2.1. Definition of Poetry

Poetry is a literature work that make people smile, According to (Waluyo, 1995: 1) the earliest work of literature ever known was in the form of poetry. Poetry is the expression of ideas and feelings through a rhythmical composition of imaginative and beautiful words selected for their sonorous effects, (Tomlinson, 1998: 38).

According to Tjahjono in (PERON, 2017), “Poetry is literary thought that able to bring a new atmosphere, which could invite the readers to enter the meditation area and self-reflection”. It means that poetry is created when emotions find the right words to express themselves to give the readers atmosphere is about understanding character feelings. As a reader who can have a relation with the characters feeling from the poet, and feel the pain or joy, then atmosphere can be created. For the most part, atmosphere is about choosing the correct emotions that go with a certain character and the situation they are in.

According to Robert Frost as cited in Kennedy & Gioia, (2007: 656), “Poetry is a rhythmical composition of words expressing attitude, design to surprise and delight and to arouse an emotional response”. Poem deals with emotion and presents the emotions of the poet as they are aroused by some scene, some experience and some attachment.
According to Eliot (“T. S. Eliot - Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion...,” n.d.), poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality. But, of course, only those who have personality and emotions know what it means to want to escape from these things.

To conclude, poetry is the express of author feeling and thought based on the author mood experiences and imaginative and use spontaneous expression. Poetry flows out of her heart in a natural and fluent manner. Deep emotion is the basic condition of poetry; powerful feelings and emotions are fundamental, without them great poem cannot be written.

2.2. Definition of Eco-centrism

Eco-centrism finds values in all of nature. Ecologist Aldo Leopold as cited in Washington et al. (2017: 39) provided a classic example of the notion as ‘The Land Ethic’:

The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals [...] A land ethic of course cannot prevent the alteration, management, and use of these ‘resources,’ but it does affirm their right to continued existence, and, at least in spots, their continued existence in a natural state.”

Based on Kortenkamp et al. as cited in Hovardas (2013: 3), Eco-centrism is defined as a philosophical stance that acknowledges nature’s intrinsic value, i.e., The value nature possesses independently of human values. Hovardas (2013: 3) also takes a statement from Almeida and Vasconcelos, Eco-centrism is frequently contrasted to anthropocentrism, where human conduct is justified only in relation to human motives and desires. The eco-centric perspective is related to a need to preserve
natural systems in their equilibrium condition, which might impose limits on particular human activities.

The eco-centrism – where moral consideration is given to the whole ecosystem, and also to its various sub-ecosystems and to the human and non-human beings taken separately. From these three perspectives, the writer considers that the eco-centrism is the most consistent ethical theory due to its awareness of the environmental problems, is the most adequate because it addresses directly the moral problems and it is the most practicable because of the limits imposed to the human behavior which will help the environment to thrive, and the human beings to live in harmony (Callicott, 1986: 392).

Callicott criticized severally the traditional humanism which has developed the mentality of an exploiter, superior to the other non-human beings, and also to the non-living entities which belong to the environment, with a destructive and consumerist behavior. Pollution and some of the strongest technologies, the consumption of the resources, are just some of the problems that the human focused ethics has generated in nature. Even if there are some supporters of this current that have a pro-nature orientation and that might correct their behavior and attitude towards nature and living beings, Callicott brings accuses to this theory.

According to Regan, et.al (1992), Callicot criticizes the old ethics which find equally moral all the human beings and he also criticizes T. Regan for pinpointing the humanistic perspective of the environment which has as a result “not an environmental ethics, but an ethics upon how to use the environment, a management ethics” (Callicott, 1986:393). A severe critic is brought to extensionism and its two phases: the first – which brings moral consideration for the A severe critic is brought to extensionism and its two phases: the first – which brings moral consideration to
the animals with sensibility or that might be subject to life; the second – the ethic based on life which extends the moral value over all the living beings.

Callicott criticizes Singer and Regan first of all because they have extended morality only over the animals that can have sensibility or that might be subject to life. Thus, the invertebrate animals, the plants and the rest of the ecosystem do not have moral consideration, even though they contribute to the sustainability and survival of the human and non-human beings. On the other side, his critic refers to the fact that these philosophers allow the exploitation of animals than to protect them so as not to cause them useless pain or to assure their wellbeing through minimal rights.

He criticizes the fact that by means of this theory of rights, it does not make a distinction between the wild and the domestic animals. Than he brings into discussion the problem that both Singer and Regan have analyzed, if the predator animals should be extinct. The answer is no, because it will still not diminish the pain of nature. The plants and nature as a whole will still suffer. Callicott takes one of Singer’s arguments: “it would be enough for people to stop killing and being cruel to animals” (as cited by Callicott, 1986: 398).

As supporters of animals’ freedom/ rights, Singer and Regan used to criticize the fact that the moral agents have indirect duties towards the sensitive animals. There are some indirect duties towards plants or towards the animals that are not sensitive, which are also part of the biotic community. The rest of the biotic community will be handled in favor of the privileged class of sensitive animals. That is why Singer and Regan are criticized. They leave open the problem of the inherent value of individuals that are not sensitive or subject to life (Callicott, 1986:397- 401). Callicott extends even more than Taylor the biotic community to the whole natural
ecosystem, including even the non-living beings, like a global system owed to technology and to the modern community.

Sometimes, Callicott makes references to the whole universe, “to this cosmic evolutionary, ecologic painting of the planet which can stimulate some moral feelings such as affection, respect, love, sympathy, even patriotism with whom the human mammals are genetically endowed” (Callicott, 1986: 407). From the perspective of modern biology, the biotic community of Earth is represented by the tribe, and each of its species is a separate clan. Thus, environmental ethics would become more holistic, more preoccupied with the biotic community and less with the individual.

The community becomes the object of respect and of moral consideration. “The ethical ground” makes humans see the wellbeing of nature as a standard for the moral quality, for the good and evil caused by the human actions. He states that each time humans get involved in a project, be it personal or public, they must evaluate the impact on the environment, than they must choose the actions that will increase the diversity, integrity, beauty, stability, health, and wellbeing of the biotic community or of the whole ecosystem (Callicott, 1986: 408-409).

Based on those definitions quoted above it can be concluded that eco–centrism is perspective or ethic where all the living organisms and their natural environment has a value and need to be respect. Eco–centrism refuse to place any aspect above the others.

2.2.1. Definition of Deep Ecology

Deep ecology is an ecological philosophy that promotes an eco-centric lifestyle to remedy the problems of depleting resources and planetary degradation.
An integral part of this eco-sophy is the process of forming a metaphysical connection to the earth, referred to as self-realization; an unfolding of the self out into nature to attain a transcendental, non-egoist state. The deep ecology movement developed in the early 1970s in response to concerns about the lack of connectedness, reciprocity and simplicity in the shallow environmental worldview dominant in Western society. The founder of deep ecology, Arne Naess (1973), outlined its main principles of connectedness to nature, biospheric egalitarianism, wilderness preservation, population management, biodiversity, and reduction of resource use 1973.

In the same article Naess argued that shallow ecology was a narrow (anthropocentric) science that mainly addressed pollution or other environmental problems that threatened the affluent in society, Deep Ecology Journal of Philosophy in Schools 2(1) 40 whereas lifestyles that protected the earth were deep ecology (eco-centrism). Another more metaphysical process in deep ecology, described by Naess as ‘self-realization’, is the deeper questioning of the relationship between the Self (the ecological self) and nature (Fox 1990b). Sometimes this is referred to as an unfolding of the Self outwards into the environment (Fox 1990a), and it means moving towards an oneness or meaningful life by recognizing the intrinsic value of all biological systems (Mathews 1991). Naess did not see this as a moral position but rather saw the connectedness as deriving from a love and respect of all life and of all nature (Fox 1990b), including the inanimate part of ecosystems such as mountains and rivers.

For Naess, self-realization was moving from the narrow ego to ‘as expansive a sense of self as possible’ (Fox 1990:106). Naess was also influenced by Rachel Carson’s Silent spring (1962) to have a deep humility towards the
earth, and cites her as saying that humanity was a ‘drop of the stream of life’ (Naess & Rothenberg 1989:165). Naess was not the only scholar to devise an ecosophy; Felix Guattari was also a key figure in the study of ecosophy (Guattari 2000) and his approach of the three ecologies is described as an ecological philosophy that ‘engages with the material, social, and ideological “registers” of life’ (Greenhalgh-Spencer 2014:324) and is presented as a lens to ‘illuminate pedagogical practice’.

In the source analysis of Guattari’s pedagogical usefulness, it does fulfill a role in moving towards valuing the non-human world, but his emphasis on social problems differs from what we see as the more important aspects of deep ecology relating to the metaphysics of the Self. Naess grounded his philosophy in the work of Spinoza (Naess 2005b) and his concept of self-realization was influenced almost entirely by Gandhi (Naess 1988). Spinoza’s monism and Gandhi’s maturation of the self are key ingredients in the deep ecology platform that provide unique models for embracing ecological philosophy.

Deep ecology promotes the complex thinking required for environmental reform and it does this by promoting an ecological consciousness to counter dominant worldviews that threaten the planet (Devall & Sessions 2007). It is important to establish some pedagogical terrain for deep ecology within the philosophy of education landscape, and the principal foundation is Dewey’s dissertation on education and culture (Garrison, Neubert & Reich 2012). The roots of environmental education can be traced to the liberal-progressive philosophy of Dewey (Gough & Gough 2010). According to Garrison et al. (2012), Dewey saw humans as part of nature: Since his early acquaintance with Hegel, Dewey had realized that nature and culture are not opposite but relational to each other.
The Deep Ecology Journal of Philosophy in Schools 2(1) 41 was convinced that humans as cultural beings are a part of nature. They act within nature, with it, and partly also against it at the same time. (p. 1) this view accords with the monism of deep ecology (Naess & Sessions 1995). Dewey also held the view that the individual (or self) is co-evolving with the environment and he viewed the environment as the total of all that is experienced by the self. Dewey contributed insight into the unfolding of the self by stating that education was an ‘unfolding of latent powers towards a definite goal’ (Dewey 2012: 79). This is seen as a drawing out of the student and a developing of the mind, which is not dissimilar to Naess’ deeper questioning towards a gestalt state of existence (Naess 2005a).

From the several explanations above the writer conclude that deep ecology as a social movement that human recognize that nature has an inherent value. Deep ecology also inform people to change their relationship to nature rather than depend on the relationship where human values nature simply by its usefulness to human beings.

2.3. Consideration on Eco-centrism

In ethical terms, in the literature on environmental ethics the distinction between instrumental value and intrinsic value (in the sense of “non-instrumental value”) has been of considerable importance. The former is the value of things as means to further some other ends, whereas the latter is the value of things as ends in themselves regardless of whether they are also useful as means to other ends. For instance, certain flowers have instrumental value for bees who feed on them, since
feeding on the flowers is a means to survival for the bees. However, it is not widely agreed that flowers have value as ends in themselves.

We can likewise think of a person who teaches others as having instrumental value for those who want to acquire knowledge. Yet, in addition to any such value, it is normally said that a person, as a person, has intrinsic value, i.e., value in his or her own right independently of his or her prospects for serving the ends of others. For another example, a certain wild plant may have instrumental value because it provides the ingredients for some medicine or as an aesthetic object for human observers.

But if the plant also has some value in itself independently of its prospects for furthering some other ends such as human health, or the pleasure from aesthetic experience, then the plant also has intrinsic value. Because the intrinsically valuable is that which is good as an end in itself, 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 (see O’Neil 1992 and Jamieson 2002 for detailed accounts of intrinsic value).

In evolutionary terms, there is no logical dividing line (temporally or taxonomically) that can define where or when intrinsic value began (Piccolo, 2017). Other species literally are our cousins and relatives (close and distant) – a biological kinship that many have recognized as conferring moral responsibilities towards all species. So does the recognition that we are a part of nature, not apart from nature; this erodes notions of human supremacy (Crist, 2012; Taylor, 2013).

In spiritual terms, eco-centrism has generally been at variance with the predominant religions in the world, which have tended to offer escape from mortality and relief from the suffering that human life naturally involves. History and science
also note that many people and some societies have developed eco-centric moral sentiments, and that these have been ecologically and socially adaptive. In short, the role that religion and spirituality plays in environmental behaviors has been complicated and mixed (Washington et al. 2017: ). There is evidence, however, that eco-centric values (often buttressed by, if not directly rooted in, scientific understandings of ecosystem complexity) are increasingly being fused into nature-based, eco-centric spiritualities, in many cases innovatively so (Taylor, 2010).

In ecological terms, Eco-centrism reminds us that the ecosphere and all life is interdependent and that both humans and non-humans are absolutely dependent on the ecosystem processes that nature provides (Washington, 2013). An anthropocentric conservation ethic alone is wholly inadequate for conserving biodiversity. Eco-centrism is rooted in an evolutionary understanding that reminds us that we are latecomers to what Leopold (1949) evocatively called “the odyssey of evolution” (in his musing ‘On a Monument to the Pigeon’).

Based on the data above the writer can define the consideration on eco-centrism has instrumental value if it is valuable for something else. Consideration on eco-centrism also has intrinsic value if its value is “for itself” and independent of its value for something else.