

## An Outline of an Ecumenical Environmental Ethic

---

### Abstract

*An ecumenical environmental ethic is grounded on some values, imperatives or principles of the world's major religions. Its basic feature is that it prescribes standards of behavior that are appropriate for human relationships with the natural world. In this paper I provide an outline of such an ethic. I do this in two ways. Firstly, by comparing the Hindu, Judeo-Christian, and Buddhist views on the natural environment and human interaction with nature. Secondly, by presenting some of the common values, imperatives or principles that emerge from these religions with regards to human relationships with the natural world. Although this account of an ecumenical environmental ethic is incomplete I believe it provides the basis for further discussions of not just what a complete account of ecumenical environmental ethic will look like but what it has to offer in the overall debate of how best to deal with the various environmental problems confronting us today.*

### Introduction

Discussions about the extent and scope of environmental degradation, global warming, climate change, and loss of biodiversity have grown in the last decade or so. This is not unexpected given the present state of our planet. These discussions have taken different forms, some of which include proposals outlining various ways of dealing with the numerous environmental problems facing humanity today. Since humans are primarily responsible for many of these problems these proposals generally embrace some species of environmental ethics, which in addition to defining human relationships with the natural world, prescribe what are and are not good attitudes and behaviors towards it.

In this paper I'm interested in a species of environmental ethics that emerges from some cultural and religious traditions, that is what one might call *ecumenical environmentalism* or an *ecumenical environmental ethic* — an ethic that I believe hasn't been rigorously presented and defended in the literature. An ecumenical environmental ethic can be defined as an ethic that derives from the values, imperatives or principles of some of the world's major religions. In general, the ethic prescribes norms of behavior that are appropriate starting point for human relationship with the natural environment. Specifically, it emphasizes what constitutes responsible and

appropriate conduct and attitudes towards nature. Thus, my objective here is a very modest one. I seek to present an outline of an ecumenical environmental ethic that I hope furthers the discussion about how we ought to be thinking about the various environmental problems confronting us today.

I aim to achieve my objective in two ways. First, I shall compare some of the views on the natural environment of some of the world's major religions, namely, how Hinduism, Judeo-Christianity, and Buddhism understand humans and their relationship with the natural world. Here I will be comparing and contrasting Hinduism with Judeo-Christianity and Buddhism with Judeo-Christianity. I have excluded from consideration some other dominant world religions such as Islam, Taoism, and Shintoism. A complete account of an ecumenical environmental ethic will include these. For the purposes of this paper, I will be using Judeo-Christianity to refer to the standards of ethics and principles held in common both by Judaism and Christianity. Second, I shall briefly present some of the common values, imperatives or principles that emerge from these religions with regards to nature and the relationship of humans with it. Hereinafter, I shall refer to these values, imperative or principles simply as "environmental principles" not only because they constitute part of the core of an ecumenical environmental ethic but because I believe they can provide some nuanced ways of thinking about how to deal with the multifaceted environmental problems that we are faced with at present.

Although I do not pretend to present a full-fledged account of an ecumenical environmental ethic I hope that what I present in this paper will be sufficient to provoke further discussions on the subject. My reason for taking up this project is partly informed by the twin claims made by O. P. Dwivedi's in his article entitled, "*Satyagraha* for Conservation: A Hindu View". Firstly, that "environmental education will remain incomplete until it includes cultural values and religious imperatives." Secondly, that "a synthesis of the key concepts and precepts from each of [the world religions] pertaining to conservation could become a foundation for global environmental ethic."<sup>1</sup>

### **Hinduism and Judeo-Christian Perspectives on the Environment: Some Similarities**

One similarity between both Hinduism and Judeo-Christianity is in the area of creationism; both subscribe to the existence of some creator that is responsible for life and life forms. In Hinduism the god of creation is Brahma, who is one of the gods of the *Trimurti* (or trinity) the others being Vishnu (the maintainer or preserver of creation) and Shiva (the destroyer or transformer of creation). The *Rigveda* elaborates on the conception of creationism in

---

<sup>1</sup> Dwivedi, O. P. (2008), "*Satyagraha* for Conservation: A Hindu View" in *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Louis Pojman (ed.), Belmont: Wadsworth, p.311.

### Hinduism:

The Vedas and the universal laws of nature which control the universe and govern the cycles of creation and dissolution were made manifest by the All-knowing One. By His great power were produced the clouds and the vapors. After the production of the vapors, there intervened a period of darkness after which the Great Lord and Controller of the universe arranged the motions which produce days, nights, and other durations of time. The Great One then produced the sun, the moon, the earth, and all other regions as He did in previous cycles of creation.<sup>2</sup>

In the Judeo-Christian view, there is also the mention of a Supreme Being (Yahweh or Jehovah), the creator of the universe, life and life forms. The Holy Bible says at Genesis 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." After this opening statement, Verses 1 to 25 of the same chapter then go ahead to list all that God has created.

Another similarity between both belief systems is that they see the natural environment as providing humans with various means of subsistence. However, they encourage humans to maintain a responsible relationship and attitude towards it when they use it for life. To this extent they outline guidelines for dealing with not just sentient beings but the natural environment in general. Hinduism recommends wide-ranging duties to animals and birds arising from the concept of *Ahimsa* (non-violence) and reincarnation. I will come to these in a moment. One Hindu scripture speaks of Yajnavalkya Smriti warning of hell-fire to those who are the killers of domesticated and protected animals: "The wicked person who kills animals which are protected has to live in hell-fire for the days equal to the number of hairs on the body of that animal."<sup>3</sup> Another Hindu scripture says: "A person who is engaged in killing creatures, polluting wells and ponds and tanks and destroying gardens, certainly goes to hell."<sup>4</sup> For its part, Judeo-Christianity denounces destruction to nature. This is seen in the *bal tashchit* principle which literally means "do not destroy" and which comes directly from Deuteronomy 20:19-20:<sup>5</sup>

When you besieged a city for a long time, making war against it in order to take it, you shall not destroy its trees by welding an ax against them, but you shall not cut them down. Are the trees in the field men that they should be besieged by you?

---

<sup>2</sup> *Rigveda*, 10:190.1-3.

<sup>3</sup> This passage can be found in the *Tajnaralkyasmriti, Acaradhyayah*, v. 180.

<sup>4</sup> *Padmapurana, Bhoomikhanda* 96:7-8 quoted in Dwivedi, p.315.

<sup>5</sup> Gordis, Robert (2003) "Judaism and the Environment" in *The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book*, Donald VanDeVeer and Christine Pierce (eds.), Belmont: Wadsworth, p.65.

Robert Gordis notes that the principle of *bal tashchit* forbids all sorts of deforestation and extends as well to all aspects of life, on the basis of the “recognition that every natural object is an embodiment of the creative power of God and is therefore scared.”<sup>6</sup>

### **Hinduism and Judeo-Christian Perspectives on the Environment: Some Differences**

Hinduism is both a monotheistic and polytheistic religion claiming that although there are many Gods, each is the Supreme Being. That is, “Hindus contemplate divinity as the one in many and the many in one.”<sup>7</sup> Also, Hinduism promotes God as the efficient cause and nature as the material cause of the universe. Judeo-Christianity on the other hand is strictly monotheistic. It maintains a strong dualism between God and the material world.

Another noticeable difference between both views is that Hinduism lends itself to a robust biocentric or nature-centered value system — the view that places the biosphere at the center of the universe.<sup>8</sup> This can be seen from the Hindu concepts of *ahimsa* and reincarnation. About *ahimsa* and reincarnation one Hindu scripture says: “[F]orm is the source and indestructible seed of multifarious incarnations within the universe, and from the particle and portion of this form, different living entities, like demigods, animals, human beings and others, are created.”<sup>9</sup> Both the concepts of *ahimsa* and reincarnation form the basis for the Hindu belief that all life is equal; of love of nature and non-violence toward all living things. *Ahimsa* prohibits inflicting violence on any living thing and reincarnation postulates that organisms can take on life in another form once they die. The idea that a being or soul could come back as any life form once its previous life has expired leads to the view that all life is connected. Given that the different embodiments of life are interchangeable, it follows that human life is placed

---

<sup>6</sup> Gordis, p.65.

<sup>7</sup> Dwivedi, p.312.

<sup>8</sup> There are two kinds of biocentricism. The first is *biocentric individualism* — the view that the total ecosystem only matter from the moral point of view because individuals find their good in them — and defended by commentators like Taylor, Paul W. (2010), “The Ethics of Respect for Nature” in *Environmental Ethics: The Big Questions*, David R. Keller (ed.), Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 175-182. The second is *biocentric holism* — the view that the biosphere as an interconnected whole (ecosystem) has moral standing — and defended by scholars like Baird Callicott, J. (2005), “Holistic Environmental Ethics and the Problem of Ecofascism” in *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Michael E. Zimmerman et al (eds.), Upper Saddle River, Pearson Prentice Hall, pp.116-129.

<sup>9</sup> *Srimad-Bhagavata*, Book I, Discourse III: 5.

on an equal moral pedestal with non-human life forms. That is to say, no species on the planet has special moral priority over another. This view seems to give a strong motivation for Hindus to revere animals and treat them with respect. Thus, Hindus see refraining from trading and eating meat as both upright and a moral duty in and of itself. The notion of coming back in another life as a species other than human deters practitioners from indulging in meat trading and eating since one could be eating or harming a deceased loved one. Judeo-Christianity, on the other hand, seems to support an anthropocentric value system — the belief that humans are at the top of the species hierarchy and centre of the universe. Genesis 1: 28 states: “Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it and have dominion over the fish in the sea and over the fowl of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.” The misinterpretation of this passage, in particular the various applications that have been made of it has been partly blamed for fostering the sort of values and attitude that have led to environmental degradation in the past.<sup>10</sup>

Another difference is that Judeo-Christianity encourages a stewardship model of managing the planet. As Genesis 1:28 states humans have been given the authority to subdue other life forms. Of course, on a charitable reading such subduing should be understood as managing the natural environment in a responsible way.<sup>11</sup> Such management could be for present and future anthropogenic use or for the glory of God. But in Hinduism, the model that is encouraged is strictly one of non-stewardship but respect for nature, one that aims at conservation and takes all lives, human and non-human to be of equal value and possessing the same right to existence. Since only God has absolute sovereignty over all creatures, human beings according to Dwivedi have no dominion over their own lives not to talk of that of non-human life. That is to say “humanity cannot act as a viceroy of God over the planet.”<sup>12</sup>

A final difference between both beliefs systems is that they share the value of a positive and compassionate stance towards nature despite the

---

<sup>10</sup> For example, Historian Lynne White Jr. wrote an article in 1967 about the historical basis of our environmental problems “The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis,” *Science* 155:1203-1207. In the article he attributes the human-centered ethic that has permeated our world and which has led to the various exploitation of nature, the devastating of ecosystems, mass deforestation, and the extinction of numerous species to the misinterpretation of the Genesis passage by Judeo-Christianity or Judeo-Christianity as practiced in the churches. In particular, by the late Medieval Latin Christian idea that humanity is to *dominate* nature, the idea that placed humans above all other species and which takes them to be created merely for human utilization and satisfaction. See also Linzey, Andrew (1990), “For God So Loved the World,” *Between the Species* 6(1): 12-16; Attfield, Robin (2003) “Stewardship Versus Exploitation” in *The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book*, pp.66-71.

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion of the sort of charitable reading I am suggesting here see Linzey, pp.12-16 and Attfield, pp.66-71.

<sup>12</sup> Dwivedi, p.312.

degree that this stance takes in both perspectives on the one hand, and the varying interpretations of what it entails, on the other. In general terms the positive and compassionate stance entails the respective value and importance that they place on not harming living things. Judeo-Christianity holds that although humans are above the natural world they have a duty towards protecting it due to the fact that God as creator of nature has placed humans as its viceroys or stewards. As Linzey puts it, for God loved the world so much including his creatures that the humans as viceroys have an obligation to also love it. That is to say, “we cannot love God and hate his non-human creatures.”<sup>13</sup> By contrast, Hinduism holds that humans are part of nature, they are not above other life forms and thus by destroying or harming the natural worlds, they are in fact injuring themselves.

### **Buddhism and Judeo-Christian Perspectives on the Environment: Some Similarities**

Buddhism<sup>14</sup> and Judeo-Christianity share some aspects in common with regards to the natural environment. Judeo-Christianity denounces destruction of nature as we saw with the principle of *bal tashchit*. Likewise, Buddhism condemns injury to all life including flora and fauna. There are Five Precepts that are well-known in Buddhism which form the minimum code of ethics for every Buddhist. The first of the precepts involves abstention from injury to life. It is, as De Silva notes, “the casting aside of all forms of weapons, being conscientious about depriving a living being of life.”<sup>15</sup>

Another similarity is that Buddhism and Judeo-Christianity promote the idea that there is value in all life, human and non-human, and nature as deserving of protection. In addition, they both hold that one ought to exhibit a level of caring towards nature, that all living creatures ought to be treated respectfully and compassionately. With regards to Judeo-Christianity we see this in the injunction to “minimize the pain of living creatures” as outlined in a number of scriptures. For example, Deuteronomy 22:10 forbids pulling a plough with an ox and a donkey, as the unequal pairing would burden the weaker animal. Also, Deuteronomy 25:4 prohibits muzzling an ox during the threshing period so that he could not eat any of the grain, and Leviticus 22:28 forbids slaughtering an ox or a sheep together on the same day. Like Judeo-Christianity, Buddhism prescribes “compassion and

---

<sup>13</sup> Linzey, p.60.

<sup>14</sup> Buddhism rests on the teachings of Buddha (Siddhartha Gautama), a spiritual teacher said to have achieved full enlightenment after abandoning his comfortable life in the palace for a life of mendicant. He described the dharma, or “truth about right living”, as not an invented approach to life but a single ultimate truth discoverable by anyone. See Watson, Peter (2006), *Ideas: A History from Fire to Freud*, London: Phoenix, p.158.

<sup>15</sup> De Silva, Lily (2008), “The Buddhist Attitude Towards Nature” in *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, p.321.

sympathy for all living beings” of all quarters without restriction as well as a universal attitude of loving-kindness.<sup>16</sup> Buddhism encourages a gentle non-violent attitude towards the vegetable kingdom as well as animals. And expectedly, the concept of karma and rebirth readily prepares the Buddhist to adopt a sympathetic attitude towards animals. De Silva states:

The *Karanzyamettei Sutta* enjoins the cultivation of loving-kindness towards all creatures, timid and steady, long and short, big and small, minute and great, visible and invisible, near and far, born and awaiting birth. All quarters are to be suffused with this loving attitude. Just as one’s own life is precious to oneself, so is the life of the other precious to himself. Therefore a reverential attitude must be cultivated towards all forms of life....

Both Buddhism and Judeo-Christianity encourage responsible use of nature and natural resources. Buddhism not only prohibits wastefulness and excess but also, cherishes frugality as “a virtue in its own right.”<sup>17</sup> It also “tirelessly advocates the virtues of non-greed, non-hatred, and non-delusion in all human pursuits.”<sup>18</sup> The principle of *bal tashchit* (in Judeo-Christianity) according to Gordis encourages humans to have a proper view of property. That is, the principle forbids humans not only from destroying the property of a neighbor or someone else but also that which they own. This idea of a responsible relationship with property comes out of Leviticus 25:5-60 which encourages the exercise of moderation in the use of resources from the land.<sup>19</sup>

### **Buddhism and Judeo-Christian Perspectives on the Environment: Some Differences**

In this section I shall be examining four differences. The first concerns the status of God in both religious views and how this informs a different value commitment with regards to the natural environment. Judeo-Christianity has a monotheist foundation; the belief of a God forms the basis of human relationship with the natural world and consequently human attitude towards it. This belief gives birth to the “recognition that every natural object is an

---

<sup>16</sup> De Silva, p.321

<sup>17</sup> De Silva, p.320.

<sup>18</sup> De Silva, p.320.

<sup>19</sup> The verses in this chapter of Leviticus brings out the practice of Sabbath, primarily, the Sabbatical Year whereby every six years of harvest is followed by “a Sabbath to the Lord” during which the land is supposed to lie fallow. See Gordis, p.65.

embodiment of the creative power of God and is therefore sacred.”<sup>20</sup> Although the natural world personifies God’s creative power, the earth is non-divine; all it is is the non-divine creation of a transcendent, divine, and personal God.<sup>21</sup> Because the environment is God’s creation, humans must value it *anthropocentrically*. In contrast, Buddhism suggests that all reality forms a self-sufficient unity that is immanent and divine. The transient physical world in which humans and nature reside is merely an illusion behind which the divine lies.<sup>22</sup> Thus Buddhist core principles and morality is not based on the existence of a God; the incentive to respect life and abstain from harming it seems more personal. Moral conduct fuels one’s journey to Nibbana (Nirvana) or a state of bliss and fulfillment, and it is the ultimate goal for those who practice Buddhism.<sup>23</sup>

A related difference is with regards to what motivates actions and attitude towards the natural environment. Judeo-Christian actions and attitudes toward the environment are informed by the Scriptures and God’s sacred laws.<sup>24</sup> That is, Judeo-Christians deploy themselves as agents of God that have a duty to watch over and to take care of nature or as stewards responsible for managing and shaping the natural world.<sup>25</sup> In this sense human beings utilize nature’s resources because it is their divine duty to shape and use the world. Buddhists, on the other hand pursue right living (through virtues such as contentment, compassion, and wisdom) in order to escape the suffering of the transient world.<sup>26</sup> This is informed by the view that the cosmos is governed by five interconnected natural laws: physical, biological, psychological, moral, and causal laws, wherein causal laws act among the other four. Natural changes are reflections of the interlocking of human beings and nature with the law of causality. Thus the moral choices of human beings affect the changes that occur in nature, which in turn affects the wellbeing of humans.

Thirdly, whereas Buddhist values encompass universal ways of living, those of Judeo-Christianity often outline specific rules and principles. As we have seen there are injunctions with regards to treatment of animals such

---

<sup>20</sup> Gordis, p.65

<sup>21</sup> Clouser, Roy, (1991), *The Myth of Religious Neutrality: An Essay on the Hidden Role of Religious Beliefs in Theories*, Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, p.43.

<sup>22</sup> Clouser, pp.40-41.

<sup>23</sup> De Silva, p.321.

<sup>24</sup> Linzey, p.59.

<sup>25</sup> See Attfeld, pp.66-71.

<sup>26</sup> See Oxtoby, Willard G. and Alan F. Segal (2007) (eds.), *A Concise Introduction to World Religions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.389-90; De Silva, p.323

as rules about wielding an ax against a tree or not yoking together an ox and a donkey. Buddhism highlights the earth's dynamic nature and its principles allow room for evaluating what is or isn't ethical without necessarily being concerned with rules of behavior. It states for example, that if humans conduct themselves without greed and hatred and live moderately, that is "eschewing both extremes of self-deprivation and self-indulgence" then they are living in harmony with nature.<sup>27</sup>

Finally, the Buddhist holds a *biocentric value system* towards nature. Nature and sentient beings are inherently valuable for their sake. It encourages the appreciation of nature's beauty for its own sake.<sup>28</sup> It promotes each person's own emotional involvement with nature, views the relationship between humankind and nature as interdependent and reciprocal, and maintains that all components of the universe are of equal value although they may vary in terms of "innate spiritual potential."<sup>29</sup> Hence, each human being must act in accordance with the Buddhist teachings in recognition that *dhammaniyama*, the causal law, links the psychological and moral health of individuals to the health of the environment. But unlike Buddhism, Judeo-Christianity promotes an *anthropocentric value system* towards the natural world. Nature is valuable only in the sense that humans can utilize and shape it for their ends. In the Genesis passage, the instruction is to subdue the earth, have dominion over it and use it for the benefit of humans.

### **Principles of Ecumenical Environmental Ethic**

From the foregoing discussion there are at least four environmental principles from these religious systems that I would like to emphasize. These principles can be taken as forming part of the foundation of an ecumenical environmental ethic. Here, I will briefly outline them without attempting any rigorous discussion.

The first environmental principle is that of *compassion or loving-kindness for life forms*. All the religions that we have examined stress in some form the importance of maintaining a positive attitude and being compassionate towards non-human animals in particular and the natural world in general. Of course, they do hold different motivations as to why compassion ought to be exercised. However, they all seem to share the view that compassion towards non-human animals is basic to human relationships with these life forms. Being compassionate here requires treating other life forms with a sense of concern for their interests whatever these are. It requires seeing them *feelingly*. That is, being sympathetic towards their interests and taking these into consideration when we act towards them.

---

<sup>27</sup> De Silva, p.323.

<sup>28</sup> De Silva, p.322.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, p.321.

Secondly, there is the environmental principle of *respect for living things*. This principle is similar to the one above in that it takes as important the interests of other life forms. It is however different in that it emphasizes not merely a feeling attitude towards them but recommends seeing living things as having a good or interest of their own that is both independent and connected with those of humans. Respect for living things emphasizes that our actions can affect life forms negatively or positively, that is, they can be harmed or benefited by what we do to them. Their individual welfare is not only factored into human interaction with them, their welfare is taken as an important component of an ethical stance towards them since our behavior and attitude towards them can diminish their life or make it go well overall.

The third environmental principle is the principle of *responsible use of nature and natural resources* which is invariably the sustainability principle in these religions. We find this principle explicitly in Buddhism and Judeo-Christianity and as well as in Hinduism. This principle piggybacks on some other core ethical values in these religions, namely moderation, frugality, and non-greed. The person that maintains a responsible use of the natural world does not set out to exploit beyond what is necessary. And what is necessary is understood in terms of providing means for subsistence. This principle, along with the values that it embodies eschew wastefulness and all sorts of practices that demonstrate lack of frugality and moral restraint. The point is that for survival humans have to depend on the natural world for food, clothing, shelter, medicine, and other requisites and necessities. But in order to achieve optimum benefits from nature we have to understand nature and strive to satisfy our needs and not greed. In that way we would be able to utilize natural resources and live harmoniously with nature.

Finally, there is the *stewardship principle* that emerges primarily from Judeo-Christianity. Stewards, as used in business, are supposed to look after and take very good care of various and existing resources, holdings and interests. Within the context of the Judeo-Christian usage of the term it also suggests cultivating and shaping the natural environment in a way that is beneficial for all of those concerned. Thus, it is befitting of a good steward to be adept and conscientious at managing the resources that have been thrown at him or her. A good steward would not waste resources, nor be nonchalant about how his or her actions affect the interests and welfare of those holdings, in this case the natural world.

## **Conclusion**

What is important about the four environmental principles is that they do not appeal to any religious commitments; they have religious roots but a secular application. That is, they can easily be applied to any secular understanding of our relationship with or commitment about nature that we may have. A case in point is the stewardship principle and the principle of responsible use of nature and natural resources.

The stewardship principle that emerges from Judeo-Christianity has been gaining currency and momentum in discussions of the environment and environmental sustainability today. We see this, for example in the emergence of various environmental groups like “Wetland Stewardship Partnership”, “Big Ten Environmental Stewardship”, “Alberta Environmental Stewardship Coalition”, and “Alberta Stewardship Network”. A noteworthy point here is that in the present use of the term environmental stewardship, discussions of what it entails viz-a-viz environmental sustainability have barely any religious undertone. Although the environmental stewardship and stewardship principle are buzzwords today one needs to emphasize that they require some unpacking if they are to be properly applied. A rough way to understand how they might work in practice is to think generally of the stewardship model in business, where stewards are supposed to maximize the interests of the business for its owners.

With regards to the principle of responsible use of nature and natural resources we can see how, as one of the core principles of the ecumenical environmental ethic, it provides us some nuance and useful ways of thinking about consumption and recycling. Indeed, this principle will condemn in the strongest possible terms not only our consumption patterns and lifestyles today but also the excessive exploitation of nature. This principle encourages moderation, frugality, and eschews wasting what is usable. A good insight into what this principle might entail is provided in this account in Buddhism. It is said that in order to illustrate this principle, Ananda explained to King Udena the thrifty economic use of robes by the monks in the following order. “When new robes are received the old robes are used as coverlets, the old coverlets as mattress covers, the old mattress covers as rugs, the old rugs as dusters, and the old tattered dusters are kneaded with clay and used to repair cracked

floors and walls.”<sup>30</sup> Clearly then this principle has much to teach us not simply about the way we consume resources but what will do in terms of recycling resources. More importantly, the principle helps us to consider the value of living moderately. Living moderately and eschewing both extremes of self-deprivation and self-indulgence helps to foster an attitude and ethic of harmoniously living with nature.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, p.320.

### References

- Attfield, Robin (2003) “Stewardship Versus Exploitation” in *The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book*, pp.66-71.
- Baird Callicott, J. (2005), “Holistic Environmental Ethics and the Problem of Ecofascism” in *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Michael E. Zimmerman et al (eds.), Upper Saddle River, Pearson Prentice Hall, pp.116-129.
- Clouser, Roy, (1991), *The Myth of Religious Neutrality: An Essay on the Hidden Role of Religious Beliefs in Theories*, Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- De Silva, Lily (2008), “The Buddhist Attitude Towards Nature” in *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, p.319-323.
- Dwivedi, O. P. (2008), “Satyagraha for Conservation: A Hindu View” in *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*, Louis Pojman (ed.), Belmont: Wadsworth, pp.310-318.
- Gordis, Robert (2003) “Judaism and the Environment” in *The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book*, Donald VanDeVeer and Christine Pierce (eds.), Belmont: Wadsworth, pp.62-65.
- Linzey, Andrew (1990), “For God So Loved the World,” *Between the Species* 6(1): 12-16
- Lynne White Jr. (1967), “The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis,” *Science* 155:1203-1207.
- Oxtoby, Willard G. and Alan F. Segal (2007) (eds.), *A Concise Introduction to World Religions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Padmapurana, Bhoomikhanda* 96:7-8.
- Rigveda*, 10:190.1-3.
- Srimad-Bhagavata*, Book I, Discourse III: 5.
- Tajnaralkyasmriti, Acaradhyayah*, v. 180.
- Taylor, Paul W. (2010), “The Ethics of Respect for Nature” in *Environmental Ethics: The Big Questions*, David R. Keller (ed.), Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp.175-182.
- Watson, Peter (2006), *Ideas: A History from Fire to Freud*, London: Phoenix.