

token, Green philosophies should produce a more one we are contriving at present. But that is not the reason. That is merely the bonus. By the same token, it that Heaven was the reason for doing good. It, too, there are, of course, 'low-church' Christians who as never meant to be a literal place; but was, rather, a of life and a state of mind that could be achieved on fits Green philosophy very well.

Assion is necessary. I have said that a Green world, ures that are not necessarily of great benefit to us, is vironmental world, which is tailored for our own ws, then, that in creating a Green world we would be ce - because, by so doing, we would eschew the ng a world that would meet our material needs h sacrifice is it reasonable to make?

HOW MUCH SHOULD WE SACRIFICE?

re eminent in conservation circles (politically rather ve been known to say that they prefer animals to ke that get conservation a bad name; they confirm in ho prefer to do nothing the notion that conservation it conceals an extremist form of anti-humanitarian- no serious conservation biologist who is anti- eneral argument is that human beings *must* curb their nth, and eventually reduce their numbers (by benign s) in their own self-interest; and that other creatures uld be encouraged to do so, as this diminution takes

o sometimes seem to be direct conflicts between the those of humans. Livestock farmers do lose stock to cheetahs (which can make short work of a flock of take short work of a run of chickens). Arable farmers out to cockatoos, monkeys, and elephants. Such are small-scale and man-made. If the world took ightly seriously, then it would be possible for us to such problems; partly by paying compensation, and nces and ha-has to confine the animals. ts occur when farmers spread into land previously nimals: goats into the Sahel, once the domain of x; cattle into reserves throughout Africa and Asia. It gh-handed for Europeans to suggest that farmers

should not spread out when they need to. We, after all, have long since taken over most of our continent's fertile valleys, and pushed aside most of the deciduous forest. It also seems inhumane to tell Sahelian farmers they should not try to make a living from the desert - for there is nowhere else for them to go. If the oryx die - well; so did the boar in England, when we cut down our woods.

European objections are not simply self-righteous, however. The fact is that rich, temperate lands, well farmed, can support enormous populations, relatively cheaply. Desert is not good farming land, and could not become so unless huge amounts of money were poured into it. Farmers in the Sahel make a very poor living, with yields of grain (sorghum), or of milk and meat, which are sometimes only a few per cent of what can be achieved in Europe. It is a bad use of land, by any standards, and the people and their livestock suffer from its inappropriateness. They are not there by choice, however, or because they are foolish. They have been forced into this unpromising territory. The reason they are forced is not, in general, because the good agricultural land in their own countries is too scarce to accommodate them, but because it is owned by the rich, and is not available to subsistence farmers. People who farm unpromising land are, in general and in effect, exiles in their own countries. But it is politically easier (because it is cheaper, and does not incommode rich landowners) to push people into the wilderness than to make it possible for them to stay on richer lands. The 'conflict' between people and animals is, in such common cases, a sham. The real conflict is between poor people and rich people. The rich people make no concessions; so the poor are forced to do metaphorical battle with wild animals.

Again, if the world at large truly cared then we would do something about such conflicts. It would not cost very much (compared with the cost of most of the West's indulgences) to pay Sahelian farmers not to farm, but to look after oryx instead. Indeed it would cost a great deal less to do this than we spend on compensating the farmers of Europe or the US for not growing wheat or potatoes.

Yet we must concede that a Green world cannot be as comfortable for human beings as an environmentalist world, for the latter, by definition, is designed expressly to serve human needs. So how much discomfort should we be prepared to put up with?

Just to stick to generalities, it does seem absurd to ask people coolly to give up their lives to save animals. They just would not do this, even if it were 'right' to do so. But on the other hand, we cannot all aspire to live like the Queen of Sheba, or the average inhabitant of Hollywood. As Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University has commented, the average well-planned and self-satisfied middle-class Los Angeles family of two parents