



A NON-ANTHROPOCENTRIC ENVIRONMENTALIST OUTLOOK OF THEOCENTRISM

Olaniyan Adeola Seleem¹

EOI: 10.11216/gsj.2022.07.74818

Abstract

Analogous to anthropocentrism, theocentrism, or simply called God-centeredness, is the position that considers everything as revolving around God as its sole proprietor. It exists in many strands but here it is strictly employed in environmental sense. There was a misconceived assumption that theocentric position is nothing but a typical ontological anthropocentrism, a strand of anthropocentrism that claims humans' superiority on the ground of his beingness. Of which, anthropocentrism, or any strand of it for that matter, however enlightened it claims, "has been prosecuted for 'rape' allegation and can never be freely acquitted from the environmentalists court of law, no matter how eloquent its solicitor could prove to be." The question is; could true theocentric position be co-notorious given the acclaimed qualities of God as Omnipotent and Omniscient?

Key Words: Theocentrism, Anthropocentrism, Zoocentrism, Biocentrism, Ecocentrism, Eco-feminism, Dominioniship, Stewardship

Introduction

Science, together with his twin brother, technology, promised heaven on earth that; they would proffer lasting solution to all humans' problems, both epistemic and material needs in its entirety, but a holistic assessment has shown that the rate at which they jointly solve problems is arithmetically as against the geomorphic rate of their problems creation, to state it in the

¹ Graduate Student, Department of Philosophy, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. Email: olaniyanadeolaseleem140@gmail.com ORCID ID: <https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-3989-4593>

mathematics terms. Taking a unilateral assessment, one could not do but wrongly conclude that the world has witnessed unprecedented growth as a direct result of humans' advancement in science and technology that dominate the last few centuries: from transportation; road, rail, water and aircraft media technology to information and communication technology down to agriculture and food production and processing technology to healthcare advancement through energy generation and power supply just to mention but few, all this witnessed growth in one perspective or the other. The question that begs for answer is; are these changes called growth truly translate to development?

A deep, more especially, thorough environmentalist reading would answer this question in negative form. This is evidential in environmental crises that surface in different forms; climate change, desert encroachment, specie loss, acidic rain, ozone depletion, global warming, a tremendous decline in cultural values, spiritual deterioration, emergence of strange but chronicle diseases, war, famine, hunger and poverty, all are nothing but pointers to the fact that the growth was devoid of development in the real sense of it. Meanwhile, behind all these atrocities is a specie called 'human' who, perhaps, out of arrogance or ignorance, dethroned—and elevated itself onto the throne of—God, all in the name of colonising the nature, by providing a self-centered answer to the question; “who owns the nature?”¹ “Humans own the nature,” it simply answers. This is, in a way, parallel with the Europeans Eurocentric answer to the question; “who owns all the continents of the globe?” where the European, out of their Eurocentric gaze to justify their colonialism agenda, dubiously answers that: “all the continents are owned by Europeans,” as illustrated by Achille Mbembe.² In *The Laws of Nature*, gotten perplexed on the bad fate of nature in the hand of humans, A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda lamentingly opens his introduction with this remark, permit me to quote him lengthily thus:

Man prides himself on being a creature of reason, above the lowly beasts. Yet it seems that when he applies his reason to unlocking the secrets of nature for his benefit, he sinks deeper and deeper into a quagmire of intractable problems. The internal combustion engine gets us where we're going faster, but also results in chocking air pollution, the greenhouse effect, and a dangerous dependence on oil. Harnessing the atom gives us cheap energy, but also leads to weapons of mass destruction, Chernobyl, and a rising tide of dangerous radioactive waste. Modern agribusiness produces a dizzying variety and abundance of food at the supermarket, but also results in the death of the family farm, the pollution of ground water, the loss of precious topsoil, and many other problems. It is clear we're missing something in our attempts to harness the laws of nature for our own purposes. What is that “something?” We found out in the very first *mantra* of the *Īsopaniṣad*, the foremost of ancient India's book of wisdom known as the

Upaniṣads: “Everything in this creation is owned and controlled by the Lord. One should therefore accept only those things necessary for himself, which are set aside as his quota, and one should not accept other things, knowing well to whom they belong.”³

In reaction against the environmental problems that were immanent, the environmental-minded scientists, philosophers as well as religious researchers enthusiastically came on board to advocate for environment. They came in form of theories which include; anthropocentrism,⁴ zoocentrism,⁵ biocentrism,⁶ (geo)ecocentrism,⁷ and eco-feminism⁸ which differently centered around exclusively humans, animals, entire biomes, ecosystem holistically or feminism-informed ecology as their names individually suggests. Continuous intellectual efforts have shown that these theories are inadequate and ill-founded in one way or the other. However, in addition to all the available criticisms that were ever levied against these theories, they are generally alleged here that all these theories cannot suffice to rescue the environment more than they have done because, at least, they are all erected on ill-founded secular assumption that dubiously removed the hands of God from the scene of which God is the creator of the nature, human inclusive.

Sadly, the environmental problems presumably persist with the introduction of God's hands into it as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures, mainly Bible and Qur'an. This becomes the bases of loud cry, in discontent and disappointment, of a reputable Western Historian *per excellent* named Lynn White in his celebrated paper published in 1967 titled *The Historical Root of Our Ecological Crises*. With all manner of sincerity and humility, he confesses that what the Whites boast of as their science and technology so much so that it is axiomatically believed to be Whites' in origin, is historically exposed to be Occidental in origin, most especially from the gifted Arabs.⁹ He nevertheless, proceeds to criticise Holy Bible for being anthropocentric on its account of creation as contained in the Genesis despite that it is so glaring that anthropocentrism is the most notorious of the environmental theories ever devised by man. Said Nasri also lunched an allegation similar to White's from Qur'an's perspective in 1966.¹⁰ Although, Ibrahim Ozdemir denies the allegation, and argues that the problem results from a piecemeal and oversimplified approach that were been given to some verses of the Qur'an in the course of mimicking or imposing meanings from Christians' view,¹¹ of which I also agree with him.

Anyhow, according to a Yoruba adage, when trees fall on one another, the topmost should be removed first. In this view, I have made a case to rescue the Holy Qur'an of anthropocentric allegations in my earlier published paper titled *Theocentrism is not Anthropocentric: An Enlightened Environmentalist Reading of the Holy Qur'an*. In that article,

Islamic descriptive environmental ethics was dichotomized from the prescriptive ones where the former highlights the 'is' while the latter highlights the 'ought'. Here, efforts shall be made to debunk the allegation that Bible is anthropocentric. This we shall do by providing an alternative enlightened reading with the aid of sharp hermeneutics and comments of some great Christian scholars. Insight shall also be drawn from other world religions including traditional African beliefs, where necessary, to justify our position.

Theocentric Environmentalism

What is environment? Without much ado, we shall allude to an all-inclusive definition of environment that I submitted in my earlier work titled; *Algazel's Sufism as a Critique of Islamic Environmentalism*. This is accepted on the ground that it neither subjectifies nor objectifies anything at the expense of anything. Accordingly:

The totality of everything, circumstances and conditions, biotic or abiotic, natural or artificial, material or spiritual, concrete or abstract and/or permanent or temporal, which affects, partners or influences, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously and/or positively or negatively the survival, wellbeing and flourishing of everything, that I call the environment of a given thing.¹²

From etymological point of view, the concept 'theocentrism' was coined from the three components; *theo*, which is derived from the Greek word *theos* that denotes God and *centric*, from Latinized form of Greek *kentrikos* "pertaining to a center," from *kentron*, and the suffix "-ism," which is used to indicate "doctrine." Accordingly, theocentrism is the doctrine that places God at the centre of everything in the universe. The underlying assumption, therefore, is that the question of "how to best think about our relation with nature" is, by definition, a question bigger than human beings and so an appeal to a higher authority is sacrosanct so as to proffer an adequate and enlightened answer.

According to this doctrine, universe exists for God and that from God is the manual (in form of Holy Scriptures) in which the catalogue of interrelationship and interconnectedness of everything in the universe, is, implicitly or explicitly, contained. These heavenly Scriptures include the written ones as Holy Bible, the Holy Qur'an, the Vedas, the Īsopaniṣad and the Upanishad, Shariat Ki Sugmad, Baghavat Gita, Tora, *et cetera* as well as non-written oral believes as it is contained implicitly in many religious practices in form of myths, taboos, totems and restrictions. It is an undeniable fact that the ocean of scientific and technological growth that majorly birthed environmental crises is mostly popularised in, and, today, has its current flowing

from, the Western region of the globe. And bearing in mind that it has been remarked by Lynn White, among other scholars, that moral values of the West are largely devised by the Christian tradition either by implicit or explicit reading of the Bible. It is on this ground that Bible and Christianity views shall be interrogated emphatically with an aim to debunk the surface reading that is offensively anthropocentric. In this regard, Christian views shall be dichotomised along two lines viz; the *traditional* and the *alternative enlightened* reading. Insight shall nevertheless be drawn from other worldly religions too.

A Traditional Reading of the Holy Bible

According to Christian doctrine, the nature is created by God. Alluding to the account of creation in the *Genesis*, human, who is the last of God's creations, has dominion over nature. It was an account of a last child of a family who becomes the commander over his elderlies! The account is a long one which has it that; the creation takes God six etheric days and rested on the seventh day. In the first day, God, purportedly created the heaven and the earth formless, void and dark such that the spirit of God was moving upon the face of water then created light out of His command and made a separation between the light and darkness to form day and night. On the second day, He created firmament in the midst of the waters so as to divide waters, one above it and the other one below it such that the firmament is called the Heaven that makes a divide between the earthly waters and the water in the cloud.

On the day three, He gathered all the waters together to make the Seas and that the dry land appeared to make the terrestrial where He inhabited grasses, herb yielding seeds and fruit yielding trees. This concluded the third day of creation exercise. On the fourth day, He regulates days and nights as marked by light and darkness to be the signs for seasons, days and years. Hence, he made two great lights; the greater light, known as sun, to rule upon the day while the smaller one called moon, accompanied with stars, rules upon the night. On the day five, God, purportedly, created all the aquatic lives including whale and the arboreal flies of the firmament and endowed them the power of procreation. On the sixth day, He is accounted to have created the terrestrial animals cattle and creeping ones and beast in kinds and blessed them to multiply. All these were discussed within long and continuous twenty-five verses of the *Genesis*.¹³ It is noteworthy that all these He created were not by crafting creativity but by His Divine Commandment, according to the account. He concluded the sixth day, and eventually, His

creation exercises, with the creation of mankind. It is recorded further in the subsequent three verses thus:

(26) And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. (27) So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. (28) And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.”¹⁴

This account has been interpreted as men’s charter, granting humans the right to subdue and inhabit nature. What is more, the last verse of the chapter made it more horrible as it issued another mandate as it is partly read thus: “...and subdue it.”¹⁵ This makes it more glaring that Genesis was not only telling human of what they can do, but what they should do. By this account, God is represented as issuing this instruction before the fall.

To worsen it, God is still presented to have urged Noah, after the Fall, not only to have reaffirmed the latter but also to have added two significant stipulations; the duo of which culminate to the worse destiny of the nature in the hand of human. These two stipulations are: “And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth and upon all the fishes of the sea: into your hand are they delivered,” and “every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you.”¹⁶ These verses permit not only to dominate the nature by mercy but to do so forcefully and with cruelty and that the animals be killed for meat unlike what used to be the case in the Garden of Eden, where Adam was essentially a vegetarian as he was ordered to eat: “every herb bearing seed ...and every tree, in that which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed.”¹⁷ The above representation is a critique of the Historian John Passmore over the Genesis account of origin.¹⁸ I believe that this account, supposedly makes it clear that theocentrism, so defined, is anthropocentrism, the ‘notorious’ environmental theory that has been considered to be the basis of human nonchalant attitude towards the nature. This makes one to be skeptical whether this is the true position of God on human-nature relationship or it is a caricatured form of God’s charter. However, this shall be considered as the traditional reading of the Bible.

Interestingly, many Western scholars have attacked this position from Christian point of view, hence calling for an alternative reading of the Bible. According to the information

available to us, the earliest noticed of these allegations was made by Lynn White who points out that “what people do about their ecology depends on what they think about themselves in relation to things around them. Human ecology is deeply conditioned by beliefs about our nature and destiny.” From this, he alleged that “Our [Westerners] daily habits of actions, for example, are dominated by an implicit faith in perpetual progress which was unknown either to Greco-Roman antiquity or to the Orient. It is rooted in, and is indefensible apart from, Judeo-Christian theology.” He made reference to the account of creation in the Bible as earlier stated and launched his allegation that: “especially, in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world had ever produced.”¹⁹ He launched the allegation on the ground that it was the Christianity who commits the Pagan beliefs in animism, which was environmental friendly, into the flame of ignorance. This allegation creates an intellectual vacuum that is aimed at bridging by providing an alternative enlightened reading which shall be done under the subsequent subheading.

An Alternative Enlightened Reading of the Holy Bible

Turning to Passmore once more, having problematised the predominant reading of Genesis, which is hereby tagged as the traditional reading, Passmore considers the account as portraying ‘dominionism’. Looking for an alternative reading of the story of Genesis, I took a step backward to look for the word in the original language of the Bible which was translated to mean ‘dominion’ in English language as it is known that the account of the Genesis was not originally written in English language. It is discovered that the word is *radah* which is a Hebrew word for ‘rule’ which is more close to ‘stewardship’. Stewardship, is based on two tenets; “that humans are caretakers of nature in that we look after it in some way;” and “that humans are important, but other creatures also have value.” These tenets are inferred from the alternative reading of the story of Genesis. This is what must have informed Robin Attfield to have argued that:

[T]he Christian tradition should be viewed as one in which domination of the natural world implies not a predatory attitude towards it, but the contrary. It implies that we should have dominion in the sense of being a steward appointed by God to look after and cherish both the garden he has given us to cultivate and the creatures that live in it. We do not unconditionally own parts of the earth, but hold them on trust.²⁰

This is done, perhaps, by blending the dominion account of creation with the God's injunction in the Garden of Eden whereby man was put “into the Garden of Eden to dress and keep it,”²¹ with the one that portrays man as being created in God's image,²² the whole story changes from the

traditional outlook of man as dominion over nature to steward over same, whereby human is seen as co-worker of God in creation, but not as co-equal, anyway. Further more, the notion of man being created in the image of God should be considered as a potential, rather than actual, status of man of which to attain its actualisation is conditioned on a series of internalisation of a true knowledge of God in relation to the nature among other conditions. In other words, it is an exclusively reserved status for people of high and mature level of spirituality. Even by this interpretation, human-centeredness in environmental matters still persists only that the stewardship is a weak or relative anthropocentrism as opposed to the dominionship which is a strong anthropocentrism. None of these interpretations rise above anthropocentrism. It will also do well to remind the arrogance of human supremacy on the account of creation in Genesis that human is otherwise portrayed in the same account of the *Genesis* as being originally dust where it states: “for dust you are, and to dust you shall return.”²³ If nothing more, I believe this should be sufficient to check humans’ that nature is their mother out of which they were made and always remains a part of it. Humans’ birds should stop defecating into the pot onto where it shall return for final processing!

However, beyond dominionism stewardship which has also been faulted as anthropocentric in different degrees, Andrew J. Hoffman and Lloyd E. Sandelands’ theocentric notion is quite different from all of the above accounts and interpretations taken from *Genesis*. They critique the theories on ground as binary oppositional outlook into man-nature relationship. As an alternative, Hoffman and Sandelands introduce God into the scene. Unlike the Genesis, allegedly, two-term metaphysic account where God, purportedly, stands aloof and only issues command on what should be the code of conduct in form of Scripture, Hoffman and Sandelands’ theocentric notion is three-term metaphysic such that humans and nature are considered as separate creations of God. By this, the relationship turns to father-siblings one whereby God is the father and humans and nature are siblings of the same father.²⁴ Humans, sharing the same father with nature, relates with nature as siblings in love and mutual respect rather than domination and/or stewardship.

Let me paint a scenario to illustrate this point better; consider that a father, in this case, God, embarks on a journey leaving the siblings at the mercy of one another, it would be to the best joy of the father upon return to hear the report that each and every sibling complementarily contributed the best of their own quota to ensure they are all met in good conditions. On a division of labour system, for instance; the females keep the kitchen and cleanliness of the

surrounding, the males do the farming, the youngsters make themselves available at the service; to be sent on errands as the need be, all to ensure that the balance is kept and each is well catered for in term of feedings and all that, and anyone that fails to adequately do its side will not only suffer for it in the hands of other siblings but also would face the warrants before their father on their father's return. Chesterton echoes this allegory more succinctly thus:

Only the supernatural has taken a sane view of Nature. The essence of all pantheism, evolutionism, and modern cosmic religion is really in this proposition: that Nature is our mother. Unfortunately, if you regard nature as a mother, you discover that she is a stepmother. The main point of Christianity was this: that Nature is not our mother: Nature is our sister. We can be proud of her beauty, since we have the same father; but she has no authority over us; we have to admire, but not to imitate. This gives to the typically Christian pleasure in this earth a strange touch of lightness that is almost frivolity. Nature was a solemn mother to the worshippers of Isis and Cybele. Nature was a solemn mother to Wordsworth or to Emerson. But Nature is not solemn to Francis of Assisi or to George Herbert. To St. Francis, Nature is a sister, and even a younger sister: a little, dancing sister, to be laughed at as well as loved.²⁵

By this, the earlier asked question that; “who owns the earth?” is answered in a better way. While anthropocentrist and ecocentrist's answer the question differently as “humans” and “nature” respectively; either of which objectifies or deifies nature as the case may be, the adequate answer, from an enlightened theocentric point of view, is “God.” Having this at the back of his mind, Schaeffer, in his relation with a tree, meditates thus:

Why do I have an emotional reaction toward the tree? For some abstract or pragmatic reason? Not at all. Secular man may say he cares for the tree because if he cuts it down his cities will not be able to breathe. But that is egoism, and egoism will produce ugliness, no matter how long it takes. On this basis technology will take another twist on the garrote of both nature and man. The tyranny of technology will grow to be almost total. But the Christian stands in front of the tree, and has an emotional reaction toward it, because the tree has a real value in itself, being a creature made by God. I have this in common with the tree: we were made by God and not just cast up by chance.

Suddenly, then, we have real beauty. Life begins to breathe. The world begins to breathe as it never breathed before. We can love a man for his own sake, for we know who the man is—he is made in the image of God; and we can care for the animal, the tree, and even the machine portion of the universe, each thing in its own order—for we know it to be a fellow creature with ourselves, both made by the same God²⁶

By this view, human-nature relationship becomes harmonious. The case becomes interesting the more when Saint Francis of Assisi is reported to have extended his gospel to the entire nature as a whole. He considers that the issue of morality is not in humans' exclusive list but for all

existences; plants, animals and the non-living minerals like stone are all included. He added that all existences are sanction-worthy for their adequacy or otherwise. According to a legendary, Francis was reported to have preached to the birds in rebuke to men who would not heed. Accordingly: he urged the little birds to praise God and, in spiritual ecstasy, they flapped their wings and chirped rejoicing. In another legendary, a fierce wolf ravaged the Land around Gubbio in the Apennines, Francis of Assisi talked to the wolf and persuaded him of the error of his ways, which made the wolf to repent and died in the odor of sanctity and was buried in consecrated ground.²⁷

At the heart of his discussion, according to White L., is animism, holding that everything in existence, including such living things as human, plants, goats and even tiniest ants; and the non-living things “flames a sign of the thrust of the soul toward union with God.”²⁸ Traditional African perspective towards environment is also pantheistic; the belief that the natural environment harbours gods or goddesses and so, the natural environment is respected and regarded for what it harbours. This is spelt out in many of their mythological narrations, proverbs, totems and the taboos which go a long way to checkmate their interrelationship with the environment.²⁹

Theocentric environmentalist begot one of its strongest arguments in the ideology of Socrates and some religious orders which include, Pythagoreanism, Krishna Consciousness, Eckankar, and the likes who dwell so much on animism and reincarnation out of the believe that each and every existence contains a soul which emanates from God with the same degree but, with time and purification, the soul transforms from one object into another ranging from the non-living mineral resources, which is considered to be the lowest in their hierarchy, to the lower animals, higher animals and eventually becomes human as a compensation for its deeds. Reincarnation is at the heart of this ideology. To this end, they believe, humans can attain spiritual perfection through his/her merciful treatment of other beings; man, animal and the non-living alike. Even though, they are divided on whether any being that has attained human manifestation can still, due to his/her mal-activities, be reincarnated as an animal, a plant or a mineral, as the punishment for his/her injustice, such that Krishna Consciousness³⁰ and Pythagoreans are affirmative to this notion while Eckankar negates it, claiming that he/she can only come as a less privileged human as a punishment for his/her injustice, that he can never come other than human again,³¹they nevertheless univocal on the claim that agape-type love should be exhibited to every existence equally if one wants soul liberation.

Coming from Krishna Consciousness doctrine, Bhaktivedanta, explains that, as any agriculturist can easily bear witness to this, the environmental problems are not resulted from the inability of the nature to cater for the ever increasing number of its inhabitants if the law of nature is truly understood and conserved, However there is problem of insufficiency for humans needs on the one hand, as it is evidenced in hunger and extreme poverty that is still experienced by a good proportion of human population, and, on the other hand, the ill-health of the environment resulting from over exploitation and misuse of the earth for cash crop and capital oriented activities rather than food production. Both are as a result of humans' misunderstanding of the laws of nature from the point of view of the Supreme Lord. According to the tradition which he was advocating for, all of the earth's inhabitants are sons and daughters of the Supreme Lord. Yet, the self-acclaimed giant of all the creatures, humans, superimposed themselves over others and treat them with cruelty. This, he argued, is the root course of the problem. He further states it clearly thus:

The source of our problem is the desire for sense gratification beyond the consideration of anyone else's rights. These rights are the rights of the child in relation to the father. Every child has the right to share the wealth of his father. So creating a brotherhood of all creatures on the earth depends on understanding the universal fatherhood of God.³²

Devall and Sessions also corroborate this view thus:

Spiritual growth or unfolding begins when we cease to understand or see ourselves as isolated and narrow competing egos and begin to identify with other humans from our family and friends to, eventually, our species. But the deep ecology sense of self requires a further maturity and growth and identification which goes beyond humanity to include the nonhuman world.³³

Hence, spiritual growth is attached to kind interrelationship among men, on the one hand, and between men and their external environment on the other hands as an equally important and indiscriminate part of God's creation. Only by this mindset that an individual can realise and attain perfection and salvation of the soul that is preached, in different forms, by any and every religious body including Christianity.

Concluding Remarks

A mere abstract entity a religious belief may be called but it plays more than a decisive role in shaping humans' action. So heavy is its weight that, rightly or wrongly conceived, people have committed suicide, murder and, worst still, genocide, homicide and epistemicide just in the name

of “my religion commands it.”³⁴ German Holocaust and Japanese suicide that follow the end of World War II are still fresh in memory. It is on this ground I consider it a worthwhile effort to make religion as a basis for emancipation of environment that is yearning for rescue from everywhere. Meanwhile, it is quite unfortunate that many religious people, despite their submissiveness to religious command, are destitute or deliberately ignore this fact. More often than not, people are found of justifying their cruel relationship with nature, making references to their religious Scriptures mainly the Abrahamic religions. I have made effort to reread the Holy Qur’an environmentally in my earlier paper cited above and here is my effort to reread the Holy Bible too. It is hereby made a worthwhile invitation of more competent hands to advocate for, and popularise, environmental ethical discussion from Scriptural point of view as failure to do so, or as appropriate as it needs, is highly detrimental on our dear environment, leaving it at jeopardy and in return, not only making environment unfit for us and the future unborn generations, to live but also making all our salvation attempt chimera because, in my own dictum, *the more environmentally conscious you are, the more Godly you are.*

I am aware that a critique may oppose this position as a theory that is devoid of practice, owing to humans' nature as omnivores as well as materialists who cannot do but depend on other components of the nature for food, shelter, clothing and objects of knowledge among other needs. They may raise their worry that; is this theory not an attempt to deny humans' survival in the name of conserving/preserving nature or any salvation reason. As valid and reasonable the critique seems to sound, it shows that the message is misconceived. The logical maxim is; *everything exists for everything.* Hence we can infer that for the system to a stable equilibrium and for the continuity of the cycle, each component would keep on interdepending on the others for their “essential needs.” Humans are not excluded in this interdependency. The only additional message that this article is sending is that “equity” rather than “equality” should be the code of conduct. By this way, human, like every others should strictly plug from nature’s tree out of necessity and not with callousness but with sobriety, love and mercy. Put differently, human should shun excess, luxury and extravagance as much as possible, as the more the excess, the more the burden on the nature. You should not travel on private jet, in the name of bragging for wealth, when flying on public plane could do. You should not go on convoy of cars when going on less could do, *ad infinitum*, as the more you do that because you can afford it financially, the more the burden you put on nature.

References

- ¹ Olaniyan A. S. and Shamima P. L. 2022. Theocentrism is not Anthropocentric: An Enlightened Environmentalist Reading of the Holy Qur'an. *Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics*. Bangladesh: BJBio Publisher. 13 (1): 77.
- ² Mbembe, A. *Out of the Dark Night: Essays on Decolonization*: Columbia University Press. 9780231160285. Jan. 2019.
- ³ Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, A. C. 1991. *The Laws of Nature: An Infallible Justice*. India: The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. Rpt. 2007. Ix.
- ⁴ Passmore J. *Man's Responsibility for Nature: Ecological Problems and Western Traditions*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1974: 6.
- ⁵ Reagan, T. 1983. *The case for animal rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- ⁶ Taylor, P. W. 1986. *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- ⁷ Callicott, J. B. 1991. The wilderness idea revisited: the sustainable development alternative. *Environmental Professional*.
- ⁸ Buckingham, S. Ecofeminism in 21st Century. *The Geographical Journal*. June, 2004. 170.2
- ⁹ White L. 1967. The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis. *Science*. America: American Association for the Advancement of Science. March 10, 1967. 155.3767: 1203-1207.
- ¹⁰ Nasr, S. H. *The essential Seyyed Hussein Nasr*. Ed. W. C. Chittick. Indiana: World wisdom. 2007.
- ¹¹ Ozdemir, I. Towards an Understanding of Environmental Ethic from A Qur'anic Perspective. *Islam and Ecology*, ed. Richard Foltz. Harvard University Press. 2003: 18.
- ¹² Olaniyan, A. S. *Algazel's Sufism as a Critique of Islamic Environmentalism*. Project. Philosophy, Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. 2021: 10.
- ¹³ The Holy Bible: 1884. *The Revised Version with Revised Marginal References*. London: Oxford University Press. Genesis 1: 1-25.
- ¹⁴ The Holy Bible: 1884. *The Revised Version*. Genesis 1: 26-28.
- ¹⁵ The Holy Bible: 1884. *The Revised Version* Genesis 1: 28.
- ¹⁶ The Holy Bible: 1884. *The Revised Version*. Genesis. 9: 2-3.
- ¹⁷ The Holy Bible: 1884. *The Revised Version*. Genesis. 1: 29.
- ¹⁸ Passmore, J. 1974. *Man's responsibility for nature: ecological problems and Western traditions*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 6.
- ¹⁹ White, L. 1967. The historical root of our ecological crises. *Science*. America: American association for the advancement of science. March 10, 1967. 155.3767: 1205.
- ²⁰ Cf: Connelly, J. and Smith, G. Eds. 1999. *Politics and the Environment: From Theory to Practice*. London: Routledge. 18.
- ²¹ *The Holy Bible: The Revised Version*. Genesis 2: 15.
- ²² *The Holy Bible: The Revised Version*. Genesis 1: 26-27.
- ²³ *The Holy Bible: The Revised Version*. Genesis 3: 19.
- ²⁴ Hoffman, A. J. and Sandelands, L. E. 2004. Getting Right with Nature: Anthropocentrism, Ecocentrism and Theocentrism. *Ross school of business working paper series*. Michigan: Working paper series. 17-19.
- ²⁵ Chesterton, G.K. 1908. *Orthodoxy*. New York: Dodd, Mead & company. 115-116.
- ²⁶ Schaeffer, F.A. 1970. *Pollution and the death of man: the Christian view of ecology*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House. 77.
- ²⁷ White, White, L. 1967. The historical root of our ecological crises. *Science*. America: American association for the advancement of science. March 10, 1967. 155.3767: 1207.
- ²⁸ White, L. 1967. The historical root of our ecological crises. 1206.
- ²⁹ Etieyibo, E. 2017. Ubuntu and the environment. *The palgrave handbook of African philosophy*. Eds. A. Afolayan. & T. Falola. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 12.

-
- ³⁰ Prabhupada, B. S. 1984. *Coming Back: the science of reincarnation*. Jahu: The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. 37.
- ³¹ Twitchell, P. 1987. *The Key to Secret Worlds*. America: Eckankar Publishers.
- ³² Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, A. C. 1991. *The Laws of Nature*. X.
- ³³ Devall, B. and Sessions, G. 1998. Deep Ecology. in *Environmental Ethics: reading in theory and application*. Pojman, L. P. ed. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company. 145. As cited in Ojomo, P. A. 2016. *An Earth-Eco-Socialist Reconstruction of Aldo Leopold's Land Ethic*. Lagos: UNILAG Ph. D Thesis. 42.
- ³⁴ Bewaji, J. A. I. 2013. Epistemicide, Epistemic Deficit, Sterile Leadership and Vicious Cycle of African Underdevelopment. *Holistic Approach to Human Existence and Development*. (Eds.) K. A. Ollu-Owolabi and A. B. Ekanola. Ibadan, Nigeria: Hope Publications. 269-312.

