Outlines of the Environmental Ethics of the Ofutop People

Oduora Okpokam Asuo[1]*, Asira, Enya Asira[2]

[1,2]Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria.

E-Mail: *destinysophia@yahoo.com, asiraunical@gmail.com*

Abstract: This paper on "Outlines of the Environmental Ethics of the Ofutop People" posits that there is a latent conservation ethic in the cultural beliefs and practices of the Ofutop tribe of Ikom Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria. Taboos, totems, and religious regulations featured prominently in this ecological model and these practices helped the conservation of the environment even though the aim was not ecocentric from the onset. It is argued here that this shortcoming can be remedied by making the practices more ecocentric than anthropocentric but leaving the practices as an indigenous means of environmental conservation. This paper adopted an expository and analytic approach in highlighting the environmental conservation practices of the Ofutop people especially in relationship with modern theories of environmental ethics.
Keywords: Environment, Conservation, Taboo, Totem.

INTRODUCTION

Every culture in the world has a way of relating with the environment. The civilized man, the barbarian, the American, the Chinese, the Indian, the African and all others have an undeniable attachment to the environment. If not for any other reason, this is done to ensure that the proceeds from the environment can be sustained. This bond with the environment may seem metaphysical in some cultures as parts of the environment are revered and even worshiped. This is what gives rise to the use of taboos and totems to attribute extraordinary strength and life to special animals and plants. In some other cultures the bond is rather loose and basically anthropocentric. In this case, which is also common in many African and non-African cultures, man sees himself as the centre of creation and the major consideration in God's scheme of creation. Accordingly, the relationship between man and the environment aims primarily at the protection of human interests. There could be conservation practices but all are aimed at the salvation of human interests. The issue eventually will be that when the interests of other parts of nature clash with those of man, the latter will prevail thereby leading to environmental degradation and problems like climate change and deforestation.

Conservation practices among the Ofutop people involve both the former and the latter. Religion and religious beliefs played a predominant role in man's relationship with the environment. Certain forests have been conserved till date because of the attachment of religious significance to them. For instance some forests were meeting places of religious cults while some others were designated as evil forests thereby unconsciously conserving them. Some animals in Ofutop forests like the scaly anteater have been protected till date because it is a taboo to eat them. Unfortunately some of these practices have been pushed into obscurity because of the advent of Christianity and erosion of the fear of the gods. People no longer respect or dread the parts of nature that were dreaded by men who lived before foreign religions took root, the environmental conservation role of these religious practices is either lost already or is gradually being lost.

The Ofutop people are found in Ikom Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria. They occupy the area around the banks of the upper Cross River between Ochon in Obubra Local Government Area and Akam in Ikom Local Government Area.The Ofutop share boundaries with Ochon in the south, Akam in the north, Etara in the west and the Cross River in the east. The Ofutop clan is made up of seven villages- Okangha Mkpansi, Ekpokpa, MKpura, Okangha Nzimowan, Ndam, Abaragba and Okosora. The economy of the Ofutop people is mostly agrarian. Their major crops are yams, cassava, maize, groundnuts and melon as well as other tree crops like oranges and cocoa. They are majorly subsistence farmers but sometimes also process their products into finished goods like garri for sale in their weekly markets. The language of the Ofutop is efutuop.

**Corresponding E-mail: destinysophia@yahoo.com*

This paper is aimed at the excavation or resurrection of these practices with the hope that with certain modifications to accommodate modern day realities, the environmental conservation ethics of the Ofutop can be of help in properly educating ourselves on the need for and ways of protecting and conserving the natural environment.

THE SEARCH FOR A VIABLE ENVIRONMENTAL ETHIC

The search for a viable and an acceptable environmental ethic is as old as the birth of the philosophy of environment itself. This may be the reason that some scholars and thinkers readily equate environmental philosophy with environmental ethics. Zimmerman explains this when he assists that "environmental philosophy is often regarded as identical to environmental ethics, that is, as an effort to examine critically the notion that nature has inherent worth and to inquire into the possibility that humans have moral duties to animals, plants, and ecosystems" [1]. He however rightly cleared this misconception by holding that environmental philosophy is broader than environmental ethics. This line of argument is also supported by Asuo and Maduka when they aver that;

> One can say without mincing words that environmental ethics has grown to be the most influential of all the branches of the philosophy of environment… while accepting the pride of place that environmental ethics occupies in the philosophy of environment; it is apt to also vehemently state that the field of philosophy of environment is broader than environmental ethics [2].

Even though it is argued here that environmental philosophy holds a distinct and higher identity from environmental ethics, yet discussing the issues that are generated by the philosophy of environment almost always degenerates to discussing ethical or moral concerns. Consequently, philosophers of environment have often sought for an ethic that can suffice to proffer solutions to the myriad of environmental issues that abound in the present world.

The search for a viable environmental ethic appears to be a continuing one as noted by Richard Sylvan in his article "Is there a Need for a New, an Environmental Ethic?" He held that the kind of ethics dealing with man's relationship with fellow man in human societies will prove incapable of dealing with people's relation to land and to the animals and plants which grow upon it [3]. According to Sylvan this kind of ethic is noticeably absent in western tradition. Since the traditional ethic is incapable of handling this aspect, regarding them as outside the moral domain of man and considering the present predicaments of the environment, it becomes necessary to either excavate an ethic from cultures that had one or create a new ethic with the task of filling the moral void and providing flexibility in dealing with moral issues that involve man and non-human nature. It is in line with the need for a new; an environmental ethic discovered by Sylvan that we are advocating a reassessment and possibly adoption of the ethics of environment of the Ofutop people. This is not however to suggest that other philosophers of environment had not suggested or articulated an environmental ethic. Rather, this new ethic seeks to fill the lacuna left by their brands of environmental ethics. Paul Taylor listed a number of systems of environmental ethics in his article "The Ethics of Respect for Nature". These include the following:

HUMAN-CENTRED OR ANTHROPOCENTRIC SYSTEM

According to Taylor, in this kind of ethic,

> Human actions affecting the natural environment and its nonhuman inhabitants are right (or wrong) by either of two criteria: they have consequences which are favourable (or unfavourable) to human well-being, or they are consistent (or inconsistent) with the system of norms that protect and implement human rights. From this human-centred standpoint, it is to humans and only humans that all duties are ultimately owed [4].

From the foregoing, the only being that is worthy of moral consideration in the human-centred or anthropocentric ethic, is man. This ethic is based on the assumption that morality and ethics are human constructs and hence are limited to humans and human understanding of reality. It is also based on the thinking that only man is worthy of moral consideration and the environment has only an instrumental value rather than an intrinsic one.

For instance, the deforestation of the forest in Boki Cross River State, will become of moral concern, as it is now, if it is known that it threatens humans in the form of climate change or any other way. The major problem with this kind of ethic is that it is an epitomization of human selfishness and pitches the well being of the environment directly against the welfare of man. Where human welfare is seen to outweigh the well being of the environment it gives man the leverage to sacrifice the environment at the altar of human welfare. For instance the economic importance of continuous oil drilling in the Niger Delta is often seen to be of higher benefits to man than protecting the creeks and villages in these areas. So oil spills and the degradation of the water and marine life have become the norm in those areas while people watch in helplessness thinking that the economic survival of the country outweighs the health of the natural environment. Taylor succinctly puts it this way:

> We may have responsibilities with regard to the natural ecosystem and biotic communities of our planet, but these responsibilities are in every case based on the contingent fact that our treatment of those ecosystem and communities of life can further the realization of human values and/or human rights. We have no obligation to promote or protect the good of nonhuman living things, independently of this contingent fact [4].

This absolute commitment to the good of humans and the lack of commitment to the intrinsic value of nonhuman nature is the main problem of the anthropocentric ethical system. It is also a flaw of the Ofutop ethic of the environment which we are seeking to redress as we front it for adoption.

BIOCENTRIC OR LIFE-CENTRED SYSTEM

In the words of Taylor,

> From the perspective of a life-centered theory, we have prima facie moral obligations that are owed to wild plants and animals themselves as members of the Earth's biotic community. We are morally bound (other things being equal) to protect or promote their good for their sake. Our duties to respect the integrity of natural ecosystems, to preserve endangered species, and to avoid environmental pollution stem from the fact that these are ways in which we can help make it possible for wild species populations to achieve and maintain a healthy existence in a natural state. Such obligations are due those living things out of recognition of their inherent worth [4].

This kind of environmental ethic urges the recognition of nonhuman living beings as having an inherent moral worth. They are to be seen from the perspective of having an intrinsic rather than instrumental value. Asuo and Maduka explained that this ethic assumes that life should be the superintending value in ethical considerations. So in environmental relationships, the aim should be to protect life in all its ramifications and not just human or animal life [2].

Even though this brand of environmental ethics is more encompassing than the anthropocentric system yet it has some loopholes that need to be plugged. The major problems were uncovered by Asuo and Maduka in their work *Environmental Philosophy: Concepts, Issues and Perspectives*. According to them;

> The major difficulty with this view is that the life possessing members of the ecosystem cannot survive in a vacuum. They need the non living components for survival. An ethic that undermines the protection of the abiotic factors of the environment eventually leads to the degeneration of the very biotic factors that it seeks to protect [2].

The problem highlighted above is important for the consideration of an environmental ethic. An ethic that gives consideration to life alone will surely be insufficient to handle the intricacies of the environment bearing in mind the network of the relationships and interconnectedness between living and nonliving parts of every ecosystem on Earth. How, for instance, can we give moral consideration to the fish in the sea and not the water itself or the insects in the soil and not the soil itself. The problem is obvious and needs to be fixed by a more encompassing environmental ethic.

The Ofutop people, like most Africans, view everything around them as being energy possessing. Stones, water bodies, vegetation and even insects are regarded as beings that can be used by the gods in doing their bidding hence are given reverential ontological positions. This animism can easily be seen with a visit to shrines where stones are kept as intermediaries with the gods or by listening to folk stories. Such a conception of nature evidently leads to carefulness when dealing with nonhuman parts of nature.

Organicist or Holistic Systems

This type of environmental ethics sees the whole natural order of the earth as a complex but unified web of interconnected organisms, objects, and events. The ecological relationships between any community of living things and their environment form an organic whole of functionally interdependent parts [4]. By the teachings of this system, every part of the ecosystem is important and needs to be preserved for the good of others. The forests need the crickets just as much as humans need the rivers. Realizing this should make humans more careful in making their moral decisions knowing that no part of the environment is dispensable but all are needed for the well being of all. Like ecofeminism, it is an ethic based on good relationships.

According to Paul Taylor, this ethic is predicated on respect for nature [4]. This respect is gained by understanding that there is inherent worth in nature regardless of the ontological ranking or grading that men might want to ascribe to nonhuman nature. The problem however is very few people are wiling to grant such an ontological status to nonhuman nature. Respect for nature is inherent in the ethics of the Ofutop people. The people saw nature as a brother and this can be seen in their worship of trees, streams, stones, snakes, birds etc. The religious significance of other parts of nature mobilized the people for a traditional conservation ethic.

NATURE OF THE OFUTOP ETHİC OF THE ENVİRONMENT

Every gathering of people has a unique set of practices and beliefs that coordinate how they relate with nature. This is true of both the Africans and non-Africans. The Ofutop had an ethic of the environment before the intervention of colonialism and westernization and their ethic was a supervisory tool in the way they related with the land and the resources of the land around them. It must be stated that this ethic was in no way so codified that all can refer to it in cases where reference was to be made to an ethic of the environment; rather it was a set of values and attitudes which indirectly served the role of conserving or protecting nature [2]. On the whole, the Ofutop ethic of the environment shared certain attributes with those of other African people and communities. Some of these attributes include the following:

1. It was a communalistic ethic: traditional Ofutop communities saw land and resources like rivers, fishes in stream, firewood etc as belonging not to individuals but the community. This attribute of the Ofutop ethic of the environment was in no way peculiar to the Ofutop alone. It was common practice all over Africa before the introduction of the radical individualism that accompanied western civilization and capitalism. This attribute was exhaustively discussed by C.K. Omari in his "Traditional African land Ethics". As he puts it

> In traditional African societies, there was a difference between 'ownership rights' and 'possession rights'. These two concepts constituted both a legal and social framework for individual as well as social groups… with respect to ownership right; it was the social group that was considered the owner of the land. This could be a clan, a kingship group, or a family. Every member of the social group had the right to ownership and had an obligation to see that this right was maintained and observed. To have the right of ownership meant a great responsibility for both the individual and community, because the ultimate owner of the land was God, who is above all human beings… the important thing which united all African societies with regard to ownership of land was that land was considered a communal property belonging to both the living and the dead. Those ancestors who lived on the land belonged to the same social unit which owned and controlled the land, and each individual who used the land felt a communal obligation for

its care and administration before passing it to the next generation [5].

Land and the resource thereof was not seen as a particular man's possession or property. Rather, each member of the social group had equal entitlement to it. The head of the family, called "Ofun" in Ofutop, is responsible for overseeing who has access to the land and for what purpose it was to be put.

This method of using land gave some form of reverence to the land and also placed restraint on how people used it and for what purpose it was used. Even though the aim may not ultimately have been for the purpose of conservation, yet this land tenure system ensured the protection and conservation of the land and its attendant resources.

2. It was humanocentric: in the ontology of the Ofutop, humans were considered higher than all other physical beings. Even ancestors and other spiritual beings were considered to be "useable" by men. For instance, with appropriate sacrifices, the ancestors or gods could be called to act in man's favour. Nature and the environment were seen as placed in creation to help the realization of human comfort. The plants, animals, rivers, streams etc have relevance for man. Whatever rules, regulations or values that were attached to these parts of nature were done to ensure the safety and comfort of man in the first place. If, for instance, certain animals were considered totems, or a forest was declared "evil", the intention was basically to serve human ends. There was no desire to first and foremost serve the interest of the animal or the forests. By their orientation therefore this ethic of the environment was basically human-centered or anthropocentric.

3. It was enshrined in religion: the religious affiliations of Africans significantly influenced and still influences almost all areas of life. This was why John Mbiti posited that the African is notoriously religious [6]. The relationship of the African to nature was also moderated by religious beliefs and inclinations within the social group. Omari succinctly captured the place of religion and religious attitudes in the conservation of nature thus:

> The reverence of Africans towards nature and natural places was a religious attitude and practice which, while it developed around the religious thought and history of a particular social group, indirectly served other social function in the whole community. In the case of shrines and initiation rite centres, taboos developed around the destruction of trees, shrubs, and the sacred places themselves. The forests, certain kinds of trees, animals, and sources of water were preserved in the name of religion. Perhaps people did not practice such attitudes in the way a modern person would conserve the forests, but out of their religious beliefs and values and their reverence for sacred public places, an ecological and environmental concern was developed. As a result, in traditional African societies there was a balanced ecosystem; people and nature interacted in such a way that the harmony between them was maintained [5].

Environmental conservation ethics of traditional Africa were indirectly carried out through religious rites and practices. This type of ethic may be accused of not being coordinated with the ideal of protecting the environment but it has the strength of religion and its attendant reverent dispositions towards it as a support. The convictions that attended the religious myth of the African can, in no way be compared to the teachings of modern day conservation campaigns. No wonder therefore that while the Africans saw it as unthinkable to consider cutting down forests that were designated sacred. It takes nothing for poachers to invade a game reserve in search of rhinoceros tusks, despite the availability of conservation laws.

The Ofutop ethic of the environment was similarly based on religion and religious beliefs and practices. Certain forests were reserved for initiation rites into manhood or womanhood. Religious cults like "Otaba" and "Ekpa" had initiation rite centres in designated forests which were not to be penetrated by non-initiates. Similarly certain trees and animal species were seen as having serious religious significance hence could not be felled or killed without clearance from the gods or spiritual leaders of the community. These practices helped to conserve the environment and maintain sanity between man and nature, at least in part. The religious tendencies of the Ofutop found expression in totems, taboos and sacredness. Most Africans, used totems and taboos as a means of conserving the environment.

Totems are animals that have been chosen and attached respect for religious purposes while taboos restrict human or social actions in certain areas of life. The Ofutop had certain animals like the boa constrictor as untouchable species while the scaly anteater was attached an ominous religious myth that made its killing and eating a taboo.

Similarly, certain forests and forest products were declared sacred because of their affiliation with certain religious cults. People revered these places and left them to be conserved. In most village of the Ofutop, there are still conspicuous signs of forests that were declared sacred or evil, hence could not be tampered with. The importance of these cannot be overemphasized. As Omari rightly said, "in traditional African societies, religious taboos and restrictions took the place of aforestation campaigns which are now being waged by governments… people knew their responsibilities towards natural resources without being reminded through special campaigns. Positive values towards the use of natural resources were inculcated from generation to generation…" [5].

4. It was borne out of love for nature: It is common knowledge that Africans were called "bush men" by European colonizers. This appellation was not just because Africans were seen as "uncivilized" but mostly because of the entangled relationships that existed between the Africans and nature. The Ofutop viewed themselves as an inseparable part of nature. Unlike the western mind that views nature as different from humans, the Africans saw themselves as an inalienable part of nature. Nature was not just the provider of the milk needed to feed man but it was also seen as a mother that needed to be taken care of. This point was properly made by Asuo and Maduka when they asserted that

> "the African before the coming of the white man loved to live with and within nature. He knew and relished the bond that existed between him and the environment and hardly did he engage in the western type of urbanization which sponsored the plundering of nature to create chance for the growth of towns and cities. It is a common phenomenon in African villages to have huts or houses hemmed between disjointed forests. These trees served as windbreaks and sun shields as well as companions" [2].

In line with the assertion above the Ofutop people loved nature and did all to "feel" nature around. Plantations and villages were common place and different species of flora and fauna were preserved as companions in such villages or plantations. Even in recent times, visits to any of the Ofutop village will expose a people that cherish the companionship of nature. This is easily seen in the preponderant greenery around and the desire amongst the people to plant both economic and ornamental trees as well as protection of water bodies.

5. It was enforceable. Unlike modern ethics of the environment that can barely be enforced, the Ofutop ethic of the environment was effectively enforced. As hinted above, the entire community or social group was involved in its formulation and implementation; hence people were not expected to default. Where the forests, streams, fishes, animals etc were to be protected for religious purposes, a breach of the moral code was an invitation for the anger of the gods. This was often manifested in strange infirmities plaguing offenders and their families and in some cases death. The spirits were often placated with sacrifices meant to heal the wounds created in the relationship between that man and the threatened part of nature as well as between humanity and the spiritual.

In cases where communal restrictions were laid on certain forests, streams, rivers or plant species for the purpose of allowing maturity of these species before use by man, it is expected that no member of that community should go against the restrictions. Where a person harvests fish from such streams or rivers or cuts down the forest, sanctions are handed down in diverse ways. The Otaba cult could be sent to lock up the family house of the offender until adequate and appropriate fines and punishments have been paid and served. This was a frightening experience that made every member of the community to want to abide by every regulation made about how to conserve the environment. Other punishments included ostracization of offenders and in some cases, outright banishment from the community.

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF THE OFUTOP ETHİC OF THE ENVİRONMENT

Like most traditional ethical models, the Ofutop ethics of the environment currently suffers some setbacks. One of the most threatening issues bothering traditional African ecology and environmental ethics is development. This is also true of the Ofutop ethic of the environment. Omari captured this succinctly when he averred that "many of the economic activities which seem to threaten the African

ecology are done in the name of development" [5]. It is a common phenomenon in African states to find multinational companies collaborating with local agents and plundering the environment. The argument is often that this development aids the economy to grow and provide jobs for the people. But raping the environment to satisfy human needs often results in problems that still affect man and human societies. This is probably where the tenets of sustainable development will become helpful. Environmental impact assessments should necessarily precede every act or plan of development to avert traumatic effects on the environment.

Opening of macadamised roads in and around the forests of Ofutop has had a devastating influence on the environmental ethics of the people. Some of the plundered forests were once regarded as impenetrable and untouchable but the successful entrance of machines to dis-virgin these forests ultimately raised questions about the validity of the hitherto held religious beliefs. The consequence of this invasion has been a relentless raping of the forests and the extinction of many species of plants and animals.

Closely related to the above is the erosion of African value system as a result of their collision with western value system. The ethics of the environment of the Ofutop and indeed Africans had its anchor on values of communalism and communal decision making. This backbone of African environmental ethics has been broken by western economic and social values that tend to venerate money and individual attainments above community interest. Omari puts it this way:

> A money economy has not only altered social relations among people, but it has also affected people's attitudes towards nature and natural resources. Because of the new values inculcated through western education and religion… people and see natural resources as objects for exploitation and profit-making. Resources are used for individual private gain and satisfaction. Furthermore, the western concept of individual achievement through power relationships has undermined the communal decision making processes which helped communities maintain a balance between available resources and their use by individuals. Instead, decisions about resource use are now based on a bureaucratic and legal system [5].

The influence of westernization on traditional environmental ethics is one of the most dangerous factors plaguing the ability of present day African states to achieve ecological peace and balance. It has changed the economic orientation of the people, the social conclusion of the communities has been weakened and the reverence once attached to nature has been replaced with tendencies to grab and manipulate resources for personal profit. This scenario plays out absolutely among present day Ofutop people and leaves a lacuna as far as the realization of a viable environmental ethic is concerned. Another problem that has bedevilled the Ofutop ethic of the environment is the intrusion of foreign religions. The Ofutop were traditionalists before the coming of the white man and the beliefs which sustained their environmental ethics derived directly from this religious orientation. With the introduction of Christianity into Ofutop, especially among those that dwelt around the banks of the Cross River, these beliefs started to crumble. The teachings of Christianity demonised traditional beliefs and most Christian denominations encouraged their members to flout the taboos and restrictions that sustained and maintained ecological peace. For instance the belief that the scaly anteater caused irritation and death when killed and eaten was called to question and Christians were encouraged not to "call any meat unclean". This caused the totem around the specie to become weak and exposed the animal to dangers that were unheard of among the Ofutop.

Another problem that is observed with the Ofutop ethics of the environment is that it lacked a conscious non-anthropocentric approach to its enforcement. In other words it became enforceable when the people who made felt that the welfare of members of the community was threatened. Where nonhuman beings were protected, they were privileged to be serving the good of men. Nonhuman nature had an instrumental value within the Ofutop ethic. This trait within the Ofutop ethic can be removed by a conscious effort to see to the careful handling of every part of nature and treating each part of nature as a "brother" and "neighbour".

PROSPECTS OF OFUTOP ETHİCS OF THE ENVİRONMENT

According to Omari, to discuss these religious attitudes and values because they were suited to an underdeveloped, pre-modern world is not to appreciate the community function they served with respect to ecology and natural conservation [5]. This is directly or indirectly asking for the extension of traditional ethics of the environment. The argument that the Ofutop ethic is outdated and does not suit the modern world is flawed in many ways. In the first place, people are now aware that traditional African value systems are not as useless as western thinkers seem to suggest. Even in regular social ethics, the death of African moral codes has translated to young people growing into adults without the sound morals that made a complete African. The restrictions, regulations and taboos which merged to give birth to a morally sound African are gradually becoming extinct and exposing a people that have loose social consciousness. Similarly the gradual loss of the ethic that maintained peace and balance between man and nature has caused problems in the African ecological terrain. The Ofutop people have witnessed more loss of forests and forest resources in the last two decades than in the eight decades before then. This period of loss coincided with the period when westernization, growth of Christianity and radical individualism soared among the Ofutop.

To get back the influence that the Ofutop ethics had on the environment, it is important for all, including religious bodies, governments, and individuals alike to be aware that maintaining a healthy and sustainable environment is in everybody's favour and should therefore transcend parochial and individual interests. With this in mind, all religions should support actions and activities that have potential for enhancing the health of the environment. Furthermore, governments should encourage communal ownership of land and its resources and should regulate the use of same to avoid the usurpation of rights of ownership by some powerful individuals that will use the sale of land to enrich themselves.

Finally, individuals should see the need to commit to the enhancement of human/nature relationship. This can be done by developing conducts that will engender the protection of the environment as well as giving moral and financial support (where necessary) to anybody or social unit that directly or indirectly works for the protection of the environment.

One of the most important lessons that present day societies, especially in Nigeria, can learn from the Ofutop ethic of environment is the need for the making and implementation of laws that should keep the environment healthy. The Ofutop did not just make laws to protect the environment and its resources but also ensured that every member of the community abided by these both in the interest of immediate generations and for posterity. There is a near absence of appropriate laws to protect the environment in Nigeria and where they exist there is virtually no mechanism for implementation and punishment of offenders. This impacts negatively on the environment and the effects can be seen in the anti-environment activities like uncontrolled logging, hunting, bush burning and pollution of water bodies that are still rife in Nigeria.

CONCLUSION

The central argument of this paper has been that like most African societies, the Ofutop people had an ethic of the environment which still has the potential to help solve the current plethora of problems connected with the environment. This ethic of the environment was a fine blend of social cohesion mechanisms and religious beliefs and practices. Even though western education, foreign religions and devaluation of enabling values have threatened the foundation of this ethic, we are of the opinion that if we are guided by the motive of enhancing the health and protection of the natural environment, we can reinvigorate this ethic of the environment to the benefit of both man and nature in general.

REFERENCES

[1] Zimmerman, Michael (Ed) *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology.* New Jersey, Prentice Hall; 2001. p3

[2] Asuo, Oduora; Enyimba, Maduka. *Environmental Philosophy: Concepts, Issues and Perspective*s. Calabar: Grey Matter Company, 2012.p14-138

[3] Sylvan, Richard. "Is there Need for a New, an Environmental, Ethic?". *Proceedings of the xv World Congress of Philosophy*; No 1 Varna Bulgaria, 1973. p205-210.

[4] Taylor, Paul W. "The Ethics of Respect for Nature" *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Fall 1981). p.197-218.

[5] Omari, C.K. "Traditional African Land Ethics". In *Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge, International Response*. Ronald Engel, Joan Gibb Engels (eds) London: Belhaven Press, 1992. (168-175

[6] Mbiti, John. *African Religious and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann, 1977.