

Postgraduate/Distance Learning

Assignment coversheet & feedback form

**THIS SHEET MUST BE THE FIRST PAGE OF THE ASSIGNMENT YOU ARE
SUBMITTING -(DO NOT SEND AS A SEPARATE FILE)**

For completion by the student:		
Student Name: Elizabeth Sithabile Nyanhete		
Module code: HPCA7023 Module title: Ecology and Spirituality	Student ID number: 2503461	Educational support needs: Yes/No
Module tutor: Jack Hunter		
Assignment due date: 5 January 2026		
If your module has multiple submissions please indicate which piece of work this is.		
1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th		
I confirm that this is my original work and that I have adhered to the University policy on plagiarism. Signed (type your name in) Elizabeth Nyanhete.....		
Email submission: if you are submitting this form via email, please tick this box ☐ (as a substitute for your signature) to confirm that you agree to the above declaration.		

Assignment Mark**Final Mark**

WILL BE GIVEN ON TURNITIN

NB. All marks are provisional until confirmed by the Final Examination Board.

PLEASE NOTE: ALL COMMENTS WILL BE POSTED ON TURNITIN

For completion by Marker 1 :

Comments:

Marker's signature:

Date:

For completion by Marker 2/Moderator:

Comments:

Marker's Signature:

Date:

AGREED INTERNAL MARK (where necessary):

Comment on process of arriving at agreed mark:

External Examiner's comments (if relevant)

External Examiner's Signature:

Date:

Question: Critically analyze the concept of ecopsychology

Topic: A critical Analysis of Ecopsychology Through its Synthesis with Deep Ecology for Community Praxis.

Introduction

The ecological crisis presents not as only a single issue but as a cascade of interrelated symptoms, with each one revealing a more fundamental cause. The most visible of these are pollution and climate chaos which are manifestations of a deeper systemic malfunction. The Gaia hypothesis formulated by James Lovelock (2000) proposed that the earth functions as a self-regulating living organism with living beings that interact with each other in a complex system. From this perspective, human activity has become destructive to the earth systems, overwhelming Gaia's ability to self-regulate (Lovelock, 2000). This reframes the crisis from a set of external problems to evidence of a disconnection in the human-planet relationship. The scientific evidence of this disruption was framed by Dickinson and Murphy (2007). They explained that the ecosystem comprises of both living and non-living components whose interactions provide the conditions that sustain life like clean water and fresh breathing air. Pollution and land degradation compromise the ecosystem stability by interrupting the natural cycles that sustain life on the planet (Dickinson & Murphy, 2007). Therefore, the ecological crisis is not just an issue of the problem caused by humans but a symptom of collapsed relationship between humans and the natural world. The persistence of the crisis begs the question: what drives and sustains its existence? The answer to the question points to an existential and psychological alienation from the earth that has generated the dominant world view inclining humans to believe that the earth exists solely for human benefits. To provide a solution for the crisis, psychology and human values that have led to the disconnection with nature must be analysed to come up with long-term sustainable fixes.

This essay aims to critically analyse two responses to the ecological crisis: Ecopsychology and Deep Ecology. Firstly, the principles of ecopsychology will be outlined drawing on Theodore Roszak's concept of the ecological unconscious, to examine how healing the mind can reconnect people with the natural world once again. Subsequently, deep ecology will be evaluated through the concept of self-realization developed by Arne Naess. This essay argues that although the concepts stem from different roots, they ultimately complement each other. Ecopsychology provides a crucial understanding of the psychological dimension of the ecological crisis and creates the emotional capacity for people to engage with the ecological self. This approach answers to how Deep Ecology can be implemented through handling the psychological aspect first. The synthesis of the two ideas establishes the foundation for building sustainable ecological peace.

Literature Review

Roszak (1993) developed the concept of ecopsychology which was directly inspired by Sigmund Freud's (1922) model of the unconscious. He argued that the Freudian model was too shallow as it did not explore beyond the depths of the personal unconscious. He posited that there is a deeper layer, the ecological unconscious which signifies that humans are inherently bonded to the natural world which standard psychology has ignored. Thus ecopsychology explores the bond that humans have with the natural world. In an archival interview, *Thinking Allowed*, Theodore Roszak argued that there is an existential crisis that stems from the narrative that humans exist in alienation with the natural world. He suggested that indigenous cultures offer a greater understanding of sanity and madness, premised on a necessary balance between the psyche and nature and that humans must recapture the sense of unity with nature. The human psyche is an evolutionary phenomenon which is grafted into the planet that humans evolved from, a concept he termed the ecological unconscious. It is this that connects humans to the natural world and allows us to understand our own nature (Roszak, n.d., cited in *Thinking*

Allowed TV, 2010). From his perspective, humans need to heal their innermost being before they can access their ecological unconscious.

Building on Roszak's (1993) theoretical framework, Ralph Metzner's (1999) *Green Psychology* book provides the practical tools to heal our relationship with nature. Metzner extended Roszak's theory that modern psychology has purposely omitted the ecosystem in a conspiracy to deliberately disconnect humans from the natural world and ignore their oneness with nature. He asserted that there is a need to shift from the anthropocentric worldview to adopting the interconnectedness of mankind and nature. Metzner (1999) identified the greatest threat as the decline in the human spirit as a result of alienation from nature, contending that embracing ecofeminism and ecopsychology would significantly catalyse a paradigm shift. He proposed techniques such as sensory-awareness exercises and nature based rituals. Therefore reconnecting with the earth is a spiritual and psychological process called re-earthing and not just a shift in policy and laws (Metzner, 1999).

Laura Sewall and Thomas Fleischner (2019) offer a constructive critique of ecopsychology arguing that the field often accords humans with such specificity and honour that is not afforded to non-human organisms. They observed that the natural world is commonly reduced to trees and animals which has led to the neglect of other species who are commonly referred to as 'it'. To refer to a human being as 'it' would be to strip them of human dignity yet this is standard practice when referring to non-human organisms. This linguistic habit inhibits the potential closeness of human beings to the non-human natural world. The labels that we often use for nature can make us feel less concerned about it and we tend to see inferior us. The concept of natural history developed by Fleischner (2005) in early work provides a bridge for re-engaging a more informed human with the rich animated world. Natural history dates back to the time of hunters and gatherers who were so in touch with the non-human world such that they knew everything about the animals and plants. It demands for humans to practice it in order to ease

anxiety and alienation from the rest of the world. Practicing natural history allows human beings to explore the intricate details in nature. If the non-human world is stripped of its identity it becomes obsolete to us and we do not see its use and humans remain out of touch with their interdependence on other species (Sewall and Fleischner, 2019). Thus, Sewall and Fleischner (2019) position natural history as a complementary supporting philosophy to ecopsychology in grounding the ecological unconscious.

Environmental philosophers have linked the ecological crisis to anthropocentrism within Western traditions. This worldview stems from dualism of mind and matter where the mind is exclusive to humans and the rest of the natural world is mindless thus granting humans the presumed intrinsic moral value to exploit nature for human use. To challenge this narrative, philosophers have argued that nature needs to be assigned a mind of its own to grant it moral standing (Mathews, 2019). Freya Mathews (2006) unifies the work of ecopsychology and deep ecology by extending the philosophy of deep ecology to support the need for ecopsychology. In her book, *The Ecological Self*, she posits a panpsychist approach claiming that the universe is a single self-realising being and human beings are modes of this universal singular reality. She derives an ethics of conative resonance that evokes feelings that drive us to act, making it a key drive for motivation. This justifies ecopsychology by showing that if our overall wellbeing is ontologically linked to the earth, then the feelings of despair and alienation of the psyche diagnosed by Roszak (1993) and Macy (1995) are symptoms of a sick relationship with the earth that proves disengagement from the earth. Healing the symptoms is the first step in reconnecting us to where we truly belong. Likewise, the ecological unconscious described by Roszak (1993) is a clear indication of our subjectivity to the world. Mathews argued that the consciousness is not something that magically appears in the complex brain but it is an inherent aspect of the cosmos that offers solutions to hard problems. Mathews (2006) thus demonstrates a philosophical link showing that reconnection of the psyche advocated by Roszak (1993) is

not merely therapeutic but it is the metaphysical realignment with the fundamental nature of a sentient cosmos.

Conversely, Mathews (2006) deepens the concept of the ecological Self central to deep ecology by Arne Naess (1995). She clarifies that it is not just a matter of ethics but is ontological in nature. She shows that it is not only about ethical identity but ontological reality which subjects us to recognising ourselves as subjects to the universally subjective cosmos. In relation to the ecological unconscious, this demonstrates that it is not just a human-centred metaphor but signifies innate biophilic tendencies towards the natural world. Her philosophy shows that healing the psyche and transforming ethical identity are two facets of the same project, realigning our existence with the sentient nature of reality.

The work of Joanna Macy (1995) synthesizes ecopsychology and deep ecology by acting as the crucial bridge between the two. She introduced the idea of being one with nature such that we suffer with nature when it suffers, which is what ties us to our ecological Self. Macy posits that our ability to feel the world's pain is an indication that we are indeed one with nature. This supports Roszak's (1993) idea of the ecological unconscious. Since humans cannot exist alone, no one is exempted from the pain that comes from destroying the planet. She articulated the idea of radical interdependence, illustrating that humans live in a web of interconnectedness, like cells in a living organism all dependent on each other. When part of that body is violated by our actions, we all feel the pain including the pain that future generations may suffer. Macy reframed this grief and anxiety that is felt as warnings and a catalyst for transformation. The methodology of the 'Work that Reconnects', allows people to embrace their grief and sadness in order for them to see the world with new eyes and develop positive solutions in healing their relationship with the natural world. This process creates space for gratitude, owning the pain, adopting a renewed mindset and moving forward (Macy, 1995).

In spite of ecopsychology offering crucial insights in the ecological crisis, the critiques of Alysha Jones and David Segal (2018) highlight its limitations. Ecopsychology runs the risk of reproducing and reinforcing settler colonialism due to its frequent disengagement from settler colonialism and colonial history. They argued that ecopsychology focuses on personal reconnection with nature and overlooks the displacement of indigenous people from their lands that has facilitated access to land for non-indigenous ecopsychologists practitioners. Addressing this gap welcomes Ecopsychology practitioners to hold uncomfortable conversations and address unsettling questions to ensure their practice respects the land and maintains sovereignty of the Indigenous people. They proposed achieving transformative change through acknowledgement of the presence of settler colonialism and decolonization. The core difficulty of tackling this problem is that settler colonialism is a structural force grounded in societal narratives. To address this issue, it is necessary to de-centre the dominant narratives by allowing indigenous people to re-write their stories thereby re-writing history. Active listening is key in building trust as it is ethical duty of practitioners to perpetuate peace without causing harm (Jones & Segal, 2018).

While ecopsychology addresses the psychological symptoms that arise from our alienation from nature, deep ecology tackles the philosophical root causes that have led to the ecological crisis. Arne Naess (1995), the founder of deep ecology, challenged the anthropocentric worldview that lies at the heart of the crisis. He argued that humans are multifaceted beings with different levels of maturity in each aspect of their lives. An adolescent ecological Self significantly contributes to carelessness towards the land. He advocated for a shift from a human-centered worldview of dominance to a recognition of the intrinsic value of life and the interconnectedness of all forms of life. He developed the concept of Self-realization, which allows people to pursue their integral part in the 'Self' that encompasses all life. Harming that Self is essentially harming oneself (Naess, 1995). Therefore Naess believed that before healing

our relationship with nature, we must recognise our interconnectedness and the symbiotic relationship that exists between us and nature.

The dominant world view objectifies non-human life as the 'other', existing primarily for human narrow purposes. On the contrary, deep ecology understands the 'I' in relation to the 'other'. Bill Devall and George Sessions (1999) built their platform around Naess's (1995) concept of Self-realization. Their approach is fundamentally ontological rather than merely ethical. They argued that ontology is the core of all ecosophical concerns. The goal is not to instill a sense of duty towards nature but to inspire a deeper perception of reality and self, a perspective they referred to as ecological realism. This naturally inclines us to search for an opening towards harmony with nature and the pursuit for global disarmament and radical nature conservation (Devall & Sessions, 1999).

Social ecology theorist, Murray Bookchin (1991) engaged in a critique centred on biocentric philosophy and ecological humanist philosophy. Murray warned ecologists not to focus merely on the biological dimension of the crisis urging an analysis of the social dimension of the crisis and understand the interaction between the two. He challenged deep ecologists for loosely using the term 'us' and called for a clear definition of 'us' in reference to the claim that we as humans are destroying the earth and have become the most dangerous species on earth. He called for a clear definition of 'us' urging that it should correctly identify the social hierarchies embedded within our social structures such as patriarchy, racism and industrial capitalist economic systems that are the primary drivers of resource exploitation. For Bookchin (1991), the conflict is not humans versus the earth but our social structures versus the earth. He further expanded his argument on the asocial 'species centered' way of thinking that blames the victim. He noted that it would be unfair to blame everyone for the ecological crisis as it would exonerate the powerful institutions involved. Using the term 'we' masks the reality of social powers and institutions. While agreeing with deep ecologists on the urgency of saving the earth

he insisted that real change requires dismantling of these social structures, not merely philosophical change in consciousness (Bookchin, 1991).

While ecopsychology and deep ecology originate from two different disciplines, psychology and philosophy, they converge on a common insight that the ecological crisis stems from a fracture in human-nature relationships. Ecopsychology reveals the psychological symptoms of the crisis which include grief and alienation while deep ecology confronts the philosophical root cause in anthropocentrism. This section moves beyond a basic comparison to perform a critical synthesis by integrating those dimensions to propose a more comprehensive solution for the problem. By analysing their respective methods and critiques, this section will argue that both ideas are mutually reinforcing with a shared analytical weakness regarding social structures pointing towards a truly holistic response.

Critical Analysis

The most significant difference in the two fields is in how they diagnose the ecological crisis. Ecopsychology directs its diagnosis inward, towards the flawed human psyche which manifests as symptoms of a sick relationship which include anger, despair, and grief. Theodore Roszak (1993) theorised this alienation from the environment as a sickness of the ecological unconscious. Joanna Macy (1995) articulated it as environmental despair. On the other hand, deep ecology from the perspective of Arne Naess (1995) directs its analysis outward towards the structures of thought, targeting the systems of belief that have led humans to view themselves as superior beings with the power to manipulate and exploit the earth for personal gain. Thus, one field explores the subjective experience of human alienation while the other confronts the dominant narrative that enables the ecological crisis.

Due to their distinct nature of diagnosis, both frameworks naturally have different approaches to solving the ecological crisis. Ecopsychology's methods are fundamentally therapeutic aimed

at healing the psychological wounds of alienation. It employs practices such as re-earthing sensory awareness, and rituals, embracing ecofeminism and ecopsychology to facilitate a paradigm shift in worldviews. These methods significantly contribute to reconnecting with nature and accessing the ecological unconscious (Metzner, 1999). Similarly, natural history practice involves the exploration of the intricate details of nature, grounding the ecological unconscious (Sewall & Fleischner, 2019). Through the 'Work that Reconnects' methodology, people can reignite their ecological unconscious by transforming despair and grief into empowerment for change (Macy, 1995). The goal of ecopsychology is to prepare the psychological ground by healing the wounds and facilitating reconnection with the earth. On the other hand, deep ecology targets the underlying paradigm of human identity, the ecological Self (Naess, 1995). Its methodology seeks a paradigm shift in human perception based on how one views their place in the world and the broader perception of self. The goal is to equip individuals with capacity for purposeful action towards healing and growth (Devall & Sessions, 1999). Thus one field prepares the ground for inner healing and the other plants the seed for growth of the ecological Self.

A deeper synthesis of ecopsychology and deep ecology emerges from their shared diagnosis of alienation which is the existential wound of a fractured relationship with the more-than-human world. The primary terrain of ecopsychology is based on the psychological split between the self and the earth. Theodore Roszak (1993) theorized this split as the suppression of the ecological unconscious which forms the human psyche's inherent bond with the earth. The symptomatic grief, despair and anxiety articulated by Macy (1995) are the consequences of this alienation with the natural world. When the inherent bond with the earth is severed, it fosters a shift in the human perception of the relationship with the non-human world subjecting it to anthropocentrism. This, in turn, generates the psychological conditions facilitated by the deep ecology critique that opposes demoting nature to an 'it' that is subjected to human

exploitation. Thus this double alienation is self-reinforcing by creating a vicious cycle at the root of the ecological crisis. By jointly illuminating the interplay between the two ideas, ecopsychology and deep ecology provide a more in depth analysis of the ecological crisis than either could alone.

A critical analysis highlights that despite the profound strengths of both fields, they share a common limitation identified by the critiques in each field. Both ecopsychology and deep ecology have been critiqued for insufficiently integrating all the actors into their framework particularly the socio-political structures and justice. Jones and Segal (2018) argued that ecopsychology disengages its methodology from the realities of settler colonialism that shape alienation and access to the land for healing. Likewise, deep ecology according to Bookchin (1991) ignored and downplayed the social injustices and hierarchies embedded in social structures that facilitate exploitation of the earth for incentives, particularly capitalism and industrialism who are the key drivers of incentivised exploitation.

The critiques levied by Bookchin (1991), Jones and Segal (2018) should be seen as constructive critics towards the philosophy of ecopsychology and deep ecology. They represent the necessary contradiction to propel the theories towards a concrete synthesis of the theories. Both methodologies neglect the social and political influences, which can neutralize their transformative potential. The critics insisted that in order to achieve full potential, the journey of discovering the ecological Self must pass through the terrain of social responsibility, acknowledging historical harms such as settler colonialism. A true practitioner of deep ecology cannot diagnose the problem superficially by blaming all of humanity without holding the colonial and political powers responsible that negate harm. In ecopsychology one cannot pursue reconnection without acknowledging the displacement of indigenous people from their own land by colonial settlers. Thus, their critique does not nullify the need for psychological healing but mandates that the healing must be coupled with a commitment to pursue justice

following settler colonialism, addressing social and political injustices. Despite expertly addressing the psychological and philosophical dimensions of the crisis, the critiques are revealing demonstrating that the methodologies are incomplete without integration of the socio-political aspect into play for a holistic response. Ultimately, both critiques affirm that healing the human-nature relationships cannot succeed if it obscures the urgent need to heal unjust human-human relationships.

The preceding analysis demonstrates that the divergent paths of ecopsychology and deep ecology are not contradictory but sequential and interdependent. The therapeutic work of ecopsychology is aimed at healing the human psyche by healing alienation of the ecological unconscious thereby preparing the psychological ground. It clears the emotional blockages and prepares a healed individual connected to the earth. Deep ecology's work focuses on the philosophical work of planting a new seed of identity through the concept of the ecological Self and Self-realization. It aims to provide the tools and direction for the individual to grow holistically. One field addresses how to feel and the other addresses how to be. Thus both fields complement each other and reinforce each other in the transformative process. Each process depends on the other to begin the transformative work, in order for one to cultivate their ecological identity they need to do so with a healed reconnected ecological unconscious which is reconnected to the earth. In order for the healing to take place fully, one must have the ethical guidance of embracing their oneness with nature.

Recommendations

Inner healing must transcend private practice to become a community-based transformative action. This means weaving the methodologies of theorists like Joanna Macy's (1995) 'Work that Reconnects' and Sewall and Fleischner's (2019) natural history practice into the community fabric to protect the integrity of our relationship with the environment. Creating spaces for people to collectively share grief, despair and anxiety fosters community commitment to transformative action and healing. This process is not individually based but is a holistic approach for the benefit of communities. It operationalizes the concept of ecopsychology by making the healing of the ecological unconscious a shared community experience that directly fuels the will to reconnect and engage with the natural world. Applying the concept of the ecological Self requires the implementation of cultural interventions that reshape ethical identity at community level. Story telling can be a powerful tool to rewrite dominant narratives and provide Indigenous people the opportunity to reclaim the history of their native land. This practice aligns with healing the socio-political injustices brought about by settler colonialism, as highlighted by Jones and Segal (2018). These practices move ecopsychology and deep ecology beyond philosophical ideas to actual lived experiences that individuals and communities can experience.

Strategic integration of ideas is key to structural transformation. Emotional healing and resilience from community grief work and new narratives can become the driving force towards targeted political campaigns. A healed community that understands its position in the natural world can confidently move towards the notion of protecting the environment that they are inherently bound to by challenging dominant narratives and social powers that incentivize exploitation (Bookchin, 1991). This produces environmental activists who defend the environment, not out of a sense of duty but because of the love they have for the environment.

Political campaigns become an expression of a self-defence mechanism to protect the philosophical concept of the ecological self, developed by Arne Naess (1995).

Summary

This essay has argued that in order to achieve a comprehensive response to the ecological crisis, the manifestation of both the psychological symptoms and the philosophical causes must be addressed. Moving beyond theoretical diagnosis, it proposes a practical framework of integration demonstrating how ecopsychology and deep ecology can be operationalized through community initiatives to foster ecological stewardship and resilience. Through critical analysis, it has demonstrated that, although emanating from different disciplines, ecopsychology and deep ecology provide the necessary complementary methodologies to address the ecological crisis. However, neither the psychological methodologies nor the philosophical methodologies are sufficient in confronting the ecological crisis. Ecopsychology seeks to heal the alienated relationship with nature with deep ecology providing the ethical and ontological framework to transform worldview dominant narratives aimed towards realising the ecological Self. The constructive critics do not undermine their individual validity but implore the need to integrate socio-political structural injustices.

The argument was developed through a structured examination of the crisis and the proposed remedies. Drawing on Lovelock's (2000) Gaia hypothesis and scientific evidence (Dickinson & Murphy, 2007), the analysis began by framing the ecological crisis as a profound relational existential crisis and not merely as an environmental problem. It then provided details of the crisis through the ecopsychology methodology proposed by Roszak (1993) in his concept of the ecological unconscious. The development of the idea was traced through Macy's (1995) idea of re-earthing and the transformative 'Work that Reconnects' concept. The focus then

shifted towards Deep Ecology analysed through the principle of Self-realization by Arne Naess (1995), Bill Devall and George Sessions (1999) call to action. The critical comparisons revealed the two ideas as complementary of each other and not competing ideologies towards necessary transformation.

Conclusion

The convergent critiques from the socio-political analysis delineate the necessary evolution of an integrated response. They reveal that the complementary work of ecopsychology and deep ecology is crucial in achieving a response for the ecological crisis. However they achieve their full potential when combined with a third dimension, the socio-political dimension. Introducing this third dimension creates a three tiered model that involves the methodologies from the two ideas and the socio-political aspect. Ecopsychology works inward targeting the healing and reconnection of the ecological unconscious; deep ecology transforms worldview and dominant narratives through ethical re-identification; Structural transformation addresses the social and political structures that incentivise exploitation. Ecological peace building must therefore address both the human-nature relations and human-human relationships. The ultimate task is to reconnect with the earth through inner psychology transformation of the human psyche, transform world views and create ecologically sound individuals, weaving together methodologies with socio-political change.

References

1. Bookchin, M. and Foreman, D., 1991. *Defending the earth: a debate between Murray Bookchin and Dave Foreman*. Montreal: Black Rose Books Ltd.
2. Devall B. and Sessions G., 1999 Deep Ecology, In: Smith, M.J. ed. *Thinking Through the Environment: a Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 101-121.
3. Dickinson, G. and Murphy K., *Ecosystems*, Abingdon: Routledge.
4. Fleischner, T.L. 2005. Natural history and the deep roots of resource management. *Natural Resources Journal*, 45 (1), pp. 1-13.
5. Freud, S., 1922. The unconscious. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 56(3), pp. 166-169.
6. Jones, A.T. and Segal, D.S., 2018. Unsettling ecopsychology: Addressing settler colonialism in ecopsychology practice. *Ecopsychology*, 10(3), pp. 127-134.
7. Lovelock, J., 2000. *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Macy, J., 1995. Working through environmental despair. In: Roszak, T., Gomes, M.E and Kanner, A.D. eds *Ecopsychology: restoring the earth, healing the mind* [Online]. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books. Available at: <https://www.rainforestinfo.org.au/deep-eco/macy.pdf> (Accessed: 2 December 2026).
9. Mathews, F. (2019) Living Cosmos Panpsychism. In: *The Cambridge Handbook of Western Mysticism and Esotericism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 131-141.
10. Mathews, F., 2006. *The Ecological Self*, Abingdon: Routledge.
11. Metzner, R., 1999. *Green psychology: Transforming our relationship to the earth*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions

12. Naess, A., Self-realization: An ecological approach to being in the world', *In*: Sessions, G. ed. *Deep ecology for the twenty-first century*, Boston: Shambhala, pp. 225-239.
13. Sewall, L. and Fleischner, T.L., 2019 Why Ecopsychology Needs Natural History. *Ecopsychology*, 11 (2), pp. 78-80.
14. ThinkingAllowed, 2010. *Theodore Roszak: Towards an Eco-Psychology* (excerpt) – Thinking Allowed DVD w/ Jeffrey Mishlove [Online video]. Available at: <https://youtu.be/83VHiA2HhkM?si=92lgo6dX-0Mt-Dcs> (Accessed: 1 December 2025).