

# A Critical Analysis of Speciesism as an Anthropocentric Worldview of Environmental Ethics: Humans' Responsibility to Non-Human Species.

PRANAB KIRTUNIA, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, BEJOY NARAYAN MAHAVIDYALAYA, ITACHUNA, HOOGHLY, WEST BENGAL- 712147

## Abstract

Human interference to the environment is increasing day by day. As a result, the environment is facing complete destruction. Each member has an important role in the environment, they form a beautiful environment in harmony with each other. But human oppression destroyed and affected the other species of the environment. That's why the environment stand at the crucial point of the destruction today. Now we feel the urgency of analyzing it, when the environmental crises, like the exhaustion of natural resources and greenery, climate catastrophe, animal killings etc. are at doorstep. Human civilization has achieved significant progress in scientific, technological, industrial and economic fields, but all developments in these fields have been pursued, and are being pursued, at the high cost of exploitation and exhaustion of environment. Man cannot survive as a completely separate entity from the environment. Because the members of the environment are interdependent in relation to each other. So the environment must be protected. We have to protect other members of the environment as well as animals and to create a healthy and beautiful environment. Human are the most intelligent being of this world, who are capable of moral conduct. So they have responsibility to protect all members of the environment. We should overcome the narrowness of anthropocentric morality and to extend the circle of moral considerations to the ecocentric morality. The result will be a beautiful and healthy environment. In this paper, I will address the shortcomings of the anthropocentric approach to the moral consideration and try to show how the non-human beings can be included in moral consideration. That is, we will try to find a way to extend the circle of moral consideration from human-centric to leaving beings, where all living beings to be given respect. Finally, I will try to find out a guideline of on creating a healthy and peaceful environment through human friendly behavior towards animals by eliminating aggression and violence in society and environment.

**Key words:** Environmental Ethics, Intrinsic value, anthropocentrism, speciesism, human chauvinism, Deep Ecology,

## Introduction

Human can't live alone in the environment. Each member of environment is interconnected and interdependent. No one can live in isolation here. The environment is built through relationships and interdependence with the members who live around us. In addition to human, animals, plants, rivers, mountain etc. all are important members of the environment, all together creating a healthy environment. But human continue to oppress and destroy other members of the environment. Such as killing animals, destroying trees, closing ponds, rivers and canals, blocking the flow of rivers, excess using petrol and diesel powered vehicles have been rapidly polluting the environment. As a result, holes have been appeared in the ozone layer, ultraviolet rays enter the Earth's atmosphere. As a result the atmosphere is warming up, the greenhouse effect is destroying the environment. Ultimately human, animals, plants, all members are being affected. About

human activities it is mentioned "the desire to subdue and dominate the environment propels man to consistently engage in activities that result in the release of hazardous greenhouse gases into the air and bring about unhealthy climate change."<sup>1</sup>

Human and non-human animals have the right to live in a healthy environment. But man-made environmental pollution is harming and destroying non-human lives. When an action directly or indirectly affects other members, includes in moral judgment. An actions that do not affect others are not included in moral judgment. Anthropocentric moral judgement acknowledges moral responsibility to only humans, not to biotic community. Non-human living beings like animals have been used as a means of gaining human purpose, so not only animals have been harmed, but the whole environment has been harmed by human activities. We should extend the circle of moral consideration to all living beings.

### History of Moral Responsibility

If we analyze the development of ethics from the origin of ethics to the present day, we will see that traditional ethics consider moral responsibility to human only. In ancient society, it was often the case that female, Tenant and enslaved had no moral rights. In order to take their lives as king desire. The king thought that they were all the property of the king. They are valued in the interest of the king. They have no intrinsic value. Their value depends on the needs of others purposes. They had instrumental value which is depend on others. Gradually the circle of moral consideration extended from the king to queen then to the tenant and enslaved. At first male were included in moral considerations. It was said that children, women, old people were unable to make and understand moral decisions. Later the circle of morality was extended from male to human. Traditional ethics consider moral obligation only to human, which is called anthropocentric morality. Moral obligation did not considered to non-human species. We confront so many ethical problems in our daily lives, but traditional ethics are not enough to overcome these moral issues. We needs a new ethics for overcoming of moral issues that arisen in special situations in our daily life. This new branch of ethics is called applied ethics. Traditional norms have failed to address various moral issues in practical life, and these norms have been insufficient to acknowledge moral responsibility towards non-human world. In this situation the emergence of environmental ethics, which is important branch of applied ethics. We noticed two main aspects of environmental ethics: human-centered or anthropocentric moral consideration and ecocentric moral consideration or ecocentrism. Anthropocentrism consider only human being is the central being of the universe. according to Encyclopedia Britannica "Anthropocentrism regards humans as separate from and superior to nature and holds that human life has intrinsic value while other entities (including animals, plants, mineral resources, and so on) are resources that may justifiably be exploited for the benefit of humankind"<sup>2</sup>. Other hand ecocentrism is a moral standing, where morally considered both human and the non-human world. Sheryl D. Breen mention in her essay Ecocentrism "Ecocentrism is an ethical worldview based on an interconnected web of dynamic relationships among living entities and systems that include land and climate as well as animate individuals and species"<sup>3</sup>.

### Environmental Ethics is an Expanding Circle

Environmental ethics is a branch of applied ethics that deals with interaction of human and non-human beings in the environment, and to discuss the guidelines for overcoming moral issues caused by interactions, and to differentiate between right action and wrong action. Generally human interests will be given more importance in ethics, as the ethics is made by human. However, human interest are protected in traditional ethics, even at the crucial cost of non-human world. The biggest challenge to the environmental ethics is how to minimize humans's interference to the environment, to protect non-human lives and how to incorporate them into moral considerations. Environmental Ethics is concerned with the values attached to the natural world and humans interactions and impose the moral value to the non-human world. Mainly two important theories of environmental ethics are anthropocentric worldview and ecocentric worldview. Many thinkers thought that anthropocentrism is not only tie up the relation of human to other humans, but promotes the exercises for

protecting human interest. Moral consideration is applicable only to human beings. An attempt is made to formulate ethical principals at the center of human interest.

The term 'anthropocentrism' laterally means human-centeredness. It derive from the Greek words 'anthropos' and 'kentron'. 'Anthropos' means 'human being' and 'kentron' means 'center'. So it is a world view which think that humans are at the centre of all purpose and important entity in the world. Non-human world exist only for serve the human needs. Anthropocentrism is a normative concept that is set of human experience and privilege, derived from the Biblical teaching, where humans are considered only living beings, made by the image of God. The appropriateness or impropriety of any work is determined by putting human interest at the center. That is, any work is good if that work protects human interest. And a work is wrong if it harmed human-interest. In this case no moral responsibility of man towards animals is accepted. In anthropocentric world view admitted intrinsic value of human. That is to say, the value of man is recognized as the value which is entirely his own value, whether he is used for someone else's purpose or not, he is valued by himself. On the other hand the practical value of non-human species other than humans is acknowledged. That is, they are valuable only if they are useful to human interests, that is, they fulfill or can fulfill any human interest. Here we can easily see that no moral responsibility is accepted towards the non-human world. So this world view protect only human interest even at the crucial cost of the nonhuman world. In Freud word's "[The human ideal is] combining with the rest of the human community and taking up the attack on nature, thus forcing it to obey human will, under the guidance of science".<sup>4</sup>

According to anthropocentrism human being is the central position and most important being in the universe Bertrand Russell wrote "I am unable to believe that, in the world as known, there is anything that I can value outside human beings, and, to a much lesser extent, animals".<sup>5</sup> Person's behavior, which affects other, includes in moral considerations. Similarly, if human behavior affects animals, then that behavior should also be included in the moral consideration. However, some ethicists claim that since animals are like instruments, so humans have no moral obligation to them. Humans' moral responsibility is only towards own species members. However, Jeremy Bentham said that just as humans have a moral right to live, not to suffer, so do animals. So at the same time we have a moral obligation to both of humans and animals. Jeremy Bentham said that it is not justifiable to recognize moral dignity on the basis of species members alone.

The first attempt to transcend human-centered morality is seen through the efforts of Jeremy Bentham., He claimed that the criteria of moral consideration must be the capacity of 'suffering'. He said that the standard of moral judgment should be sentient, meaning that those with sentience should be included in moral considerations. He added that in the case of the inclusion sentience should be subject of moral consideration. In book *The Lord Chief Justice of England on Vivisection* mentioned of Bentham word's "The question is," "not, can they reason, or can they sopeak, but can they suffer?"<sup>6</sup> Thus he spoke that the sentient beings must include in moral consideration. He said that the sentience should be the standard of moral consideration. Bentham says that humans have a right to live and right not to suffer. Also animals have same right. A group of philosopher think that the right to live and right not to be suffer do not applicable to nonhuman such as animals. These rights apply only to the human beings. In this context, they say that whether it is a right to live or right not to be suffered, that can only be exercised by human beings. As non-human beings cannot consciously feel the pain. We know that no one gives up the rights. The rights have to be taken. So the right not to be suffered and the right to live do not applicable to the animals. If we see that the animals breed and nurture future generations to sustain their species in the future, then the question arises that moral values should be accepted towards animals just like human beings? If animals are considered important like human beings, then what we should do if the survival of animals or the survival of a particular animal is dangerous to human beings? Actually human beings are generally considered to be more important than nonhuman beings, because they are the creators of moral values and they may consider killings of non-human beings or animals in the interest of human beings. In principle we have a moral responsibility towards every member in the environment i.e. we have a moral responsibility to protect them, to maintain the diversity of different members in the environment and save the environment. However, when there is a conflict between the right to live of



mankind and the right to live of non-human beings, we may violate the right to live of animals in protecting of humans. Humans have the right to enjoy their freedom, also non-humans have the same right in the environment. Second, human and non-humans both have the right not to be tortured or harmed by others. The questions are, do animals feel pain? Why do people have a moral obligation to animals or by what standards moral responsibility is to be recognized? Now the question is how do we know that animals suffer? Humans express their different feelings through their behavior, animals also express their different feelings through their behavior, and that is, they behave as we do when we feel pain. Jeremy Bentham says that the physical behavior changes for pain. The same thing applies to animals. But the supporter of anthropocentrism claims that the moral obligations applicable only to human beings. Humans should protect their own species and the members of the human species will be included in the moral consideration. Since ethics is man-made, moral consideration is applicable only to humans. This type of speciesist thinking is deeply linked to the sexism and racism. In the journal of encyclopedia of applied ethics L Goralnik and M P Nelson wrote “Discrimination against another species based on the fact that its members are not human”<sup>7</sup>

Such anthropocentricity is called speciesism, that believes humans have a moral obligation towards own species. It seeks to protect them as members of the same species and to justify discriminatory treatment to other species by humans. The most objectionable place of anthropocentrism is speciesism, here moral responsibility is acknowledged to humans only. But no moral dignity is acknowledged for the animals. Species attitudes are comparable to sexism and racism that consider moral responsibility and moral dignity only to own species members. This species view is deeply rooted to race and gender, which is not morally justified. Prasanta Sarkar wrote in his article *Wrongness of Moral Speciesism* “Speciesism is that type of differential treatment we humans traditionally make on the basis of species membership only. We count interests of members of our own species at the interests of members of other non-human species”.<sup>8</sup> All kinds of contemporary speciesism are not indefensible. Though we can say that there are enough reasons for morally unacceptance of speciesism. Proponents of speciesism make some arguments in support of anthropocentrism; firstly, the value of humans’ life is more important than the value of animal’s life. So animal’s life cannot be compared with humans’ life. Second, animals cannot express their needs to others, but humans can express their needs to others in the society. Third: Animals cannot apply their own reasoning, but humans apply their own reasoning. Fourth: Ethics depends on mutual understanding and communication. People are capable of mutual understanding and it is possible for people to talk to each other. But animals do not have this ability. Fifth: Morality always depends on the use of sophisticated language - which humans do, but animals cannot. Sixth: Man is the creator of morality. In this morality there is a reflection of human experience, there is no reflection of animal’s experience. So Moral obligations applicable only to human beings. Seventh, animals do not respect human rights, human beings have no moral obligation to respect the rights of animals. Eighth, Superior animals dominate and hunt inferior one, and it is a natural law. Same thing may be applicable for human and animals. Human is higher than animals so humans have the right to dominate inferior animals. Humans have moral potential but animals do not have this. That is why morality applies only to human beings. However, proponents of animal liberalism and some philosophers believe that the above arguments can never justify the cruelty to animals by humans.

### **Different types of Speciesism**

Speciesism tries to derive the moral justification of anthropocentrism. There are three different types of speciesism. Raw speciesism, Strong speciesism and Weak speciesism.

## Raw speciesism

According to Raw speciesism humans are humans, humans are the member of human species and on the other hand animals are not human so humans have no moral obligation to the animal. In support of situation a poster is stated "whether one views humans as animals or not, the fact remains that nonhumans are in fact, not human."<sup>9</sup> Raw speciesism do not show any morally valid argument in support of speciesism just like of racism. Racist say that white is white" and "black is black", Raw speciesist also says that "humans are humans" and "animals are animals". Note here that raw speciesist cannot make any valid argument in their favor. That's why Peter Singer says that speciesist thinking is blind to superstition and indefensible. Donald A Graft wrote "Raw speciesism appeals to justifying reasons that refer simply to species membership and no more."<sup>10</sup>

## Strong Speciesism:

Another two speciesism are strong speciesism and weak speciesism. These two name just a label. These names are not divided in the nature of the argument those have been produced by them. But these two speciesism have been divided accordingly how they apply their arguments in favor of speciesism. There are many arguments in favor of speciesism by strong speciesism. 1). Biological species concept, 2). Genetic typism, 3). The importance argument, 4). The special relation argument, 5). The divine command arguments.

### 1. Biological species concept:

According to biological species concept if two animals can interbreed to produce viable offspring can be said similar species. Each species member has the responsibility to protect own species members and keep to save their future generation. Therefore it is nothing wrong. But this biological species concept does not clear the concept of species. We can see many exceptional case where two member of same species are not capable in interbreed to produce viable offspring though they are single species. For examples, the several groups of owl-monkey *Aotus trivergatus* cannot interbreed, those all are single species. Against the biological species concept Ernst Mayr wrote in his book *The Growth of Biological Thought: Diversity, Evolution, and Inheritance* "It is sometime claim that the biological species concept was invented by ornithologist is valid only for birds. The historical facts refute this assertion".<sup>11</sup> This counter example clearly proof that the biological species concept is not enough for establishing moral ground of speciesism.

### 2). Genetic typism

Genetic typism is an effective argument in support of speciesism. This argument claimed that there is not more than 2% genetic dissimilarity among members of human species so humans have the moral responsibility to their own species and they also can be said human. But if we focus our attention to the bonobos and humans, we can see there is not more than 1.6% genetic difference, which is the less difference from humans own species member. It is well established theory of biology. So we can say that the availability of percentages of genetic content not to be moral position for discriminating attitude toward animals by the human. Genetic typism is an effective argument in support of speciesism. This argument claimed that there is not more than 2% genetic dissimilarity among members of human species so humans have the moral responsibility to their own species and they also can be said human. But if we focus our attention to the bonobos and humans, we can see there is not more than 1.6% genetic difference, which is the less difference from humans own species member. It is well established theory of biology. So we can say that the availability of percentages of genetic content not to be moral position for discriminating attitude toward animals by the human.

### 3). The importance argument

Supporters of strong speciesism claim that human is more important than animals or other species. So human give more importance their own species, and the same other species will give more important their own species. Donald A Graft states “in practice, we do not always consider humans to be more important than animals.”<sup>12</sup> But here we can see always we do not give more important own species. Whether the important criteria to be understood in Absolut sense or relative sense. If we understood the importance criteria in 'absolute' sense then the question will be raised what is the definition of the term ‘absolute’ and how it to be assessed? On the other hand if we understood importance criteria in relative sense then again the question will be raised by whom it is important? But we can see in rich countries people spend many foods to their own pets but poor hungry peoples are not getting proper foods. any way whether human beings are importance in a relative sense or absolute sense, though it is not to be morally justified for oppressing less important person by more important person.

### 4. The Special Relation Argument:

Some philosophers argued in support of speciesists attitudes in the special-relationship argument. They try to establish the speciesist attitudes is morally justified. J.A. Gray argued in favor of speciesism by invoking what we call the special relation argument. Some speciesist members claim that human species will save humans’ member, because the members of human species have a special relationship. they say if we see a situation where two Childs are in danger or in a fire, in this situation if there is no other options to a mother to save both child simultaneously, mother will move first to save her own child from risky situation, because of there is mother-son special relation. But Peter singer says that morality must have two criteria universality and impartiality, which are absent in the 'Special Relation Argument ‘. In absence of these two characteristics in the argument of special relationship fails to pass the culmination of morality.

### 5. The Divine Command argument:

God created man according to his own image and created other animal and nature resources for human purposes only. So man has no responsibility or obligation to other animal or nature resources but man can use other animals or nature in his own way. Genesis mentioned “God created man in his own image”.<sup>13</sup> Although some animal liberalists say that the Divine Command argument is not morally right. It cannot morally justify speciesism. They say that the God created man and give him the responsibility to protect and respect others species on the earth. Therefor there is no moral basis for man to oppress other animals for his own interest.

### Weak Speciesism:

There are many arguments in favor of speciesism. Many of them directly support to the species attitudes and some of indirectly support species attitudes. The arguments try to establish the moral stances of weak speciesism. The arguments in favor of speciesism are 1) Appeal to rationality, 2) The distinction between moral agent and moral patient and 3) The argument from marginal cases.

### The Appeal to rationality

Weak speciesists claim humans are more rational than others species. Rationality is relevant to moral status of a being. So human only to be considered as moral being. Therefor human contains moral status. Human can exhibit rationality in greater than animals. Here question may be arise which characteristics of species is more important for considering moral status of a being? We can see there are many species and they have many characteristics, even they are more capable for applying some characters than human. Like Cheetah can run



fast than human, monkey can climb faster on tree than human, elephant is stronger than human. But in which characteristics humans are more capable and unique than animals, is considered as relevant to moral status or moral dignity. It has been done deliberately by human only for protecting solely human interests. But characteristics, that make animals more efficient than humans are not considered relevant for moral status. Weak speciesism claim that animals have no moral understanding. They are unable to understand morality therefore we have no moral obligation towards them. There is no obligation to include them in moral considerations. Weak speciesists claim “animals are not smart enough to comprehend the notion of rights.”<sup>14</sup> There is no need for morally consider of animals, animals like moral patient and human only being as moral agent. However, two special points are relevant to the doctrine of rationality: i) The distinction between moral agent and moral patient and ii) The argument from marginal cases.

### **The distinction between moral agent and moral patient**

A moral agent is a person who can make moral decisions independently and who possesses advanced conceptual abilities about moral principles. And all of these features only apply to an adult. So the adult is always accepted as the moral agent who is morally responsible for his own actions. But on the other hand there are many people who cannot make moral decisions independently themselves are called moral patients. Like the child, the sick person, old people etc. are known as moral patients. Of course, all of them have sentient ability.

### **The argument from marginal case**

Many supporter of speciesism on the basis of marginal case said that human beings have reason but animals do not have it. However, it can also be said that there are many people who do not possess reason or demonstrate reason by their behavior, yet they are included in moral consideration. Also they are considered as moral patient. Such as children, mentally handicapped, old people, sick people etc. So this question can easily come up why the same argument is not applicable to the animals? In support of speciesism it is said that humans' children will be adult human beings in the future, that is, they will be moral agent, and they have the potential to be moral agents. But animals never could be a moral agent.

Again the question arises, how it is reasonable the potentiality places above actuality? Donald A Graft wrote "There are many species that can reason in a way that we have to regard as superior to some human marginal. On what grounds do we privilege potentiality over actuality?"<sup>15</sup> However, based on the discussion of three types of speciesism, it cannot be said that they do not provide any ethical standard by which we can morally support speciesism. It is no need to criticize all behaviors of humans toward non-human world, but there are many peoples, who have a violent attitude towards animals, kill them, and destroy the diversity of the environment and disturbing the balance in the ecosystem. The scientific findings of ecology established that anthropocentrism is at the centre of the universe in the evolutionary process. But it is also true that all species are interdependent on each other's for their own existence in the evolutionary process. Human do not occupied a special place in this world. But it is true that anthropocentrism is not totally rejectable. Of course, there are some objections against the application in practice of some principles of anthropocentrism, which are harmful to the environment.

The main reason for criticizing of anthropocentric world view is speciesism, which was used as a label for unjustified preference for the human species. It consider moral responsibility and dignity only to human, as we are human so we have moral responsibility to the members of human species. Others species could not be morally considered. Speciesist attitude is comparable to racism and sexism, those who consider moral dignity and moral responsibility only to the members of own race and sex, and that is never morally justifiable. Historically speciesism and racism is very closely linked and they are deeply connected each other. Though it would not be true that the all form of contemporary speciesism are indefensible.

Although we can say that there are sufficient reason for morally unacceptance of speciesism. According to most of environmentalists, anthropocentrism is influenced by human chauvinism, which is a completely narrow world view to the environment. The stance of speciesism may acceptable, where claims the species

members have moral obligation for protecting own species members. But when it claims that the human species is superior to other species, who has moral right to dominate other species, is morally wrong. This speciesist world view is called human chauvinism. Richard and Val Routley (now Richard Sylvan and Val Plumwood) use the term human chauvinism, the strong view of morality is “ultimately concerned entirely with humans, than non-humans”.<sup>16</sup> However, many speciesists claim that animals kill animals that are weaker than them, but if people kill animals, then what’s wrong? As animals protect own species member. So why do humans have a moral obligation to protect other species? It is said that animals never kill other animals unnecessarily, they kill to satisfy their hunger, though there is exceptional case. But in the case of human beings, it is seen that human kills other animals without basic needs. They kill animals for satisfying their secondary needs. Basic needs are necessary things to survive, such as food, water, air, cloth etc. Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti mentioned “a minimal list of elements that human beings necessitate, in order to fulfill basic requirements and achieve a decent life. Typically, the list includes basic commodities, such as food, clothing, and shelter, as well as essential services, as access to drinking water, to sanitation, to education, to healthcare facilities, and to public transportation”.<sup>16</sup> Secondary needs are the things, which is not necessary for surviving a normal life. Such as for meat, TV, fridge, luxurious vehicles etc.

Man tortures and kills animals other than his basic needs and does not hesitate to kill animals to meet even the smallest needs. Question may arise, why should we fulfill our responsibility towards animals? What is the benefit to us? it can be replied that all members of environment are important elements in this environment. We are dependent and integrated each other. So if one member of environment is harmed, environment will be damaged totally. The healthy environment will be ruined. And this policy will increase the tendency to commit heinous acts, that is, the tendency to commit acts of violence such as killing and torturing animals will increase day by day, which will have a profound effect on human life and will lead to chaos in society. This kind of behavior will not only be limited to animals, this kind of violent behavior will also be applied by human to his own species. Therefore, unnecessary killing and oppression of animals by human never be morally justified. Second, each member of the environment is intrinsically valuable itself, which is not depend on the interests of others. Tom Regan, Peter Singer argued for intrinsic value of animals. Tom Regan holds a 'direct duty' view of animal rights. His argument "any being that can be seen as a “subject of a life,” like human beings, should never be treated as a means toward an end. Since animals too are “subjects of a life,”... they have intrinsic value like humans and not mere instrumental value.... they have a right to be considered as members of a moral community (as moral patients, not as moral agents that require a higher level of rationality) in which duties and respect are owed to them”.<sup>17</sup> So it is the responsibility and duty of human to protect members of the environment and to make a healthy sustain developed environment.

Every members of environment are important, who jointly form a healthy environment with each other. It is about human-nature relation in the book *Justice, Society and Nature: An Exploration of Political Ecology* “the survival of the natural world is dependent upon what humanity does. At the same time humanity remains completely dependent for survival upon non-human nature that is to say upon our planetary biosphere and all its inhabitants”.<sup>18</sup> So people should protect all members and make healthy environment. No one here is a lord or servant, and everyone is simple member of the environment. It is not necessary to pretend that humans are better than other animals. Leopold expressed “changes the role of Homo sapiens from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it”.<sup>19</sup> It implies respect both to the fellow members and the biotic community.

Since human beings are capable of ethical behavior, so he should protect all members in this environment, provide harmony among them and to ensure environmental sustainability. Human should do the actions that are good for the environment and avoid those actions that are bad for the environment. Every member of the



biosphere is equal in principle. Every human being should fulfill his own responsibilities. People should behave in a way which is good for the environment and refrain from doing things that are harmful to the environment. In this environment we need to strengthen our relationship with other members by taking care to avoid violent attitudes towards them. Violence against other members must be avoided. We must be immersed in the mantra in our daily lives that we are all interrelated, integrated, interconnected and interdependent. Leopold said “a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.”<sup>20</sup> We create an environment together and we are not separated from it. So we have to refrain from hurting others and create a beautiful environment through respect and love for them. The whole environment like a unite body. Leopold’s word “The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively; the land.”<sup>21</sup>

## Conclusion

Standing in the twenty-first century we are being driven by the hatred and violence. Every single entity in this society and environment cannot survive as a completely separate entity. Everyone is interdependent. Humans are dependent on others species in the environment. The whole environment depends on the mutual understanding, interdependence and connectedness of human and non-human world. But from the long time the human intervention to the environment damaged the balance of different members of the environment, healthy environment is being destroyed. In this situation we have to rethink how to create a healthy environment by protecting the members of environment. The traditional attitude of humans towards environment, is merely anthropocentric. This approach is the root cause for harming environment.

Arne Naess, the Deep Ecologist admit in biospherical egalitarianism that believe every members of the biotic community are morally equal. Deep Ecology is most influential world view of the environmental ethics in contemporary philosophy, which is a radical holistic environmental ethical theory. In the deep ecology the moral consideration apply to the all members regardless of biotic and abiotic community of the ecosystem. Here it is belie that all members of the biotic and abiotic communities have equal right, right to blossom etc. Every life has the right to survive, to grow as he or she is. Naess word’s “Deep ecology is egalitarian in that everyone and everything is equally valuable as part of the whole. This transpersonal ecology calls on us to go beyond class, gender, and species and find our deepest fulfilment in harmony with nature.”<sup>23</sup> Næss also mentioned “biospherical egalitarianism—in principle,” recognizing the practicalities of unavoidable killing for other lives. In that case, the administrative rules can determine the responsibility of human beings towards animals and at the same time, every human being should have a respectful attitude towards animals. Each person will fulfill his responsibilities by caring for the animals around him in different ways. In this way, human beings will have to minimize a violent tendency towards animals, but even after caring for animals, the hatred towards animals may remain, but we will be able to increase our love for many animals. My aim is how to transcend this human-centered view and include others species especially of animals in moral consideration. With correction of the errors of human-centered moral consideration and how to transcend moral consideration from human to living beings. Just changing and creating the moral principles will not make us realize our moral responsibility towards animals and environment. We must continue our relentless efforts to fulfill our responsibility to nonhuman world, both in theory and in practice.

## Notes and References

1. Jürgen, S, et al (Ed.). *Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict: Challenges for Societal Stability*. London & New York, 20012, p. 530.
2. Boslaugh, Sarah E. *Anthropocentrism*. Encyclopedia Britannica, 11 Jan. 2016,
3. Morin, Jean-Frédéric & Orsini Amandine (Ed.). *Essential Concepts of Global Environmental Governance*. London & New York: Routledge, 2017, p.57.
4. Duckworth, Passmore J. *Man's Responsibility for Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 25 February 2009 vol. 50, no. 191, p.107, p.106-113, 1974.
5. Goralnik, L & Nelson, M. P. "Anthropocentrism." *Encyclopedia of Applied ethics*. USA: Michigan State University, 2012, p.145, p.145-155.
6. Coleridge, J.K(et al.). *The Lord Chief Justice of England on Vivisection*. Philadelphia: The American Anti-Vivisection Society, 1884, p-11.
7. Goralnik, L & Nelson, M P. "Anthropocentrism." *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*. USA: Elsevier Inc., 2012, p.145, p.145-155.
8. Sarkar, P. "Wrongness of Moral Speciesism." *International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies*. Volume-IV, Issue-II, September 2017, Page No. 62-67.
9. Graft, Donald A "Speciesism." *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*. USA: Academic Press, 1998, p.198, p.191- 205.
10. Ibid. p.197.
11. Mayr, Ernst. *The Growth of Biological Thought: Diversity, Evolution, and Inheritance*. England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003 p. 278
12. Graft, Donald A "Speciesism." *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*. USA: Academic Press, 1998, p.201, p.191- 205.
13. Genesis. 1.27) (AGES The Holy Bible, p.6.
14. Graft, Donald A "Speciesism." *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*. USA: Academic Press, 1998, p.203, p.191- 205.
15. Ibid. p.204.
16. Chiappero-Martinetti, Enrica "Basic Needs" *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*, In Michalos, Alex C.(Ed.) Netherlands: Springer, 2014, p.329-335. DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5\_150, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5\\_150](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_150)
17. Kolb, R.W. *Encyclopedia of Business Ethics and Society* (Vol.5) (Ed), New Delhi: Sage Publication. 2018. p.96,
18. Low, Nicholas & Gleeson Brendan. *Justice, Society and Nature: An Exploration of Political Ecology*. London & New York: Routledge, 1998, p.155-156.
19. Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac: Sketches Here And There*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1987 p.204.
20. Ibid. p.189
21. Ibid.p.204
22. Louis P. Pojman & Paul Pojman (Ed.). *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*. USA: Cengage Learning, 2017. p. 239.
23. Louis P. Pojman & Paul Pojman (Ed.). *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*. (7th ed) USA: Cengage Learning, 2017.p.216.

## **Books**

1. Chiappero-Martinetti, Enrica “Basic Needs” *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*, In Michalos, Alex C.(Ed.) Netherlands: Springer, 2014, p.329-335.
2. Coleridge, J.K(et al.). *The Lord Chief Justice of England on Vivisection*. Philadelphia: The American Anti-Vivisection Society, 1884.
3. Ehrlich, Dr. Paul. R. *The Population Bomb*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968.
4. Genesis. 1.27) (AGES The Holy Bible,
5. Goralnik, L & Nelson, M. P. “Anthropocentrism.” *Encyclopedia of Applied ethics*. USA: Michigan State University, 2012.
6. Jürgen, S, et al (Ed.). *Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict: Challenges for Societal Stability*. London & New York, 20012.
7. Kolb, R.W. *Encyclopedia of Business Ethics and Society* (Vol.5) (Ed), New Delhi: Sage Publication. 2018.
8. Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac: Sketches Here And There*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1987.
9. List, Peter. C. *Environmental Ethics and Forestry: A Reader*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
10. Lovelock, J. *The Ages of Gaia; A Biography of our Living Earth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988
11. Louis P. Pojman & Paul Pojman (Ed.). *Environmental Ethics: Readings in Theory and Application*. USA: Cengage Learning, 2017
12. Low, Nicholas & Gleeson Brendan. *Justice, Society and Nature: An Exploration of Political Ecology*. London & New York: Routledge, 1998.
13. Mayr, Ernst. *The Growth of Biological Thought: Diversity, Evolution, and Inheritance*. England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.
14. Morin, Jean-Frédéric & Orsini Amandine (Ed.). *Essential Concepts of Global Environmental Governance*. London & New York: Routledge, 2017.
15. Naess, Arne. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
16. (Sessions, G. (Ed.). *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-first Century*. Boston & London: Shambhala, 1995.
17. Regan, Tom. *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983
18. Stone, Christopher D. *Should Trees Have Standing? Law, Morality and the Environment (3rd ed)*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

## **Journals and other Sources**

1. Boslaugh, Sarah E. *Anthropocentrism*. Encyclopedia Britannica, 11 Jan. 2016,
2. Cheney, Jim. “Intrinsic Value In Environmental Ethics: Beyond Subjectivism and Objectivism.” *The Intrinsic Value of Nature*, vol.75, no.2, p.227-235, April, 1992
3. Duckworth, Passmore J. *Man's Responsibility for Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 25 February 2009 vol. 50, no. 191, p.106-113, 1974.
4. Graft, Donald A “Speciesism.” *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*. USA: Academic Press, 1998, p.191-205.



5. Jenni, Kathie. "Western Environmental Ethics: An Overview." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*. Vol. 32, no. 1, p. 1-17. 2005.
6. Lee, A. Keekok.. "We and Humility: Intrinsic Value in Nature. Beyond an Earthbound Environmental Ethics." *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement*, vol. 36, March 1994, p. 89 – 101
7. Naess, Arne. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary." University of Oslo, *Inquiry*, Vol.16, p. 95-100.
8. O'Neill, Onora. "Environmental value, Anthropocentrism and Speciesism." *Environmental Value*, vol.6, no.2, p. 127-142, 1997.
9. Routley, Richard. "Is There A Need For A New, An Environmental Ethics." *Proceedings of the XVth World Congress of Philosophy 17<sup>th</sup> to 22 September*. Varma, Bugaria: Sofia Press, 1973.P. 205-210.
10. Sarkar, P. "Wrongness of Moral Speciesism." *International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies*. Volume-IV, Issue-II, September 2017, Page No. 62-67.
11. White, Lynn. Jr. "The Historical Root of Our Ecological Crises." *Science*. Vol. 155, no. 3767, p. 48-54, 10 March, 1967.

