless of being a “city elf born and bred” (AF 36). She misses the surface nature acutely and can more easily appreciate her surroundings because she is only capable of brief visits (Naess 1989, 62). The fairies appreciate many aspects of natural environments, yet mostly they remain “tourists”, as Holly must feel when she forces herself to leave the appreciation of nature until after her official business is concluded. Tragically, Artemis and Butler kidnap Holly before she has the chance to enjoy nature further, and she is taken to a cellar enforced with concrete – a desolate place compared with moonlit rivers and oaks. When she breaks the concrete floor and gets in touch with the earth she is once again empowered through magic which enables her to escape the cell (AF 189):

A sliver of brown amongst the grey. Could it be true?... There was indeed a small patch of earth poking through the cement. Holly fumbled the acorn from her boot, clasping it tightly in bloody fingers.

‘I return you to the earth,’ she whispered, worming her fist into the tiny space. ‘And claim the gift that is my right’.

In another passage, the dwarf Mulch escapes the Fowl Manor by travelling through the earth: “His heart calmed immediately as the scent of minerals filled his nostrils. Safe, he was safe” (AF 197). These are powerful statements in favour of natural versus manmade.

Apocalypticism is one influential way of viewing the world. Those who believe that some form of the world’s end is nigh have throughout the centuries lived to the fullest and devoted themselves to a given cause. It is especially powerful in times of crisis, as the world is simplified to friends and enemies, and it can be traced as far back as Genesis and Revelation in the Bible. (Garrard 2012, 2, 94 & 113–4) Apocalyptic discourse is a force that can create and make a change, as well as convert the doubtful (Garrard 2012, 113). Many of the most influential environmental writings, such as Carson’s *Silent Spring* and Paul Erlich’s *The Population Bomb*, make extensive use of the trope and environmental crisis itself is apocalyptic (Garrard 2012, 102 & 107)

Artemis Fowl follows the “characteristic features of tragic apocalyptic rhetoric” that can be found in the *Silent Spring* as well: the warning of coming environmental disaster is “presented in terms of absolute authority”, that of the fairies’ understanding of long term processes. In addition the aggressive and polluting humans are “evil” and “the consequences of failure to heed the warning are catastrophic, and the danger is not only imminent, but already well under way”. (Garrard 2012, 103) The fairies speak of the human threat as catastrophic and unavoidable, already close to destroying the whole nature and their race. They believe it is only a matter of time, and no other alternative is considered.

Despite the sonorous effect of apocalyptic rhetoric, many disappointed people are bound to lose faith and spirit since the apocalypse has not yet come. This is a symptom of the green movement as well: both successes and criticism have come out of apocalyptic preaching. Many environmentalists besides Naess continue to argue that if we do not change our ways now, apocalypse will come. (Garrard 2012, 93, 101 & 115; Buell 1995, 285) Naess stresses the “if”: *if* we

do not act, apocalypse is likely to come. However, if we *do* act, the disaster will not happen at least yet, and that is the greatest possible victory despite the self-negating rhetoric. (Naess 1989, 27)

Apocalypse has also been turned into an entertaining and emotional way of describing reality. Environmental “doom merchants” sell bad news (Garrard 2012, 101 & 115), and *Artemis Fowl* can be argued to be a part of such phenomena as it has become trendy to include environmental problems in writing. Greg Garrard discusses how apocalyptic thinking can take a comedic or tragicomic stance, sometimes both. In the comedic stance as described by Stephen O’Leary in 1994, people are flawed but have to try to make their way through everyday life, like Holly Short does. There is a chance that apocalypse will come, but there is the everyday life to think of as well. In Holly’s case, her everyday life consists of preventing the apocalypse as a police officer. Tragicomic stance depicts a hero with guilt and a predetermined, unavoidable destruction. (Garrard 2012, 95) This is problematic for the environment and long-term thinking as Garrard explains: “Only if we imagine that the planet *has* a future, after all, are we likely to take responsibility for it”. (Garrard 2012, 116)

Another problem with apocalyptic thinking according to Gary Snyder is that “the condition of our social and ecological life is so serious that we’d better have a sense of humor”. In his opinion an overabundance of “doom scenarios” is harmful for the environmental movement. A better way “is to make us love the world” instead of fearing for the end of it. (Snyder 1999, 335–6) Joanna Macy and Chris Johnstone in their book *Active Hope: How to Face the Mess We’re in Without Going Crazy* (2012) also endorse thinking so positive that some have denounced it as overly utopian. The writers remark that the social justice and suffragette movements were also viewed as utopistic before their breakthrough, and no status quo is unbreakable. (Hrynkow 2013, 73–4) The fairies have all but abandoned hope and are incapable of acting for the good of the planet, only guarding themselves. Perhaps the fairies have reached the same conclusion as Robinson Jeffers’s giants in “The Inquisitors” (1987), that the humans can only permanently harm themselves, and life on Earth will once more flourish after people are gone. Artemis is not concerned with the end of the world,

although he is accused of risking it, as the apocalypse has already partly fallen on him when he temporarily lost both of his parents. He is clearly not a comic hero, but neither is he a tragic one as there is no force on Earth that can stop him. As such, he is more of an anti-hero, as noted earlier.

Besides the aforementioned, Naess (1989, 183) describes the relationship between Joseph Meeker's theory of comedic and tragic stance from 1972 and deep ecology:

Ecosophy T has certain of Meeker's comedy characteristics: equality, joy, unfolding in small communities. But also a little of the tragedy: ideals (guidelines) for nonviolence are suggested which are impossible to attain if they are understood strictly and absolutely... [Tragedy] stresses inspiration for working to better social conditions. The more relaxed comic mode with its penchant for personal adaptation seems to abandon the less resourceful to the mercy of the elements.

Artemis Fowl fails to live up to this in everything but the occasional experiencing of joy. Personal adaptation is the status quo for both fairies and humans. In these aspects the novel is an ecological failure.

Both plants and animals "have the *right to live*". Naess continues philosophising (1989, 165):

What is the *right to live*? A definition is often arbitrary, and it leaves out the mythic component. A good definition, by definition, lacks a mythic function. But sentences with mythic function are still required today. The scientific and philosophical turns of phrase can easily come to overlook important sources of meaningfulness and general appeal.

The term "right" is the best that Naess could intuitively find, and could not "reject [it] in all seriousness". At the same time he concedes that other philosophers need not accept the term for their own part. (Naess 1989, 167) "Right" is not a specific term in itself, even if it is clear enough for language users to use it in their daily lives. The fairies regulate their life through the semi-religious codes of the Book, accepting the right of others to live. Their isolation accentuates their joy when they have the chance to visit above ground, but there are downsides to their living in the caves. They are not in a close relationship with other species as Haven is a bleak place when it comes to diversity of life. Nor do they get deep pleasure and satisfaction from *daily* partnership with the environment and everything in it. The fairies underground and Artemis inside his house are alienated from most of the natural environments, and therefore according to Naess alienated from themselves (1989, 28).

Naess hopes that people would come to see their own identity in a wider scale. Self-realisation is an ongoing process and an ultimate goal that aims at personal and communal perfection. (Naess 1989, 84) Others have discussed the same concept under other names, such as “‘the universal self’ ‘the absolute’, ‘the *ātman*’, etc.” (Naess 1989, 85). Martin Heidegger, a philosopher of existential phenomenology, also promoted self-realisation in the form of “letting be” (*Gelassenheit*), wherein other living beings are allowed to live their potential, and coexistence is non-hierarchical (Garrard 2012, 34; Mummery 2008, 99–100). Hwa Yol Jung and Petee Jung wrote in parallel lines of “ecopiety” in 1989, wanting to “convey *a deeply abiding sense of care and reverence* for coexistence among all beings and things, whether they be human or not” (Naess 1989, 33). According to these theories, it should be acknowledged that human species is not the only important species on Earth nor are we isolated from everything else. This is more than mere romantic thinking, as Naess states, as “[o]ur biological heritage” lets us delight in intricate living diversity, and this delight can be further perfected (1989, 23). In Ecosophy T, the term “Self-realisation” with capital S indicates “a kind of perfection”. It is a process of maturation and integration that can never be complete as it would require every living being to realise their potential to the fullest. (Naess 1989, 84) It is a continuous process and “a way to live one’s life” (Naess 1989, 9), but it is what all deep ecologists are working towards in theory. As much as social ecologists have criticised the radical green movement, at least John Clark is also in favour of decentralised and non-hierarchical communes where people can act as free social beings and experience “joyful self-realization” (Naess 1989, 12).

Naess was greatly influenced by Baruch Spinoza’s *Ethics* (1677) which was a comprehensive philosophical treatise published after the author’s death. Spinoza was one of the great rationalists of the 17th century, contemplating the character of the world and of humans, as well as how to achieve happiness (Nadler 2006, x). Among other things, he discussed the political, theological, moral and psychological dimensions of “human freedom” (Smith 2003, xiii) which can be achieved at least partially through knowledge of God or Nature, meaning the whole of universe. This allows some

autonomy and self-determination to pursue greater joy (Huenemann 2008, 85–6). Naess agrees with Spinoza that a child's ego needs to grow and mature into identifying with other people (1989, 85). Deep ecology hopes for the development of such deep identification with the rest of the nature as well, not merely humans. Naess studied several notable philosophers extensively and was, among other things, acquainted with Immanuel Kant's transcendental idealism which was a revolutionary and modern branch of philosophy in the late 18th century. It sees the limits of reason and then combines reason with experience, thus yielding the basis for morals. Moral obligation and responsibility are dependent upon human freedom. (Dudley & Engelhard 2010, 1 & 6) Especially the concept of *beautiful action* is important to Ecosophy T. People act beautifully when they do the right thing because it *feels* right, not because there is a general moral law to dictate it. When people are inclined to act benevolently towards the ecosphere, they have matured and moved closer to Self-realisation than someone who adapts to the environment because they have to. Naess is of the opinion that people can get deeper joy from unity than from winning competitions or "conquering" nature. (Naess 1989, 85–6) Ursula K. Le Guin supports the idea and adds that it is the exploitative market of unlimited growth that will soon limit people's freedom in more drastic ways than environmentalist demands ever would (Le Guin, quoted in Murphy 2009, 95). Biologist Lynn Margulis in *Symbiotic Planet* (1998) also agrees, stating that symbiosis rather than competition is the dominant form of living and therefore of culture on Earth.

Considering all this, something vital is left out in the novel. The relationships are few and far between, the characters interact too little with other beings and environments, and therefore lack an important part of their Self. Artemis tries to fight *against* natural environments and relationships, and this leaves him an incomplete person. The fairies occasionally see some of the surface world and its relatively untouched environments, but cannot be a permanent part of it. *Artemis Fowl* contains three separate worlds, namely the fairy nation, human settlements and nature. These realms meet each other but rarely. The relationships can be distilled as follows: the fairies dislike humans, the human characters dislike most of nature and nature itself does not have an opinion, but is visibly

damaged by humans. In line with Naess's views, both fairies and humans would benefit from deeper and more meaningful relationships with each other and with nature.

Naess discusses how the history of Earth contains awe-inspiring changes such as plate tectonics and erosion. Among these, the unfolding of life is the one process that can evoke "a proud feeling of genuine participation in something immensely greater" than the human "social career" and individuality. (Naess 1989, 165) Despite the flashes of evolutionary timescale and geological formations that Buell would also approve of, *Artemis Fowl* still mostly focuses on social relationships. Having said that, the fairies do show a consistent wide-scale perspective of the ecospheric dynamics. Whereas Artemis discovers magic and fairies with a child's faith in such things, he delights in overcoming magical secrets with the newest technology and his intelligence. In the fairy nation, some of the uses for magic have also been replaced with easier and sometimes more reliable technology. These aspects are somewhat detestable to Naess's Ecosophy T, and to Commander Root but not to others in the novel. Displacing magic indicates the erosion of a major part of fairy culture and unity.

Naess also discusses how the process of maturing and identification can be hindered (1989, 164):

[D]evelopment can naturally be destroyed by severe tragedy – such as loss of mother and later repeated losses and self-denials. Self-realisation receives a blow which can contribute to a hostile attitude towards a great deal, even to everything: a destructive urge addressed to the whole world and existence as such... such development is not a necessary progression. Favourable conditions for Self-realisation extend the radiation of good feeling to more and more nature.

Artemis suffers from loss of mother and father, having become mentally hostile and willing to exploit anything. As he gets feedback from Butler and Holly, he realises what he is doing is wrong. He matures greatly during the novel. Holly suffers from the loss of mother too, and in addition the human race "robbed" her of natural environments. Despite the unfortunate losing of above-ground natural habitats, the fairies still hold on to good will and love of nature. Being kidnapped by Artemis does not improve Holly's attitude towards humans, however. Even Holly can finally work

with Artemis, though she at first hates Artemis profoundly. Either she experiences Stockholm syndrome as her superior suggests or begins to see the good in the humans she meets.

As in any entertaining story, the characters are not perfect and finished beings but continue to evolve, to Self-realise and see more systems and totalities. The elves are gradually reaching for Self-realisation and hoping humans would do the same. They have little trust in it happening, however, and they are very sceptical that anything good should become of humans who have displayed their violent nature time and again. This is rather depressing as it lets readers to think that there really might be no hope for us. Only some of the worst parts of human behaviour are mentioned in the novel, and none of the greener enterprises that have been in process for decades. Almost all fairies seem to be drawn towards the free nature and moon, enjoying it so much that it can be seen as part of their Self-realisation. They enjoy acting for the good of the society and experiencing unspoilt environment. Naess hopes that humans could achieve similar understanding and a feeling of belonging in our natural environments as the fairies show in theory. In this *Artemis Fowl* promotes deep ecological philosophy.

As it is often claimed, the environmental degradation is in part due to false representation, lost connections and environmentally damaging cultural traditions. Naess points out the consequences of the so called “rational” thinking (1989, 54):

perhaps as many as 99% of all ‘experts’ are educated to believe that all which is beautiful and lovable (or ugly and ‘hateable’) is created by humanity, with nature as nothing in itself. But *no man apart!* Could we dispense with nature in a technological utopia? Could machines directly stimulate the nervous system with a simulation of the very qualities of the nature some of us love...?

The fairies do not quite have machines to stimulate them. They take pleasure in hot baths and fungus cigars, visiting above ground to marvel at natural phenomena. Only then do they truly feel alive and exhilarated. Artemis, however, is quite content sitting at home with his computers and money making schemes, the culture that he was brought up in. Meeting the fairies brings about maturation, letting him to begin seeing himself as a part of a larger world where technology, individuals, species and environments constitute a relational world (Hayles 2006, 164).

Naess finds that there is no clearly expressed philosophy that supports the current system: “My conclusion is that there is no articulated world-view which endorses mankind’s current role in the ecosphere. Environmentalism has no articulated philosophical system to fear” (Naess 1989, 87). That is why Colfer can easily depict a whole range of differing views, albeit in the form of an alien set of races. Naess continues that being aware of ecological destruction is not enough: people should understand, think and accept for themselves that such destruction is wrong. High material standard of living can be mistakenly seen as stable and everlasting, and as it is learned early on it is seen as the best way of life for too long. Other ideals threaten this imagined stability which is then automatically defended. Deep ecological ideas can be hard to embrace as they concern universal and long-term aspects of reality that we have only recently begun to understand in detail, whereas life is today and social constructions focus more on the every day life. (Naess 1989, 88 & 127) People generally have difficulties to plan long periods of time in advance if there are short-term gains to be had (Rawles 1996, 318). In *Artemis Fowl*, even the corrupted fairies can think long periods of time ahead. An alcoholic fairy seizes her chance to get back to health and society. A kleptomaniac dwarf forfeits his magic willingly, valuing the freedom of movement more highly. The good fairies accept and understand the value of free nature, and act and make others act accordingly to save the environment and to not exploit anything.

Naess adopts Immanuel Kant’s maxim “you shall never use another person only as a means”, substituting “another person” with “any living being” (1989, 174). Mulch transgresses this by stealing anything he likes and using violence to avoid imprisonment. For Artemis, anything and anyone is a means to his ends. Cudgeon uses a troll to put multiple lives in danger, but this is condemned in the novel in no uncertain terms. Otherwise the fairy nation respects every life form. Not only Kant and Naess call for intrinsic value for life, but “[i]t is noteworthy that a ‘democracy of life forms’ is or was characteristic of some primal societies. Their conception of the human situation is more realistic than that offered in our techno-natural scientific education”. (Naess 1989, 175)

Butler is trained to take everything in the environment into account, but he focuses mostly on humans and protecting his client's life, not in the beauty of nature. At one point he handles the holy scripture of the fairies, the Book, "reverentially" (AF 14), but it is unclear whether he has respect for the "secrets of the universe" (AF 17) contained within or merely for the goals of his employer. The novel fails in many occasions to clarify what is meant exactly, and the interpretation is left to the reader. After all the realities of the novel's characters are far from the average reader's. The fairies live in a utopistic world of green technology and magic with a great understanding and respect for all life whereas Artemis is incredibly rich and impossibly smart. Both sides consider themselves to be above any other species or individuals, hardly befitting the ideals of deep ecology. I conclude that *Artemis Fowl* has an inconsistent attitude when it comes to the deep ecological principles and theory of Self-realisation.

Naess concludes in an eloquent and inspiring note:

It is my hope that beings endowed with a brain like ours, developed through hundreds of millions of years in close interaction with all kinds of life will inevitably support a way of life not only narrowly favourable to this species, but favourable to the whole ecosphere in all its diversity and complexity. A uniquely endowed part of this ecosphere will not turn into its eternal enemy. (1989, 212, emphasis added)

I propose that Colfer's *Artemis Fowl* wishes for the same.

4.4. Responsibility to induce change

Those who agree with the philosophical outlines of deep ecology "have an obligation directly or indirectly to participate in the attempt to implement the necessary changes" (Naess 1989, 29). Naess's *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle* as a whole is meant to induce change in the world by discussing important themes and helping readers to express their own moral basics. The elites and masses both need to understand the bases of the current systems and realise the situation is neither inevitable nor right. The "populace at large" ought to take part in suggesting new goals and tactics for their society. (Naess 1989, 24) Patrick Murphy encourages people to express ideas to others time and again, to read and to write, as an idea or concept can be *learned* at any time but possibly *understood* only years afterwards (2009, viii). In other words "[t]he ideas taught today can become

the practice of tomorrow, but only if they are taught today” (Murphy 2009, 4). When it comes to solving environmental issues, there is plenty of room for different opinions on what is important, necessary, or to be done first: in any case there must be “vigorous cooperation” (Naess 1989, 31) between deep ecologists and other experts.

Ehrlich’s *Population Bomb* among other speculations of impending doom did not come to pass because they succeeded in waking discussion and action. China’s one child policy, India’s free-will and coercive vasectomies and the ideology of Zero Population Growth in the United States and elsewhere helped slow down the growth-rate. “Claims that population growth spontaneously and naturally abated as a result of industrialization, education, and prosperity ignore the significant role that consciousness raising played internationally in persuading many individuals to forgo having children” (Murphy 2009, 165), although it is not yet enough. Population crisis remains a real crisis, and Murphy takes a more pessimistic view of the situation than most (2009, 166–7):

Because the world is in few ways a better place than it was thirty years ago, and in many areas of the world a far worse place to live and die, world populations have not had the necessary conditions to reproduce or survive as rapidly... But because the growth is slower than feared and the world limps along letting millions of infants and children die each year of preventable diseases worldwide, some would have us imagine that the Ehrlichs of the world are just crying wolf.

Today, the population is feared to rise into 11 billion people by the year 2050, whereas many consider five billion to be too much for the environment (Mazur 2010, 104). Unfortunately there will always be respected professionals who will misguidedly or in pursuit of economical profit present so called “proof” that every environmental conundrum is fabricated.

Extinction is another powerful concept, as it is easily understandable to the public and decision makers, as well as a great interest to biologists as it has to do with biodiversity. The notion of extinction, of losing something irrevocably touches the feelings of many people. It is easy for people to understand, care about and relate to, especially compared with the more abstract concept of biodiversity preferred by specialists. (Hannah & Lovejoy 2011, 6) Such awareness can help people and politicians understand the dangers of the current system, leading to a “*political will to change*” which is required by the deep ecology, as stated earlier (Naess 1989, 89–90). *Artemis Fowl*

can reach people, but to what extent do readers realise that the current situation should or could be changed?

Without a change in consciousness, the ecological movement is experienced as a never-ending list of reminders: ‘shame, you mustn’t do that’ and ‘remember, you’re not allowed to...’. With a change in mentality we can say ‘think how wonderful it will be, if and when...’, ‘look there! what a pity that we haven’t enjoyed that before...’. If we can clean up a little internally as well as externally, we can hope that *the ecological movement will be more of a renewing and joy-creating movement*. (Naess 1989, 91)

Artemis Fowl alternates between negative and positive statements, but there is an unfortunate lean towards the negative still in the style of “filthy humans, they should not destroy and pollute”. The joy and pleasure experienced by the characters seems to be there to underline the sadness and anger at the expectation that everything beautiful will soon be lost. The fairies long for the old days and dread the future in a manner likely to leave the reader passive. Whereas Jennifer Ladino sees nostalgia as a “mechanism for social change, a model for ethical relationships, and a motivating force for social and environmental justice” (2012, 8), which it may well be on the short term, Murphy suggests that stressing the negative is not enough, and pining for the (possibly imagined) past is of no use. “For the cries of protest, for the historical evidence of environmental destruction and habitat degradation to win the hearts and minds of the next generation of citizens, they will need to be placed in the context of the potential for change, correction, and redress in the future”. (2009, 60) In *Artemis Fowl* the possibility for an environmentally happy ending does not exist outside a miraculous change in human personality.

Naess expects environmentalists to place greater emphasis on direct action “directed to crucially important groups” including politicians, institutions and multinational corporations. He adds several crucial groups that are needed to change society: “teachers, experts, scientists, specialists in mass communication”. (Naess 1989, 212). Eoin Colfer worked as a teacher before he begun publishing award winning novels and reaching a wide audience, thus becoming a possible force for change. Some are of the opinion that ecocriticism should focus more on local environment and issues, as understanding comes more easily from close acquaintance (see, for example, Murphy 2009). *Artemis Fowl* alternates between global, European, subterranean and Irish locations and

environmental themes, touching different levels albeit very briefly. For example, the novel does not elaborate what it is like being Irish or living there, and very little about Irish environment is mentioned except that the coastline is shaped by humans, there are remains of medieval circular forts and a secluded field. In addition water in the Dublin docks is badly polluted. While these remarks show environmental interest, they remain infrequent and scarcely rise above serving as backdrops.²

There is an ongoing “return to referentiality” wherein ecocriticism seeks to foreground books and stories that succeed in evoking thoughts in the reader – not only thoughts about the text’s own world, but the “world in which the text materially and ideationally exists at the moment of reading” (Murphy 2009, 4). Murphy stresses the importance of science fiction as it draws attention to the present reality and the world we live in with the use of analogy (2009, 89). The literature need not be the nonfictional nature writing that early American ecocriticism preferred, nor even realist fiction to be able to promote ethical understanding and awareness of reference in the reader (Murphy 2009, 4). Fictional writing and humorous presentation must not be ignored or undervalued. *Artemis Fowl* succeeds in terms of referentiality best through the themes of (super)modern technology and worry for the environment that were of special interest at the beginning of the 2000s. *Artemis Fowl* contains both a version of the “real world” of the time of writing and the partly imagined subterranean world, both realistic science fiction and escapist fantasy. Murphy disagrees with the use of fantastical elements (2009, 89):

Rather than providing the alibi of a fantasy – in the sense of an escape from real-world problems – extrapolation emphasizes that the present and the future are interconnected. What we do now will be reflected into the future, and, therefore, we have no alibi for avoiding addressing the results of our actions today.

Despite the fantasy elements, *Artemis Fowl* does tie the past, present and some of the future together in the narration, creating ample space for mimesis. There is a sense that if people do not change their ways, soon there will be nothing left of untouched nature.

² Local Irish environment receives greater focus in Colfer’s novel *Benny and Babe* (1999), and local and global viewpoints are well depicted in *Benny and Omar* (1998) as well.

Referentiality can be seen as opposing, correcting or complementing postmodern and poststructuralist theories (Murphy 2009, 4). It is practiced by nearly all readers, and all readers are important to the environmental movement, as Murphy (2009, 119–120) contemplates:

I want to call on my colleagues to read more widely in the realms of popular genre fiction to understand better the ways that their neighbors and students are being exposed to ideas about nature conservation and environmental justice that raise their consciousness while entertaining them with tales in their favorite genre of *pleasure* reading... [T]he novels... do not encourage their readers to escape anything, but rather educate them about the realities of various environmental crises and issues, while entertaining them with recognizable plots and characters. Further, they frequently rely on noncathartic or only partially cathartic conclusions, so that readers will not have the freedom to imagine that the environmental conflict or problem they raise has been solved by novel's end, but remains a problem in the world beyond the fictional work.

Some of *Artemis Fowl's* charm is that there are as much unexpected elements as there are simplistic characters. The reader is not permitted to experience mere escapist pleasure, nor does the novel solve all the problems for the reader. The imagined existence of fairies challenges the view of humans as sole ultimate masters in control of the natural world. But the novel does not directly lead to the understanding of value of *everything* natural, so it is up to the reader to come to such conclusions. Despite its good effort, *Artemis Fowl* is on a novice level compared to, for example, the *Mars Trilogy* when it comes to the consideration and evaluation of environmental philosophies.

In addition to referentiality, environmental literature can educate and inspire readers to support the environmental movement. It criticises and supports critical thinking. *Artemis Fowl* has the potential to do all this. Extensive reading also improves writing skills. Albeit written language in a novel is carefully chosen and arranged to convey a certain message, there is room for interpretation and several levels of meaning. Literature lends support to reader's imagination and the message proceeds at the reader's chosen speed, unlike in several other means of communication. There is infinite time to dwell on a certain passage, and some readers of *Artemis Fowl* likely stop to reflect on environmental themes. In the case of parents reading the novel to their children fruitful conversations become possible. More analysis can take place among friends and in Internet forums. Literature remains an art form accessible to many, an enduring medium that often withstands time better than movies, music or the spoken word. In a time filled with the infinite contents of Internet

with hypertexts and snippets of video, and an ever decreasing attention span of the public, literature is admittedly losing some of its ground. Yet it remains a fundamental field of culture simultaneously changing, maintaining and communicating ideas of the world. Literature is also a historically respected form of art capable of preserving valued concepts, sometimes becoming valuable in its physical form or precious through the association to some important occasion in life or history. The fairy Book is such an assemblage of historical heritage and an irremovable part of life for them.

Artemis Fowl plays with literary conventions, including remarkable intertextuality, merging of genres and metafictional and postmodernist tools. There is a multitude of similes derived from natural phenomena, such as “the mopeds parted like fish in a giant shoal” (AF 7) and “she felt like a nut inside a shell, between a gnome’s molars. Doomed” (AF 49), entertaining and steering the reader’s mind towards ecology. The narration is of special interest. The novel begins with first person narrator giving a brief description of Artemis and indicating that the story is recorded several years after the events. The story continues with what seems an authoritative omniscient third person narrator, but there are several aspects that render the narrator unreliable. There are strange fundamental changes in characters’ opinions, and Holly while isolated from others knows there is a troll coming next, although it ought to be highly unexpected. In the epilogue the novel is guised as a report written by J. Argon, a fairy doctor of psychology from “below the United States” (AF 156). He features within the story as well, a ridiculous character dreaming of earning money and fame with the story, described as “the so-called behavioural analyst” and being called a “charlatan” and “halfwit” by a colleague (AF 157 & 204). He claims that details of the story are “94 per cent accurate, 6 per cent unavoidable extrapolation” (AF Epilogue) and the report is based on “first-hand interviews with the victims”. The only one who could give a truthful account of Artemis’s thoughts and motives is the boy himself, and “he delights in not talking”. (AF Prologue) The other characters would likely be equally unwilling to discuss the sensitive events. If professor Argon were the narrator, very little could be trusted to be true. Both the positive and negative aspects of the fairy

world and the characters would become suspect. I maintain that the narrator is in fact omniscient, and the so called report is Colfer playing with literary conventions and giving a further level of interest to the novel. The concept of implied author is helpful here: the “multilayered communications” of narration invites the reader to engage with it “cognitively, psychically, emotionally, and ethically”, leaving the interpretation of the author’s values, morals and intentions to the reader (Phelan 2005, 5). The added layers of different narrator styles invite more reflection, which is undeniably positive.

Consequently, literature promotes understanding and understanding promotes feelings of togetherness (Murphy 2009, 115). Humans are capable of understanding that other life forms are striving for some form of self-realisation as well, which leads to “*a kind of responsibility for our conduct towards others*” (Naess 1989, 170). The conduct of fairies is not a hindrance for other species and continued evolution, but the humans in *Artemis Fowl* are seen as enemies of nature. If humans were to discover the fairy nation, it “would spell the end of everything, unless the Mud People had learned to coexist with other species. And if history had taught him any lessons it was that humans couldn’t get along with anyone, even themselves” (AF 125). Humans pollute everything they come into contact with, making animals sick and the air harmful.

A mature total view helps stating where people stand ethically. Even if there are doubts, they should be stated with humility – always keeping in mind that both action and inaction have political consequences. (Naess 1989, 73) Further challenge lies in the fact that within ecological thought, everything is interconnected and following from that, in principle everything has relevance for every decision made (Naess 1989, 72). Although it is impossible to take every aspect into account, the advocates of the deep green movement have a right and “obligation to assert and to announce” (Naess 1989, 80). It is no longer possible to lean solely on scientific “facts” when the future of environmental diversity is at stake. People need to present the environmental case as well as they

are able, and it has to be enough. In that much at least, Colfer is doing right. It is better to include some deep ecological themes than none at all.³

According to Patrick Murphy, men must overcome their fear of seeming vulnerable and weak if they express emotions (2009, 148). *Artemis Fowl* bears traces of such fear. While Artemis's father is missing, Butler makes tentative approaches of bonding during the novel. On the surface their relationship remains that of master and servant, but there are brief moments where friendship or familial bonds are formed. Artemis rarely allows himself feelings of any kind and Butler's profession requires great levels of stoicism. Yet Butler's support helps Artemis to mature and must be seen as beneficial for Butler's quality of life as well. Commander Root is afraid to show his soft side in public, his authority based on a continuous state of angry displeasure. Murphy continues (2009, 150):

I see a way of promoting this necessary male orientation toward human nurturing grounded in a larger view of ecological nurturing. In order to do that, we need to embrace the other sides of the dualisms of culture versus nature and the masculine versus the feminine, and in particular accept our own emotions as part of our minds, our minds as part of our bodies, our bodies... as part of a natural world. Fundamentally, to undertake such an embrace means to accept interaction rather than strive for control.

Holly represents the ecological nurturing and emotions balanced with her ambition to make it in the male dominated field of military defence. Whereas the fairy nation expresses a responsibility for the rest of the world, they hold on to a logic of domination, hierarchical relationships and control to a high degree, certainly above interaction. Culture is the primary focus in the novel, nature secondary. Masculinity is the key to success and femininity is most often the butt of jokes – but then again so is nearly everything else. Despite their maturing, Butler and Artemis fail to extend their emotions to the care for ecology.

Norms can be motivated through strong feelings but have a clear cognitive function, separated from spontaneous feelings and their expression (Naess 1989, 64). Norms ought to be expressed and considered in environmental conflicts. Sadly very little is articulated in the conflict between fairies

³ In later *Artemis Fowl* novels, Colfer introduces larger and deeper green themes. As he matures as an environmentalist writer, so does the reader mature along Artemis.

and humans, wherein most of the humans are not even aware of the fairies' existence. The novel at least expresses some environmentally sound norms both explicitly and implicitly, such as fairies not killing any living thing without a vital reason. Naess stresses the importance of articulating values and norms clearly and forcefully, so that the opposing side cannot ignore them (1989, 65). He also calls for "an elaboration of our norms and values which correspond to the shift of basic attitudes". For this to be done, those norms and values need to be systemised. (Naess 1989, 68) Obviously very few fantasy/children's novels offer clear systems of norms, but *Artemis Fowl* contains implied systemised and highly elaborate norms and values in the fairy Book, which contains an answer to every major question about life. It contains the fairy moral, religious and effectively secular laws in a hundred commandments. Unfortunately these are not revealed in great depth to the reader. The first rule of the Book is that it must not be revealed to humans, which implies that it does not concern them or, implicitly, the reader. However, this has the potential of rousing the curiosity of the reader, leading to further reflection.

To the sceptical reader, the fairies' grumbles about human ecological errors are dismissible as emotional outbursts. Even those, when combined with other sources of environmental communication, can in time lead to changes of attitude. *Artemis Fowl* has shortcomings in changing attitudes systemically, especially since the moral laws of Artemis, the main character, concern the prosperity of his family and the family motto is rather environmentally depressing: *Aurum potestas est* – "Gold is Power". The fairies are more mature when it comes to total view and acting upon it. They have environmental wisdom and recorded philosophy from approximately a millennium and they have developed their own ecosophies as well. The fairies do not believe humans would listen to them at all, and are convinced the human race is violent and destructive. It is possible that they are waiting for humans to mature on their own. But someone has to act, states Naess. He frequently stresses the importance of actions besides the philosophical grounds of ecosophy (1989, 29). Artemis unfortunately only acts in negatives ways and the fairies will act only if forced to do so. They hold life sacred, including human life despite their perceived degradation. Holly has emotions

and values that guide her. Even as the novel has notable merit in forcefully expressing environmental values much remains hidden, merely implied or downright negative.

In his *Ecosophy T*, Arne Naess adheres to the norms of Gandhian non-violence. People should publicly and legally discuss the problems with their enemies as often as possible. “Nonviolent direct actions must be *a part* of the fight for sound ecopolitics”. (Naess 1989, 146–8) This is where the fairies fail as they do not want to negotiate with humans. When forced into an encounter, their first official response is a strike team, only if that fails will they start negotiations. The last resort is to kill every living being within a confined area. Commander Root explains the procedure: “Either you give us back Captain Short or we will be forced to kill you all. There is no middle ground. We don’t negotiate. Not really”. (AF 155) Artemis is the first one to be able to escape the certain death from a fairy weapon of mass destruction, thus winning the “game” and the fairies are forced to let him walk out based on their own moral code. Artemis negotiates with the fairies only to show he has the upper hand. He tells himself to be evil and sinister, so it is implied that what he is doing is wrong. Sadly however, he clearly emerges the winner in the negotiations and therefore might be considered “cool” and something to look up to.

Naess states that “[s]ecrecy reduces the chance of a nonviolent realisation of your goals” (1989, 149). The fairies have little faith in the possibility of non-violent contact with mankind. They choose to remain hidden until they will be forced to use violence. They do not believe they should actively oppose the humans or kill them, a decision made democratically hundreds of years earlier, and now fear for their own lives should a war start between the two races. Even so, *Artemis Fowl* lauds violence regularly: “Mulch was tempted to hang around. There weren’t many things more fun to watch than a heavily armed Recon officer going to town on a bunch of unsuspecting humans” (AF 195). The military police force and especially the LEPrecon is respected and has a certain power and responsibility in the fairy society. The officers are highly trained and depicted as heroic, eager to use violence although if it is nearly without exception non-lethal. The fairies possess a weapon of mass destruction however, a blue-bomb that kills every living being in a confined area,

leaving the landscape as it was. It is used as the fairies' last resort in Fowl Manor, but the humans manage to escape it so it "only" kills the rats and insects in the house. Almost all the characters speak lightly about killing or getting killed. On a deeper level the fairies are capable of identifying with other life forms, leading them to defend themselves primarily with non-violent security technology.

When a social conflict occurs, people easily resort to stereotyping their opponents. Whereas it may strengthen the motivation to struggle, "it makes communication distorted and is not in line with the principles of nonviolent conflict resolution". Instead, fair play and an open mind are of help. (Naess 1989, 71) The fairies do not keep an open mind, and treat the whole humankind as a collective blight on the planet. The superhuman intelligence of Artemis and the warrior-code of Butler opens their eyes to the possibility that some people are worth their notice. Artemis does not play fair but instead he studies the fairy rules of conduct to turn them against his opponents. Most characters are prone to stereotyping each other in the novel. Stereotypes are often a part of an entertaining story, but they are injurious in the broader perspective.

Rob Nixon discusses the "slow violence" that is practiced by the economical elites against those who are too poor to protest. It is done gradually and out of sight, for example when the toxic waste and large industry is moved from Europe to Africa. He writes: "We need, I believe, to engage a different kind of violence, a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive" that is practiced out of sight. (Nixon 2011, 2) In *Artemis Fowl*, the humans who suffer from environmental degradation are not mentioned, and very little attention is paid outside Europe. In their place the fairies have to face the consequences of being out of sight, suffering a form of slow violence because they are separated from their natural environments.

Naess points out that "[a]ll human beings have long-term interests in common" (Naess 1989, 149). At the end of the novel, some of the humans and fairies find common ground and co-operate in a small-scale way, paving way for a deeper understanding of each other. This is preferable to the violence practiced throughout the adventure. Naess also states that provoking and humiliating

opponents is a sure way to invite violence along with treating others as “stupid” or “bad” (1989, 149–150) *Artemis Fowl* is full of “humorous” insults that are meant to aggravate the opponent. Artemis is an expert of manipulating others to make fools of themselves, but the fairies are guilty of provocation and prejudiced condemnation as well. When Holly Short is kidnapped she becomes incredibly hostile and prone to violence, which is in part understandable after the torments Artemis puts her through. Artemis and Butler are perfectly willing to resort to violence and criminal activities, even if they do not end up killing anyone in the novel. There is one semi-positive statement against violence to be found: “Even though it was most definitely not in his nature, Mulch had no option but to attack” (AF 166). He only attacks for self-defence, which is justification for the character but not for the author.

Many of the Gandhian non-violence hypotheses apply for *Artemis Fowl*, for example “[t]here is a strong disposition in every opponent such that wholehearted, intelligent, strong, and persistent appeal in favour of a good cause is able ultimately to convince him” (Naess 1989, 149). Holly and Butler ultimately convince Artemis that he has acted morally wrong. Artemis in turn convinces Holly to help him get back his mother. Some of the deep ecologists, including Naess, “favour unilateral disarmament and establishment of unheroic nonviolent defence” (1989, 160). *Artemis Fowl* could not be further away from this with its adoration of the newest technology and the biggest gun.

At present the dominant policies of the West promote resource waste. To criticise and undermine these policies, the struggle–growth ideology must be rejected by a majority of people. (Naess 1989, 140) Colfer does not clearly reject these policies: it is at best implied in the novel with the unending energy sources and near-perfect recycling. Naess admits and encourages that one activist can only concentrate on a few environmental themes at once. Environmental activists should not criticise the efforts of each other. (Naess 1989, 91) Colfer presents a few main problems which are stamped in the memory of the reader. This increases awareness and introduces a different

mentality and ideology. Many people have read and will read *Artemis Fowl*, but the range of its success depends on how many think critically upon the themes.

In the history of mankind the human race has overcome many instincts. Some have resulted in more harmony, some have led to environmental disasters. A widely accepted idea among ecophilosophers is that the human species are among pioneer species (Naess 1989, 182–3):

Mankind during the last nine thousand years has conducted itself like a *pioneer invading species*. These species are individualistic, aggressive, and hustling. They attempt to exterminate or suppress other species. They discover new ways to live under unfavourable external conditions – admirable! – but they are ultimately self-destructive. They are replaced by other species which are better suited to restabilise and mature the ecosystem. If mankind is to avoid being replaced then the struggle against nature must cease.

The characters of *Artemis Fowl* are individualistic, aggressive and hustling to be sure. Artemis does not care what happens to other species, unless there is a profit for him. The fairies live in unfavourable conditions, but they are far less invading than the humans who have replaced them above ground. Colfer does not offer ways of being a less self-destructive pioneer invading species.

Naess sees the future of deep ecology leading to revolutionary and radical changes through reformatory steps (1989, 156). As noted earlier, the fairy society is, on the one hand, a slight reform and, at the other hand, a substantial reorientation. However, the novel fails to speak of the reorientation of our existing society. It rather discusses fantastical and utopian technological reform and individuals of significantly higher moral and longer age which allows them to follow the examples of their forebears from a millennium ago.

Artemis Fowl suggests that better technology leads to cleaner nature, implies that respect for living things results in a happier life, and finally insinuates that replacing mankind with a more advanced species would likely result in healthier environments. This is a mix of misanthropic and utopian science fiction, which many cannot take seriously. Yet even a radical insinuation can have an effect on the reader, temporarily or otherwise. On the whole there are no great insights into the actual causes of the environmental degradation in *Artemis Fowl* besides the violence and stupidity of mankind. Planning and actions are left for the reader. I shall conclude with the encouraging remarks from Patrick Murphy (2009, 171–2):

Writers who address the problem of global warming and other potential anthropogenic natural disasters need to be supported and taught, not dismissed or ignored. And that is true whether or not they get the science quite right or even if their scenario turns out to be too extreme, because they are voicing concerns that promote social engagement, reader research, and critical consciousness. Critically conscious readers have the ability to evaluate what they read, consider its degree of accuracy and plausibility, and do follow-up reading, if they so choose.

In the following chapter I will show how some of the simplistic solutions in *Artemis Fowl* are not enough to solve the environmental crisis, and what would have needed more in-depth treatment to produce even better results.

5. Shallow ecology: problems and benefits

Shallow ecology is best understood in contrast with deep ecology. Whereas deep ecology takes a long-term and wide-ranging, all-encompassing view, shallow ecology concerns itself with solving short-term fractions of ecological problems. (Naess 1989, 33 & 162) Shallow approaches treat nature as an instrument with mere extrinsic value, as something for humans to use as resource (Garrard 2011, 24). The rhetoric of stewardship, that is the sense of mastery and entitlement over nature, and human self-interest are shallow (Garrard 2011, 51).

Shallow ecology is considerably less radical and has already been practiced for decades to alleviate environmental destruction and its effects (Garrard 2011, 23). Unlike deep ecology, shallow ecological approach may ignore many aspects and evidence and only address a small part of the problem at hand (Naess 1989, 150). John Benson suggests that instead of *deep* and *shallow*, it would be better to name them “deep green” and “light green” standpoints with shades in between the two extremes (2000, 16–17). His suggestion has good grounds and might be used in a different context. However, deep and shallow as terms are so widely used that this thesis prefers to stay in line with Naess’s usage of stark contrast between the two concepts.

As Naess criticises, the shallow point of view is short-sighted, does not take the long-range into account and ultimately seems to lead to destruction. It only caters the rich people in the developed countries, making things more comfortable for them for the time being. (Naess 1989, 28) Usually the relief to environment is only temporary and other factors of the original problems rise to

cause more damage (Naess 1989, 150–1 & 162). The fairies have arranged their own habitats sustainably, but they have failed to consider the long-term which includes the actions of humans. Shallow ecologists believe in the strength of laws, regulations and ministries (Naess 1989, 162), as do the fairies. Naess discusses how at present there is an ultimate and incompatible collision of interests between individuals, which the shallow ecological thinking does not endeavour to mitigate. To lessen the negative impacts of modern societies' way of life on natural environments and among people, deep ecology calls for “increased compatibility” between mature people and nature (Naess 1989, 85) whereas

Supporters of the shallow ecology movement... only tinker with the built systems, but do not question their own fundamental methods, values, and purposes. They do not look deeply into the nature of our relationships with each other and other beings. They assume that we can do fine without making basic changes... The planning and development models are based on an outmoded economic philosophy that fails to include the ecological context... The deep, long-range approach is to create institutional practices that are evolving, self-organizing, and creative. (Drengson, introduction in Naess 2008, 26–7)

As noted earlier, both the human and fairy world operate under the “demands” of economy. Whereas the novel perceives natural change, history and process, the national systems seem static and unable to evolve.

Many people are concerned with environmental issues, for example global warming and pollution, but still wish to maintain or improve their standard of living and social stability, definitely worried but leaving the improving of things to governments and organisations. The preferred method is technological improvement, and many people in high places believe technology is the only thing that is needed to solve the environmental crisis. (Garrard 2012, 21; Naess 1989, 96)

The main accomplishment in sustainability within the fairy nation is also a technological improvement, that of nearly clean and eternal energy sources. Arguably it has not improved the fairy economy or politics, which continue to bear many similarities to industrial nations.

Naess points out that “[t]he limitation of the shallow movement is not due to a weak or unethical philosophy, but due to a lack of explicit concern with ultimate aims, goals, and norms”. It is merely a symptom of the fact that the supporters have not developed a mature enough world view

to consider the long-term consequences of their actions (Naess 1989, 33) or all the life forms and dynamic relations that are involved in any given situation. Naess does not mean to scold supporters of shallow ecology as such (1989, 12):

The word ‘shallow’ as used to name approaches and solutions which do not take such a wide perspective has an unfortunate defamatory ring. Words like ‘narrow’ and ‘limited’ may be no better. Yet some argue that all we can work for in the practical world is for solutions that would be classified under these categories.

Western traditions, such as liberal democracy, human rights and Christianity take precedence over environmental crisis, and shallow ecologists are often accused of making compromises with the ruling socio-economic order (Garrard 2012, 22). Thus described, most of the population of the developed countries can be described as supporters of the shallow ecological movement. However, the shallow view and actions do not sufficiently take into account future generations or the good of the ecosphere.

Pollution and resource problems make up a real part of the concerns of the ecological movement, but the way these problems are taken up in the industrial countries has not been satisfactory for several reasons, neither in short- nor in long-term perspectives. Firstly a priority has been given to them without attacking deeper links of the causal chains: the systems of production and consumption, the technologies, the lack of global and local solidarity, the lifestyle anomalies. One can perhaps go as far as to say that pollution and resource discussions have pushed away all the deeper aspects. The shallow movement has dominated the deep. (Naess 1989, 150–1)

It is a symptom in *Artemis Fowl* as well that pollution seems to be the greatest problem, unstoppable among humans. The techno-economic system is not taken into account, nor does the novel consider enough many different places or lifestyles. As mentioned above, generally the fairies’ conduct confirms mostly with the shallow view, and Artemis fails even at that. As a result the environmental degradation continues in the novel unabated, because the focus is too narrow to consider realistic solutions to the environmental crisis. The responsibility is left to the readers and the world is hoped to develop in the right direction. Naess laments that it is often said that economic growth need not be opposed, that “technical development will reduce pollution to tolerable levels and prevent serious resource depletion” (1989, 96). It has done so in the fairy society, but there is no such hope for “stupid” humans. Sarcastic remarks of being able to live completely without trees

after the forests have died (Naess 1989, 96) have become frighteningly close to mark for the fairies. They have actually learned to live in an environment with almost no plants, but it is not to their liking.

Ecologists and ecologically knowledgeable people often cannot talk in public about the deeper sentiments they may have. This includes many experts and advisors within large companies. Employers choose the environmental questions, preferring shallow subjects. Certain opinions remain dangerous to the careers of professionals should they be published under their own names. (Naess 1989, 151) Perhaps this is why fantasy and ecology often go hand in hand within literature, as any serious themes can be taken as far as the author pleases but can at the same time be defended as not so serious, being “mere” fictional writing.

The positive side of shallow ecology is that it can more easily be achieved already. There are numerous people who are aware of environmental problems and support shallow improvements, and there is undeniable power in numbers. Much advancement has been achieved through political and consumer pressure, such as the expansion of organic agriculture (Garrard 2012, 21–2) and improved clean technology. Shallow ecology has been practiced for a long time and its actualisation is considerably more realistic. It is arguably the only thing that can be achieved in current economical and political atmosphere, even as there is a world-wide slow increase in green political thinking and action. (Naess 2008, 99) It is still not enough to reach sustainability. Naess points that while the deep ecology movement has greatly strengthened, others have strengthened more (2008, 95).

Only a few environmentalists have endeavoured to defend shallow ecophilosophy. Martin Lewis is one who defends science, technology and a change in government policy in his “Promethean” environmentalism in *Green Delusions* published in 1992. He claims that instead of radical social changes, ecology and economy ought to be better adapted in order to protect nature. He notes that cities are centres of cultural vitality and less harmful to environment than suburban sprawls. (Quoted in Garrard 2012, 22) Naess agrees that for now and as long as there is

overpopulation, cities are better for protecting natural diversity, but the living conditions ought to be improved (1989, 155). Lewis has faith that capitalism together with educated consumers will solve most problems of pollution and resource scarcity (Quoted in Garrard 2012, 22). Garrard points out that such technocratic approach has been tried out for a considerable length of time already, and yet the environmental degradation is only getting worse (2012, 23). It is possible that shallow ecologist thinkers suffer from “scientification”, the deluded belief that other people’s opinions need not be asked since they would eventually reach the same conclusions based on hard science (Garrard 2012, 188–9). However, as noted earlier, science is neither completely objective nor the sole source of understanding and experiencing reality.

Garrard sees a balancing between shallow and more radical ecologies as the most likely candidate for success in the near future, and he mentions Greenpeace among successful actors for being radical on the outside but promoting everyday environmentalism such as recycling as well (2012, 23). In the 1980s Naess was too optimistic with many of his predictions of how environmental matters would proceed: “The coming decades will probably see certain dichotomies between human societies play themselves out (e.g. the North–South conflict), as well as between mankind and other living beings (the destruction of habitats of other species)” (1989, 168). Unfortunately however, the economy and population grow ever larger and lead to more environmental and social exploitation, the ideology of the standard of living has remained virtually unchanged and environmental hazards still vary in quality and proportion. At least the information flow is ever growing as well, and more people become aware of global affairs faster than ever before in human history. Naess had several predictions and hopes for the future:

It is to be hoped that an ever-increasing minority will view unsustainability as an undignified, stupid — if not plainly ridiculous — state of affairs. One also hopes that an increasing minority will express this attitude with increasing boldness — but without arrogance, since few activists can avoid making use of the facilities offered in the industrial societies. (Naess 2008, 290)

Colfer’s fairies are not afraid to condemn unsustainability as undignified, stupid and worthy of ridicule. *Artemis Fowl* is a bold statement and although the fairies are arrogant, the novel’s message

is one of concern and even desperation caused by the state in which the world is today. The readers are unlikely to disagree.

6. Conclusions

Artemis Fowl is a worthy addition to the long list of environmental fiction. Although it is not even meant to be a perfectly deep green novel, it is delightfully spirited. Whether Colfer included environmental crisis in his novel out of genuine worry for the planet or merely to make money out of entertaining apocalypticism, he has done the environmental movement a favour.

Artemis Fowl refuses a strictly human-centred view and substitutes it with an outsider's view in the form of fairies. Although they are not so radically different, the non-human viewpoint is constantly present and varied through sub-races and numerous different locations and situations. Most of the fairies are uncompromising with their view of ecosphere's intrinsic value. Albeit the main plot is a shallow concern for the humans getting more riches in the novel, there is also a deeper worry for the well-being of everyone, including the fairy race and the rest of nature. Further study could compare later novels in the *Artemis Fowl* -series to see whether there is any difference or improvement in environmental consciousness, ethics or depth of consideration.

The environmental criteria desired by Buell are also presented creditably well in *Artemis Fowl*. The novel moves between an ancient manor in Ireland to distant countries and underground, neither stressing nor ignoring the different levels of societies and localities. Natural processes and dynamic change of environments are referred to from time to time and the non-human point of view is present and valued. Most of the environmental changes are caused by human actions, especially pollution which is a shallow concern. All in all, the novel successfully covers a limited selection of long-range and large-scale topics along with the more traditional shallow subjects. It has a rightful place among environmental literature.

Besides the feeling of isolation, inclination to violence and techno-economic system of growth, *Artemis Fowl* presents a politically sound environmental philosophy. It condemns the large-scale destruction of habitats and species caused by humans. The fairy respect for life and ecosphere

are in line with deep ecology and the fairy ecophilosophy promotes an ethical foundation for “right relations with the earth”, as Cheryll Glotfelty among others hoped already in 1996. Only the “root causes of environmental degradation” are missing. (Glotfelty 1996, xxi) It is my hypothesis that if the humans were not on the way, the fairies would make the surface world a deep green paradise. As the story stands now there is no possibility of change in the human society, and so the novel goes only half-way in that respect.

Even as *Artemis Fowl* takes note of many environmental processes and problems, it does not reflect deeply enough on possible solutions. That is left for the readers. It is of little matter, as consciousness-raising remains one of the major objectives of environmental writing and people have the potential to explore further and take action on behalf of the environment. The moral environmental dilemmas and criticism are carried through the novel, not letting the reader out of the story with perfectly cathartic content. The wide historical and environmental aspect combined with mythical interconnectedness of fairy and natural magic will be carried in the readers’ (sub)consciousness. I am confident that many people have received an eye-opening reading experience that has led them deeper into the areas of sustainability and environmental ethics. Combined with other works and resources, *Artemis Fowl* may inspire a sufficient amount of people to help form a healthier and happier world for all living beings.

In conclusion, *Artemis Fowl* as a raiser of eco-consciousness is better than many novels that only depict the social world, granted that it falls short compared with the large existing group of more serious environmental fiction. The novel is situated somewhere between shallow and deep, between serious groundbreaking ethical reflection and light-hearted entertainment, as the following quotation encapsulates: “We can debate ethics at a later date. Right now I suggest we make ourselves scarce” (AF 195).

Works Cited

- Allister, Mark. 2001. *Refiguring the Map of Sorrow: Nature Writing and Autobiography*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.
- Andrews, Cecile. 1997. *The Circle of Simplicity: Return to the Good Life*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Azzarello, Robert. 2012. *Queer Environmentality: Ecology, Evolution, and Sexuality in American Literature*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Becher, Dominik. 2013. "The Disappearance of Evil?: The Anti-Villain as Identification Figure for Young Readers." In *Fictions and Metafictions of Evil*. Eds. G. Branny and G. Holland. Frankfurt am Main and Berlin: Peter Lang AG.
- Benson, John. 2000. *Environmental Ethics: An introduction with readings*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bidinotto, Robert. 2003. "Environmentalism or Individualism?" <<http://econot.com/page4.html>> [Accessed 20 February 2015]
- Bradshaw, Corey and Brook, Barry. 2014. "Human population reduction is not a quick fix for environmental problems." *PNAS* 111, 46.
- Brennan, Andrew and Lo, Yeuk-Sze. 2011. [2002] "Environmental Ethics." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2011 Edition)*. Ed. E. Zalta. <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2011/entries/ethics-environmental>> [Accessed 20 March 2015]
- Buell, Lawrence. 1995. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Belknap Press.
- Buell, Lawrence. 2001. *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture, and Environment in the U. S. and Beyond*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Colfer, Eoin. 2011 [2001]. *Artemis Fowl*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Colfer, Eoin. 2014. *Artemis Fowl*. <<http://www.eoincolfer.com/artemis-fowl>> [Accessed 20 March 2015]
- Commoner, Barry. 1971. *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Dickerson, Matthew and Evans, Jonathan. 2006. *Ents, Elves, and Eriador: The Environmental Vision of J.R.R. Tolkien*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Dobrin, Sidney and Kidd, Kenneth (eds.). 2004. *Wild things: children's culture and ecocriticism*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Dudley, Will and Engelhard, Kristina (eds.). 2010. *Immanuel Kant: Key Concepts*. Durham: Acumen.

- Eagleton, Terry. 2003. *After Theory*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Eckersley, Robyn. 2004. *The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty*. Cambridge, MA, USA: The MIT Press.
- Eldredge, Niles. 1995. *Dominion: Can Nature and Culture Co-exist?* New York: Henry Holt.
- Foreman, Dave. 2004. *Rewilding North America: A Vision for Conservation in the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Fromm, Harold. 2004. "Ecocriticism's Big Bang: A Review of *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology, and the Environment* by Glen A. Love." *LOGOS* 3, 3.
- Fromm, Harold. 2009. *The Nature of Being Human: From Environmentalism to Consciousness*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Garrard, Greg. 2012. *Ecocriticism*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Glotfelty, Cheryll and Fromm, Harold (eds.). 1996. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press.
- Hannah, Lee and Lovejoy, Thomas. 2011. *Saving a Million Species: Extinction Risk from Climate Change*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Hayles, N. 2006. "Unfinished Work: From Cyborg to Cognisphere." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23, 7-8: 159–166.
- Hayles, N. 2012. *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hayward, Tim. 1995. *Ecological Thought: An Introduction*. London: Polity.
- Hrynkow, Christopher. 2013. "Macy & Johnstone, "Active Hope: How to Face the Mess We're in Without Going Crazy"." *The Trumpeter* 29, 1: 73–75.
- Huenemann, Charlie. 2008. *Understanding Rationalism*. Durham: Acumen.
- Huggan, Graham. 2009. *Extreme Pursuits: Travel/Writing in an Age of Globalization*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ingram, A., Marshall, I., Philippon, D., Sweeting, A. (eds.). 2007. *Coming into Contact: Explorations in Ecocritical Theory and Practice*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press.
- Johnson, Loretta. 2009. "Greening the Library: The Fundamentals and Future of Ecocriticism." *Choice* December 2009: 7–13.
- Jung, Hwa and Petee Jung. 1989. "The Way of Ecopiety: Holistic Education for Ecological Ethics." *Holistic Education Review* 2, 3: 32–38.

- Keenan, Celia. 2004. "Who's Afraid of the Bad Little Fowl?" *Children's Literature in Education* 35, 3: 257–270.
- Kern, Robert. 2003. "Ecocriticism: What Is It Good For?" In *The ISLE Reader: Ecocriticism, 1993–2003*. Eds. M. Branch and S. Slovic. Athens and Georgia: The University of Georgia Press.
- Kerridge, Richard. 1998. "Small rooms and the ecosystem: environmentalism and DeLillo's *White Noise*." In *Writing the Environment*. Eds. R. Kerridge and N. Sammells. London: Zed Books.
- Korsgaard, Christine. 2005. "Two Distinctions in Goodness." In *Recent Work on Intrinsic Value*. Eds. T. Rønnow-Rasmussen and M. Zimmerman. Dordrecht, NL: Springer.
- Kroeber, Karl. 1994. *Ecological Literary Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ladino, Jennifer. 2012. *Reclaiming Nostalgia: Longing for Nature in American Literature*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Leakey, Richard and Lewin, Roger. 1995. *The Sixth Extinction: Patterns of Life and the Future of Humankind*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Lewis, Martin. 1992. *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*. London: Duke University Press.
- Love, Glen. 2003. *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology, and the Environment*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Margulis, Lynn. 1998. *Symbiotic Planet: A New Look at Evolution*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mazur, Laurie. 2010. *A Pivotal Moment: Population, Justice, and the Environmental Challenge*. Washington, D.C. and Covelo: Island Press.
- McKee, Jeffrey Kevin. 2003. *Sparing Nature: The Conflict Between Human Population Growth and Earth's Biodiversity*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Mummery, Jane. 2008. "The Interpretation of *Da-sein* as a Transformative, Poetic and Ethical Being." In *Heidegger and the Aesthetics of Living*. Ed. V. Karalis. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Murphy, Patrick. 2009. *Ecocritical Explorations in Literary and Cultural Studies: Fences, Boundaries, and Fields*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Myers, Norman and Simon, Julian. 1994. *Scarcity and abundance: A Debate on the Environment*. London: Norton.
- Naess, Arne. 1973. "The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement. A summary." *Inquiry* 16, 1: 95–100.
- Naess, Arne. 1989. *Ecology, community and lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*. Trans. and ed. David Rothenberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Naess, Arne. 2008. *Ecology of Wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess*. Eds. A. Drengson and B. Devall. Berkeley: Counterpoint Press.

- Nadler, Steven. 2006. *Spinoza's Ethics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nixon, Rob. 2011. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Oppermann, Serpil. 2006. "Theorizing Ecocriticism: Toward a Postmodern Ecocritical Practice." *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 13, 2: 103–128.
- Phelan, James. 2005. *Living to Tell about it: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Plumwood, Val. 1993. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Potts, Donna. 2011. *Contemporary Irish Poetry and the Pastoral Tradition*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press.
- Rawles, Kate. 1996. "Ethical Implications of the Gaia Thesis." In *Gaia in Action: Science of the Living Earth*. Ed. P. Bunyard. Edinburgh: Floris.
- Schroll, Mark. 2010. "Reflections on Naess' Humor and Ecosophy from Two Meetings." *The Trumpeter* 26, 2: 45–47.
- Smith, Steven. 2003. *Spinoza's Book of Life: Freedom and Redemption in the Ethics*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Snyder, Gary. 1999. *The Gary Snyder Reader: Prose, Poetry, and Translations*. Washington: Counterpoint.
- Stableford, Brian. 2004. *Historical Dictionary of Science Fiction Literature*. Lanham: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc..
- "Standard of Living." Entry 1. *Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster. Web. 20 March 2015. <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/standard%20of%20living>>
- Toadvine, Ted. 2008. "Phenomenology and "Hyper-Reflection"." In *Merleau-Ponty: Key Concepts*. Eds. R. Diprose and J. Reynolds. Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing.
- Wells, Ira. 2013. *Fighting Words: Polemics and Social Change in Literary Naturalism*. Tuscaloosa: University Alabama Press.
- Werner, Erich. 2013. "The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture, Lawrence Buell (1995)." In *Encyclopedia of the Environment in American Literature*. Eds. G. Hamilton and B. Jones. North Carolina: McFarland.