



Original Article

Environmentalness is Godliness: A Critique of an Anthropocentric Reading of the Bible

Adeola Seleem Olaniyan

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.3329/bjbio.v14i2.59>

Abstract: Theocentrism is the position that places God at the center of discourse; God is the Landlord and Manager of everything that exists. Analogous to other environmental theories such as anthropocentrism, zoocentrism, biocentrism, ecocentrism, and eco-feminism, theocentrism posits that God owns the universe and so the best manual on how to come to terms with the universe emanates from Him. God's commands are contained both in written scriptures and in oral traditions. While the former includes the Bible, Qur'an, and Bhagavad Gita, amongst others, the latter includes proverbs, myths, taboos, totems and rituals observed by different cultures across the globe. Unfortunately, a prevailing misinterpretation of scriptures considers theocentrism as nothing but ontological anthropocentrism, of which anthropocentric position in all its strands is egoistic. It is the moribund environmentalist position humanity has ever devised. The argument of this paper is that the authentic theocentric position is anti-anthropocentric. This position is embedded implicitly or explicitly in the Scriptures if it can be carefully unraveled. It continues thenceforth to establish that theocentric position is distinctly different from every other position. It is yet the most environmentally friendly position, without necessarily being at the expense of humans.

Keywords: Compatibilism, Envirosophy, Divine Command Theory, Environmentalness, Theocentrism,

Introduction: Ethics is the philosophy of morality; the latter is defined as the code of conduct a people live by. Amaechi Udefi defines ethics as "the systematic study of the principles of good behavior that is, good behavior as it applies to the individuals in their interaction with other people and the environment or society¹. Joseph Omoregbe

sees ethics as the discipline which studies the morality of human conduct¹. Environmental Ethics was birthed as a reaction against the environmental problems that were imminent. Philosophers as well as religious researchers enthusiastically came on board to advocate for the environment since the 1960s and becomes popularised in its full length in the 1990s². In a

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



Content of this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- CC BY-NC 4.0 International License.

In a bid to criticise the notorious anthropocentrism, as an environmental theory, many other theories were birthed, which include; animal ethic or zoocentrism, biocentrism, ecocentrism and eco-femism.

However, in addition to many other earlier criticisms of philosophers, these theories too cannot suffice to rescue the environment more than they have done because, at least, they are all erected on ill-founded secular assumptions that dubiously removed the hands of God from the scene of which God is the creator of not only humans but the whole of the nature. Divine Command Theory (DCT), which is a strand of Deontological Normative Ethical Theory, is appealed to. The central tenet of DCT, according to John Hare, is that; what makes something right or wrong is that God commands or forbids it³. Hence, Theocentric Environmental Theory appeals to God as the proprietor of nature from whom the best manual, with which we can harmoniously relate with nature, emanates⁴. Philosophy is considered as an apogee of human reason. Meanwhile, DCT appeals to religious faith. At this point, there is a need to briefly but critically draw a searchlight to see whether faith and reason interrelate or whether they are vowed enemies of each other. The onus of this paper is to substitute the prevailing secular environmental theories with the non-anthropocentric theocentric environmentalism that has its justification from the Divine Command Ethical Theory. This shall be done by, firstly, presenting a traditionalist reading of the Bible that is allegedly anthropocentric. After that, an enlightened reading of the Bible shall follow. Finally, a concise but critical dialogue between faith and reason shall suffice now.

Methodology: The methods we adopted in this research include; exposition, critical analysis and hermeneutics. By the exposition, we mean to bring to the fore, the immanent environmental problems. By critical analysis, the problems shall be critically analyzed with the aim to show how they are implied by human actions masterminded by wrongly conceived human ideologies. Finally, with the aid of a sharp hermeneutics toolkit, this paper

engenders a re-reading of the Bible so as to rid it of the alleged anthropocentric face and to establish an authentic theocentric position that is environmental friendly. This research idea was conceived during in year 2016 during my studies in the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria and was completed in year 2023. Different versions of The Bible were read and theologians as well as men and women of Christian faith were engaged in a critical discussion. For literature review, both physical and virtual search engines were explored which include Google Scholar, Research Gate, and Webinar. The key words used in the course of the searching include; theocentrism, environmental ethics, anthropocentrism, ecocentrism, animal ethic and environmentalism.

A Dialogue of Faith and Reason: Appealing to Howe and Howe, Faith is simply defined as merely a personal trust in someone or something⁵. Here, we employ it in strict religious perspective. *Object* and *act* of faith are two important concepts within the definition of faith. An object of faith is the person or thing in which one trusts while an act of faith, according to Kreeft and Tacelli, has four aspects: the emotional, the intellectual, the volitional and the heart and will aspect of faith⁶. Appealing to Howe and Howe once again, the act of faith “involves the whole person’s emotions, intellect, volition, will and heart, in a total commitment of trust in another”⁷.

On the other hand, reason, according to Ferre, is “the ability to identify, to discriminate, to evaluate, to interpret, to test, to order and to direct experience”⁸. An act of reason indicates both subjective and personal acts of the mind, which are used to discover, interpret, and understand the truth. According to Howe and Howe, there are three classic determinants that serve as acts of reason. These are: simple apprehension, judgment and reasoning⁹. An object of reason is whatever the mind can know by reason. According to Howe and Howe; “Any object of reason can be grasped, understood either to be or not to be, and demonstrated, without any assumptions based on faith in divine revelation, to be true or false”¹⁰. It is noteworthy that while the faith so

defined is religious, the reason is a philosophical watchdog.

J. Swindal classifies *Faith and Reason*, into four main classes. The Conflict Model sees similarity in the aims, objects or method of faith and reason and that any time a conflict seems to be, which is considered as a genuine rivalry by its adherents, the scientific-minded naturalists favour reason while the religious-minded fundamentalists favour faith. The Incompatibilist Model holds that the duo is distinct whereby empirical and divine facts are the aims of reason and faith accordingly; this gives no room for rivalry between them. Transrationalism, Irrationalism and Fideism are the three sub-divisions under this model which claims; the superiority of the reason, irrationality or *absurdum* of faith and the conception of faith as the basis of knowledge. The Weak Compatibilist Model is the third, which holds that, although, both maintains distinct domains of evaluation and cogency, there is, nevertheless, a possibility of dialogue between them. The last model is Strong Compatibilist Model which holds that there is a kind of organic connection between faith and reason. Natural theologians are persuaded by this position. It is on this ground, for example, the cosmological proof for God's existence and the argument for the impossibility of science unless God's goodness ensured the world is intelligible, are inferred¹¹. Divine Command Theory, from which theocentric environmentalism derives its justification, is erected on Strong Compatibilist Model.

Unfortunately, environmental problems, apparently, persist with the introduction of God's hands into it as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures, mainly the Bible and the Qur'an. This becomes the basis of loud cry, in discontent and disappointment, of a reputable Western Historian named Lynn White in his celebrated paper published in 1967 titled: *The Historical Root of Our Ecologic Crises*. With all manners of sincerity and humility, he declared that what the Western world flaunts as theirs so much so that it is axiomatically believed to be theirs originally, is historically exposed to be Occidental in origin, most especially from the gifted Arabs¹². He nevertheless, proceeds

to attack Bible for being anthropocentric on its account of creation as contained in the Genesis despite the overwhelming allegation that anthropocentrism is the most notorious of the environmental theories ever devised by humanity. Said H. Nasri also launched an allegation similar to White's from Holy Qur'an's perspective in 1966¹³. Ibrahim Ozdemir denies the allegation from the Qur'an's perspective. I agree with Ibrahim's argument that the problem is not originally scriptural as the critiques would allege only that they result from a piecemeal and oversimplified approach that were being given to some verses of the Qur'an in the course of mimicking or imposing meanings from Christians' view¹⁴.

According to a Yoruba adage, *bí igi bá wó lu igi, ti orí è ni àá kókò yàn* (when trees fall on one another, the topmost should be removed first). In this view, effort has been made in my earlier work titled; *Theocentrism is not Anthropocentric: An Enlightened Environmentalist Reading of the Holy Qur'an*¹⁵, to rescue the Holy Qur'an of the anthropocentric allegations. In that article, Islamic descriptive environmental ethics was dichotomised from the prescriptive ones where the former highlights the 'is' while the latter highlights the 'ought'. This squares the descriptive as distinct from Prescriptive/Normative Ethics. Here, efforts shall be made to deny the allegation that the Bible is anthropocentric. We shall do this by providing an alternative enlightened reading with the aid of sharp hermeneutics and comments of some great Christian scholars.

Theocentric Environmentalism: Here, we shall allude to the definition of environment as it is given thus: Environment is "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 everything¹⁶. Etymologically speaking, the concept 'theocentrism' is derived from Greek and Latin words, *theos*, which denotes God and *centric* which is, in turn,

derived from the Latinised form of the Greek word *kentrikos*, which is "pertaining to a center". Accordingly, theocentrism is the doctrine that places God at the centre of everything in the universe.

A Theocentric assumption is that the universe is created by God, and still remains the property of God and that from God, 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, Tora, Jabbur, the Vedas, the Īsopanishad, the Upanishad, Shariat Ki Sugmad, Baghavad Gita, *et cetera*¹⁷. It also includes the non-written oral beliefs as it is contained implicitly in many religious practices in form of myths, taboos, totems and restrictions¹⁸. 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. 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, the Holy Bible and Christian views shall be interrogated emphatically with an aim to debunk the surface reading that is offensively anthropocentric. In this regard, we shall draw a dichotomy of Christian views along two lines viz.; the *traditional* and the *alternative enlightened* reading. Insights shall, nevertheless, be drawn from other worldly religions too.

Discussion: A Descriptive Traditional Environmental Ethical View of the Holy Bible: In the Garden of Eden, 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"¹⁹. However, the story seizes, taking an inference from the account of creation in Genesis. According to the *Genesis*' account of creation, human, which 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-in-Chief over his elderlies! The account is a long one, which has it that; the creation of the world took God six etheric days. He rested on the seventh day. On the first day, God, purportedly, created the heavens and the earth in a formless, void and dark state, such that, the spirit of God was moving upon the face of the water. He then created light out of His command and made a separation between the light and the darkness to form day and night. On the second day, He created the 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.

After this, God gathered all the waters together on the third day 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. On the fourth day, He regulated 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 fifth day, God, purportedly, created all aquatic lives including whale and arboreal flies of the firmament and endowed them the power of procreation. On the sixth day, He is accounted to have created terrestrial animals, cattle and creeping ones and beast in kinds and blessed them to procreate. All these were discussed within the long and continuous twenty-five verses of the first chapter of the first book of the Holy Bible; the Holy Book of Genesis²⁰. It is noteworthy that all these He created not by crafting creativity but by His Divine Commandment. His creation exercises were concluded with the creation of humankind. This is presented in the subsequent 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 earth²¹.

This account has been interpreted as humans' 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 permission as it is partly read thus: "...and subdue it"²². This, apparently, shows that Genesis was not only telling human what to do but what should be done. By this account, God is represented as issuing this instruction before the fall.

As if that was not enough, another commandment was issued to Noah, after the Fall, not only to reaffirm the latter but also to add two significant stipulations; the duo of which culminate to the worse destiny of the nature in the hands of humanity. 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"²³. These verses permit not only to dominate 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 vegetarian²⁵. The above representation is a critique of the Historian John Passmore over the Genesis account of origin²⁵. I believe that this account, allegedly, makes it clear that theocentrism, so defined, is anthropocentric; the 'notorious' environmental position that has been considered to be the basis of human nonchalant attitude towards nature. This makes one to be sceptical 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 a traditional reading of the Bible.

To the interest of this paper, many Western scholars have attacked this position from

Christian points of view and make notable efforts to reread the Holy Bible in an environmentally friendly manner. According to the information available to us, the earliest notice of these attacks was launched by Lynn White, who remarks that what people do about their ecology depends on what they think about themselves in relation to things around them. He says further that human ecology is deeply conditioned by beliefs about our nature and destiny. From the above, he alleged that 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. Rather, he confesses, 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 produced²⁶. He launched the allegation on the ground that it was 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 enlightened reading, which shall, hereby, be considered as the normative environmental ethical divine commandment. We shall do this in the subsequent subheading.

A Normative Environmental Ethical View of the Enlightened Reading of the Holy Bible:

Genesis was originally written in Hebrew and translated to English Language. The original word is *radah* which is a Hebrew word for 'rule' which is closer to 'stewardship'. Stewardship is based on two tenets. While the first is "that humans are caretakers of nature in that we look after it in some way," the second is "that humans are important, but other creatures also have value." These tenets are, rightly, inferable from a reading of the story of Genesis by Robin Attfield. He corroborates this view thus:

[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*²⁷.

Meanwhile, we need to remember that it is said in the same Genesis that mankind was created in God's image²⁸. A good blend of this and the dominion account of creation together with God's injunction in the Garden of Eden whereby man was put "into the Garden of Eden to dress and keep it"²⁹, would bring about a total change in the whole story from the ugly 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. Furthermore, the notion of man being created in the image of God should be considered as a potential, rather than actual status of mankind, of which 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 God's consciousness. Even by this interpretation, human-centeredness in environmental matters still persists only that the stewardship is a weak or relative anthropocentrism with a fair look as opposed to the ugly dominionship which is a strong anthropocentrism. As a matter of fact, none of these interpretations rises above anthropocentrism. It will also do well to remind the arrogance of human supremacy of the account of creation in Genesis that human is otherwise portrayed in the same account of *Genesis* as being originally dust as it states: "for dust you are, and to dust you shall return"³⁰. I believe this is sufficient to check humans' that nature is the mother out of which human beings were made and always remains a part of.

Beyond dominionism and 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 grounds of 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 father³¹. Humans, sharing the same father with nature, relates with nature as siblings in love and mutual respect rather than domination and/or stewardship.

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 joy of the father upon his return to get the report that each and every sibling complementarily contributed the best of their own quota to ensure they are all in good conditions³². On a division of labour system, for instance; the females keep the kitchen and the house chores, the males do the farming, the youngsters make themselves available at the service; to be sent on errands as the need may be, all to ensure that the balance is kept and the interest of 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.

Hence, the question; "who owns the earth?" is answered in a better way. While anthropocentric and ecocentric advocates would 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 that "God owns the nature." 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 God³³.

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 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 legend, Saint Francis was reported to have preached to 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 rejoiced. In another legend, a fierce wolf ravaged the Land around Gubbio in the Apennines, Saint Francis also talked to the wolf and persuaded him of the error of his ways, which made the wolf to repent and die in the odour of sanctity and was buried in consecrated ground³⁴.

According to White, at the heart of his discussion, is animism, holding that everything in existence, including such living things as

humans, plants, goats and even tiniest ants; and the non-living things, flame a sign of the thrust of the soul toward union with God³⁵.

Why environmental Crisis: There is a 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 Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda 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 for that matter, superimposed themselves over others and treat them with cruelty. This, he argued, is the root cause of the problem³⁶. 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 God³⁷.

In the introductory part of the same book, he points out that environmental problems result from humans' self-acclaimed rationality status of which their understanding is still shallow. This is majorly caused by their attempts to discredit God and take control over and above everything. Hence, every action they take yields consequences that outweigh the benefits thereby derived. He reports more elaborately 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 choking 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 purposes³⁸.

Hence, Devall and Sessions argue that human self-realisation in relation and harmony with nature is the sole key towards human spiritual growth and unfolding. He puts it 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 world³⁹.

Spiritual growth is attached to kind interrelationship among men, on the one hand, and between men and their external environment, on the other hand, 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.

Conclusion: The goal of Ethics is not limited to the establishment of working theories that ensure peaceful and harmonious living among individuals, ethnic groups, nations and international relations. It also includes a creation of harmonious and enabling environment among other living and non-living entities of nature. There have been prevailing environmental ethical theories that are decidedly secular, appealing to one normative ethical theory or the other. We argue that these theories are inadequate hence a call for their replacement with Divine Command informed theocentric environmental ethical

theory. Although, the idea of Divine Command is less salient outside the Abrahamic religions, it is highly influential and enjoys a wide acceptance in Judeo-Christian as well as Islamic doctrine⁴⁰. Here lies the strength of our application of it as a critique of Christian Theocentric Environmental Ethics.

Meanwhile, it is quite unfortunate that many religious people, despite their submissiveness to religious command, are destitute of, or deliberately ignore, this fact. More often than not, people are found of justifying their cruel relationship with nature, making references to their Abrahamic religious Scriptures. It is hereby made a worthwhile invitation of more competent hands to advocate for, and popularise, environmental philosophy (simply called envirosophy) discussion from Scriptural points of view as failure to do so, or as appropriate and urgent 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 attempts chimera because, in my own dictum, *the more environmentally conscious you are, the more Godly you are.*

I am aware that a critique may object this position as a theory that is good in paper but devoid of practice, owing to human nature as omnivorous as well as materialistic who cannot do but depend on other components of nature for food, shelter, clothing and objects of knowledge among other needs. They may press their worry that; is this theory not an attempt to deny humans survival in the name of conserving/preserving nature or any salvation agenda? As valid and reasonable as 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 be at stable equilibrium and for the continuity of the cycle, each component would keep on inter-depending on others for their "essential needs. However, the principle of austerity, pity and love is highly recommended and encouraged in the course of the interrelationship.

References

1. Udefi, A. Philosophy: Meaning, Method and Application. Ed. A. Udefi. Philosophy and The Sciences: An Invitation to Interdisciplinary Studies. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd. 2010: 7. ISBN: 978-032-290-6.
2. Laal, M. A brief history of enviroethics and its challenges. Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine. June 2009; 2(10): 2. PMID: 23908724. PMCID: PMC3714002. URL: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/224767102>
3. Hare, J. E. 2012. Divine Command. Ankara University, Faculty of Divinity. 2012; 53(2): 187. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1501/llhfak_0000001370
4. Hoffman, A. J. and Sandelands, L. E. Getting Right with Nature: Anthropocentrism, Ecocentrism and Theocentrism. Ross School of Business Working Paper Series. Michigan: Working paper series. Oct. 1, 2004; 18(2): 17-19. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=901660> (Accessed on June 2023)
5. Howe, T. A. and Howe, R. G. Knowing Christianity is True: the relationship between faith and reason. Ed. F. J. Beckwith, et al. Eds. To Everyone an Answer: a case for the Christian worldview. Illinois: InterVarsity Press. 2004: 28.
6. Howe, T. A. and Howe, R. G. Knowing Christianity is True. 2004: 30.
7. Howe, T. A. and Howe, R. G. Knowing Christianity is True. 2004: 30.
8. Ferre, N. F. S. Reason in Religion. Rowley, H. H. Ed. London: Thomas Nelson. Jan. 1, 1963: 3. ASIN: B0007DM13Y.
9. Howe, T. A. and Howe, R. G. Knowing Christianity is True. 2004: 25.
10. Howe, T. A. and Howe, R. G. Knowing Christianity is True. 2004: 27.
11. Swindal, J. Faith and Reason. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. U. S. A: Duquesne University. <https://www.iep.utm.edu/faith-re/>
12. White L. The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis. Science. America: American Association for the Advancement of Science. Mar. 10, 1967; 155(3767): 1203-1207. URL: <http://www.jsor.org/stable/1720120>
13. Nasr, S. H. The essential Seyyed Hussein Nasr. Ed. W. C. Chittick. Indiana: World wisdom. 2007. ISBN-10: 1933316381. ISBN: 13: 978-1933316383
14. Ozdemir, I. Towards an Understanding of Environmental Ethic from A Qur'anic Perspective. Islamand Ecology, Eds. R. C. Foltz, F. M. Denny and A. Baharuddin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 2003: 18. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350726446> (Accessed on June 2023).
15. Olaniyan, A. S. and Shamima, L. P. Theocentrism is not Anthropocentric: An Enlightened Environmentalist Reading of the Holy Qur'an. Ed. L. P. Shamima. Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics. Bangladesh: BJBio. Mar. 2022; 13(1): 70-79. <http://bjbio.bioethics.org.bd/index.php/BJBio/>
16. Olaniyan, A. S. Algazel's Sufism as a Critique of Islamic Environmentalism. Project. Philosophy, Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. 2021: 10.
17. The Assisi Declaration. Messages on Humanity and Nature from Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam and Judaism. Bath, UK: Alliance of Religion and Conservation. 1986. <http://www.arcworld.org/downloads/THE%20ASSISI%20DECLARATIONS.pdf>
18. Etieyibo, E. Ubuntu and the Environment. The Palgrave Handbook of African Philosophy. Eds. A. Afolayan. & T. Falola. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2017: 12. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59291-0>
19. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version with Revised Marginal References. London: Oxford University Press. 1884; Genesis 1: 29.
20. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version. 1884. Genesis 1: 1-25.
21. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version. 1884. Genesis 1: 26-28.
22. The Holy Bible: 1884. The Revised Version Genesis1: 28.
23. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version. 1884. Genesis 9: 2-3.
24. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version. 1884. Genesis 1: 29.
25. Passmore, J. Man's Responsibility for Nature: Ecological Problems and Western Traditions. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1974: 6. ISBN-10: 9780684138152. ISBN-13: 978-0684138152
26. White, L. The Historical Root of Our Ecologic Crises. Science. March 10, 1967. 155.3767: 1205.
27. Connelly, J. and Smith, G. Eds. Politics and the Environment: From Theory to Practice. London: Routledge. 2000: 18. ISBN: 0964-4016.
28. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version. 1884. Genesis 1: 26-27.
29. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version. 1884. Genesis 2: 15.
30. The Holy Bible: The Revised Version. 1884. Genesis 3: 19.
31. Hoffman, A. J. and Sandelands, L. E. Getting Right with Nature. Oct. 1, 2004; 18(2): 17-19.
32. Chesterton, G.K. Orthodoxy. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1908: 115-116. URL: <http://www.ccel.org/chesterton/orthodoxy.html>
33. Schaeffer, F.A. Pollution and the Death of Man: The Christian View of Ecology. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House. 1970: 77. ISBN: 9780842348409
34. White, White, L. The Historical Root of Our Ecologic Crises. March 10, 1967; 155(3767): 1207.
35. White, White, L. The Historical Root of Our Ecologic Crises. March 10, 1967; 155(3767): 1206.
36. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, A. C. The Laws of Nature: An Infallible Justice. India: The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. 1991; Rpt. 2007. x. ASIN: 07MZXM5V5
37. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, A. C. 1991. The Laws of Nature. 1991; Rpt. 2007. x.
38. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, A. C. 1991. The Laws of Nature. 1991; Rpt. 2007. ix.
39. Devall, B. and Sessions, G. Deep Ecology. Environmental Ethics: Reading in Theory and Application. Eds. L. P. Pojman & P Pojman. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth Publishing Company. 1998; 5th Edition 2008: 145. ISBN: 9780495033.
40. Hare, J. E. Divine Command. 2012; 53(2): 187.

Authorship: I confirm that I was the sole author who develop and wrote the article.

Declaration of interest: None

Funding: None