'Anthropoholism' As An Authentic Tool For Environmental Management

Samuel Akpan Bassey

Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria.

E-Mail: *samuelbassey15@yahoo.com*

Abstract: Ever since nonhuman entity along with the environment became a major ethical issue, anthropocentric worldviews have been blamed for all that is morally wrong about our dealings with nature. Those who regard themselves as non-anthropocentrists/ holistic scholars typically assume that the West's anthropocentric axiologies and ontologies instigate all of the environmental degradations associated with human species. In contrast, a handful of environmental philosophers aver that anthropocentrism is entirely acceptable as a foundation for environmental ethics as human's perspective cannot be entirely removed from the decision-making process. They often argue that it is possible for the man to act responsibly towards the environment for humanity and its future generation. Thus, there is an ever-present tension between anthropocentrism and holism, with each side trying to dominate each other. In my opinion, these extreme views are lump sided, as such lack room for tolerance. The thrust of this paper is to bridge the gap between these ethical theories with the theory of 'anthropoholism'. Anthropoholism is a thesis in environmental ethics that acknowledges man (anthropo) values, role in the ecosystem as well as the ontology, but argues that despite this position, man is just a part of nature, such that he cannot exist independently of the environment, or can he be understood without reference to the environment. With this, the theory of anthropoholism is able to bridge the gap between the two extreme views by explaining the connection between them. With the philosophical method of exposition and critical analysis, this work is carried out.
Keywords: Anthropocentricism, Anthropoholism, African Communalism, Environment.

INTRODUCTION

Modifying the relationship amongst humans and nature is one of the basic issues confronting human societies which must be managed properly. With the expanding decay of our ecological world, coupled with the recent disturbing report released by the UN's IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) on a new level of global warming caused by climate change in the year 2018, an environmental emergency is now required [1]. Most individuals now understand that we can't depend on financial and legal techniques alone to tackle the issue of environmental decadence. This implies that people now have to be morally responsible towards the environment. It is only after we have embraced a proper disposition and mindset towards nature and have also set up the right moral relationship between individuals and nature, that we can have the capacity to love and regard nature with honesty.

Humans could now boast of space travel, internet, cars and other kinds of unimaginable technological achievement that once seemed unachievable, However, these technological breakthroughs somewhat pose dangers to human life as well as other beings within the environment, and as well cause environmental degradation. Humans now find themselves trying to solve the problem in which they brought upon themselves through their ingenuity.

This could explain why Heidegger is so critical of Western metaphysics and thinks questioning the essence of technology will actually help us as *Dasein* to have a free relationship with technology as well as the environment. The understanding of this free relationship requires that humans first re-examine what it means to be human and how it is that humans come to understand the world around them through their practical experience and mindset. Ultimately, by grounding his notion of ethics within the sphere of ontology, Heidegger envisioned humans as *Dasein* in a free relationship with modern technology and the environment at large as one that will require a completely different attitude of being-in-the-world [2].

However, such "attitude" should not be embedded in strong anthropocentric connotations, because of its supremacy and dominating disposition towards technology and the environment. 'Strong Anthropocentricism' acknowledges man at the center of the universe and further allude that other beings within the environment are of instrumental value to man. Strong anthropocentric attitude has been blamed for man's dominant tendencies towards other beings within the environment, which have in turn led to environmental decadence. A similar view is seen in Eurocentric attitude, a belief that Europeans are supreme, which in turn led to racism, colonialism, and subjugation of other human persons. However, if man is to live in peace and fulfill his potential with his fellow man as well as other beings

within the environment, there is a need to reject every supremacy ideology and enact ethics advocating tolerance within human society and the environment at large.

However, Man has an important role to play as long as environmental ethics is concerned. This paper argues that it will be a futile venture to attempt a strict non-anthropocentric environmental ethics as human point of view will always be visible. One of the reasons is because one thing that makes environmental ethics possible is man's obligation towards the environment. This implies that if a particular ethics requires a being to put other beings into consideration, if an ethic is a guide to action, then that becomes the beings own ends. This is what Frederick Ferré called 'perspectival anthropocentrism'; which for me represents weak anthropocentrism.

Weak anthropocentrism acknowledges human central position in thought process, obligatory position, but advocates that human alludes to moral dispositions and theory as to not transgress this position into the egoistic and dominating tendency on the environment. This is plausible for environmental ethics but incomplete if it does not attempt to look at the environment holistically. This is because it is only within holistic environmental ethics that we can understand the interdependence of being and the significance of all beings to the environment; as such the existence of any being is hinged on the whole.

Also, extreme holistic position would be one-sided if it does not acknowledge the role of man (a part) in the whole. This is also because the interests of a whole are reducible to the interests of its parts, as such the collective responsibility of the whole is also the responsibility of the part in that whole. This as such explains that the part has an important role to play within the whole.

To explain the above vividly, this paper presents a theory called 'anthropoholism' which attempts to bridge the gap between anthropocentric and holistic environmental ethics. The theory accommodates the role of 'human' (the individual' as well as "individuality of persons") within the thought process, environment as well as ontology but also accommodates the communal holistic spirit of man being a part of the whole and as such cannot exist independently of the whole or fulfill any potential outside the whole. This paper avers that such disposition should be an underlying rationale behind man's actions and deliberations as far as the environment is concerned.

THE NOTION OF ANTHROPOHOLISM

The concept of Anthropoholism is made of two words, namely, "anthropos" which is a Greek word that means "man or human being" and "Holism" which is often used to represent all of the wholes' in the universe. Holism is a concept defined by Alfred Adler. In philosophy the theory implies the "parts of a whole are in intimate interconnection, such that they cannot exist independently of the whole, or cannot be understood without reference to the whole, which is thus regarded as greater than the sum of its parts" [3].

The theory arose from the fact that human beings ought to protect nature because they depend upon it, because it is beautiful and full of life, because it has intrinsic worth, because of history, ontology, because of its complexity [4]. Or, conceivably they ought to protect nature because of some responsibility they hold, a duty regarding the natural world. One or more of these reasons are shared by different theories in environmental ethics. Whichever reason it could be, it is evident that it all involves human's perception, values, and action towards the environment. To this, the human's role and perception will always be an important factor in environmental ethics and conservation.

Human beings are an integral part of nature and are tied to it through a series of interactions and interconnectedness. From an ecological standpoint, *Homo sapiens* is part of the environment (whole) – its evolutionary success is primarily dependent on factors such as climate, resource availability, and other beings within the environment. The biblical book of Genesis also confirms that in the Garden of Eden, God did create the environment, and then placed man as part of it. However, the story highlighted that the environment existed in a perfect state of harmony, as man and animal coexisted without death or threat.

However, in the environment, humans, as well as other beings, occupy a position which accounts for its responsibility towards ecological balance [5]. This position within both ontology and ecosystem cannot be taken for granted as there is no way environmental ethics will be fashioned out without alluding to it. Man's role as a part of the whole (environment) and their attitude towards the same, however, has changed with the passage of time. As human existence and the existence of all other species within the environment are now been threatened by human blind technological progress and unrestrained

appetites for luxury, profit, and power. It is claimed that "for modern man, nature has become like a prostitute- to be benefited from without any sense of obligation and responsibility toward her. The difficulty is that the condition of the prostituted nature is becoming such as to make any further enjoyment of it impossible" [7]. Man's problem started when he began to think that he could act independently against the harmonious relationship which was inherent in the environment for his own selfish use. He began seeing other beings from an instrumental end.

From this perspective, Man envisaged the environment as a *storehouse of materials* for mere use and exploitation. This dominating and egoistic attitude of man towards nature has now led to the environmental degradation of great magnitude. Since human is a part of the environment and not independent of it, his actions are now affecting every member of the environment; as what affects the parts, affects the whole and vice versa. Man is gradually realizing his misdeeds and wrong treatment of nature and therefore seeks a way to solve the crisis.

In this regard, it is very necessary for human beings to change their attitude towards the environment. Human beings have been the cause; however, the same humans will be the solution. There is no new theory needed, other than re-imbibing an attitude of respect for nature and understanding that he is just a mere part of the whole (Anthropo-holism).   It is therefore high time for human beings to realize and be conscious that they are part of the biotic community and every member of that community, be they plants, animals, insects or birds have a right to survive and deserve respect from every other member of the community. But one thing which must be remembered is that all species of the biotic community survive through the prey-predator relationship amongst them. It is a natural process and therefore has to continue. Thus, it should be taken for granted that human beings to a certain degree are predators, i.e. they are dependent on other species for their survival. This role of predatorship of human beings is permissible as far as their survival is concerned but not beyond that, as long as it does not translate to egoistic and dominating tendencies. Human beings, apart from being predators for their survival, need to act justly and humanely towards all other species of the biotic community. What ought to be our attitude towards nature can be put down in the following manner:

> "if we can bring ourselves fully to admit the independence of
> nature, the fact that things go on in their own complex ways, we
> are likely to feel more respect for the ways in which they go on.
> We are prepared to contemplate them with admiration, to enjoy
> them sensciously to study them in their complexity as distinct
> from looking for simple methods of manipulating them" [8].

To develop such an attitude towards nature, Man must see the environment as something less 'strange' which could enable individuals to be concerned or take interest or even care for it.

From the above reasoning, anthropoholism can be defined as a theory in environmental ethics that acknowledges man (anthropo) central role; perspective and place in eco-system as well as ontology but avers that Man is just a part of nature, such that he cannot exist independently of the environment, or cannot be understood without reference to the environment (holism).

THE PROBLEM WITH ANTHROPOCENTRIC ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

Many environmental philosophers point to anthropocentrism as the major cause of our environmental problems. The term anthropocentrism comes from the Greek phrase 'Anthropos' and 'kentron'. 'Anthropos' means 'human being' and 'kentron' means 'center'[3]. Inferring from it etymologically, anthropocentrism means human-centredness. However, this definition has been improved upon over time by different scholars to reveal different variant.

Aldo Leopold and his supporters hold that anthropocentrism is unacceptable as a source for an environmental ethics because it inevitably leads to the exploitation of nature; it also turns nature into a means of satisfying trivial human desires [9]. Anthropocentrism is also discarded by Tom Regan, Peter Singer and others in the animal liberation movement [10].They often argue that it is simply an unwarranted prejudice or bias, analogous to racism or sexism, which cannot be rationally defended. To them all, anthropocentrism is rooted in supremacy attitude towards nature, which is the major reason for our ecological problem. This criticism is also shared by many environmentalists worldwide echoing the same sentiments. Nevertheless, the difference variance of anthropocentrism sheds more light on what is actually wrong with the theory.

Bryan G. Norton articulates two versions of anthropocentrism, which he called "weak" and the other "strong" anthropocentrism [11]. For Norton, the 'weak anthropocentrism' necessitates that human beings endeavor to control their decision making process by carefully examining their considered preferences while taking into cognizance a world view derived from sound aesthetic, moral ideals, sound scientific theories as well as a metaphysical framework that interpret these theories [11]. The keywords within this definition are 'human' and 'control'. These keywords acknowledge 'human' at the center of the decision-making process while also attempting to 'control' his/her biases against other beings within the environment. To this, weak anthropocentrism seems to be environmental friendly based on its mutual consideration as well as tolerance with other beings in the environment. Light and Rolston echo the same sentiment when they aver that 'weak' anthropocentrism or stewardship is using a human-centered perspective to indirectly conserve and protect the natural environment [12].

The use of the adjective "weak" further suggests that there exists a version called, strong anthropocentrism which is typified by uncontrolled destruction and exploitation of nature to serve the human interest. This implies that strong anthropocentrism transgresses from mere man-centered perceived perspective to egoistic and dominating perspective; hereby perceiving other beings within the environment as mere instrumental end to human. Many human practices, like the destruction of habitats, cruelty to animals, endangered species, and disturbing eco-systemic balances are now being criticized based on strong on anthropocentrism. From the above analysis, it is evident that the problem with anthropocentrism in environmental ethics lies with the strong version because of its egoistic, supremacy and dominating tendencies towards the environment and not weak anthropocentrism.

To support the above statement, it is important to note that our mentality about the world is limited and shaped by our position and way of being within it. From the angle of any particular being or species in the environment, there are some respects in which they are at the center of it. This is what Frederick Ferré called 'perspectival anthropocentrism' [13], which is a version of weak anthropocentrism. It appears to be inescapable, unavoidable that we as humans should be interested in ourselves and our own species think like humans and see things through human eyes. Ferré in supporting this view writes, "We have no choice but to think as humans, to take a human point of view even while we try to transcend egoism by cultivating sympathy and concern for other centres for intrinsic value" [14]. Also, Mary Midgley avers, 'We need…to recognize that people do right, not wrong, to have a particular regard for their own kin and their own species…I don't, therefore, see much point in disputing hotly about the rightness of 'anthropocentrism' in this very limited sense'[15]. Mary Anne Warren also avers that:

> We are not gods but human beings, reasoning about how we ought to think and act. Our moral theories can only be based upon what we know and what we care about, or ought to care about. If this makes our theories anthropocentric, then this much anthropocentrism is inevitable in any moral theory that is relevant to human actions [16].

From the above argument, it is evident that it is a needless attempt to wipe out any level of 'selfhood' from environmental ethics altogether; because what is inevitable about 'weak anthropocentrism' is precisely what makes ethics possible. It is a basic element of obligation, if a particular ethics requires a being to accommodate other beings into consideration, if ethics is a guide to action, then such *becomes the being's own ends*. This becomes a limitation on any attempt to construct completely non-anthropocentric ethics. To explain this in simple terms Hayward asserts that, "Values are always the values of the valuer" [17]. In support to this, Norton and Hayward argue differently that the inevitability of a human reference point makes it impossible to create a totally non-anthropocentric value system that has no basis in the human experience and existing human values. The notion that values can simply be recognized and selected without any need to refer to human interpretation is a delusion. Even the natural balance advocated by eco-centrism is a human perception of what balance ought to look like. One perspective of balance might also be that human beings do not interfere in the workings of nature so that nothing will be disturbed.

It is important to note that it is only on 'weak anthropocentrism' that we can situate anthropocentric environmental ethics which requires humans to act responsibly towards the environment for man's sake. However, one problem with anthropocentrism is how to maintain the weak version and not allow it transgress into strong anthropocentrism. This is the major reason for Socrates' assertion 'Man know thyself'. Which is to say, understanding and control of oneself, leads to a possible mastery and

development of self for the promotion of self, others, society and the environment at large. In addition, the imperative of *ibuanyidanda* philosophy demands that we as humans should "Allow the limitations of being to be the cause of your joy" [18]. Since existential human nature is said to be ambivalent, adhering to the warning of those two moral philosophers can help tame this irrational element of the egoistic and supremacy tendencies of strong anthropocentrism.

Furthermore, to support weak anthropocentrism postulations, it is widely accepted that self-love can be considered a precondition for loving others, as such; nobody can give what he or she does not have. The biblical scripture "love your neighbor as yourself" [19] further highlight this claim. All these considerations are not projected to show that anthropocentrism is not a problem at all; rather they lead us to spell out more carefully what is wrong to hold a 'strong anthropocentric' mindset and not weak anthropocentric' mindset.

This is the major reason why the theory of 'anthropoholism' takes cognizance of man's (anthropo) central role both as a reference point, as the center of ontology and ecosystem while also alluding to holistic environmental ethics. However, weak anthropocentrism and 'anthropoholism' are two different theories altogether, but both views share some similarities. While 'weak anthropocentrism' attempts to consider human preferences while taking into consideration ethical, aesthetic and scientific theories as well as metaphysical framework in fashioning environmental ethics, it does not necessarily imply holistic philosophy. 'Anthropoholism' on the other hand takes a holistic approach; all species-being, animate as well as inanimate- including man is considered to be an integral part of the environment, interdependence on one another and cannot exist without the environment as a whole.

Also, Anthropoholism does not necessarily consider moral worldview as a reason for man's responsible behavior towards the environment as in the case of 'weak anthropocentrism'. Anthropoholism attempts to explain the actual interconnectedness and interdependence of man with nature, this as such should be the driving rationale behind man's endeavor as far as the environment is concerned. This is because Man is one with nature, not over nature and not supreme over nature. Nevertheless, both 'weak anthropocentrism' and 'anthropoholism' sees human beings at the central of thought process, decision making as well as the ecosystem.

From the aforementioned, it is evident that 'anthropoholism' as a theory seeks to bridge the gap between anthropocentric views as well the holistic views in order to solve the age long debate between the anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric environmental ethicists. Even within African holistic environmental ethics, it is acknowledged that man is at the center of the ecosystem as well as ontology, while still maintaining its holistic view. The understanding of being at the centre can help human beings live responsibly within the environment since this position demands a sense of duty and responsibility. This can even foster what can be called '*environmental nationalism*'. Environmental Nationalism is an ideology that stresses devotion, allegiance or loyalty to the environment and holds that such obligations overshadow other group or individual interests.

Also, strong anthropocentric assumptions have now gradually been challenged by the findings of the modern science of ecology, which challenges humans' distinct and supremacy mentality within the environment, explaining man to be a product of natural evolutionary processes. These researches point to the fact that all beings within the environment are related to one another and that they have a crucial interdependence with one another.

The arguments posed above suggest that the aim of fully overcoming anthropocentrism in environmental ethics will be a futile one. The proposals for a total rejection of human-centeredness is not helpful as this could miss the real problem which is in 'strong' anthropocentrism, which is having a supremacy mentality as well as dominating tendencies against other beings.

AFRICAN ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS (HOLİSTİC ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS)

Many scholars have developed some important views about rejecting strong anthropocentric attitude and adopting holistic environmental ethics. For this reason, many African environmental scholars began explaining African environmental ethics from African communitarian perspective which is sometimes referred to as holistic environmental ethics. Holistic environmental ethics is a viable environmental ethics as it preaches interdependence and interconnectedness of humans and nature. From Christian perspective, in the book of Genesis, God created Adam and Eve and placed them in the Garden of Eden, where they lived in harmony with nature until they disobeyed God's instruction and ate the forbidden fruit [20]. This shows that the interconnectedness and interdependence of humans and nature

is not only unique to traditional African societies, it is also evident in the Christian God's original intention. Nevertheless, Africans have been said to be deeply communal. This implies that they acknowledged the interconnectedness and interdependence of humans to humans (in a community setting) and Man to nature (in an environmental setting).

African communalism can simply be understood using Mbiti's statement "I am because we are since we are therefore I am" [21]. What Mbiti means here is that the reality of the community takes precedence over the reality of individual life. Relating this communal position to environmental ethics, it therefore means, the environment takes precedence over 'individual'. That is, without the environment, the individual cannot be. Menkiti, went further to aver that the community takes epistemic and ontological precedence over the individual [22]. From the logic of both Menkiti's and Mbiti, the individual must of necessity be subject to the normative power of the community (in this case environment) and is thus not seen as the primary reference point for moral actions.

From both Mbiti and Menketi's view, it seems the African system of thought rejects every form of "individualism". However, it is true that we cannot isolate ourselves outside the community and environment at large, that individuals are largely interdependent, and that the moral self develops within a social context where culture and history play crucial roles. However, the self is important because it is through individual self-perspective (perspectival anthropocentrism) that communitarian views can be fostered.

This view is also shared by Gyekye's version of communitarianism which he called; moderate communitarianism [23]. In moderate communitarianism, Matolino argues that Gyekye accuses both Mbiti and Menketi of failing to accommodate the rights and freedom of individuals within the community [24]. Accordingly, Gyekye regards Mbiti and Menkiti versions as radical and philosophically indefensible. In his moderate communitarianism, Gyekye sees the community as a reality in itself and not as a mere association of individuals. He, however, stresses that individual rights and capacities should be recognized for they define who a person is. But he carefully concedes that these capabilities should be realized within the context of a community [25]. However, it is evident that Gyekye saw the mistake and misinterpretation of many holistic scholars on not recognizing the importance of the 'individual' within a holistic/ communal thought system. Gyekye's position is very vital as it provides a strong case for 'Anthropoholism'.

From the aforementioned communal background, many African environmental ethicists took the communal values inherent in African communalism to explain African environmental ethics. For instance, Tangwa describes it as eco-bio-communitarianism against the western perspective he called anthropocentric. Segun Ogungbemi called African traditional ethics "ethics of care" and later proposed "ethics of nature relatedness", while Mogobe B. Ramose called it ecology Ubuntu et cetera. The driving rationale behind these postulations is to show the importance of African communal value to environmental ethics.

Why African communitarianism to environmental ethics? This is because it is a theory that reflects African thought and worldview. It is hinged on aspects such as the holistic approach, African morality, African traditional religion, African ontology, the idea of the common good, respect for nature and more importantly the interdependence and harmonious relationship between Africans and the environment. Tangwa had summed it up when he avers that within the African worldview, the distinction between plants, animals, and inanimate things, between the sacred and the profane, matter and spirit, the communal and the individual is a slim and flexible one [26].

This can also be explained using Ugwuanyi's notion of traditional personification of natural forces and phenomena, in which he states that whatever Africans believed to be the home of sacred spirits, that thing becomes sacred: hills, mountains, rocks, trees, thick forests [27]. Kaoma explains further that Africans believe that God, ancestors and other spirits can manifest in nature [28]. These show the connection that exists between African religion and the environment. This bond is very significant in the sense that it shapes African people's approach towards nature and further help Africans imbibe what Tangwa called '*live and let live*' attitude towards nature. Because of this theological link between beings in African ontology (God, ancestors, man, and other lower forces (other being in the environment), Africans are careful regarding how nature is being approached and treated.

For example, since sacred forests are seen as places of memory, it is a taboo to harvest goods from such groves. Doing so is considered an attack on God, ancestors and other spirits. From this perspective, people are likely to conserve nature out of reverence for spiritual forces resident in nature as opposed to

instrumental reasons alone. A totemic animal which is identified with each tribe in Africa has taboo attached to it, such that the locales are forbidden to eat such animals. Infringement of this taboo has some severe implications, which could be a form of sickness, diseases or even death. What this entails is that since Africans are religious people, infringement of such a taboo is not an option. It can, therefore, be argued that totemism does not only name or point to a natural relationship that exists between human beings and non-human animals, it also points to a spiritual or rather metaphysical relationship. Creation myths also point to a mutual relationship between humans and non-humans in Africa. However, despite the different variance of creation myth within African cultures, it has been observed that most creation myths show the connection between God, human, land, animals, mountains, and forests. This cosmic relationship between the supernatural, humans and the environment shaped African people's understanding of traditional religion as well as their encounter with nature and environment at large [29].

From the aforementioned, it is evident that African communal and ontology worldview helps African to conserve the environment holistically. Nevertheless, Tempel's, Mbiti's and many other communal scholars agree that man is at the center of the ontology, although, Mbiti caution that this does not imply that man should harm the natural environment. Rather, that man should seek coexistence with nature. Also, it is also agreed among these scholars that human beings has a central role within the environment. For instance, Mbiti explains that a person is one with nature, able to communicate with nature, responsible toward nature and the chief priests of nature [30]. This position is also echoed by Ekwealo who argues that human being's special position is of a caretaker of the universe, a task which goes with appropriate responsibility and consequences [29]. The postulations above are simply an explanation of what Frederick Ferré calls 'perspectival anthropocentrism' [13]. The details and the explanation above from this African scholars fall into the category of weak anthropocentrism. It is weak anthropocentrism because they admit man's central position to both African ontology and eco-system while advocating for tolerance.

This is the major reason why there has been a lot of confusion surrounding the classification of African environmental ethics. Many have branded it as holistic environmental ethics, due to the interdependence of beings within the environment. To some other, it is another anthropocentric environmental ethics, because it sees human beings as central to both ontology and ecosystem. However, with the theory of 'anthropoholism,' African environmental ethics can be explained vividly as it accommodates both weak anthropocentricism as well as holistic environmental ethics within its speculation. 'Anthropoholism,' bridges the gap between long-standing debates between anthropocentric and holistic environmental ethics in environmental discussions. 'Anthropoholism' acknowledges the individual's central role within thought process as well as ecosystem and ontology, but admits that such is just a mere part of the environment and as such is in mutual interdependence with other beings within the environment and it is only within the environment that his potential can be fulfilled.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to highlight the source of disagreement between anthropocentricism and holistic environmental ethics. Having considered the issue involved, it seems that the disagreement is as a result of the debaters' incoherent, inconsistent and lack of tolerance to accommodate one another within the environmental framework. As shown with the African environmental outlook, both anthropocentricism and holistic views are very important for the articulation of a viable environmental ethics. As a way out, this paper is hinged on the theory of Anthropoholism. The theory of Anthropoholism bridges the gap between the two extreme views. The advantage of Anthropoholism over both anthropocentricism and holistic position is seen in its ability to accommodate both positions. Upholding this thesis of Anthropoholism does not only address the disagreements entailed in the entire debate but more importantly, exposes the actual aspect of both perspectives which reveals in simple terms the role of the individual and the environment at large, their interconnectedness and interdependence.

REFERENCES
[1] Watts, J., (2018), We have 12 years to limit climate change catastrophe, warns UN, web page: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/08/global-warming-must-not-exceed-15c-warns-landmark-un-report, retrieval date: 04.09.2019.

[2] Heidegger, M., (1993). *The Question concerning Technology* in Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings (Revised and Expanded Edition) (London. Routledge).

[3] Barney, K. F., & Perkinson, M. A. (2016). *Occupational therapy with aging adults: Promoting quality of life through collaborative practice*. St. Louis, MO: Elsevier. P.292

[4] Akpan, B. S., & Leonard, N. (2018). Environmental Ethics: From Philosophy To Movement. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research*, (2).

[5] Okpe, T. A., & Bassey, S. A. (2018). Environmental Problems and the Question of Intergenerational Justice from the Kantian Perspective. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(3), 373-382.

[6] Hossein, S. (1968). *Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis of Modern Man,* Vikash Publishing House Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, Bombay, Bangalore, Calcutta, Kanpur, p.I8.

[7] Gyekye, K. (2003). "Person and community in African thought". In P. H Coetzee and A. P. J Roux, (eds*.), Philosophy from Africa*: Johannesburg. 42.

[8] Passmore, John. (1995). *Attitude to Nature from Environmental Ethics,* edited by Robert Eliot, Oxford University Press, p. 141.

[9] Frierson, P. (2013). Metastandards in the Ethics of Adam Smith and Aldo Leopold. *Environmental Ethics*, *29*(2), 171–191. http://doi.org/10.5840/enviroethics200729219

[10] Remele, K., & Tutu, D. (2013). Animal Protection And Environmentalism. In *The Global Guide to Animal Protection* (pp. 68–69). Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/j.ctt2tt9r9.40

[11] Norton, B. G., (2005). Environmental ethic and weak anthropocentrism. In L. Kalof & T. Satterfield (Eds.), *The Earthscan reader in environmental values* (p. 81-96). London, UK: Earthscan

[12] Light, A., & Rolston III, H. (2003). Introduction: Ethics and environmental ethics. In A. Light & H. Rolston III (Eds.), *Environmental ethics: An anthology* (p. 1-12). Malden, MA; Blackwell Publishing Inc.

[13] Diehm, C. (2010). Minding Nature: Val Plumwood's Critique of Moral Extensionism. *Environmental Ethics*, *32*(1), 3–16. http://doi.org/10.5840/enviroethics20103212

[14] Crowther, R. (2019). *Wellbeing and self-transformation in natural landscapes*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan., 239

[15] Midgley, Mary. (1994). "The End of Anthropocentrism?." Philosophy and the Natural Environment. eds. Robin Attfield and Andrew Belsey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[16] Mary Anne Warren, (1997). Moral Status: Obligations to Persons and Other Living Things (Oxford University Press, 43

[17] Asouzu, Innocent I. (2007). Ibuarụ: The Heavy Burden of Philosophy beyond African Philosophy. Münster: Lit Publishers

[18] Tim Hayward, (1997), "Anthropocentrism: A Misunderstood Problem," *Environmental Value*s 6, no. 1, 51

[19] Haas, P. J. (2005). Elliot Dorff. Love Your Neighbor and Yourself: A Jewish Approach to Modern Personal Ethics. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2003. xvii, 366 pp. *AJS Review*, *29*(1), 181–183. http://doi.org/10.1017/s0364009405320095

[20] Chen, J. (1995). Of Agriculture's First Disobedience and its Fruit. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, *48*(479), 1261–1332.

[21] Mbiti, J.S.(1970). *African Religions and Philosophies*. New York: Anchor Books. 35

[22] Menkiti, I.A.(1984). "Person and Community in African Thought". In R. A. Wright, (ed.), *African Philosophy: An introduction*. Lanham: University Press of America. 170

[23] Gyekye, K. (1997). *Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience.* New York: Oxford University. 49

[24] Matolino, B. (2008). *The Concept of Person in African Political Philosophy: An Analytical and Evaluative study*. PhD Thesis: University of KwaZulu-Natal. 75

[25] Mbiti, J. S. 2001. "African religion and the world order". In Mische, P.M and Merking. (eds) 2001. *Toward a global civilisation. The contribution of religions*. New York: Peter Lang. pp.361- 370.

[26] Tangwa, G. (2006). "Some African reflection on biomedical and environmental ethics". In Wiredu, K. (ed.) *A Companion to African Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 389. 387-399.

[27] Ugwuanyi, L.O. (2011). "Advancing an environmental ethics through the African world-view". Proceedings of the 1st International Technology, Education and Environment Conference. *African Society for Scientific Research* (ASSR). 7

[28] Kaoma, K.J. (2010). "Ubuntu, Jesus, and Earth: Integrating African religion and Christianity in ecological ethics". PhD Thesis. Boston University. 88

[29] Akpan, B. S., & Adie, T. (2019). Eco-Communitarianism: An African Perspective. *Research & Reviews: Journal of Ecology*, *7*(3), 8-15.

[30] OGAR, J. N., & BASSEY, S. A. (2019). African Environmental Ethics. *RAIS Journal for Social Sciences*, 3(1), 71-81.