

The Ecorealist Manifesto Article

Posted on October 31, 2018

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/the-ecorealist-manifesto-the-ecorealist-manifesto-article-article/>

Introduction

Gregg Easterbrook's "The Ecorealist Manifesto" and Ayn Rand's *The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution* examine environmentalism from sharply different philosophical starting points. Both defend human agency, reason, and technological capacity, yet they disagree about the meaning of environmental limits and the legitimacy of collective intervention. Easterbrook argues for a pragmatic environmentalism that accepts ecological damage, recognizes successful regulation, and evaluates policy through evidence, trade-offs, and technological possibility. Rand treats radical environmentalism as part of a wider ideological attack on industrial civilization, individual liberty, and human flourishing. Their historical contexts help explain the difference. Rand wrote around the rise of the modern environmental movement and the first [Earth Day](#) in 1970, when pollution, population growth, nuclear power, and antiwar activism were politically prominent. Easterbrook wrote after major environmental laws had already produced visible improvements in some forms of pollution. Comparing the texts therefore requires attention not only to ideology but also to what each author assumes about nature, technology, markets, regulation, and the ability of societies to recover from environmental harm.

Ecorealism, Environmental Change, and Evidence

Ecorealism rejects both environmental denial and the belief that nature exists in one permanent state of balance that human beings must preserve unchanged. Ecosystems change through fire, storms, succession, migration, climate shifts, evolution, and extinction, while human societies also transform landscapes through agriculture, cities, energy systems, and industry. Easterbrook's argument is that environmental policy should distinguish harmful change from change itself and should learn from cases in which regulation and technology have improved conditions. Reductions in lead exposure, sulfur pollution, some toxic releases, and urban air contamination demonstrate that severe problems can respond to policy rather than confirming either fatalism or complacency. The same reasoning also places limits on optimistic generalization. Recovery from one pollutant does not establish that every ecosystem can be restored or that irreversible losses should be accepted because future technology may repair them. Dryzek (2013) characterizes environmental discourse as a struggle over how problems are defined, who bears responsibility, and what counts as a feasible solution. Ecorealism contributes to this debate by treating environmental performance as something that can be measured, compared, and revised (Easterbrook, 1998).

Rand's Defense of Industry and Human-Centered Progress

Rand's critique begins from a different concern: she believes some environmental arguments treat industrial production, technology, and human self-interest as morally suspect in themselves. Her defense of industry emphasizes that modern agriculture, sanitation, medicine, transport, energy, housing, and communication support billions of people whose lives cannot be sustained by a romantic return to preindustrial conditions (Rand, 1971). This argument draws attention to the human costs that can accompany environmental policies when they ignore affordability, reliability, employment, or development. It also explains why Rand interprets certain appeals to untouched nature as an implicit demand for sacrifice. The limitation of this framework is that private benefit and industrial growth do not automatically account for harms imposed on people who are not parties to a transaction. Pollution, greenhouse-gas emissions, habitat destruction, and toxic exposure can create costs that markets fail to assign to the producer or consumer responsible for them. Rand's emphasis on individual rights therefore raises an additional question: how should institutions protect individuals whose health, property, or future opportunities are damaged by another actor's economic activity?

Technology, Regulation, and Environmental Recovery

The two readings overlap most clearly in their confidence that human intelligence can alter environmental outcomes. Easterbrook treats technology and regulation as complementary tools, while Rand emphasizes innovation arising from freedom and productive enterprise. Environmental history contains examples that support both parts of this picture. Cleaner fuels, catalytic converters, wastewater treatment, energy efficiency, improved industrial processes, and renewable technologies required engineering, investment, and organizational capacity. Many of these changes also expanded only after governments created standards, liability rules, incentives, or monitoring systems that altered the costs of pollution. The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) framed this problem as sustainable development: meeting present needs while preserving the capacity of future generations to meet theirs. That formulation does not resolve every trade-off, but it highlights why environmental policy cannot be reduced to a choice between growth and protection. Some interventions impose short-term costs while preventing larger future losses; others may shift burdens to workers, consumers, or poorer regions. The analytical task is to identify the distribution of costs, the reversibility of damage, the availability of alternatives, and the uncertainty surrounding ecological thresholds.

Biodiversity, Climate, and Irreversible Risk

Easterbrook's emphasis on ecological change becomes most difficult when environmental losses are irreversible. Species extinction is a natural evolutionary process, yet human activity can accelerate it through habitat conversion, invasive species, pollution, overexploitation, and climate change. A pragmatic framework must therefore decide when uncertainty justifies precaution rather than waiting for complete proof. Climate change presents a similar challenge because industrial energy systems support development while greenhouse-gas accumulation creates long-term risks that are not confined to the people receiving the immediate benefits. Rand's insistence on reliable energy and human development remains relevant because abrupt elimination of existing systems without workable alternatives could impose severe hardship. Easterbrook's framework, by contrast, is more compatible with staged transition, adaptation, cleaner technology, and iterative policy adjustment. Nordhaus and Shellenberger (2007) later argued that environmental politics should move beyond catastrophe-centered rhetoric toward innovation and institutional transformation. Their approach illustrates how the debate has evolved: contemporary environmental questions often concern how to redesign industrial systems rather than whether industrial civilization should continue at all.

Environmental Justice and the Distribution of Costs

Neither reading gives sustained attention to environmental justice, yet distribution is essential to evaluating both market freedom and regulatory policy. A national average can improve while one community remains exposed to refinery emissions, contaminated water, hazardous waste, or flood risk. Similarly, a climate policy can reduce emissions while increasing energy costs for households that lack alternatives. Environmental justice asks who receives the benefits of development, who bears pollution, who participates in decisions, and whether affected communities possess meaningful legal and political power. This perspective complicates a purely aggregate cost-benefit analysis because some harms involve health, displacement, cultural loss, or rights that are difficult to convert into one monetary figure. It also complicates a simple defense of regulation, since poorly designed rules can reinforce inequality or move pollution to less powerful regions. The strongest comparative lesson from Easterbrook and Rand is therefore procedural as well as substantive. Claims about environmental necessity or economic freedom should be tested against evidence, but affected people must also have access to information, representation, and remedies when decisions expose them to risk.

Conclusion

"The Ecorealist Manifesto" and *The Anti-Industrial Revolution* share a rejection of fatalism and an emphasis on human reason, but they assign different roles to markets, regulation, and ecological limits. Easterbrook presents environmentalism as a reform project that can learn from successful

pollution control, changing science, and technological innovation. Rand focuses on the danger of treating human production and self-interest as inherently immoral and warns that environmental policy can become coercive when it ignores the material conditions required for life and development. The texts also reveal complementary blind spots. Optimism about environmental recovery can understate irreversible loss, while confidence in voluntary exchange can understate external costs imposed on people who lack bargaining power. Contemporary environmental policy therefore cannot be understood through a single opposition between industry and nature. It involves questions of evidence, rights, technological capability, distribution, uncertainty, and institutional design. Reading the two authors together is useful precisely because their disagreement forces environmental claims to confront both ecological consequences and human consequences rather than assuming that either domain automatically overrides the other.

Works Cited

Dryzek, J. S. (2013). *The politics of the Earth: Environmental discourses* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Easterbrook, G. (1998). The Ecorealist Manifesto. In J. S. Dryzek & D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *Debating the Earth: The environmental politics reader* (pp. 66–69). Oxford University Press.

Nordhaus, T., & Shellenberger, M. (2007). *Break through: From the death of environmentalism to the politics of possibility*. Houghton Mifflin.

Rand, A. (1971). *The New Left: The anti-industrial revolution*. New American Library.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.