

REHABILITATION OF ANTHROPOCENTRISM: A CRITICAL APPROACH

**Tapan Kumar De
Prasenjit Nanda**

Introduction:

There is a long debate between anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism in environmental ethics. It has become a dominant theme of the new fields of study. Since the inception of the environmental ethics as a distinct academic field, has to a great extent been critical of the dominant western tradition of anthropocentrism. It is true that we have completed a long journey from anthropocentrism to animal liberations and from animal liberations to environmentalism. On the way, anthropocentrism has brutally criticized by the animal liberationists, as well as by the environmentalists. The criticism is based on the expansion of moral boundary. Criticisms are made only on the basis of its literal meaning, i.e. humanity as the centre of existence and this attitude does not want to extend the moral boundary to non-human being. That is designated as traditional concept of anthropocentrism.

It is said that if we are playing our role keeping ourselves in the central point of environment and trying to serve our purpose in the expense with the rest of the nature, i.e. biotic and a-biotic community we will certainly appear as wrong doers, as our action will lead to the following destructive results.

1. Our continuous current growth practices would certainly lead us to an environmental crunch including a cultural and economic denomination of the human race.
2. Our objective to maximize the physical benefits of the people alive today would lead us to reject concerns for people infesting the earth in future. And
3. Our present actions influencing the physical conditions of earth tend to a “global non-equilibrium” that will tend to a global catastrophe.¹

In this paper I shall try my level best to bridge up the gap between anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism to show the possibility of the rehabilitation of anthropocentrism in its revised form. In the first part of my discussion the development of anthropocentric attitude along with the criticism will be highlighted. And in the second part of my discussion, I

shall show the acceptability of the concept of anthropocentrism in its revised form. It will be shown that a new concept of anthropocentrism, i.e. **eco-friendly anthropocentrism** will help bridge-up the gap between anthropocentrism and non- anthropocentrism.

Human beings have a profound role to play towards environment. Today degradation of environment is an open secret. The fact is well known all over the world that human's aspiration leads to the degradation of our nature or environment. To satisfy their need, to make their life more comfortable and sophisticated they are always trying to fight against nature without any justification. That is why at present we are on the verge of extinction.

Environment is our home. We are trying to cut off its columns consciously or coconsciously to make our artificial house more comfortable. Human being is the latest child of nature. He has a special God gifted quality of intelligence. This quality has been designated as 'Surplus in Man' by Rabindranath Tagore. This quality differs human being from the other children of nature. Not only that with the help of this quality human beings are trying from the very beginning of the existence to fight against nature to get more comfortable by using the nature only as resource provider. This fighting dissociates him from nature and opens the door of degradation of nature. They take their home only as the resource providing place for human and think that they are on the earth to master over the world. All non-human beings and natural resources are there to serve their purpose. In fact there is a creation theory of Christian religion that says clearly the superiority of human beings. This attitude is called human centeredness or anthropocentric attitude. Surely this attitude leads to the degradation of our environment. And ethically this attitude cannot be supported.

Literally anthropocentrism means human centeredness. This concept is used at the time of describing human beings' attitude to nature. From the time being a particular attitude has been adopted by the human beings focusing on the acceptance of superiority of human beings to the other members of nature. It is said that as human beings possess some special qualities, they deserve the superiority. That is why they have the right to dominate the nature for their own interest. Biotic and a-biotic community is there to serve the purpose of human interest as resource.

The concept of anthropocentrism also incorporates the idea of value. Generally, we see that there are two kinds of values. One is intrinsic and the other is instrumental value. It is also accepted by the followers of anthropocentrism that only human beings have intrinsic

value. Non – human beings and the rest a-biotic community possess only instrumental value. So human beings deserve their privilege position on earth as they are the only bearer of intrinsic value.

There is another concept, i.e. the concept of the possibility of ethics also responsible for the anthropocentric attitude. It is true that the purpose of ethics is to provide the ground of judgment of human behavior from ethical point of view. The behavior of non-human beings does not create any ethical debate. So it is said that only human beings are ethical beings and they have the right to treat others on their own way.

So according to the anthropocentric attitude there is no ethical offence by enjoying a superior position on earth to dominate the nature to use its resource to fulfill the interest of human beings as only human beings have the right to be treated as ethical entity having inherent value which must be respected.

From this discussion we can infer the philosophical basis of the attitude to nature where the interest of human beings has a privilege position.

1. Man is intelligent being and has some special qualities.
2. Such qualities make him superior to the other beings.
3. The superiority of human beings is supported by the concept of inherent value.
4. Only human beings have inherent value.
5. The interest of human beings must be respected and counted for at the expense of others.
6. All ethical principles are formed to judge the behaviour of human beings. So it must be justified to treat human beings as the only member of ethical boundary.

All these statements entail a belief that human beings deserve the right to place him in the centre to dominate the whole biotic and a-biotic community for their own purpose and there is nothing wrong in it.

The Development of Anthropocentrism:

There are two aspects that provide the ground of development of anthropocentrism. The first one is religious aspect and the second one is philosophical or secular aspect. The religious aspect consists in the divine command and the secular aspect consists in rationality.

The divine command, especially, the creation theory of the Bible clearly explains the superior position of human beings and provides the space for the domination of nature. Ac-

According to this theory, 'God created human beings, making them to be like him. He created them male and female, blessed them and said, "Have many children, so that your descendants will live all over the earth and bring it under their control. I am putting you in charge of the fish, the birds, and the wild animals."'2

On the other hand, secular context is based on rationality and wants to extend the boundary of morality only to sentient beings. Philosophically, it is articulated in western philosophy. It is true that the anthropocentric attitude has a long history. This concept has been laid down by the early Greek philosophers Plato upholding the view that the immortal soul is distinct from the mortal body. This paved the way for the soul to trap the physical world. Like Plato the early rationalist philosophers hold that what is mental (special) is different from what is physical (material). The proclamation of Greek sophist Protagoras, 'Man is the measure of all things'³ is the philosophy as the final version of anthropocentrism.

Nature, to human beings is nothing but only for domination. The theory of domination has its roots in the philosophy of Aristotle and the creation theory of Bible. Aristotle suggested that, 'nature has made all animals for the sake of man.'⁴ Bacon has also the idea of domination. He told, 'Our main object is to make nature to serve the business and conveniences of man.' Nature must be bound into services to human kind. He hoped that humanity would subdue 'nature with all her children, to bind her to service and to make slave'⁵

Marxist economic theory holds that the purely natural material in which no human labour is objectified has no value.⁶ John Locke also is not ready to accept any value to raw nature. According to Locke when the raw nature is improved by human beings, only then it acquires value. Even after the improvement, labour is the main factor in any value assessment.⁷

Thomas Hobbes upheld the view that the society is composed of nothing more than self interested atomistic individuals. The individualism also acquired recognition from the world of science represented by Newton and Galileo. Their metaphysics of nature is based on mathematization invigorated the notion of individual existence.

This emphasis on individual existence, which is one of the roots of anthropocentric point of view, is the main theme of the rationalist thinkers. A number of enlightenment thinkers like Kant, Hegel also advocated for individualism.

Generally, anthropocentric attitude offers its two forms – one is strong anthropocen-

tric attitude and the other is called weak anthropocentric attitude. Strong anthropocentrism may be described in three philosophical senses- i.e., ethical, ontological and epistemological senses. As an ethical view it refers to the explicitly stated or implied claim that only human beings have intrinsic value; all other natural beings and things have only instrumental value, and human interests thus always trump the interests of non-humans and environment. As an ontological view, anthropocentrism refers to the position, sometimes identified as Aristotelian or Thomistic, in which humans are seen as the centre of the universe or the end of creation. As an epistemological view, anthropocentrism is tautological.⁸ On the other hand, weak sense of anthropocentrism offers a slight ethical view regarding this matter. It includes responsibility to nature, wise management and conservation of resources. It also states the necessity of the preservation of species and natural wonders. In a word, it has its own attitude to value landscape in a different manner, recognizing its present and future beauty, cultural expressiveness, therapeutic and recreation value, ability to inspire individuals and communities to care for and protect nature.⁹

Argument in favour of Anthropocentrism:

- i. **Anthropocentrism ought to be valued above Biocentrism:** The word anthropocentrism refers not only to the concept of human centeredness, but to cultural entity. According to this explanation, humanity is the most significant entity on earth with intrinsic value. On the other hand, biocentrism considers all forms of life as having intrinsic value. In other words, biocentrism holds that all living beings are ends in themselves. Now a day, humans are beginning the slow process of writing their wrongs, and becoming more environmentally conscious, in the attempt to preserve human existence along with the environment. This is an anthropocentric attitude, and not at all biocentric.
- ii. **Anthropocentrism improves the Human condition:** It is argued that the individual culture and technological skill of human beings are among the attributes that make their species special and different, and these qualities help human beings to become the most successful species on earth. In essence, it can be said that the use of a human-centered society and thought process leads to great growth and prosperity, physically, and socially, in our world, by humanity's use of the resources around it in a responsible and careful manner, it is able to further improve its society and world.

By using our resources in the way we see fit, and by doing that which is in our own best interests, we can improve our condition along with the rest of the world.

- iii. **Anthropocentrism and Human Rights:** It is said that anthropocentrism is the basis for some naturalistic concepts of human rights. You know that 20th century is designated as the century of human rights. And 21st century is called the century of the rights for all. Right for all does not refer that the human beings are outside the circle. So, human rights are there and we have to accept it. Where there is the concept of human rights, the concept of anthropocentrism is there as basis.
- iv. **Pragmatic Consideration:** The reconsideration of anthropocentrism has been made from the pragmatic point of view. There are two senses of reconsideration. The first one is substantive and the second one is methodological. The basic difference between these two senses lies in what we mean by pragmatism and how we use pragmatic concepts and principles.

The substantive content of pragmatism is developed as a practical guide to environment policy. For example, Byran Norton presents a revisionist interpretation of Leopold's famous maxim, A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community as a practical management principle for environmental policy rather than a claim regarding the ontological and moral status of ecosystems. Norton claims that Leopold's 'land ethic' need not be treated as a moral claim about the validity of non-anthropocentrism'. It is, rather, a shift in emphasis in management strategies for natural resources.

The main theme of the environmental policy of preservation is intended to preserve human options and human values of experience. It also explains that the natural resource management will proceed from a human perspective and also, that human values quite legitimately shape the modeling decisions of ecological and physical scientists.

In this way pragmatism rehabilitates and reestablishes anthropocentrism as the basis of environmental ethics.

On the other hand, methodological sense of pragmatism is trying to explore the possibility of practical environmental disputes with the theoretical idea of anthropocentrism. It is nothing but the use of pragmatic method to throw lights on the debates of environmental ethics.

- v. **Sagoff's View:** Sagoff uses examples of things in nature which society wishes to

preserve for various values. For example, he discusses obvious instrumental grounds, like potential medicinal reasons for preservation. He then contrasts that society may wish to preserve a ten thousand year old forest for its aesthetic qualities, clearly, the very definition of aesthetic is the appreciation of beauty! If man appreciates the beauty of an object, it serves him! Lastly Sagoff talks of moral value of objects in nature. Yes, we must preserve resources, but only for the sake of preserving human resources, not to preserve nature for its own sake or for its value to human beings.

In Environmental ethics there is a different concept regarding the attitude of human beings towards nature. This concept says that human being is nothing but a member of the environment like other animate and non-animate nature. So, he has no right to fulfill his purpose at the expense of the others. Rather, being intelligent, it is his duty to take care to save the health of our environment.

Animal Liberation Theory:

Animal liberation theory is one of the leading non-anthropocentric theory that wants to extend the moral boundary at least to those non-human creatures who have the capacity to feel pain and pleasure. There are two separate defenses of the moral status of rights of animals: the utilitarian and the deontological arguments. Peter Singer is the leading utilitarian thinker. Peter Singer, in his famous book, "Animal Liberation", says that animal liberation movement today is analogous to racial and gender justice in the past. It is said by the utilitarian that all sentient beings are morally considerable as they have the ability to feel pain and pleasure.

Some thinkers, like Singer, offer arguments for the extension of moral boundary from human beings to non-human beings having sentience. Peter Singer, one of the leading animal rightists argues in his famous book, 'Animal Liberation; A New Ethics for our Treatment of Animals' that all sentient beings have right to life free from needless suffering and that they are morally equal to humans.¹⁰ He again says, "It is wrong to inflict needless suffering on another being and that animals should be treated as the independent sentient beings that they are, and not as means to human ends."¹¹

Following Singer it can be said that extension of moral boundary depends on being sentient. This theory is called Sentientism. This theory excludes the non-sentient beings from the boundary of morality. According to Singer, "there can be no reason- except the selfish desire to preserve the privileges of the exploiting group- for refusing to extend the basic prin-

ciple of equality to members of other species.”¹²

The second type of defense of animal rights Tom Regan also believes that to have moral right one must be sentient. i.e., one must have the power to feel pain and pleasure. Sentientism is severely criticized by the other thinkers. It is said by the critique that Singer and Regan had made a mistake as they only accepted the concept of value of life in narrow sense. In that sense intrinsic value indicates the sentient being, i.e., the capacity to enjoy pleasure and pain. But from biocentric outlook the theory preached by Singer and Regan is only a part of the story. The value of life itself must be counted for.

Goodpaster, one of the leading biocentrists, says that we should be suspicious of sentientism because the capacity for pleasure and pain is simply a means that some organisms use to realise their ends. More precisely, sentience is a biological adaption that occurs in some organisms that are conducive to fulfilling their biological functions.¹³ Sentientism proceeds with a biological adoption and clearly indicates that the criterion of being sentience is the basis of a being to be moral. Again this attitude thinks that it will be able to offer a solution to the problems of the extension of moral boundary created by the moralists. Goodpaster thinks that there is an argument in favour of sentientism to offer logical basis for it.

- 1) All and only beings who have interests are morally considerable.
- 2) Non- sentient beings do not have interests.
- 3) Therefore, non- sentient beings are not morally considerable.¹⁴

There is no doubt that the argument is formally valid argument. Again, there is no doubt that the first premise of this argument is true. A being who has interest must be morally considerable being and it is implied that no one has the right to do anything against the interest of a being. But the second premise is not true. Goodpaster also denies the truth of the second premise. ‘non-sentient beings do not have interests’ – this claim of the sentientism is not morally justifiable. This sentience clearly declares that to have interest one must be sentient. This claim confers a narrow meaning to the word ‘interest’. Here the word ‘interest’ is used only to indicate the capacity of experiencing pain and pleasure. The scope to use the word in ‘preferential sense’ is ignored. Those who do not have the capacity to enjoy pain and pleasure also have interest, i.e. preferential interest. In that sense non-sentient beings also have interest and that is why they are also morally considerable. The capacity to enjoy pain and pleasure is not necessary to have interest. So, the conclusion offered in the above argument is

not morally justified. As for example, plants have no capacity to feel pain and pleasure, but they have interests based on their needs for Sun, water and somehow other things that helps to grow the plants.

Here sentientists have something to say in favour of their view that without sentience there is nothing for morality to take into account. Dale Jamieson in his book, 'Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction' offers a useful analogy to represent the matter. He says, "Compare a well-watered plant to a well-oiled car. In both cases we can say that each is a good of its kind that they function at a very high level, and so on. It is also clear that the language of interests can be applied to both. We can say that it is in the interests of trees to have adequate hydration and nutrition; and we can say that it is in the interests of cars to have their oil changed regularly and to be kept in good repair. When it comes to cars, it is uncontroversial that this is a non-literal use of the word 'interest'. We can speak as if cars have interests, but we do not really believe that they do so. What is at issue between sentientism and biocentrism is whether the sense in which plants have interests is the sense in which humans have interests, or whether the fact that we speak in the way regarding plants is a non-literal use as it is in the case of cars. Those who favour a life criterion say that plants have interests in the same sense as humans; those who support sentientism say that talking about the interests of plants is non-literal, as it is when we talk about the interests of cars. For the sentientist, the reason a person has interests and a car does not is that what happens to the person matters to her, while nothing matters to the car. In this respect, the car and the tree are similar and a person is different. It matters to the person that her interests are respected, but not to the tree or the car. We may prefer that the car or the tree be in tiptop condition, but that is our preference, not theirs."¹⁵

The above analogical discussion throws clear light to the positions held by the sentientist and biocentrist. The biocentric outlook is ignored by the sentientist keeping focus to the literal and non-literal senses of the word 'interest'. The sentientists do not bother to incorporate the non-sentient beings into the arena of the morality. They think that a car and a tree are on the same boat having preferential interests. But I think that the view of sentientism is not acceptable as it overlooks some other important factors that offer the line of difference between a car and a tree. Though trees have no capacity to enjoy pain and pleasure like human beings, they have other mechanisms to respond to threats and other various out world stimulations. Not

only that they seek to satisfy their interests, i.e., they want to flourish, to have flowers etc. Whereas, a car has no such mechanism or interests, it runs according to the designers and operators interests.

So, it can be said that there are significant differences between a car and a tree. A car has no interests of its own, but a tree has; the functioning of a car depends on its design, but a tree does not. With these differences I can say that the non- literal meaning of the word 'interest' cannot be applied to a tree like a car. And if it is true then the demand of the sentientists cannot be morally justified.

Biocentrism:

Biocentrism differs from sentientism in respect of the expansion of moral boundary beyond sentient beings. It accepts moral status of all beings on earth. Biocentrism is designated as life-centered outlook and the rejection of anthropocentric outlook is its main concern. Paul Taylor says, "If we were to accept a life-centered theory of environmental ethics, a profound reordering of our moral Universe would take place. We would begin to look at the whole of the earth's discipline in a new light. Our duties with respect to the 'world' of nature would be seen as making prima facie claims upon us to be balanced against our duties with respect to the 'world' of human civilization. We would no longer simply take the human point of view and consider the effects of our actions exclusively from the perspective of our own good."¹⁶

It can be said, following the theory, that there is a radical change of our attitude to be accepted by us towards nature. It clearly says that human beings are simply a biological creature with equal intrinsic value. It does not deny the uniqueness of human beings, but reminds us that we are nothing but only one species of animal life. It also tells us that we are one with all the other members of the biotic community along with our ecological situation i.e. an integral part of the nature. Our real position on this earth is clearly and firmly explained by Taylor in this way, "When we accept the biocentrism outlook and when we view the realm life and nature from its perspective, our awareness of the moment to moment existence of each living thing is sharpened and clarified concentrated attention upon a particular organism discloses certain features that we as individuals share with it like ourselves, other organisms are teleological centers of life."¹⁷

Ecocentrism:

Ecocentrism goes beyond biocentrism. Biocentrism only wants to enlarge the boundary of

morality to biotic community. They have no intention to incorporate a -biotic community into the area of morality. On the other hand, ecocentrism offers a new kind of attitude regarding morality. It wants to incorporate the whole ecosystem into the moral boundary. Aldo Leopold, one of the leading thinkers, explains clearly the concept of ecocentrism in his famous book, 'A Sand Country Almanac'. In this book he demands for the integrity, beauty and preservation of nature as a whole. He says, "All ethics so far evolved rest upon a single premise: that the individual is a member of a community of interdependent parts."¹⁸

From this saying, it implies that the key point of the whole world is the interdependent nature of individual beings. So, one or two specieses must not be treated as superior having the right to enjoy the moral status. The concept explained in this book by Leopold is called 'Land Ethic'. The meaning of 'Land Ethic' is also explained by Leopold clearly. He says, "The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land."¹⁹

According to Rowe, The ecocentric argument is grounded in the belief that, compared to the undoubted importance of the human part, the whole ecosphere is even more significant and consequential: more inclusive, more complex, more integrated, more creative, more beautiful, more mysterious, and older than time. Ecocentrism goes beyond biocentrism with its fixation on organisms, for in the ecocentric view people are inseparable from the inorganic/organic nature that encapsulates them. They are particles and waves, body and spirit, in the context of Earth's ambient energy.²⁰ Ecocentrism focuses on the biotic community as a whole and tries to keep intact the integrity and beauty of the ecosystem. The ecocentric attitude, by contrast with the sentientism, believes that the protection of natural world is necessary for protection of nature. Deep ecologist, Arne Naess has identified anthropocentrism as a root cause of the ecological crisis, human overpopulation, and the extinction of many non-human species.²¹ Going through the basic concept of biocentrism it can be said that it wants to mould the attitude of human beings towards nature by accepting inherent values of biotic community. What will be the position of human beings on earth? To answer this question we must have to follow the observations of Aldo Leopold. He says, "In short, land ethic changes the role of homo sapiens from conquerer of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it. It implies respect for his fellow members and also respect for the community as such."²²

Criticism:

It is true that all non-anthropocentric theories are intended to go beyond anthropocentric attitude by enlarging the moral boundary set up by the anthropocentrism, i.e. from homosapiens to non-human beings and finally, from non-human beings to non-animate nature. They all are agreeing on a point that human beings have no right to use nature along with non-human beings for their own interest. In a word, anthropocentrism, to them is nothing but a prejudice and morally objectionable theory.

Generally, it is said, by the non-anthropocentric views that there is no reason to treat human beings as special one and they have no right to disturb the natural status of the nature. It is also said that natural status occurs only when an ecosystem is left untouched by human beings. In this way, most of the non-anthropocentrists, specially, Naess, are consciously trying to separate human beings from nature. It is implied from the thinking of the non-anthropocentrists, that all actions performed by human beings must be designated as unnatural. I think that here lies the point of internal inconsistency and it will be shown easily that for this inconsistency non-anthropocentric attitudes cannot be accepted.

Let us see how the internal inconsistency arises in this connection. Separation of human beings from nature is impossible. Rather, it is an open fact that human beings are inseparable part of nature. If so, then one must have to accept the fact that human beings are natural by nature. As human beings are natural by nature, their actions are also natural. So, if you say that all actions performed by human beings are unnatural, surely you will be a victim of internal inconsistency. This internal inconsistency is there and for this reason the claims of all non-anthropocentric theories appeared as insignificant and pave the way of rehabilitation of anthropocentrism.

According to Watson, human beings ought to curb their evolutionary tendencies, rather let them flow as Naess and others argue, because we have such a great potential for being destructive. The fact that only human behavior is subject to moral evaluation does set us apart. If we really are merely members of the biotic community, then surely egalitarianism implies that we ought not to be treated differently. But most non-anthropocentric ethical systems prescribe constraints only on human conduct.²³

Again he says, 'Most non-anthropocentric theorists suggest that we must preserve certain ecological systems as they are because they are natural, and so are inherently good.

But how do we know what the good is? That is, what kinds of ecological systems are inherently good? The earth has changed considerably over its 4.5 billion year history. Why suppose that current ecological systems are somehow inherently valuable, but others are not? And why suppose that human modified ecological systems are not valuable?’²⁴

Here Watson raised a pertinent question regarding the criterion of value judgment of ecological system. Perhaps the non-anthropocentric theorists have no answer to this question and that is why the criticism made by them against anthropocentrism is not final, rather there is a chance to revive it by accepting some modifications.

Watson suggests that most environmental ethical systems are anthropocentric at their foundations. Even those who explicitly claim to be non-anthropocentric will usually make some reference to the human good of actions taken to preserve nature. And usually, this reference will end up being the grounding reason for restricting human behaviour. Why preserve a diverse global ecosystem? Because it is best for humans to do so.²⁵

Now I am going to present the general consideration regarding the rehabilitation of revised anthropocentrism following some philosopher’s statements – at first I can say the view of Næss. According to Næss the position of understanding nature following total field image came to focus on the *identification* of the human ego with nature. The idea is, briefly, that by identifying with nature I can enlarge the boundaries of the self beyond my skin. My larger – ecological – Self (the capital “S” emphasizes that I am something larger than my body and consciousness), deserves respect as well. To respect and to care for my Self is also to respect and to care for the natural environment, which is actually part of me and with which I should identify. “Self-realization”, in other words is the reconnection of the shriveled human individual with the wider natural environment. Næss maintains that the deep satisfaction that we receive from identification with nature and close partnership with other forms of life in nature contributes significantly to our life quality.

But Næss–wary of the apparent totalitarian political implications of Leopold’s position that individual interests and well-being should be subordinated to the holistic good of the earth’s biotic community (see section 4 below) – has always taken care to distance himself from advocating any sort of “land ethic”. Some critics have argued that Næss’s deep ecology is no more than an extended social-democratic version of utilitarianism, which counts human interests in the same calculation alongside the interests of all natural things (e.g., trees,

wolves, bears, rivers, forests and mountains) in the natural environment.

While Næss's Ecosophy T sees human Self-realization as a solution to the environmental crises resulting from human selfishness and exploitation of nature, some of the followers of the deep ecology platform in the United States and Australia further argue that the expansion of the human self to include nonhuman nature is supported by the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum theory, which is said to have dissolved the boundaries between the observer and the observed.²⁶

Meanwhile, some third-world critics have accused deep ecology of being elitist in its attempts to preserve wilderness experiences for only a select group of economically and socio-politically well-off people. The Indian writer Ramachandra Guha (1989, 1999) for instance, depicts the activities of many western-based conservation groups as a new form of cultural imperialism, aimed at securing converts to conservationism. "Green missionaries", as Guha calls them, represent a movement aimed at further dispossessing the world's poor and indigenous people. "Putting deep ecology might in fact be varieties of environmentalism that are more apposite, more representative, and more popular in the countries of the south." Although Næss himself repudiates suggestions that deep ecology is committed to any imperialism.²⁷ Guha's criticism raises important questions about the application of deep ecological principles in different social, economic, and cultural contexts. Finally, in other critique, deep ecology is portrayed as having an inconsistent utopian vision. So, the concept of deep ecology has a hind agendum of anthropocentrism. The concept of 'green missionaries' is nothing but a concept that bears a political aim to reach its goal silently, but strongly with the basis of a revised anthropocentrism.

Reassessment of anthropocentrism:

Now-a-days, some thinkers, like Tim Heyward think that reassessment is required for anthropocentrism to show its inevitability in environmental ethics. We have to overcome anthropocentrism to establish it. From ontological point of view one can criticize anthropocentrism, but from ethical point of view it cannot be said that anthropocentrism must be rejected.

The matter will be explained following Tim Heyward's famous book, "Political Theory and Ecological Values". In the third chapter of this book, he explains the matter as 'Anthropocentrism: A misunderstood problem', He shows that there is no ethical importance of the criticism made by the non-anthropocentric theories. Basically, according to the oppo-

ment thinkers, anthropocentrism must be rejected as it is nothing but equal to speciesism and human chauvinism. If we carefully eliminate there attributes of anthropocentrism, we will see that the rejection of anthropocentrism is superfluous. We can free anthropocentrism from speciesism and human chauvinism. Again, it can be said that anthropocentrism without the flavor of speciesism and human chauvinism is ineliminable.

How can we be able to overcome the flavor of speciesism and human chauvinism? To answer this question he says, “Overcoming human chauvinism requires primarily a degree of good faith and the development of a sympathetic moral disposition.”²⁸

Here he already appeals to the mental disposition and good faith of human beings to overcome human chauvinism. Again he says, “Overcoming speciesism requires a commitment to consistency and non-arbitrariness in moral judgment combined with the development of knowledge adequate to ascertaining what is and is not arbitrary in our consideration of non-human beings.”²⁹

So, it can be said that to overcome speciesism and human chauvinism human beings should have to inculcate some inner qualities to extend his or her heart for a wider attitude. Anthropocentrism appears as ineliminable part of ethics because, the possibility of ethics and ethical judgment depends on the ethical concept of anthropocentrism. Tim Heyward says, “The ineliminable element of anthropocentrism is marked by the impossibility of giving meaningful moral consideration to cases which bears no similarity to any aspect of human cases.”³⁰

Undoubtedly, the purpose of ethics is to provide space for the judgment of human behavior. If it is true then you have to accept the ethical position of anthropocentrism. Ethical judgement without anthropocentric flavor is impossible. The ineliminable character of anthropocentrism, in ethics, will appear as favorable element of environmental ethics to be a meaningful one.

There are two types of anthropocentrism. The first one is used in traditional sense and the other is used in moderate or revised sense. I want to introduce a third sense of the concept of anthropocentrism, i.e., eco-friendly anthropocentrism. In this sense anthropocentrism is used more comprehensively to incorporate nature in its moral boundary. This anthropocentrism is guided by the law of respect for nature, Reverence for life and comprehensive management of natural resources. Actually, anthropocentrism is nothing but to consider human beings as eco-friendly concept having the aspiration of the preservation of humanity through

the legitimate use of the natural resources. It should be kept in mind that if human beings simply waste and waste and do not contribute anything to nature, they will not be able to play the role of a true leader on earth. They should consider themselves as a true leader in the present critical juncture to lead the whole biotic and a-biotic community to accomplish the venture of the sound health of our home, i.e. the whole universe for the safety for all, i.e. for the 'Oikas', that means the whole system of sustainability, as system in which various discrete parts are interrelated.

Here I again want to introduce a principle consisted by three 'EEE'. The first 'E' designates the expansion of heart or self. The second 'E' designates the concept of eco-friendly. And the third stands for the expansion of moral boundary.

That means, to be eco-friendly one must have the attitude to expand his heart for the expansion of moral boundary to incorporate all the biotic and a-biotic community to be treated not only as the resources to serve the purpose of human beings, but also deserve respect.

It should be guided by the principle of **power of love**, instead of the **love of power**. So, according to my conclusion the rehabilitation of anthropocentrism is possible in its eco-friendly manner and I think that only this attitude will show the path to solve the environmental problems, to bridge-up the gap between the two opposite concepts, i.e. anthropocentrism and non- anthropocentrism.

Notes and References

1. Guha Debasis, *Practical and Professional Ethics*, Vol. II, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2007, pp. 16-17.
2. cf. *Good News Bible*, The Bible society of India, Bangalore, p. 5.
3. cf. W.T. Stace, *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*, MacMillan & Co., 1950, p. 112.
4. Aristotle, *Politics* (Ed.&Trans.Jhon Warrington), J.M.Dent! Sons Ltd., London,1959, p.16.
5. cf. A. Gullispie, *International Environmental Law: Policy and Ethics*, op. cit., p. 13.
6. Karl Marx, *Capital*, op. cit., pp. 206-07.
7. J. Baird Callicott and Robert Frodeman, *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics and Philosophy* (ed), Vol. 1, MacMillan Reference. USA, A Part of Crale, Cenagoge Learning, London, 2009, pp. 58-59.
8. John Lock, *Two Treates of Civil Government*, J.M. Dent Q Sons Ltd. London, 1962,

- pp. 42-43.
9. Ibid.
 10. Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for our Treatment of Animals*, New York Review/ Random House, 1975, p. viii.
 11. Ibid.
 12. Ibid, p. ix.
 13. Dale Jamieson, *Ethics and the Environment: An Introduction*, (New York University), Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 146.
 14. Ibid, p. 146.
 15. Ibid, p. 147.
 16. Eugene C. Hargrove(Ed.),*The Ethics of Respect for Nature: The Animal Rights? Environmental Ethics Debates: The Environmental Perspective*, State University of New York Press, 1992, p. 96.
 17. Ibid.
 18. Aldo Leopold, *A Sand Country Almanac*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1949, p. 203.
 19. Ibid, p. 204.
 20. Rowe, Stan J., Ecocentrism: the Chord that Harmonizes Humans and Earth, "*The Trumpeter*, 1994, **11(2)**, pp. 106-107.
 21. Naess, Arne, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement". *Inquiry* 1973, **16**: pp. 95-100.
 22. Aldo Leopold, *A Sand Country Almanac*, p. 204.
 23. <http://ocw.capilanov.ca/philosophy/phil-208-environmentalethics/non-anthropocentric.htm>. p.9.
 24. Ibid.
 25. Ibid.
 26. Byran G. Norton, *Conservation and Preservation: A Conceptual Rehabilitation, Environmental Ethics*, 1986, pp. 195-220.
 27. See Anker 1999 for cautions of interpreting Næss's Relationalism as an Endorsement of the kind of holism displayed in the land ethic, cf. Grey 1993.
 28. Tim Heyward: 'Anthropocentrism: A Misunderstood Problem', *Political theory and Ecological Values*, Politi Press, 1998, p. 45.
 29. Ibid, p. 46.
 30. Ibid, p. 50.