

Anthropocentric Approach to the Environment: An Overview

Md. Faruque Hossain
PhD Fellow, Session: 2018-2019
Institute of Bangladesh Studies
University of Rajshahi

Abstract: This qualitative study reviews secondary literature on two anthropocentric approaches to the environment, namely traditional and modern, to bring out the similarities and dissimilarities between them, and establishes human beings' need for pursuing the modern anthropocentric approach to the environment. The approaches are similar in that both the approaches consider human beings with all their cognitive faculties and freedom of choice as the center of the universe and the basis of morality and intrinsic worth. Besides, both the approaches give secondary importance to the natural world. On the other hand, the approaches differ from one another in their treatment of and attitude to nature, their recognition of responsibility towards it and their attribution of value to it. The findings show that the modern anthropocentric approach to the environment is superior to the traditional approach so far as the sustainability of the environment and the survival of human beings are concerned. The study suggests that since all entities including human are the components of the ecosystem, the focus of moral consideration should be shifted from the humanistic domain to the biotic whole.

Keywords: Anthropocentrism; non-anthropocentrism; intrinsic value; instrumental value; human-chauvinism.

Introduction

The environment encompasses the interaction of all living species, climate, weather and natural resources that affect human survival and economic activity (Johnson, et al. 1997). Every living and nonliving element function from their respective position out of their purview and constitute an ecosystem which is defined as all the plants and animals that live in a particular area together with the complex relationship that exists between all of them and their environment (Sinclair, 1987). Thus, all the entities of the environment are essential and valuable to maintain its sound state of affairs. Human being is an integral part of nature. The relation between human being and nature is reciprocal, inevitable, and causative. In contrast, prior to the 1970s, in terms of the relevant relationship between humans and nature, man was viewed as the sole agent worthy of moral consideration, and natural objects were only valuable if they served human objectives. Most philosophers in the western tradition believe that only human beings deserve moral standing, while natural objects have none (Desjardins, 2001). Davis (1988, p. 591) says, "We need not adapt ourselves to the natural environment because we can remake it to suit our own needs by means of science and technology. A major function of the state is to assist individuals and corporations in exploiting the environment in order to increase wealth and

power". Philosophers like Davis insist that humans have no direct responsibilities to the nature. The interests of human beings are the basis of morality and they are above all other nonhuman natural objects (Murdy, 1975). According to them, humans can have no duties to rocks, rivers, or ecosystems, and almost none to birds or bears; humans have serious duties only to each other, with nature often instrumental in such duties; the environment is the wrong kind of primary target for an ethic; nature is a means, not an end in itself; nothing there counts morally; and nature has no intrinsic value (Baker & Richardson, 1999). They ascribe intrinsic value merely on human beings, because human beings are explicitly different from other organisms for having vast and diverse potentiality and rationality.

According to contemporary existentialistic perception, human beings are free and responsible agents who determine development through the acts of their own will. With this human effort to develop oneself, the world is getting better (Matin, 1968). The idea of this interdependent development between human beings and the world is called Meliorism. It implies that human beings have the innate desire to develop their socio-economic conditions with the maximum use of the Earth's energy. It also states that humans would transform the world so that they can receive the highest benefit from it. In this context, numerous measures for their well-being have been adopted. Humans started appreciating the economic contribution of industries. As a result, industrialization has expanded by leaps and bounds that brought about industrial revolution. In the twenty-first century, scientific advancements and discoveries have benefited humankind in a variety of ways. They take the natural world under control and establish authority over it.

Both the advancement of science and technology and the industrial revolution have caused environmental degradation and their all-pervasive activities also expedite the volume of its plight. According to white, much of contemporary science and technology developed in a context in which this anthropocentric view of nature held sway. This lies at the root of our current ecological crisis (Desjardins, 2001). Besides, the political and economic systems (both capitalistic and socialist) were indicted because they utilized nature as a means. Science, and technology were criminalized because too much materialists, and reductionists (Pagano, 2015). Furthermore, over population and their urbanized transformation living pattern put pressure on nature and destroys harmony between man and nature. Conversely, rich nations of the world are accustomed to leading extravagant and luxurious life which provokes the depletion of the ozone layer and the increment of global warming. Consequently, sea level rises and low-lying areas of the world get inundated. Nasr uses metaphor to attack the attitude of anthropocentrism. According to him (1968), nature is treated like a prostitute by modern man. He enjoys her without showing any obligation or responsibility towards her. The difficulty is that the condition of prostituted nature is becoming such as to make any further enjoyment of it impossible (p. 18).

To the backdrop of incremental environmental degradation, in 1970s environmental ethics as a subset of philosophy starts its function by extending moral consideration to the non-human natural world. As a disciplined philosophical pursuit, it seeks to re-examine human status in nature. Some proponents of non-anthropocentrism argue for direct human responsibility to the natural world as both are integral parts of the ecosystem. For maintaining a sound ecosystem and a balanced livable natural atmosphere, they advocate for extending moral consideration to the elements of the environment. From this perspective, all things that constitute the environment are interrelated and intertwined. They are all members of a community. They interact with each other as a member of community under an ecosystem. The uninterrupted function of each and every member of the community reflects the equilibrium state of environment that is good for all. Leopold elucidates that, "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise" (Desjardins, 2001). Every member of the community has assigned function to play for a sound environment. Therefore, Non-anthropocentrism claims that the natural elements are significantly valuable and have right to live or exist.

Reversely, some anthropocentric claim that we do not need any new environmental ethics. Proponents of anthropocentrism especially Passmore believes that the western tradition contains the seeds for an ethically appropriate relationship of nature, though he criticizes western philosophical and religious traditions for encouraging man to think of himself as nature's absolute master for whom everything that exists was designed (Ibid, p. 101). Therefore, the humanistic approach which revises their past attitudinal treatment provides restorative therapy for environmental adversity. The present study aims at exploring the revised approach to anthropocentrism and compares it with the traditional approach to examine whether and to what extent the revised version has revised the attitude to environmental catastrophe. For doing this, this study uses qualitative data from secondary sources like books and journals to make an in-depth analysis of anthropocentrism. It follows comparison and contrast method to bring out the similarities and the dissimilarities between the traditional and the modern anthropocentric approaches to the environment, and evaluates their attitude to and treatment of nature in general and environment in particular.

Anthropocentrism

In terms of defining the moral relationship between man and nature, two different schools of thought are considered in anthropocentric environmental world view. Though both schools place a high value on human welfare, they differ significantly in how they deal with nature. These are known as traditional and Modern views of anthropocentrism.

Traditional Views of Anthropocentrism

Bryan Norton terms this view as a strong version of an anthropocentric attitude (Norton, 1984). This view is also known as an enlightened attitude. This

attitudinal trend is originated and developed by the western philosophical and theological tradition. Some philosophers from different ages, Judo-Christian beliefs, traditional moral theories, scientific and technological advancement, and capitalist and socialist economic systems contribute to developing this attitude.

The existence of natural world was not duly acknowledged to some Greek and modern philosophers. Greek philosophers decided that the world as we experience was not real. Modern philosophers devoted several centuries to doubting its existence. As a result, in both periods of the history of philosophy, the environment was left out (Hargrove, 1989). Greek philosophers held the explicit notion that human beings were free of moral obligation to the non-human beings and other forms of life. They thought that everything in the natural world had a specific purpose for satisfying human needs.

Sophist philosopher Protagoras argues, "Man is the measure of all things" (Russell, 1961). Everything is subject to humans. Values are determined and ascribed exclusively by human beings. They claim human mastery over everything. For their wellbeing, human beings can do whatever they want. Everything is fair to humans. Nature was considered as a means for human interest.

In his teleological view of nature, Aristotle demonstrates that the natural world is created with a specific purpose which is to satisfy human desires. He explains that nature is to be understood as an organic whole, and the things in it are meant to serve a purpose (Leahy, 2005). Human beings bear the highest attributions that empower them as the authoritative agent. Aristotle denotes in his book 'Nicomachean' that only human beings of all living things in nature deserve rational faculty of the soul as additional attribution that provides them supreme authority over others. Aristotle evaluates nature in a hierarchical order based on having the quality of life and reasoning ability.

Plants exist for the sake of animals, and brute beasts for the sake of man - domestic animals for his use and food, wild ones (or at any rate most of them) for food and other accessories of life, such as clothing and various tools. Since nature makes nothing purposeless or in vain, it is undeniably true that she has made all animals for the sake of man (Singer, 2011).

Aristotle illustrates the causes of human supremacy over nature through his systematic explanation. He continues, "Nature has made all things specifically for the sake of man therefore plants and animals were on earth for the instrumental use of man" (Johnson, 1993).

In the medieval period, Saint Augustine contends that only human beings hold cognitive faculty that empower them to rule over nature. He describes that abstaining from killing animals and destroying plants are regarded as the height of superstition. Corresponding to Saint Augustine, Thomas Aquinas follows Aristotle in ranking plants as lower than non-human animals and non-human animals as lower than humans. Human beings were considered perfect among

corporeal beings, for humans have mass life, movement, senses, and reason. Aquinas thinks that since human beings deserve the highest status, they are entitled to hunting and eating meat because “the plants make use of the earth for their nourishment, and animals make use of the plants, and man makes use of both plants and animals (Aquinas, part -1).”

Lynn White Jr. is a leading historian of the medieval age who denotes that the Judeo-Christian worldview encourages human beings to exploit nature through technology. He recommends that only a reformation of worldview can resolve our ecological problems. He demonstrates this review through his seminar paper titled “The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis” (1967). White’s view claims that the values of Judeo-Christian are responsible for the environmental degradation. Christianity, according to White, is the most anthropocentric religion of the globe, because Christianity teaches that God desires humanity to exploit nature in its interest, with indifference to other creatures. These religious traditions are represented symbolically by the passage from Genesis, in which the Judeo-Christian God creates all living creatures and wishes man in His image and likeness to rule the fish in the sea, the birds in the sky, the cattle, all the wild animals on earth and all the reptiles that crawl upon the earth. So God created them in His own image and blessed them and instructed to them to be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth (Singer, 2011).

In this model, the wilderness is a threat to human survival owing to consider it as cruel, harsh, and perilous. Both the Old and New Testaments describe the wilderness as a barren and desolate place. So, this tradition emphasizes taking nature under control and establishing supremacy over it.

In the history of the modern period, empiricist philosopher Francis Bacon expresses his profound love for humanity. He advocates for precise applications of science and technology for the sake of human materialistic development. To this end, he states that human being should know the world through the inquisition of nature by creating and applying technology (Bacon, 1955). In terms of increasing knowledge through experiments, human beings extend their dominion over inert nature. So, natural environment should be tortured to reveal her secrets. Bacon stresses expanding human knowledge to subdue and overcome the necessities and miseries of humanity. This conception refers to masculine humanity’s absolute knowledge and mastery of nature.

Descartes argues that though animals and plants are alive, he nonetheless denies that they are anything other than machines or thoughtless brutes (Desjardins, 2001). In the Cartesian view, the criterion for moral standing is consciousness. Anything not conscious is a merely physical thing and can be treated without concern for its well-being (Singer, 1981).

Kant shows that our duties towards nature are indirect (Desjardins, 2001). In his view, only humans have moral standing; and only autonomous beings, capable of free and rational action, are moral beings.

Anthropocentric attitude also lies in traditional moral theories that deal with what sorts of things are good, which acts are the right and what the relations are between the right and the good. In this respect, there are three classified forms of normative ethics which are known as utilitarian, deontological, and virtue ethics (Wilkinson, 1999).

Utilitarianism claims that the good course of action is the one that creates the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. Here utilitarianism focuses on good consequences (Kernohan, 2012).

Another approach to moral judgment examines the means of the act directly, giving no attention to consequences. This approach is called deontology or Kantianism. According to Immanuel Kant, a good action must satisfy, fulfill, or conform to some absolute, universal, and unconditional standard usually expressed as a duty, an obligation, or a prohibition. Kantian ethics stresses legitimate means (Kernohan, 2012).

Unlike utilitarian and Kantian ethics, Virtue ethics focuses on the human character. It emphasizes the importance of developing a good habit of human behavior, like courage, temperance, justice. So, virtue ethics emphasizes human excellence (Kernohan, 2012).

Therefore, normative ethics moves forward patronizing human-centered attitudes. Traditional anthropocentrism cares exclusively for human beings. It claims that the human species is superior to other things in the environment.

Traditional anthropocentrism can be compared with frontier ethics. Frontier ethics assumes that the earth has an unlimited supply of resources. If resources run out in one area, more can be found elsewhere or and human ingenuity will find substitutes (Fisher, 2019). This idea considers human being as master who manages the planet. It represents that there are no laws; every human action toward nature is just. The frontier ethic is entirely anthropocentric as only human needs are considered.

Modern Views of Anthropocentrism

From the perspective of ecological crisis, the modern approach of anthropocentrism appears to remove the limitation of ancient environmental stance. Norton (1984) terms it as a weak version of anthropocentrism. John Passmore, William Frankena, Kristen Shrader-Frechette, Don Marietta, and pragmatists like Ben Minteer, Bryan Norton, Eugene Hargrove, and Andrew are the proponents of this ideology (Nelson, 2012). They believe that the solution to the environmental crisis lies in the traditional anthropocentric approach. However, they suggest that this approach will have to be employed competently. They think that this approach is necessary and sufficient to live in harmony with nature.

Unlike traditional view, modern attitude ascribes values on non-human elements of nature as aesthetic, educative, or restorative. These values are relatively exceptional than the instrumental. They stress the sustainability of the environment.

John Passmore thinks that the natural world is not valued directly for its own sake but indirectly for the sake of humans who find it valuable for the benefits it brings to them (Gudorf & Huchingson, 2010).

According to Norton (1984), human contact with nature could prompt individuals to question their own and others' ecologically irrational commitments and shape normative ideals affirming human harmony with the environment. He stresses that human beings should form a normative standard for ensuring harmony with nature. That is why he focuses on human contact with nature that creates moral responsibility towards the environment. In this perspective, outdoor recreation, environmental education, and ecotourism might have a dominant influence on the growing affinity in the human mind concerning the natural world. Besides, evaluating landscape differently, recognizing its present and future beauty, cultural expressiveness, therapeutic and recreational value, and ability to inspire individuals and communities will compel the human being to care for and protect the environment.

Following Norton, Hargrove acknowledges that environmental value necessarily originates from humans. In effect, Hargrove draws the attention to epistemological anthropocentrism and its logical necessity. Unlike Norton's weak anthropocentrism, however, Hargrove's version included recognition of the intrinsic value of natural objects. Grounding his approach in the naturalistic traditions of nineteenth-century landscape painting and field naturalism, Hargrove demonstrates that people may ascribe intrinsic value to the elements of nature what they judge to be beautiful or scientifically interesting—just as one might ascribe intrinsic value to a priceless work of art such as the Mona Lisa—even though that ascription is made from a distinctly human point of view and is intimately related to a complex suite of human values (Hargrove, 1989). He firmly believes that this value will play a pivotal role in the protection of the natural world.

The pioneer of traditional conservationism Gifford Pinchot contends that nature is a resource to be conserved to meet human welfare. According to conservationists, we seek to protect the natural environment from exploitation and abuse so that humans can receive long-lasting benefits from it (Desjardins, 2001). The principle of conservation states that natural resources have no intrinsic value; they should be used and controlled by all people. They represent this strategy from a utilitarian outlook.

On the other hand, the preservation movement holds an anthropocentric attitude differently. As a human being, he must protect the natural world for his own sake. Human management has a moral duty to play for preserving the natural

environment. Preservationists continue that human management should be for the protection of nature. They tend to oppose greater access to and use of natural resources by human beings (Sandler, 2017).

Comparative study between Two Views

As modern approach to the environment springs out of traditional ideology to dispel its limitation in addressing environmental decay, they contain some similar and dissimilar features. In similar lens both approaches contend that humans are the center of the universe (Callicott & Frdeman, 2009). Human beings have cognitive faculties and freedom of choice, which place them at the highest position of all living and nonliving organisms in the universe. They continue that because human beings are the foundation of morality, they are entitled to inherent worth, whereas nature is regarded as means to their benefit (Kopnina, 2018). They also believe that humans who measure everything are apart from and above all other nonhuman natural objects. The natural world is interpreted in terms of human values and experience. Conversely, both hold explicit different characteristics in ascribing the status of nature and its sustainability.

Proponents of traditional approach argue that humans have no obligation to nature. They deny harmonious relationship between man and nature. They ascribe instrumental value to nature. They consider nature just as resources that exist for human use (Callicott & Frdeman, 2009). Natural resources do not need to be conserved and preserved for their sustainability because of their boundless availability. As the earth's resources are limitless, they should be exploited without restraint. Proponents of this view favor greater human access to and use of natural resources for human socio-economic development (Desjardins, 2001). While they evaluate humans as conqueror of nature, the nature should be tortured and ruled over in order to expose its secrets. In accordance with traditional approach, all contingent problems are solved by manpower, technologies, and the market economy (Callicott & Frdeman, 2009).

Proponents of the modern approach, on the other hand, recognize indirect responsibility for the environment. They impose different types of value on nature such as aesthetic, educative, or restorative unlike instrumental. They recognize harmonious relationship between man and nature (Hargrove, 1989). They think that natural resources are limited. Nature can replenish itself from its moderate use but excessive use cause harm of it permanently. Natural resources need to be conserved and preserved as they are limited. They think that humans should take care of nature to ensure its long-term viability. They consider human as manager of nature. They urge for preservation and conservation plan to protect the natural environment. Since resources take time to regenerate, they should be used wisely and with caution. They hold that humans have responsibility towards the generations to come who have legitimate right to enjoy the natural beauty and bounty. Thus, human management should be for the protection of the environment (Desjardins, 2001).

Evaluation

The environment is a concept where all living and nonliving entities exist and interact with one another constantly by maintaining natural rules and regulations. All elements have their capability to replenish themselves to some extent from being exploited. But when it crosses its capacity, the healthy state of the environment begins to wane. Consequently, the environmental disorder appears that is a concern for the existence of all organisms in this universe.

The anthropocentric approach to the environment is a long-standing and pristine school of thought that started its function when the environmental predicament was alien to all. Traditional anthropocentric approach evidently differentiates humanity from the natural entities in terms of rank and status. They think that humans are the best organisms of all. Because, they have certain goal, reason, self-consciousness, self-control, and the ability to communicate through symbols. Consequently, only humans receive moral treatment and enjoy moral rights. This view considers human beings as conqueror. In this respect, the primary concern of human beings is how to conquer human miseries and necessities. Conversely, the traditional anthropocentric approach considers nature as merely a resource that has no moral consideration. It exclusively contains the instrumental worth. Nature has no right to live of its own life. Nature exists to be used for human purpose. To them, nature is nothing but service provider. With its boundless resources, nature fulfills material gratification of humanity.

Since human beings are apart from and above nature, the harmonious relationship between them is rejected. This ethics states that humans have no responsibility other than their current fellows. Nature is regarded as source of unlimited resources that should be exploited extravagantly for the betterment of humanity. This view encourages humans to greater access to and use of them. They think that all contingent problems should be resolved by manpower, science and technologies and market economy. They place a high value on accumulating knowledge that will enable humans to rule over everything. In terms of increasing knowledge through experiments, human beings extend their dominion over inert nature. In this respect, nature is the fertile field of experiment. Humans have been torturing and exploiting natural environment to expose her secrets through undue and unabated application of science and technology. As a result, technological and scientific application without moral criteria without compassion to other natural entities brings in misfortunes for humanity as well as ecological balance. Various diseases and flues like COVID-19 pandemic that the world experience are the consequences of habitat destruction of wildlife and unethical experiment on them and their close contact.

On the other hand, they think that development means incremental advancement of socioeconomic condition of human being. This attitude makes humans greedy and selfish. These features of human tend to build up consumerist society to get material comfort. Materialistic greed of consumerist society affects the nature enormously that severs the inter relation among the entities of

ecosystem. In accordance with the view that the primary purpose of humanity is to produce and consume material goods. It considers that material wealth is the best measure of success. Matter and energy resources are unlimited because of human ingenuity in making them available. As a result production and consumption of goods increase endlessly with the rise of standard of living. The importance of material goods for human life cannot be categorically denied. However, dependence on material comfort should be moderate. Otherwise, excessive greed on matters brings about ecological destruction that is a grave threat for the existence of humanity. These lead to environmental pollution and resource shortage on a global scale which can be termed as ideological cause of the environmental crisis.

This view provides legal right and complete authority of human beings to exploit natural resources in terms of advancement of the standard of human living and it empowers human beings as the master who manages the planet. Because the traditional approach only advocates for human interests, moral considerations, and development, it eventually leads to the establishment of a profound philosophy of Humanism, human chauvinism, and speciesism, these terms are defined as “a prejudice or attitude of bias in favor of the interests of members of one’s own species and against those of members of other species (Singer, 2002). The traditional approach to the environment has no concern and strategic stance to address environmental crises; instead, faulty evaluation and reckless handling of nature, as well as its widespread use, inevitably result in environmental disaster.

The limitation of this approach ushers a new window in searching for another avenue for the equilibrium state of living and nonliving elements of the ecosystem. In this background, the Modern anthropocentric approach to the environment comes into being for addressing the incremental deterioration of ecology. This approach argues for employing traditional attitude in an expert way for resolving the existing ecological concern. The proponents of this movement acknowledge the indirect responsibility to nature. Unlike instrumental value, they ascribe different values to nature for the protection of the environment. It emphasizes on outdoor recreation, environmental education, and ecotourism so that people come to know the importance of nature. It also ascribes new value to the nonhuman being and things of the environment as a non-instrumental value that is not akin to the intrinsic or final value. They term the value as aesthetic, educative, or restorative other than the instrumental. This value creates in the human mind based on his interest. This human interest inspires individuals and communities to care for and protect nature. Individuals and communities are motivated to take care of and protect the environment because of this human interest. They encourage for the sustainability of the environment. This view advocates for the strategies of conservation and preservation for the protection of healthy environment. They intend to safeguard the natural world from exploitation and abuse so that humanity can benefit from it in the long run. They

are against any harmful human activity in protecting the natural environment. They endeavor to keep the wilderness as it is, in its natural state. These imply that humans should protect the environment, not for its own sake but of its value to them. We should maintain harmonious interaction with nature since the balance of the ecosystem is dependent on how we handle it.

Traditional view of nature is almost unanimously rejected since it ultimately leads to environmental exploitation and the manipulation of nature to meet trivial human demands. It is also rejected by even its fellow modern version of anthropocentrism. Conversely, Modern views ascertain new categories of value unlike instrumental for preserving a mutual and peaceful interaction between humans and nature. They hold that though human beings are apart from and above nature, healthy environment is necessary for the existence of humanity. As a result, they emphasize on maintaining harmonious and peaceful relationship between man and nature. They use these techniques to benefit from the environment though nature has no right to live of its life.

Based on the aforementioned analysis, it can be stated that the modern anthropocentric approach to the environment is superior to the traditional approach in combating environmental problems. The traditional view is not accepted due to its partial, one-sided, prejudiced and extreme speciesism ideology. This approach establishes speciesism which then evolves into greed-driven individuality, resulting in widespread environmental devastation. Conversely, modern view argues that human's consciousness regarding the importance of nature and precise application of conservation and preservation techniques can address the current environmental crisis. Though, this theory is also condemned by non-anthropocentrism. Because the modern view fails to adequately prevent environmental crises in terms of having a felt preference that rewards those who cause irresponsible environmental deterioration and biodiversity loss. Aldo Leopold, an eco-centrist warns about the relationship of human beings with nature that nature is not a commodity but a community of which we are a member. He characterizes the community as countless animate and inanimate entities and their interdependencies. All living things, including humans, must be viewed as members of the ecological community. The harmonious and stable relationship of every community member is a resource for the continuation of the lives of others. The ecological conscience teaches that humans are members of the biotic community, biotic citizens rather than conquerors of nature (Desjardins, 2001).

Conclusion

The anthropocentric approach to the environment emphasizes human mastery and authority over nature in specifying the ethical relationship between human beings and the environment. Anthropocentrism regards the environment as a means to human interest. In its traditional stance, nature holds an endless resource and full of mysterious fields of knowledge. It claims that human beings have no responsibility to the environment other than using it for their development. They

exploit and manipulate natural resources and conquer the natural world with an authoritarian and domineering outlook. Cognitive ability and the ability to reason belong to them alone. But the modern attitude of anthropocentrism takes a somewhat different stance out of its ancestry fellow traditional view. Unlike the traditional one, this new attitude accepts indirect responsibility to nature. It persuades a harmonious relationship with the environment. In this attitude, the role of the human being is to enhance or perfect the world of nature by cooperating with bringing out its potential. This view does not impose intrinsic value on the non-human being but works for their protection in ensuring longstanding use for the generations to come. Both views approach the environment to hold ancient roots and a long history in western culture, and fundamentally human-centered. Of them, especially a traditional approach fails to consider the interest of non-human beings completely. This version of anthropocentric attitude ultimately leads to environmental degradation. So, it needs to be rejected and superseded.

However, the modern version of anthropocentrism contributes to the protection of the environment. Because this approach wanes the rate of environmental degradation to some extent, but it is insufficient to resolve the crisis. This approach advocates attributing different values to the natural entities in order to achieve ecological harmony but denies them the right to live their own lives. However, as an integral entity, nature has its own significance as a whole where humans are mere a part. They are but members of the biotic citizens rather than conquerors of nature. Environmental ethics requires more than a simple concern for individual animals of a certain type. At a minimum, we need to consider questions about the moral status of diversity of plant and animal life, about ecological communities, and about our role in those communities. The focus of moral consideration should be shifted away from individuals to biotic wholes. A shift to such holistic and truly non-anthropocentric ethics from humanistic would require addressing ecological plight.

References

- Alder, J. and Wilkinson, D. (1999). *Environmental Law and Ethics*. Macmillan Press Limited.
- Aquinas, T. (2012). *Summa Theologica (Part I)*. Authentic Media Inc.
- Bacon, F. (1955). Selected Writings of Francis Bacon, with an introduction and notes by Hugh G. Dick (New York: The Modern Library).
- Baker, E. & Richardson, M. (1999). *Ethics Applied: Ethics and the Environment*. Simon & Schuster.
- Callicott, J. B. and Frdeman, R. (2009). *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics and Philosophy*. Library of Congress publication.

- DesJardins, J. R. (2001). *Environmental Ethics: An introduction to environmental philosophy* Belmont: Wadsworth. *Thomson Learning*.
- Davis, S. (1988). Charles Taylor on expression and subject-related properties. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 18(3), 433-447.
- Fisher, M. R. (2019). *Environmental Biology: Environmental Ethics*.
- Gudorf, C. E., & Huchingson, J. E. (2010). *Boundaries: A casebook in environmental ethics*. Georgetown University Press.
- Hargrove, E. C. (1989). *Foundations of Environmental Ethics*.
- Hargrove, E. C. (1989). *Foundation of Environmental Ethics*. The USA: Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, D. L., Ambrose, S. H., Bassett, T. J., Bowen, M. L., Crummey, D. E., Isaacson, J. S., ... & Winter-Nelson, A. E. (1997). Meanings of environmental terms. *Journal of environmental quality*, 26(3), 581-589.
- Kernohan, A. (2012). *Environmental ethics: an interactive introduction*. Broadview Press.
- Kopnina, H. (2018). Anthropocentrism and Post-Humanism. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1-8.
- Johnson, L. E. (1993). *A morally deep world: An essay on moral significance and environmental ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leahy, M. P. (2005). *Against liberation: Putting animals in perspective*. Routledge.
- Matin, M. A. (1968). *An Outline of Philosophy*. Rajab Ali Mullick.
- Murdy, W. H. (1975). Anthropocentrism: A modern version. *Science*, 187(4182), 1168-1172.
- Nasr, S. H. (1968). Man and nature: The spiritual crisis of modern man.
- Nelson, L. G. (2012). Anthropocentrism. *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics, Second Edition, volume 1*, 145–155.
- Norton, B. G. (1984). Environmental ethics and weak anthropocentrism. *Environmental ethics*, 6(2), 131-148.
- Pagano, P. (2015). *Elements of Environmental Philosophy*.
- Russell, B. (1961). Russell, History of Western Philosophy.
- Sandler, R. L. (2017). *Environmental Ethics: Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. M. (Ed.). (1987). *Looking up: An account of the COBUILD project in lexical computing and the development of the Collins COBUILD English language dictionary*. Collins Elt.

Singer, P. (1981). *Practical ethics*. Cambridge university press.

Singer, P. (2002). *Animal Liberation*. New York: Ecco.

Singer, P. (2011). *Practical ethics*. Cambridge university press.

White, L. (1967). The historical roots of our ecologic crisis. *Science*, 155(3767), 1203-1207.