

Cosmocentric and Deep Ecology Movement: An Extreme Web of Valuing Nature

Kemi Anthony, Emina

Department of Religious Studies and Philosophy, Delta State University, Abraka,
Delta State, Nigeria

Email: eminakemi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The core concern in environmental ethics is non-anthropocentrism, and the pursuit of environmental justice would be an unproductive endeavour without addressing this concept. The feasibility of non-anthropocentrism, strictly defined, poses a significant challenge. The consideration of the Deep Ecology movement, without engaging in circular reasoning, allows for the contemplation of non-anthropocentrism. However, it is widely speculated that the implementation of a Deep Ecology initiative is a plausible option. The philosophical framework of deep ecology is characterised as having metaphysical underpinnings. Environmental ethics are inherently practical and have real-world applications. However, the subject matter of environmental ethics has transitioned from the metaphysical realm. A major issue that ensues pertains to the potential incongruity between the Deep Ecology movement, which can be characterised as a metaphysical or ontological theoretical framework that is non-anthropocentric in its nature, and environmental ethics, which is primarily concerned with practical and applied aspects. Given the metaphysical nature of deep ecology, the question arises as to how it aligns with practical or applied ethics. Numerous scholars believe that, within the realm of environmental ethics, deep ecology, or cosmocentrism, lacks substantial pertinence. Cosmocentrism can be characterised as having metaphysical or ontological foundations. This study aims to investigate the concept of cosmocentrism as a fundamental aspect of promoting environmental justice. The term “extreme” is applicable in this context since it delineates the boundaries of environmental ethics.

Keywords: Ecosophy T; deep ecology; Environmental Ethics; Cosmocentricism.

INTRODUCTION

The philosophy of biocentrism posits that all biotic communities possess equal inherent worth (Callicott, 1990). This endeavour has been recognised as the first effort to extend value. Subsequently, the idea of ecocentrism has been developed, with a focus on including both biotic and abiotic elements within the realm of environmental justice. According to the statement, both biotic and abiotic communities possess equal worth. In this subsequent installment, we elucidate and illustrate the notion of environmental justice in relation to its intrinsic worth. The development of deep ecology has not been primarily derived from specific original sources. This lack of reference to any systematic philosophy is the outcome. The concept of deep ecology has been used in several ways. The term “ecological movement” is used due to its objective of promoting non-anthropocentrism as opposed to anthropocentrism. The Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess (1990) has coined the term “ecosophy T.”

The difference between deep ecology and superficial ecology is a topic of interest for many individuals. The perspective of shallow ecology does not align with non-anthropocentrism since it maintains the belief that the worth of nature is only derived from its use, interests, and well-being in relation to human beings.

Contrarily, deep ecology is exclusively characterised by its non-anthropocentric nature. The statement negates any notion of the supremacy of humanity. The proposition posits that nature has inherent worth that is apart from and unaffected by human goals. The stance of deep ecology is widely debated and subject to significant controversy.

The question often arises about the capacity for natural phenomena to possess inherent worth independent of human interests or valuers. Currently, we refrain from engaging in this discourse. We want to assert that the deep ecology movement has a very extensive nature. A substantial body of literature exists on this topic, including both Western and Eastern perspectives. In Western discourse, in addition to the contributions of Naess, the literary works of Devall and George Sessions have comparable significance within the context of the deep ecology movement. Within the realm of Indian philosophical philosophy, both Buddhism and Jainism include the notion of deep ecology. The environmental ethics of Buddhism and Jainism are strongly influenced by the principles of deep ecology.

Furthermore, a similar sentiment may be seen in Gandhi's environmental philosophy. Gandhi's notion of *sarvodaya* may be seen as a prominent illustration of the deep ecology movement (Haigh, 2006).

Deep and Shallow Ecology

Prior to exploring the notion of deep ecology, Naess provides an illustrative differentiation between deep and shallow ecology. According to Naess, the shallow ecology movement is dedicated to combating pollution as well as the depletion or decline of resources (LaChapelle, 2001). The primary focus of this method is centred on human beings, making it an anthropocentric perspective. The primary objective of this initiative is to safeguard the well-being and prosperity of those residing in developed nations. The shallowness of this phenomenon lies in its predominant focus on the superficial aspects of human appearance. In contrast, deep ecology adopts a worldview that might be described as a “rational total field” (LaChapelle, 2001).

Consequently, it dismisses the anthropocentric perspective of humans as the central focus within the environment, and instead advocates for a comprehensive and non-anthropocentric approach (Bassey, 2020). The deep ecology movement is characterised by its profound nature, including all aspects of the environment in a comprehensive manner. It is noteworthy that both deep ecology and superficial ecology are concerned with the environmental catastrophe. In contrast to deep ecology, shallow ecology focuses only on the immediate consequences of the environmental catastrophe. Similar to the disruptive effects of sneezing, coughing, or experiencing a headache on an individual's daily routine, pollution and resource depletion have a disruptive impact on the lifestyle of contemporary industrial cultures (Davies, 2023). Nevertheless, it would be a grave error for an individual to consume medication for the purpose of treatment without first identifying the root problems. Similarly, it would be a grave error for environmental advocates to just focus on the issue of pollution and depletion of resources without thoroughly examining their underlying social and human origins. However, when considering deep ecology, our perspective diverges significantly. Deep ecology, as a purely

non-anthropocentric perspective, considers the fundamental origins of all phenomena, resulting in a comprehensive understanding that does not prioritise individualism, subjectivism, or nominalism as significant concerns.

It has been previously shown that deep ecology encompasses a diverse range of techniques. Deep ecology distinguishes itself from other methods by emphasising its unique principle that the present environmental catastrophe may be attributed to profound philosophical factors. Therefore, the resolution of the issue necessitates a fundamental shift in our philosophical perspective. The significance of environmental ethics is contingent upon this particular aspect. The degradation of natural environments and ecological communities may be attributed to the creation of many environmental challenges. It has been well established that once natural beauty is compromised, it cannot be restored (Van den Berg, et al., 2007). The effective management of the environment remains a challenge until a more comprehensive philosophical perspective is formulated. In order to cultivate a more refined philosophical perspective, it is imperative that we undergo a profound transformation in our philosophical orientation. This shift encompasses both individual and societal changes, impacting fundamental economic and ideological frameworks. In order to cultivate a profound understanding of deep ecology, it is imperative that we undergo personal and cultural transformations. Does it include the act of creating something? Devall and Sessions argue that the phenomenon under consideration is not the creation of novel entities, but rather a revival of ancient elements. The concept of creation originates from a state of non-existence. However, what was reawakening might be seen as an awakening that had already occurred. Deep ecology may be seen as the development of an ecological awareness, which entails adopting an ecological, philosophical, and spiritual perspective towards the situation at hand. This perspective acknowledges the interconnectedness of people, plants, animals, and the Earth.

Deep ecology emerges as a form of resistance against the prevailing paradigm. The prevailing global perspective is characterised by an anthropocentric orientation, whereby individuality, subjectivism, and consumerism assume central importance (Purser, et al., 1995). The deep ecological movement opposes the ideology of anthropocentrism. If the concept of non-anthropocentrism can be considered in any capacity, it may be attributed to the deep ecology movement. Deep ecology offers a critical analysis of the prevailing global perspective, sometimes referred to as the dominant worldview. There exists a contention that attributes the responsibility for environmental degradation to the prevailing global perspective. Individuals that express disapproval towards the prevailing global perspective have been acknowledged as advocates for ecocentrism and non-anthropocentrism. Therefore, deep ecologists have tried to develop an alternative philosophical perspective that is comprehensive in nature and does not prioritise human interests. Nevertheless, the proposition of a profound shift in individuals' philosophical paradigm is met with a significant obstacle.

The essential question arises as follows: how can we start the process of elucidating the alternative when, by its very nature, it deviates significantly from the initial premise? The dominant worldview revolves on the central role of people and advocates for the promotion of human well-being. The philosophical

perspective that embraces a comprehensive worldview diverges significantly from the first standpoint. The question arises as to how one might transcend their individual and societal perspective in order to do a comparative analysis with a profoundly divergent worldview. Indeed, deep ecologists use a diverse range of approaches to address these difficulties, one of which involves drawing upon the medium of poetry. Deep ecology aims to establish a consensus on a set of fundamental principles via the use of diverse tactics. The primary function of this platform is to act as a central point of unification for the various deep ecology movement.

Platform of Deep Ecology

Deep ecology advocates for a fundamental shift in the human perspective and behaviour towards the natural world. The human perspective towards nature is inherently anthropocentric (Bassey, et al., 2020). Consequently, a number of severe environmental catastrophes were generated. Deep ecologists have extensively examined and provided insights into several environmental crises. They firmly adhere to the belief that addressing the severe environmental catastrophe requires more than just modification of our individual and collective behaviours. A fundamental shift in our perspective is necessary. Consequently, deep ecologists pursue their objectives via two distinct avenues. On the one hand, they exhibit a strong dedication to effectuating the necessary reforms. Numerous individuals who identify as deep ecologists commit themselves to effecting these transformations via their pursuits as scientists, artists, and political activists. Furthermore, proponents of deep ecology want to construct and elucidate an alternative philosophical framework that may supplant the prevailing worldview, which bears significant responsibility for the current predicament. Naess categorises the discipline that examines these inquiries and endeavours to explore alternative worldviews as eco-philosophy, seeing it with great clarity. Similar to the existence of many profound ecological perspectives, there also exist numerous methods within the realm of eco-philosophy. Naess and Sessions have collaborated to formulate the Deep Ecology Platform, which serves as a comprehensive articulation of shared ideas, including the multifaceted nature, multiple objectives, and underlying foundations of deep ecology.

The aforementioned declaration offers justifications that may elucidate and validate the action of the movement. Simultaneously, these shared ideals provide a more tangible focal point for philosophical contemplation, as opposed to more abstract concepts. Furthermore, the platform is designed with the intention of accommodating a wide range of philosophical interpretations while also providing the necessary specificity to differentiate between profound and superficial approaches to practical issues. The deep ecological framework established by Naess and Sessions is founded upon shared concepts, which may be summarised as follows:

(i) The inherent worth of the flourishing of both human and non-human life on Earth is significant. The intrinsic worth of non-human living forms remains unaffected by their potential use for specific human objectives.

(ii) The intrinsic worth of biodiversity and the multitude of living forms present on Earth contribute significantly to the overall well-being and prosperity of both human and non-human existence.

(iii) It is argued that humans do not possess the inherent entitlement to diminish the abundance and variety of natural resources, unless it is done only to meet essential need.

(iv) The current level of human intervention in the non-human environment is seen to be excessive, and this state of affairs is progressively deteriorating.

(v) The coexistence of human life and cultures may be achieved with a significant reduction in the human population. The promotion of non-human life necessitates a corresponding reduction.

(vi) A transformative improvement in one's personal circumstances necessitates a shift in the political landscape. These factors impact fundamental economic, technical, and ideological frameworks.

(vii) The primary conceptual shift is a shift towards valuing life quality, prioritising intrinsic worth in various circumstances, as opposed to strictly sticking to a high standard of living. A heightened level of consciousness will arise about the distinction between largeness and greatness.

(viii) Individuals who adhere to the aforementioned principles are obligated, either directly or indirectly, to engage in the endeavour of implementing the required modifications.

The platform of deep ecology encompasses the aforementioned eight principles, which effectively provide a framework for nonanthropocentrism. The first concept advocates for the recognition of inherent worth. The statement is made that the thriving of both humans and non-humans on the planet is contingent upon the recognition of their inherent worth. The concept of intrinsic value refers to a fundamental and inherent worth, which is distinct from being a mere instrument or means to achieve an objective, but rather is an aim in and of itself. The concept of intrinsic value does not pertain to a kind of value that have inherent worth. Valuers are not necessary for this task. The measurement is conducted with the purpose of becoming an end in its own right, rather of only serving as a means to achieve a certain objective.

The concept of intrinsic worth is distinct from that of instrumental value or use value. Kant has delineated a dichotomy between two distinct categories of values, namely, instrumental value and intrinsic value (Korsgaard, 1983). The former pertains to the worth of something as a means to achieve an objective, while the latter refers to the value of something in and of itself. The concept of intrinsic value has significance due to its inherent worth as a final objective. In this context, intrinsic worth might be seen as an inherent and profound quality that eludes expression in terms of achieving limited human objectives. When discussing environmental ethics, it is imperative to direct our attention towards two significant concerns, namely the abundance and variety of living forms. The loss of biodiversity is a consequence of extensive industrialisation and the associated technical dangers. It is essential to consider that the presence of a wide range of species and their varied characteristics have intrinsic worth. Furthermore, it is crucial to acknowledge that these attributes not only enhance the well-being of both

human and non-human life on our planet, but also contribute to their overall prosperity. Therefore, it would be an error for humans to diminish the abundance and variety of resources, unless it is done just to fulfil essential requirements. Once again, it is essential to elucidate the idea of “vital needs.”

In my understanding, the notion of “vital needs” should be associated with the idea of “basic needs.” Human beings have the capacity to influence the abundance and variety of natural resources, particularly when such interference is directly related to fulfilling their fundamental needs. Nevertheless, the anthropocentric perspective of humans towards nature or the environment overlooks the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental aspects. This failing may be attributed to the inability to differentiate between fundamental need and excessive desires. As long as people are unable to discern the difference between need and excessive want, their impact on the environment will continue to be disproportionate. Consequently, humans themselves will suffer the consequences of natural disasters and environmental emergencies. The prevailing perspective of contemporary society towards the natural world is characterised by anthropocentrism. The excessive meddling of humans with the non-human world has resulted in this outcome. Consequently, the situation is seeing a fast deterioration. Further analysis of this issue is not feasible. It is imperative that we cease this activity. The significance of deep ecology is contingent upon this particular aspect.

The philosophy of deep ecology advocates for the adoption of a non-anthropocentric perspective, as opposed to an anthropocentric one (Grey, 1993). Deep ecology is a philosophical and environmental movement that adopts a non-anthropocentric perspective, seeking to reduce and justify human intervention in the natural world. This study endeavours to build a theoretical framework that may effectively define the concept of environmental justice in its truest form. It is imperative to acknowledge that the promotion of well-being for both humans and non-humans cannot be reconciled with a significant rise in the populations of both groups. The actual scenario is just the opposite. We hold the view that the thriving of individuals is congruent with a significant

The decline in the global human population. The proliferation of non-human organisms necessitates a reduction in some factors. The importance of wise politicians' adaptability is similarly significant as it has the potential to influence fundamental economic, technical, and ideological frameworks. The deep ecology movement advocates for an intellectual shift aimed at improving the quality of life by recognising and prioritising intrinsic worth. Currently, there is a prevailing discourse advocating for a good quality of life. The presence of a high level of living does not always guarantee a true quality of life in its genuine meaning. There exists a strong correlation between a high standard of living and anthropocentrism, whereas non-anthropocentrism is closely linked to the concept of quality of life. It is possible for an individual to have a great quality of life without demonstrating proper respect for others. However, it is essential to acknowledge that sustaining a high standard of living requires the equitable treatment and consideration of all individuals. The crux of the matter is in the differentiation between “big” and “great.”

Ecology and Eco-Philosophy

How is ecology connected to eco-philosophy? It is important to consider that, similar to land ethics, deep ecology draws upon the field of ecology for many objectives. Additionally, it is believed that the field of ecology provides a substantial amount of knowledge on the functioning of natural ecosystems. The identification and resolution of environmental diseases are greatly facilitated by the use of appropriate methodologies and the implementation of effective policies. Therefore, ecology, as a discipline, offers us a comprehensive comprehension of the dynamics and functioning of natural ecosystems. This comprehension serves as the foundation upon which we may formulate assessments and provide suggestions. In addition, the field of ecology advises against the use of hasty technical remedies for environmental issues. Drawing inspiration from Leopold's ideas, Naess advocates for an approach to environmental transformation that is characterised by humility and restraint. The results derived in the fields of ecology and conservation biology often consist of assertions on the lack of knowledge or understanding.

According to Naess (2006), the ability of scientists to accurately estimate the impact of a novel chemical on a tiny ecosystem is an uncommon occurrence. Given the prevailing lack of scientific knowledge, the responsibility of providing evidence should be with those advocating for policies that include interference in the natural environment. Ecology plays a significant role in the field of eco-philosophy, just as scientific knowledge has often contributed to ethical examination. The ecosystems in which we interact exist in a condition of equilibrium, when it is reasonable to infer that they provide more benefits to humanity compared to situations of disruption and the subsequent unanticipated and extensive alterations they bring about. Through the ongoing process, we get a more comprehensive comprehension of the world, which afterwards places us in an advantageous position to provide ethical assessments and recommendations. The occurrence of this phenomenon may be attributed to the provision of novel perspectives by ecological knowledge.

Consequently, it is reasonable to anticipate that an ethical framework grounded on ecology will provide fresh assessments and recommendations. While it may be feasible to transition from the field of ecology to eco-philosophy, it is important to exercise caution over an overreliance on ecology. Naess cautions against an excessive dependence on ecology. There is unequivocal certainty that the broad field of scientific ecology has the potential to support the objectives of deep ecologists. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that scientific ecology should not be misconstrued as the ultimate arbiter in matters of environmental disagreements. Despite Naess advocating for ecology, he also shown an awareness of the potential hazards associated with ecologism. What, therefore, is the concept of ecologism? Could you please provide an explanation of the meaning of the given concept? Ecologism is a philosophical perspective that regards ecology as the preeminent scientific discipline. According to Naess, the field of ecology has the potential to give rise to eco-philosophy. However, it is important to note that ecologism and eco-philosophy are not inherently interconnected.

Naess (2006) highlighted two interconnected hazards that arise from elevating ecology to a position of ultimate authority. Initially, the speaker expressed the notion that it is essential to steer clear of the perilous tendency to transform ecology into an all-encompassing worldview. According to Naess, a comprehensive worldview has the potential to provide answers to many environmental challenges. Naess diverges from Leopold and Callicott's dependence on ecology in this respect.

Leopold and Callicott's conceptualization of ecology primarily revolves on scientific principles, emphasising the establishment of ecological predator-prey relationships within natural groups based on scientific explanations (Van Auken, 2020). It is important to differentiate between the concepts of ecology and the scientific discipline of ecology. Leopold's conceptualization of ecology may be characterised as a scientific approach, and Callicott's perspective on ecology has a striking resemblance to Leopold's. The field of ecology provides scientific perspectives and answers for a wide range of environmental concerns. Naess' stance diverges from theirs. Naess expressed opposition towards ecologism, since he argued that the ideology tends to overgeneralize and universalize ecological principles. Ecology, as a scientific discipline, has the potential to provide substantial contributions towards our comprehension of the natural world. However, it is important to acknowledge that several issues may be attributed to epistemological and philosophical origins. Therefore, it may be argued that ecology does not serve as a replacement for philosophical analysis.

Ecology has a distinct purpose and character in this context. With that being said, it is also valid to assert, as Naess suggests, that ecology may provide us with a framework for contemplating the profound philosophical inquiries that want attention. The ecological model of cognition would seek to explore the concept of individuality and its definition. What are the entities or concepts that possess inherent value? What entities possess moral standing? What should be the most effective theoretical framework for comprehending the intricacies of the natural world? The field of ecology may provide novel and enlightening approaches to addressing these questions. Moreover, these techniques may be beneficial in the formulation of alternative ecological ideologies. It is important to consider that this model does not establish the veracity of the philosophical stance formulated with its assistance. Ecology, to a certain extent, is largely focused on the topic of what is, whereas ethics is mostly concerned with the question of what ought to be. Therefore, the endeavour to integrate ethics with eco-philosophy entails an effort to integrate descriptive statements with normative statements. Nevertheless, bridging the disparity between what is now seen and what needed to be achieved would undoubtedly provide a formidable challenge. Nevertheless, eco philosophy is a deliberate effort to achieve a similar outcome.

The potential for a second danger emerges when an excessive reliance is placed on ecological approaches as the only means of addressing certain issues. This kind of temptation arises when ecology is seen just as a scientific discipline capable of providing definitive scientific solutions to particular issues. This particular kind of temptation is often regarded as the benchmark of superficial optimism for a rapid technical solution. Naess posits that environmental concerns, such as the degradation of wilderness areas and the loss of species, raise

fundamental questions about the appropriate manner in which humans should conduct their lives, akin to the philosophy of deep ecology. These inquiries possess a distinct philosophical nature and have consequential political ramifications. Naess argues that it is imperative to resist the process of de-politicization in order to maintain a steadfast commitment to the inherently political essence of the deep ecological movement. For instance, the inclination towards ecological considerations may potentially foster a sense of passivity among individuals, leading them to defer decision-making responsibilities to authoritative figures. Certain ecological models may inadvertently perpetuate a laissez-faire mindset reminiscent of the Social Darwinism ideology prevalent in the nineteenth century. The contemporary emergence of ecological awareness has led to a change in focus from physics and mechanics-based models to ontological models. However, it is important to recognise that relying only on ontological models may just serve as a superficial replacement for one expedient solution with another. From this perspective, ecology would serve as a novel approach to addressing the symptoms. Ecology may thereafter serve as a distraction from these underlying concerns. One potential concern is in the potential use of ecology as a tool within a political strategy, aimed at impeding movements that challenge the underlying assumptions of a given society.

Understanding Deep Ecology as Metaphysical Ecology

Deep ecology may be seen as a kind of metaphysical ecology, since it places great emphasis on the process of self-realization, which is considered a defining characteristic of the deep ecological movement (Diehm, 2020). The fundamental basis of deep ecology diverges significantly from that of shallow ecology. Scientific ecology, in reality, offers a framework for contemplating the profound underlying concerns associated with the environmental problem. Deep ecologists were first motivated by the field of ecology, which served as the foundation for their pursuit of alternative worldviews that challenge prevailing ideologies. Alternative worldviews include a range of perspectives that seek to address many aspects, including but not limited to variety, holism, interdependencies, and relations. The proponents of deep ecology argue that the underlying philosophical factors are responsible for the environmental disaster we now face. The dominating perspective in society is characterised by anthropocentrism. There is a need for reorganisation and a shift in our perspective towards nature, namely towards a non-anthropocentric approach.

Our primary objective is to identify and provide solutions for the existing environmental challenges. The generation of solutions necessitates a profound adjustment of our underlying mindset and operational methodologies. These fundamental inquiries include more foundational inquiries, such as the essence of humanity. What is the relationship between people and the broader natural world? What is the fundamental essence of reality? These inquiries are often recognised as metaphysical inquiries. The field of deep ecology encompasses both metaphysical and ontological inquiries in addition to ethical considerations. Deep ecologists argue that the root cause of several societal issues may be attributed to the

metaphysical assumptions underlying the prevailing philosophy of contemporary industrialised societies (Besthorn, 2012). Deep ecologists propose an alternative worldview known as metaphysical ecology, as opposed to the prevailing mainstream worldview. The dominant worldview and an alternative worldview exhibit contrasting characteristics due to their adherence to anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism, respectively. The tactics used by the individuals in question exhibit inherent differences.

The deep ecology movement fundamentally adheres to a non-anthropocentric perspective. The question of whether non-anthropocentrism is feasible within the realm of environmental ethics is a significant subject of philosophical discourse (Udoudom, 2021). However, from a theoretical standpoint, one can speculate about the potential for non-anthropocentrism by constructing a philosophical framework or notion that can effectively establish genuine environmental justice. Therefore, it might be argued that deep ecology places more emphasis on metaphysical ecology rather than scientific ecology. The prevailing metaphysical framework that underpins contemporary industrial civilization is inherently characterised by individualism and reductionism. The concept of ecologism, often known as the ecology of science, primarily adheres to the principles of individualism and reductionism. Currently, the field of scientific ecology mostly supports the principles of individualism, subjectivism, and materialism. The field of scientific ecology also presents arguments in support of reductionism. The proposition posits that the existence of entities is only attributed to persons, and that a deeper understanding of reality may be achieved by deconstructing things into their elemental constituents. All fundamental constituents are interconnected in accordance with rigorous physical principles. The prevailing perspective also posits that people are inherently distinct from the rest of the natural world. This is the point at which the manifestation of anthropocentrism is contingent. The prevailing worldview tends to categorise individuals as inherently distinct from the broader natural world, leading to the assertion that each person has a “mind,” “free will,” or “soul” that sets them apart from other natural groups, especially non-living entities. T

he prevailing perspective may be characterised as being incongruent with metaphysical holism, which posits that at a fundamental level, there is no distinction between biotic and abiotic communities. The existing conditions would stay unchanged. Drawing inspiration from the field of ecology, the metaphysical framework of Deep Ecology challenges the notion that individual human beings exist as distinct entities apart from the natural world. Deep ecologists are dedicated to the development of a philosophical perspective rooted on holism, whereby people are seen as an inherent and intrinsic component of their environment. The assertion posits that people have no inherent distinction from natural communities, hence challenging the notion of humans as morally or biotically superior actors within the environment. It has been also said that the constitution of people is contingent upon their relationships with other components within the surrounding environment. The concept of the environment is broad and inclusive, including both living organisms (biotic) and non-living factors (abiotic). The composition of biotic

and abiotic elements would have a significant role in defining the nature of human beings. In this context, the stance of Naess has significant relevance.

Naess (1991) advocates for the concept of the “relational, total-field image” in this context. In this statement, the author posits that the development of human beings is influenced by their interpersonal connections. The major concern of the deep ecological movement is the establishment of an unconditional connection rooted in principles of sharing and caring. This movement seeks to uphold environmental justice in its truest form. The absence of such relationships between people and both other humans and the natural world would result in a fundamental transformation of human beings. The primary aim of deep ecology is to reawaken human consciousness, prompting individuals to see their place within the broader natural community. This recognition entails acknowledging that the actions of other natural communities are ultimately beneficial for humanity. This particular sentiment is characterised by profound depth and a strong foundation inside the human psyche. Hence, a philosophical perspective that seeks to diminish the concept of “humans” to that of “individuals” is characterised by a notable separation from their social and natural surroundings. hence, such a viewpoint is seen incorrect and hence lacks acceptance in contemporary discourse.

The philosophical stance in question has been articulated by Warwick Fox, an Austrian deep ecologist. Fox (2020) argues that there is no definitive separation between human and non-human entities in the sphere of existence. He suggests that seeing limits implies a lack of deep ecological knowledge. Therefore, it seems that deep ecology would be characterised by a heightened ecological awareness. In the context of the ecological movement, there exists a phenomenon of compartmentalization or the presence of hypothetical limits. In this community, there exists a shared and equitable appreciation for one another. The deep ecological movement is founded upon the philosophical principle of metaphysical holism. Deep ecology may be characterised as a perspective that does not acknowledge the existence of distinct entities, but instead strongly emphasises metaphysical holism. The system operates under the framework known as 'whole field', whereby there are no discrete entities or persons that are apart from the interconnected interactions inside the system. In this context, all elements operate within the framework of a comprehensive field picture, leading to the assertion that human nature is closely intertwined with the natural world. The prevailing perspective, known as anthropocentrism, has erred in its conceptualization of human beings as discrete entities.

The deep ecology movement may be seen as a radical alternative movement that rejects the hierarchical system of inferiority and superiority. It is believed that there is potential to draw inspiration from the field of scientific ecology in order to better understand and appreciate the significance and wisdom of deep ecology. Ecology, in actuality, is not a mythical concept but rather a scientific hypothesis. When seeing ecosystems as energy circuits that facilitate the flow of solar and chemical energy, one may perhaps perceive individual creatures as being less enduring and tangible compared to the chemical and biological processes they partake in. It is certainly accurate to assert that individual creatures exhibit a transient presence, although the perpetuation of the process persists as long as the

prevailing environmental circumstances remain conducive. From our perspective, it is possible to conceptualise individual creatures as the site where these chemical processes take place. Naess asserts that scientific ecology has proposed, motivated, and reinforced the metaphysical assertion that individual creatures are formed by their connections to other beings.

An alternative route to arriving to this conclusion is contemplating the implications of attributing the state of being alive to an individual creature. The viability of an organism is contingent upon the occurrence of certain chemical and biological processes. Once the biological processes come to a halt, the organism ceases to exist. Consequently, it may be said that processes are important for the survival of an organism. Conversely, it might be posited that life manifests itself through the occurrence of these processes. In this context, the aforementioned mechanisms exhibit adequacy for sustaining life. Given that chemical and biological processes are essential and satisfactory for the manifestation of life, there are valid grounds to assert that these processes possess a reality on par with that of individual living creatures. According to the perspective of contemporary ecology, Biophysicist Harold Morowitz posited that every living being may be seen as a dissipative structure, meaning that its existence is contingent upon the ongoing exchange of energy within the system (Corning, 2002). From this perspective, the ontological status of persons poses a challenge since they are not inherently existent entities, but rather manifest as localised disturbances within the broader context of global energy flux. Similarly, the structures that comprise biological beings are ephemeral and unstable, characterised by molecules that undergo rapid change. These structures rely on a continuous influx of energy to sustain their shape and organisation. When considering people, it is evident that we have already embraced a certain worldview or metaphysical framework that has delineated our experiences in a specific manner, as opposed to other perspectives. Indeed, it might be argued that our vernacular dialect assumes a metaphysical framework whereby distinct and detached entities, such as creatures, are seen as the most fundamental and tangible entities. Thus, it is essential to exclusively consider distinct communities, ecosystems, species, and chemical cycles.

Alternatively, one might choose to designate specific anatomical components, distinct organs, separate cells, individual molecules, isolated atoms, and similar entities. Hence, we see the pervasive emergence of individualism or atomistic tendencies within the arena of prevailing worldviews. The concept of the individual human person may be interpreted in two distinct ways: as a constituent element of a larger collective entity, or as an amalgamation of several individual entities. The deep ecologist argues that the prevailing global perspective erroneously posits an artificial dichotomy between people and their environment. The adverse ecological and environmental consequences resulting from this specific metaphysical perspective have shown its inherent peril. Hence, the proposition of an alternative metaphysical framework presents a potential avenue for mitigating the adverse consequences of this widespread destruction. The Deep Ecology movement attempts to establish a connection between metaphysical perspectives and the corresponding normative principles that are drawn from these perspectives (Luke, 1997). The notion of a precondition arises from the recognition

that addressing environmental concerns necessitates the adoption of not just novel ethical frameworks, but also a reevaluation of our fundamental understanding of reality, as encapsulated by metaphysics.

Metaphysics is concerned with the study of being in its essence as being. The profound ecological movement within environmental ethics necessitates metaphysical awareness due to its role in shaping human existence and its crucial role in self-realization (Valera, 2018). Taking into consideration the aforementioned context, proponents of deep ecology transition from the realm of metaphysical ecology to address matters pertaining to ethics and politics. Hence, the objective of eco-philosophy is to provide a philosophical exposition of the metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical aspects pertaining to this alternative perspective on reality. The deep ecology movement lacks coherence as it pertains to the nature of reality or ontology. The discipline of ontology pertains to the study of the fundamental nature of reality, whereby the universe is seen as existing autonomously from human beings and their comprehension. The discipline of ontology pertains to the objective realm and its primary purpose is to grasp this reality. In contrast, human beings engage in subjective processes when interpreting, judging, seeing, valuing, and experiencing the world. These aspects exhibit subjectivity since they are contingent upon the individual human subject. Hence, individuals have the capacity to experience the world from both subjective and objective perspectives.

Deep ecologists use an objective perspective when seeing the universe, leading them to primarily emphasise the ontological dimension of reality. The difference between these two concepts has noteworthy ramifications for the field of mainstream epistemology and ethics. Deep ecologists argue that it had a deleterious impact on both our comprehension and our appraisal of the natural world. From an epistemological standpoint, it is possible to measure, test, and verify objective accounts of nature. In contrast, subjective assessments pertaining to nature exhibit characteristics of arbitrariness, unpredictability, bias, and unverifiability. Objective descriptions are characterised by their rationality and truthfulness, whereas subjective descriptions lack these qualities. Subjective judgements pertain to the ethical evaluation of value, whereas objective judgements are linked to matters of reality. When seeing the human subject as fundamentally interconnected with the natural world, the justification for maintaining a rigid differentiation between objective and subjective, actual and perceived, and truth and value becomes less compelling. In this scenario, there is a steady diminishing of their metaphysical or ontological precedence.

According to several proponents of deep ecology, it is said that by maintaining a rigorous differentiation between the person and nature, we may establish an equally rigorous differentiation between objective and subjective judgements (Hailwood, 2014). Indeed, this differentiation leads to a rationale for considering the epistemological justification of scientific and technological judgements, while disregarding the evaluative judgements of ethics and aesthetics. Nevertheless, the deep ecologists' critique of the dichotomy between person and environment also entails a challenge to the rigid separation between objective and subjective realms. Hence, eco-philosophers have the task of delineating the criteria

by which these environmental assessments might be established as valid and logical. The objective of deep ecology is to construct a comprehensive worldview that can be comprehended by those who currently lack an understanding of metaphysical or ontological reality. The epistemological framework of deep ecology entails the exploration of strategies aimed at fostering transformative shifts in individuals' worldviews. In conjunction with poetry and ritual, the religious notion of bearing witness, as well as the assertive proclamation of our ideals and the subsequent adherence to such values, serve as additional means of conveying the Deep Ecology worldview.

Self-realization and Environmental Justice

The deep ecology movement is said to be grounded in the concept of self-realization (Norton, 1992). The nurturing of the inner spirit is a subject of consideration. The phenomenon has profound characteristics within the natural environment. The subject matter pertains to the nature of ontological reality. Self-realization is a psychological process in which an individual gains insight into the notion that what is beneficial for others is also beneficial for oneself. This mental state involves the realisation that loving others is an act of self-love, caring for others is an act of self-care, and bringing pleasure to others is an act of self-fulfillment. The concept of equality is inherent to all individuals, as is their willingness to make sacrifices for the sake of others. The deep ecological movement, which is rooted in the pursuit of self-realization, serves as a means to achieve environmental justice. The concept guarantees equal consideration and moral standing for all living beings, based on a biocentric perspective. Due to its foundation in self-awareness, this approach mainly focuses on the biotic community.

Deep ecology is a philosophical perspective that focuses its attention on two fundamental principles that are considered to be ultimate standards. These standards possess an ultimate quality since they are not derived from any additional fundamental concepts or values. The fundamental principles that underpin deep ecology are self-actualization and biocentric egalitarianism. Self-realization is a cognitive and introspective process wherein individuals get a comprehensive comprehension of their own existence within the context of a profound connectivity with the whole of the natural world. The concept of biocentric equality is acknowledging that all creatures and entities are equally integral components of an interconnected entity, hence possessing equal inherent worth. The attainment of a satisfactory existence necessitates engaging in a systematic evaluation of oneself and the subsequent realisation of one's potential. In order to comprehend the notion of self-realization, it is beneficial to start the discussion by establishing a fundamental differentiation between the categories needs, interests, and desires. Needs may be conceptualised as essential components that are necessary for the preservation of life.

Basic necessities such as food, clothing, shelter, and access to non-toxic air and water are often recognised as essential need for human well-being. An individual's interests include the many elements that contribute to their overall state of well-being. It is advantageous for individuals to cultivate social relationships,

pursue educational opportunities, and maintain optimal physical well-being. Wants refer to the immediate wants and ambitions that individuals are predisposed towards. Every individual has two distinct aspects inside themselves in relation to their desires and materialistic tendencies. The self is formed via the conscious beliefs, desires, and goals of the ego. The concept of the “other self” refers to the authentic essence that exists underneath an individual's ego. The moral imperative of “Know thyself” entails transcending the superficial self in order to discern and actualize our own underlying essence. Various traditions have emerged in Greek philosophy, Christianity, Buddhism, Romanticism, and Marxism. The notion of self-realization is often regarded as a fundamental aspect of leading a fulfilling and meaningful life. The notion of self-realization is believed to have a pivotal position within the framework of Deep Ecology. The concept of deep ecology lacks coherence in the absence of self-realization. Deep ecologists propose that the fundamental concept of self is characterised by an intrinsic connection with the natural environment. Self-realization is a cognitive process including introspection, through which individuals gain insight into their own identities as interconnected entities within a broader context. The aforementioned process entails an individual's recognition that a definitive ontological distinction between humans and non-humans, as well as between self and other, is absent.

The aforementioned phenomenon pertains to the cognitive progression by which humans acquire self-awareness, seeing themselves not as discrete entities apart from the natural world, but rather as integral components of a larger interconnected entity referred to as the 'Self' (Shonin, 2016). The concept of self as stated within metaphysical holism is being referred to in this statement. It is vital to comprehend it as a cohesive entity. Similar to the interconnectedness seen among various organs inside the human body, the concept of the self may also be understood as a relational entity, including and influenced by other individuals and social contexts.

The primary aim of self-realization is to comprehend and really appreciate the interconnectedness that exists within diversity. Deep ecologists are dedicated to the attainment of self-realization, self-interest, and self-fulfillment, while also rejecting the individualistic conception of the self. Deep Ecologists often use the term “Self” to denote their comprehensive and interconnected perspective on the self, in contrast to the individualistic model which is denoted by the term “self”. This distinction allows them to articulate their holistic and relational understanding of the self. Therefore, self-realization may be defined as a transformative journey in which an individual gains a deeper understanding of their own identity as a whole, referred to as the “Self.” Additionally, this process involves a shift in perspective where personal interests are recognised and valued as part of a broader concept known as “Self-interest.” In order to adhere to the principles of the Deep Ecological programme, it is essential to undergo a personal change that encompasses the realisation of one's interconnectedness with the larger Self. The process of self-transformation or enlightenment involves the progressive transformation of a limited sense of self or ego into a more expansive and encompassing Self. Devall and Sessions provide light on the process of self-realization, emphasising its alignment with the spiritual practises found in many

global faiths. They argue that the Deep Ecology principle of self-realization transcends the conventional understanding of the self prevalent in Western societies.

The Western concept of self is characterised by its tendency towards isolation, individualism, and a primary focus on pursuing hedonistic fulfilment (Chirkov et al., 2003). From our perspective, the concept of self is often seen as being limited in scope, which therefore separates us from the broader social context. The process of spiritual development starts when individuals transcend their perception of themselves as solitary and self-centered entities, and instead foster a sense of connection and identification with other human beings, ranging from their immediate family members to close friends. The concept of self in deep ecology necessitates a heightened level of maturity and development, including an identity that extends beyond the confines of humankind to include the whole of the non-human world. This is the pivotal point at which the significance of environmental justice is contingent upon. The statement posits that all entities within the biosphere possess an inherent entitlement to exist and thrive, and to manifest their unique processes of development and self-actualization within the broader context of collective self-actualization. The fundamental concept posits that all species and things within the ecosphere are inherently equal in terms of their intrinsic worth, since they are interconnected components of a larger system.

The ethical framework of biocentrism is founded upon the principle of recognising equal intrinsic value. The concept of biocentric equality in Deep Ecology is derived from the philosophical framework of metaphysical holism, which has longstanding origins in Western thought (Baker & Coco, 2014). The moral value of people within the biotic community is considered equal, not due to their inherent worth as individuals, but only because of their membership in such community. It is often argued that biocentric ethics, which emphasises equality, primarily focuses on the biotic community and has become disconnected from the abiotic community. Hence, it is not deemed suitable for scholarly discourse in the context of Deep Ecology. However, it is our contention that proponents of biocentric equality do not necessarily oppose the notions of abiotic or cosmocentric equality. Deep ecologists are often characterised by their reluctance to engage in tradeoffs or compromises between the interests of humans and nonhuman entities. Nevertheless, in situations when there is a conflict between human interests and nonhuman interests, Deep Ecologists have a reduced inclination towards prioritising human interests. Deep ecologists want to promote a kind of equality that is less hierarchical and more democratic in nature. There is a prevalent argument in support of hierarchical equality, which we contend lacks a comprehensive understanding of its true essence. Deep ecologists are primarily concerned with the concept of comprehensive equality, which entails the restoration of environmental justice in its truest form. The primary aim of this study proposal is to demonstrate the concept of environmental equity via the recognition and appreciation of the intrinsic value of nature and its ecological ecosystems.

The elimination and total eradication of the principle of hierarchism would facilitate the achievement of this objective. In this context, it might be argued that biocentrism is insufficient in addressing the issue of environmental justice, since it

inherently upholds a kind of environmental hierarchism to some extent. The word “vital need” or “basic need” may be subject to varying interpretations. It is believed that the deep ecological programme has the potential to uncover a genuine sense of purpose. Devall and Sessions believe that essential human wants include several aspects, including affection, recreation, artistic manifestation, a profound connection with a specific environment, interpersonal bonds, and the imperative need for spiritual development in order to attain maturity as an individual (Celenza, 2014). The Deep Ecological movement engenders a cognitive shift in individuals, leading to the collective realisation that it is imperative to choose a lifestyle characterised by minimal rather than maximal effect on other species and the Earth as a whole. However, the Deep Ecological movement has been subject to much criticism. Deep Ecology emerges as a viable alternative to the prevailing mainstream worldview. As a theoretical construct, it does not pertain to a singular and comprehensive philosophical framework. Instead, it encompasses a range of philosophical and activist perspectives about ecological matters, which exhibit certain underlying economic and anthropocentric presumptions.

CONCLUSION

In this context, it is advisable to conceptualise it as a whole movement that incorporates both intellectual and activist dimensions. Deep ecology is often subject to criticism for being devoid of substance. An ideological movement that draws influence from a wide range of sources including Taoism, Heraclitus, Spinoza, Whitehead, Gandhi, Buddhism, and Native American traditions might be characterised as exhibiting eclecticism. In the most extreme scenario, it may result in a lack of comprehensibility. The primary tenet of Deep Ecology is the endeavour to preserve the inherent worth of all natural groups, hence refuting the notion that intrinsic value is only attributed to people. In this context, it offers a critique of the human-centric perspective, anthropocentrism, and the prevailing worldview. Renowned author Ramchandra Guha claims that Deep Ecology, despite its purported universality, can be identified as an ideology originating mostly from the United States. Guha further asserts that Deep Ecology may be seen as an extreme offshoot of the wilderness preservation movement. According to Eba (2020), the implementation of Deep Ecology will result in detrimental outcomes, particularly for impoverished and rural communities residing in underdeveloped nations. India may be characterised as a nation with a long history of settlement and a high population density, where agricultural communities maintain a delicate equilibrium with the natural environment. Guha argues that the implementation of a policy centred on biocentric equality and wilderness preservation will lead to a significant redistribution of income from impoverished individuals to the affluent, as well as a substantial displacement of the underprivileged population.

REFERENCES

Baker, J., & Coco, D. A. (2014). *A thread in the vine: The deep ecology of contemporary ayahuasca discourse* (Doctoral dissertation, Honours thesis, Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW).

Bassey, S. A. (2020). Technology, environmental sustainability and the ethics of anthropoholism. *Przestrzeń Społeczna*, 2(2/2020 (20)).

Bassey, S. A., Orji, M. O., & Afolabi, O. (2020). An Overview of Materialistic and Unified approach to Man - Nature Relationship. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 3(3), 17-28. Retrieved from <http://gnosijournal.com/index.php/gnosi/article/view/69>

Besthorn, F. H. (2012). Deep Ecology's contributions to social work: A ten-year retrospective. *International journal of social welfare*, 21(3), 248-259.

Callicott, J. B. (1990). The case against moral pluralism. *Environmental Ethics*, 12(2), 99-124.

Celenza, A. (2014). *Erotic revelations: Clinical applications and perverse scenarios*. Routledge.

Chirkov, V., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence: a self-determination theory perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(1), 97.

Corning, P. A. (2002). Thermoeconomics: beyond the second law. *Journal of Bioeconomics*, 4, 57-88.

Davies, K. (2023). *The rise of the US environmental health movement*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Diehm, C. (2002). Arne Naess, Val Plumwood, and deep ecological subjectivity: A contribution to the "deep ecology-ecofeminism debate". *Ethics and the Environment*, 7(1), 24-38.

Eba, M.-B. A. (2020). Human Right and Sustainable Development. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 3(3), 67-82. Retrieved from <http://gnosijournal.com/index.php/gnosi/article/view/72>

Grey, W. (1993). Anthropocentrism and deep ecology. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 71(4), 463-475.

Haigh, M. (2006). Deep ecology education: Learning from its Vaisnava roots. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education (CJEE)*, 43-56.

Hailwood, S. A. (2014). *How to be a green liberal: Nature, value and liberal philosophy*. Routledge.

Korsgaard, C. M. (1983). Two distinctions in goodness. *The philosophical review*, 92(2), 169-195.

LaChapelle, D. (2001). Profound Ecology. *Call to Earth*, 2(2), 2-5.

Luke, T. W. (1997). *Ecocritique: Contesting the politics of nature, economy, and culture*. U of Minnesota Press.

Naess, A. (1990). *Ecology, community and lifestyle: outline of an ecosophy*. Cambridge university press.

Næss, P. (2006). Cost-benefit analyses of transportation investments: neither critical nor realistic. *Journal of critical realism*, 5(1), 32-60.

Norton, B. G. (1992). Epistemology and environmental values. *The Monist*, 75(2), 208-226.

Purser, R. E., Park, C., & Montuori, A. (1995). Limits to anthropocentrism: Toward an ecocentric organization paradigm?. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 1053-1089.

Shonin, E., Van Gordon, W., & Griffiths, M. D. (2016). Ontological addiction: classification, etiology, and treatment. *Mindfulness*, 7, 660-671.

Udoudom, M. (2021). The Value of Nature: Utilitarian Perspective. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 4(1(May), 31-46. Retrieved from <http://gnosijournal.com/index.php/gnosi/article/view/100>

Valera, L. (2018). Home, ecological self and self-realization: Understanding asymmetrical relationships through Arne Næss's ecosophy. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 31, 661-675.

Van Auken, P. (2020). Toward a fusion of two lines of thought: creating convergence between Aldo Leopold and sociology through the community concept. *Socio-Ecological Practice Research*, 2, 39-61.

Van den Berg, A. E., Hartig, T., & Staats, H. (2007). Preference for nature in urbanized societies: Stress, restoration, and the pursuit of sustainability. *Journal of social issues*, 63(1), 79-96.

Vetlesen, A. J. (2017). Ethics and Value in Naess' Ecophilosophy: A Realist Perspective. *Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture, and Ecology*, 21(3), 251-261.