

"A Philosophical Appraisal"

Vittorio Falsina

Harvard University, Center for the Study of World Religions

Online Conference on Global Ethics, Sustainable Development and the Earth Charter

April 1999

1. Ethics and Sustainable Development

A point in history has now been reached where a fundamental change of course is needed in how the human enterprise is conducted. Economic development, which exploits the environment and people, must be somehow transformed into sustainable development that promotes both the ecological integrity of Earth and human rights. Such a change can only occur if the dominant values held by people and societies reflect this imperative.

As you might have noticed, the term "sustainable development" is mostly used in the current discussion in its "technical" meaning.¹ When we speak of sustainable development we usually refer to a set of practices, processes and policies that are best suited to make an efficient use of natural resources which are limited or not renewable. Therefore, under this agenda we speak of sustainable technologies, renewable resources, efficient energy, life cycle of products, green products and green markets, friendly policies etc. We are not always aware that this blueprint for alternative practices implies a substantive vision of the good that the goal of sustainable development aims to achieve. Underlining the practical agenda of sustainable development is a moral vision based on a set of values that challenge our way of doing business as usual. For instance, the vision of sustainable development makes implicit ethical claims about the good of preserving a balance with the ecosystem, the value of natural resources, the limit of human exploitation, and the responsibility of entrusting a sustainable planet to future generations. You can see how these claims are essential to the project of sustainable development. They constitute the core of its definition. And yet, they have not found an articulation in a set of normative principles that express these values and justify their validity claims. For moral claims to be true, or universally acceptable, it is not sufficient to be enunciated. They must also be critically validated. As I will point out, this is not an easy task.

The representatives of the world community gathered at the "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 were aware of the necessity of an ethical charter to ground this vision. The agenda of sustainable development for the 21st Century, Agenda 21, had to be accompanied by a document that spelled out the larger ethical vision that inspired and sustained this whole process or renewal. The Rio Summit called for an "Earth Charter" as a set of fundamental ethical values and practical principles needed by humanity to improve the quality of human life and protect the health of the Earth's ecosystem. Following that appeal, the Earth Charter initiative was vigorously started in 1994 through the joint efforts of Maurice Strong in his capacity as chair of the Earth Council, and Mikhail Gorbachev as chair of Green Cross international.² After the release of the Earth Charter Benchmark Draft I during the Rio+5 review forum, a new working draft is now making a second round for worldwide consultation. The goal of this on-line conference is

to enlarge the participation of students and academics to contribute to this project that demands global cooperation. Knowing that other speakers will focus on the historical, scientific, pragmatic, and local aspects of the Earth Charter, my presentation will be limited to examine some philosophical aspects of this project of a global ethics for sustainable development. First, I will engage the contemporary discussion on environmental philosophy that is being debated in Western academic discourse. I will argue that the concepts and theories of Western environmental philosophy, thought important, are largely inadequate to ground the principles of a global ethics. Second, I will examine the ethical project undertaken by the Earth Charter initiative. I will discuss how the variety of its constitutive sources, its method of global consultation, and the formulation of its general principles represent an innovating way of doing ethics to meet the challenges of truly global problems facing an interdependent earth community.

2. Environmental Philosophies and the Prospect of a Global Ethics

Looking at the literature in Western environmental philosophy, one is puzzled by the opposite views of ecology that are defended by environmental philosophers or activists. [The most striking difference is the attempt to create a new kind of philosophy centered on a new subject - nature - and followed by a new code of ethical duties and responsibilities, not to citizens and humans, but to animals, plants, ecosystems and the planet. Some of the positions that I will present are provocative and resent the limit of a paradox. However, they are important for our consideration because they reflect the contemporary effort to rethink our relationship with the natural world. As an expression of this growing consciousness, these views contain fragments of truth that need to be critically assessed and integrated into a global ethics.] I will discuss two orientations that polarize the debate in contemporary environmental philosophy, namely: anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. Their differences are rooted in conflicting theories of value that accord moral standing, the one strictly to humans, and the other to more than humans.³

Anthropocentrism

The first philosophical position is called anthropocentrism because it places human beings with their interests, preferences and values at the center of environmental ethics. This position rests on a conception of ethics deeply rooted in Western philosophy. Aristotle and Plato were mainly concerned on how people could live a good life in the context of a political community ruled according to norms of justice. Socrates said, "I am a lover of learning, and trees and country places won't teach me anything, whereas people in the city do".⁴ [The Jewish-Christian tradition reinforced this belief on the centrality of the human being created in God's image, and placed as the crown of creation to exert dominion over the earth.⁵] But it was with the advent of the Enlightenment that the focus of morality narrowed from the community to the single individual. Individual persons are the only beings endowed with freedom, rationality and the ability of making choices according to a life plan. Therefore, only humans have the characteristics that fulfill the conditions of moral standing. Rights and responsibilities apply only to people. They derive from the respect for their human dignity and the choice of individuals to enter a

social contract to respect their mutual obligations in society. But as John Passmore wrote, "men, plants, animals and soil do not form a community. Bacteria and men do not recognize mutual obligations, nor do they have common interests. In the only sense in which belonging to a community generates ethical obligations, they do not belong to the same community."⁶

Environmental ethics, by this anthropocentric account, is founded on what we might call a "human right to nature".⁷ As an extension of the basic human rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, today people claim a right to a healthy environment, to clean air, drinkable water, and uncontaminated food necessary for their life. Such right to nature, however, is defended against any right of nature. Nature itself has no intrinsic value and is not morally considerable. A strong anthropocentrism maintains that nature has only an instrumental value to fulfill human needs, whether these needs are food, clothing, economic development, or aesthetic pleasure and recreation. Environmental economics serves precisely to this purpose by calculating the costs of environmental protection for maintaining acceptable levels of human welfare. For instance, the depletion of the ozone layer means higher levels of skin cancer, more instances of immune system diseases and damage to human food crops. Practically, this perspective evaluates all environmental policies by the way they affect human interests and well being in the present or future generations. [John Passmore, William Baxter and William Grey, are among the defender of some form of a strong version of anthropocentrism.⁸]

There is also a weak version of anthropocentrism. Brian Norton, for instance, maintains that the belief that humans are the only valuers does not entail that humans can value only human things.⁹ People are able of complex evaluations which go beyond the narrow satisfaction of selfish interests. Human beings are aware of being part of nature and can take responsibility for the environment. However, as Norton claims, a considered preference for the preservation of nature is not based on the belief that natural things have intrinsic value or rights. [Whether this ethics of care for nature takes the forms of "stewardship" or "responsibility" it remains within the boundaries of enlightened anthropocentrism.] No doubt, a great deal of work on environmental ethics can be done from within an anthropocentric position. This reasoning informs most ecological movements, environmental agencies and programs of sustainable development. The point emphasized by anthropocentrism is that ethics is for people. But the crucial question we must ask today, in a condition of environmental crisis is the following: Can ethics be only about people? This is the question that a group of more radical environmental philosophers are trying to answer from the perspective of ecocentrism.

Ecocentrism

Ecocentrism marks a radical departure from the anthropocentric foundation of environmental philosophy. Human beings are not the only beings valuable on earth, since life on the planet is made possible by the proper functioning of a variety of organisms. Homo Sapiens, a unique species, is only one among the 5 million species that we know, and only one among the 5 billion species that have come and gone over the evolution history of the earth.¹⁰ Why should this last comer claim to have all rights?

A first group of thinkers focus on the ethics for animals. Animals hunt and howl, care for their young, grow hungry, thirsty, tired and excited. They suffer injury and lick their wounds. Animals, like humans, are sentience beings. They are value-able, in the sense that they are able to value things in their world independently from humans. Moreover, humans should not forget that they are animals too, and have genetic kinship with mammal species. The DNA sequence of chimpanzees and humans is 99% identical. Therefore, why shouldn't we value in other animal species that are so similar to ours what we value in ourselves? According to this view, animals should have rights that are, if not equal, at least comparable to those of humans. But here begins the problem for an ecocentric environmental ethics: where do we draw the line of obligation to other animal species? How to measure the value of so many different animal species, all valuable in their own functions? And even if we were to grant rights to animals, can we enforce them against human rights to land ownership, or to safety?

[According to the logic of moral reasoning, this argument is vitiated by a naturalistic fallacy.¹¹ David Hume saw that is not logically valid to deduce statement of moral obligation (ought statements) from factual premises (empirical demonstration of what is). In a valid deductive argument, nothing can be asserted in the conclusions that is not entailed by the premises. Environmental ethicists blow this distinction and claim environmental moral principles as "feedback from ecological science"¹². Can there be a "feedback" from ecology that provides justification for ethical principles without committing the is/ought fallacy? This remains a major obstacle for doing environmental ethics within the framework of moral philosophy.]

A duty to a chimpanzee? Maybe. But do I have a duty to a daisy or to a willow tree? You may think that this is getting too wild. Plants don't care, so why should we? If environmental ethics is about the respect for life, the higher animals, the vertebrates, represent only 4% of the living species on earth. Does the rest of the biosphere counts at all in our moral consideration? Plants do not have goals. Yet, each plant maintains a botanical identity. An acorn becomes an oak and the oak stands on its own. A botanist can explain that plants are modular organisms with a botanical program coded in their DNA. [They grow, reproduce, and multiply pursuing their own value, the good of their kind.] Ecocentric ethics claims that we have a duty to respect and even restore the vitality of the flora around us.

But not only single animals or plants should have a right to life, but also species and ecosystems. Species, though lacking reflective self-awareness, sentience, and organic individuality, are the dynamic living system in which the whole of individual organisms is the essential part. And species live in the womb of larger ecosystems that provide the habitat for their flourishing. Species and ecosystems too have their integrity, their biotic individuality, and therefore, a right to life. As Rolston says, "It is more important to protect this vitality than to protect individual integrity. A shut-down of the life stream on Earth is the most destructive event possible"¹³.

Ecocentrism expands the realm of moral standing to holistic dimensions. The earth, or the biosphere, is the ultimate unit of survival that ethics must consider. From here derives the

most fundamental moral norm that was already stated in the "land ethic" of Aldo Leopold, the pioneer of environmental ethics: that we have a duty "to protect the integrity, stability and beauty of the biosphere."¹⁴ A holistic ethics, Callicott says, takes the biotic community as a whole as a standard for the assessment of the relative value and relative ordering of its constitutive parts.¹⁵ But while Callicott, Rolston and Marietta defend a humanistic holism compatible with basic human concerns, another group of deep ecologists like Arne Naess make claims for a "biospherical egalitarianism, in principle".¹⁶ Human beings are seen as "knots in the net" or "strands in a web" of biospheric relations.¹⁷ Human beings don't have any claim to special treatment in the biotic community. Their value is to be assessed in relation with "the right to live and blossom" of every other life form. In this grand metaphysics of nature (Ecosophy T) morality is superfluous.¹⁸

Many philosophers have expressed their reservations about the logic and practical consequences of this type of holistic ethics. By claiming that the biotic community overrides the rights of individuals, holism might develop into a form of ecofascism. Tom Regan says that "what holism gives us is a fascist understanding of the environment."¹⁹ Similarly, Marty Kheel called ecological holism "totalitarianism."²⁰ According to this view, human beings have been assimilated into nature. Swallowed up by the organic processes of the biosphere, they have lost their human dignity characterized by freedom, reason and sociability along with their cultural identity. Holism has been accused to foster human regression to biocentric stance, and cultural regression to tribal ideals. Even Callicott, a defender of holism, admits that it would be adiabatically difficult to practice an ethics in which human beings and all other living beings have equal rights.²¹ These claims reinforce the skepticism about environmental ethics. One may draw the conclusion that once the idea of duties to others than humans starts, one slides down a slippery slope - animals, plants, species, ecosystems, clouds, oceans and dirt - and end up claiming the ridiculous: that rocks have rights.

3. After Modernity: the Emergence of a Global Ethics

From this discussion, one may realize how problematic is the attempt to develop an environmental ethics on the narrow bases of anthropocentrism or ecocentrism. Anthropocentrism can easily turn into egocentrism, and ecocentrism in ecofascism. The problem of this split is endemic to Western philosophy, especially since modernity. On one side, we have the Ego of the Enlightenment that posits itself as a higher self, the mind, the spirit that dominates the universe: man measure of all things. This Ego gives little consideration to the social and natural environments on which his life depends. The egocentric view is monological and takes everything for granted. Like Superman the Ego claims responsibility for everything, and yet sacrifices everything to himself. On the opposite side we have the Eco approach; the Romantic rebellion against the domain of the Ego fought with the impetus of the totality of nature. The believers of Eco try to demonstrate that the universe is a great and interconnected holistic system, a Web, a universal order. Their worldview, informed by the scientific evidence of physics, biology and system theory, risks to exchange Gaia for God, and reduces the personal and social dimensions of human existence to mere functions of this great system.²² Both, the Ego

and the Eco are trapped in monological and ahistorical interpretations of reality. Their reductivist views lack of depth, relations, evolution and transcendence.

The crucial dilemma that we are confronting today is this. Modernity has brought to the fore the differentiation among the self, society and nature, but has been unable to integrate them into a harmonic coexistence. The problems that we are facing on the threshold of the third millennium, economic injustices, poverty, armed conflicts, demographic explosion that put pressure on ecological and social systems, degradation of the environment, extinction of species, just to name a few, arise from the chaotic tensions among these three spheres of existence. If after modernity we will not find a way to integrate these dimensions into a new form of self-transcendence, we will face the possibility of self-destruction. The earth community stands at a defining moment. The earth has directed itself instinctively with exuberant creativity for millennia. Now, it has given over to us, in the power of the mindsphere, the major share of directing the course of earth development. As Thomas Berry wisely put it: "This is the ultimate daring venture for the earth, this confiding its destiny to human decision, the bestowal upon the human community of the power of life and death over its basic life system". ²³

In front of the magnitude of this mortal option, we realize that our moral philosophy is grossly inadequate to shape a different worldview, with new values, attitudes and principles that are called for by a global ethics. In order to do this, we need to enlarge our narrow view of ethics and draw from a variety of sources that are finding a convergence toward this global awareness. There are signs of hopes in the current shifts of global culture. Postmodernity is gradually shaping a new cultural sensitivity, with new values, attitudes and subjects. From a narrow focus the individual, to the extension of moral consideration to new subjects characterized by their "otherness" and "difference". For example, postmodernity has given relevance to the voices of women, blacks, indigenous people, the poor and marginalized, along with the natural world of animals, plants, species and ecosystems. Another characteristic of postmodernity is the disenchantment with modern science and technology and the attempt to move beyond the Enlightenment mentality that separated the material from the spiritual worlds and affirmed progress at any cost. It appears that the foundations of modernity are gradually being replaced by a newly emerging worldview based on a more inclusive cross-cultural convergence of scientific, philosophical, traditional and religious concepts of human nature, nature, and society. Their interdependence is intertwined in the destiny of the earth's community. The convergence of these various post-modern movements are shaping a common consciousness that urges us to go beyond modernity and envision a global ethics able to transcend the tyranny of all its "isms": individualism, anthropocentrism, economism, consumerism, nationalism, and militarism.

4. The Earth Charter Benchmark Draft II (working draft)

The demand for a global ethics seems to fly in the face of the evidence of a highly fragmented and differentiated world. But a complex network of commercial, financial, technological and environmental interests increasingly links people that are separated by geography, culture and ideology. This growing awareness of interdependence has a moral

value. It creates the hope of a culture of peace and cooperation with other people, other cultures, other life forms, and the Earth. On the long path toward the goal for a global ethics, the Earth Charter is the expression of an ongoing worldwide consultation. Its principles should inspire human action in the face of the new ecological, economic and social challenges that call on our global responsibility.

The Earth Charter is not an attempt to construct a global ethics ex nihilo, artificially extracting and mixing ideas and principles taken from different traditions. Its goal is not to substitute Jesus' Discourse on the Mountain with a mountain of new principles, or Moses' old Ten Commandments with a list of 15 new ones. Rather, the principles listed in the Benchmark Draft II are the expression of an emerging convergence on some basic common values that are shared by a variety of people worldwide, in spite of their different cultures, nationality, religion, and worldview.. The Earth Charter's principles are drawn from a variety of sources: from the new discoveries and insights of science, the wisdom of the world religions, and more generally from the extensive literature emerging under the agenda of a global ethics, namely the ethics of environment, sustainable development, liberation and feminism. It is also important to remember that these principles build on earlier international declarations, charters and treaties, including many drafted by NGOs. These earlier agreements embody already a transcultural ethical experience. For instance, the principles drawn from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are already and expression of an ethical code recognized by the whole humanity.

Let us turn to the text of the Earth Charter draft. The first three principles are very important because they lay the foundation of the Charter. Principle no. 1 reads: "Respect Earth and all life, recognizing the interdependence and intrinsic value of all beings; affirming the inherent dignity of each person with faith in the human potential." What I would like to point out here is the clear affirmation of both, the intrinsic value of all beings, and the inherent dignity of each person and the human potential. This formulation overcomes the dichotomy between anthropocentrism and ecocentrism and transcends the conflicting claims of the Eco and the Ego in the harmonic vision of an "Earth community"²⁴.

A distinction between the inherent dignity of persons and the intrinsic value of every living being is crucial to prevent moral standing to become so inclusive to make it impossible to formulate an ethics that can guide action and policy. Although the Charter recognizes that all living beings have intrinsic value, it acknowledges the limit of moral obligation to nature. Principle no. 6 states: "Treat all living beings with compassion, and protect them from cruelty and wanton destruction." As one can notice, the principle uses the language of compassion and non-maleficence rather than the strong language of rights. To recognize that animals, plants and every living being have intrinsic value and commend our respect and care is different from claiming that each life form have equal rights.

Principle no. 2 stresses the duty of each and every person to "Care" and accept the "Responsibility" to contribute to the well being of the greater community of life inclusive of the whole family. Principle no. 3, makes the connection with the social demands of a

global ethics: the duty to "Secure Freedom, justice, peace and earth's abundance for present and future generations". A comma of the third principle affirms that "environmental protection, development, respect for human rights (and fundamental freedoms) and peace are interdependent and indivisible". It is evident from the structure of the Earth Charter that ecological, economic and social concerns are all interrelated and are an essential part of this ethical vision.

What we have here is a very different anthropology that sees human beings embodied in nature, embraced in culture, and embedded in social relations. The fundamental dichotomy of environmental ethics has been transcended. "The universe shivers with wonder in the depths of the human," as Brian Swimme has poetically put it. [In this perception the human is seen as a mode of being of the universe, one in the midst of many other living beings, as well as a distinctive being endowed with an inherent dignity and consciousness.] The human is represented here as that being in whom the universe come to itself in a special mode of conscious reflection. I would need more time to examine the practical implications of these principles.

5. Religions, Spiritual Traditions, and the Earth Charter

A more general question that one may ask is where does the Earth Charter ground this inclusive vision found in its general principles. These principles build on several sources. However, there is one particular source that I would like to emphasize here. I am referring to the contribution of World Religions and spiritual traditions. The effort to engage the spiritual resources of various religions is essential to the task of building a global ethics based on a "common ground and shared values". The millennial experience and wisdom preserved by religions may indeed be a critical resource in helping us to re-imagine the conditions for mutually enhancing human-earth relations. It is not surprising that during the first round of consultation, over 250 religious leaders and organizations worldwide were contacted by a special Advisory Group. Since the beginning the Earth Council established a special Indigenous Peoples Network. The Earth Charter has benefited from different spiritual resources to shape its vision of the humans-nature relations. Just to mention some of them, Buddhism, with its intellectual and practical resources, has a lot to teach on this subject. Buddhism, unlike Western religions, describes a cosmology of interconnectedness in which human beings are embedded in the dynamism of nature with its cycles of birth and death. [The doctrine of the anatma, (non-self), suggests a shift from an anthropocentric view of reality to an eco-centered view of it. A similar cosmological view is held also by Confucianism, which is characterized by "natural naturalization" and "human immanentization" in contrast to the emphasis on rationality and transcendence in Western thought.] Confucianism is less concerned with the notion of a personal God than with the ongoing reality of self-generating, continuity of being in the universe, linking inorganic, organic and human life forms.²⁵

A second important spiritual resource is that of indigenous people, Native American, Hawaiian, Maori, Aboriginal, and numerous other indigenous traditions. More than any religious worldview, indigenous wisdom has demonstrated the ability to foster sustainable life styles balancing human flourishing with reverence for the earth. They can

teach us a truly human intimacy with the earth and with the entire natural world. [The thanksgiving ritual of the Iroquois, for instance, is one of the most superb ceremonies that humans have ever known. "We return thanks" - first to our mother, the Earth, which sustains us, then on to the rivers and streams, to the herbs, to the corn and beans and squashes, to bushes and trees, to the wind, to the moon and the stars, to the sun, and finally to the Great Spirit who directs all things. Tom Berry comments: "To experience the universe with such sensitivity and such gratitude! These are the primary experiences of an awakening human consciousness. Such stupendous moments reveal a striking sense of the alluring earth".²⁶]

Finally, also the ethical-religious traditions of the West, notably, Judaism and Christianity are vigorously contributing to this effort by retrieving green streams of theological interpretations in their own sources. Western religions have created a dominantly anthropocentric worldview. [The interpretation of the book of Genesis has led to a worldview which justifies the "subduing of nature" and the human "dominion" over creation.(Gn 2) Lynn White wrote: "Since the roots of our environmental trouble are largely religious the remedy must also be essentially religious."²⁷] Contemporary Jewish and Christian theologies are engendering a shift from an anthropocentric worldview to an eco-centered worldview. Eco-theology represents the most powerful interruption to contemporary theological discourse.²⁸ The spiritual and ethical insights of the traditions that we have just mentioned, along with other sources, lay the foundations for the inclusive vision emerging from the principles of the Earth Charter. There is an important connection between religions and the effort to build a global ethics. The unconditional nature of the ethical demand can find justification only in an absolute that transcends human contingency. This is precisely the area in which religions can give their most powerful contribution. Regardless of how religions ground ethical norms, whether they derive them from a divine command, or a prophet's experience, or from a sacred book, teaching or revelation in nature, one thing is sure: religions can express their ethical demands with a different authority from merely human one. And religions do not just express morality by way of principles, doctrines and dogmas, but also with symbols, prayers, rituals and festivals - that is to say, both rationally and emotionally, reenchanting the earth. Religions, with all their historical limitations, are a powerful resource for shaping human values and attitudes.

In 1993, the Parliament of World Religions attended by 8.000 representatives from almost all faiths, issued a declaration on "Global Ethics" stating the agreement of religions on human rights and environmental issues. Far from being an attempt to create a global religious ideology or a single unified religion, the "global ethic" expresses "a fundamental consensus on binding values, irrevocable standards, and personal attitudes" agreed upon by all religions.²⁹

Conclusions

In this paper I have argued that the two main orientations of Western environmental philosophy, anthropocentrism and ecocentrism are largely inadequate to ground the principles of a global ethics. I have shown how the project undertaken by the Earth

Charter initiative has enlarged the basis for the construction of a global ethics. Its dialogical method of global consultation, and its reliance on the convergence of different sources has led to the formulation of principles that are shared by a variety of people of different nationalities, cultures and religions. I have suggested that the contribution of religions, in particular, may indeed be critical to break through the conventional worldview and transcend it into a vision of mutually enhancing human-earth relations.

In conclusion, I believe that the Earth Charter represents a serious and unprecedented effort towards a global ethics for the emerging world community. The Earth Charter ends with these words: "There is a promise of new beginning in these Earth Charter principles". Yes, there is energy unleashed when people dialogue and wrestle with these principles that inspire a new way of seeing, judging and acting. Ultimately, is the realization of a new possibility of being human alive in this vibrant community of life.

References:

1. For a genealogy and analysis of the concept of "sustainable development", see Redclift, M., *Sustainable Development: Exploring the Contradictions*, (Methuen: London, 1987); Lele, S., "Sustainable Development: Some Interpretations, Implications, and Uses," *Bulletin of Science, Technology, and Society*, Vol.13, 1993, pp. 314-323; Ekins, P. "Making Development Sustainable," in Sachs, W. Ed., *Global Ecology: A new Arena of Political Conflict* (Zed Books: London & New Jersey, 1993).
2. The first international workshop on the Earth Charter was held in The Hague in May 1995, with participants from 30 countries and over 70 different organizations. An Earth Charter Commission was formed, composed of 20 eminent women and men representing all global regions and the different sectors of society. The first draft of the Earth Charter was released at the end of the Rio+5 Forum by the Earth Charter Commission. (The Benchmark Draft I of the Earth Charter is published in a special issue of *Earth Ethics*, vol. 8 (Winter/Spring) 1997, titled: "evolving values for an Earth Community," pp. 1-3.
3. For a definition of "moral standing," see: *The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book: Philosophy, Ecology, Economics*, Van der Veer, D. And Christine Pierce, eds. (Belmont CA: Dadsworth, 1994), 57.
4. Plato, *Phaedrus* 230d., Loeb Classical Library, vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977, pp. 423-4.
5. Genesis 1:29. See the provocative article by Lynn White, Jr., "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," in *Science* 155 (1967):1203.
6. John Passmore, *Man's Responsibility for Nature*, New York: Scribner, 1974), p. 116.
7. See, Susan S. Hanna, Carl Folke, and Karl-Goran Maler, eds. *Rights to Nature*, Washington, D.C. : Island Press, 1996.
8. John Passmore, *Man's Responsibility for Nature*. New York: Scribner, 1974; William Grey, "Anthropocentrism and Deep Ecology," *Australian Journal of Philosophy* 71 (1993):463-475; and William F. Baxter, *People of Penguins: The Case of Optimal Pollution*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1974).
9. Brian Norton, "Environmental Ethics and Weak Anthropocentrism," in *Environmental Ethics* 6.2 (1984): 131-148; p. 133. Notice that Brian Norton in his last book is moving toward a more integrative approach, *Towards Unity Among Environmentalists*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. See also, Eugene C. Hargrove, "Weak Anthropocentric Intrinsic Value," in *The Monist* 75 (6) 1992: 183-207, p. 187.
10. The ideas presented in this sessions are drawn from the article by Holmes Rolston, III, "Ethics on the Home Planet," in *An Invitation to Environmental Philosophy*, Anthony Weston, ed., New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
11. For a discussion of the various positions on the is/ought problem in environmental ethics, see Don E. Marietta, Jr, *For People and the Planet*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995, pp. 81-117
12. Holmes Rolston, III, "Is There an Ecological Ethics?" *Ethics* 85 (1975): 93.
13. Holmes Rolston, III, "Ethics on the Home Planet," *idem.*, p. 125.

14. Aldo Leopold, "The Land Ethic," in *A Sand County Almanac*. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.
15. J. Baird Callicott, *Animal liberation: A Triangular Affair*, in *The Animal Rights/Environmental Ethics Debate. The Environmental Perspective*. (New York, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992), 39-69. See also Holmes Rolston III, "Duties to Endangered Species", in *Environmental Ethics: Duties and Values in the Natural World*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1988, pp. 60-75; Kenneth E. Goopaster, "On being Morally Considerable," in *The Journal of Philosophy*, 75 (6), 1978: 308-325.
16. The term "deep ecologist" was coined by the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess, the pioneer of this current of environmental philosophy. For an overview of these positions, see Lawrence E. Johnson, *A Morally Deep World: An Essay on Moral Significance and Environmental Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991; and Joseph R. DesJardins, *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1993.
17. Arne Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements: A Summary," in *Inquiry* 16 (1973).
18. See for this opinion, Matthew I. Humpherey, "Deep Ecology and the Irrelevance of Morality: A Response," in *Environmental Ethics* vol. 21, No. 1 (spring 1999): 75-79.
19. Tom Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983, p. 372.
20. Marty Kheel, "The Liberation of Nature: A Circular Affair," in *Environmental Ethics* Vol. 7, No.2 (summer 1985):135.
21. See, J. Baird Callicott, "Introduction" in *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*, Michael Zimmerman, ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993, 3-11.
22. This interpretation of modernity in terms of the split between the Ego and the Eco is taken from Ken Wilber, *A Brief History of Everything*. Boston and London: Shambhala, 1996, pp. 312-328.
23. Thomas Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988, p. 19.
24. The concept of "Earth Community" is defined by Brian Swimme and Thomas Berry as "The interacting complexity of all of Earth's components, entities and processes, including the atmosphere, hydrosphere, geosphere, biosphere and mindsphere". See Swimme and Berry, *The Universe Story*, San Francisco: Harper Collins Publisher, 1994, "Glossary," p. 280.
25. Mary Evelyn Tucker, "World Religions and Global Ecological Ethics. Contributions from Confucianism and Buddhism," in *Earth Ethics*, vol. 7, no. 3&4, p. 16.
26. Tomas Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, idem., p. 14.
27. Lynn White, "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," in *Science*, no. 155 (1967):1203-7.
28. Some of the emerging eco-theologians in North America are: Matthew Fox , for creation centered spirituality; Rosemary Rueter , Sallie McFague and Elisabeth Johnson, for eco-feminism; Thomas Berry and Brian Swimme for cosmological theology; Larry Rasmussen and James Gustafson, for theological environmental ethics.
29. See, Hans Kung, "Toward a World Ethics of World Religions," in *The Ethics of World Religions and Human Rights*, Hans Kung and Jurgen Moltmann eds., Concilium 1990/2 London: SCM Press, p. 102-119. The text can be found in , *A Global Ethics, The Declaration of the Parliament of the World's Religions*, Hans Kung and Karl-Josef Kuschel, eds. , New York: Continuum, 1993, p. 20-21.