



Arne Naess on environmental ethics & its Implications for National Development

Chukwuma Joseph Nnaemeka¹, Eme Okechukwu Innocent², Onwe Jeremiah³

¹Department of Philosophy University of Nigeria Nsukka. Enugu State Nigeria.

Email: nnaemeka.chukwuma@unn.edu.ng. Tel: +2348037723330

²Department of PALG UNN.

³Department of Philosophy University of Nigeria Nsukka. Enugu State Nigeria.

Abstract: *There has been a revival of interest, among philosophical environmentalists in the area of environmental safety especially the safety of human beings since the history of mankind. Arne Naess, a Norwegian Philosopher and a frontline nature-centered environmentalist, envisages a philosophy of life, intuition, emotion (feeling) and animal liberalism, as the necessary conditions for an adequate sense of life conservation. However, the conservation of nature is for the advancement of man in his civilized society. Thus, intuition should not form the base of moral philosophy. Nature-centered environmentalism believes that like humanity, the living environment as a whole has the same right to live and flourish since it belong to biotic community. This work challenges this position and concerns itself with the task to explore the implications of this position to the environmental development. In addition, it x-rays other schools in environmental ethics, namely, anthropocentrism, ecofeminism, ecocentrism and in conclusion, it takes anthropocentric stance. Perhaps, there is a need for extending our care to nature.*

Key words: *Development, Philosophy, Human, Civilize society*

INTRODUCTION

Man's tendency to assert himself is the reason for every claim he makes in his dealings with other living creatures. This tendency is connected with his awareness of certain indubitable fundamental distinctions that man is endowed with, for example "*intellect was the principle of distinction*" seen in man that is not found in other animals. It is in this same sense of reasoning that human beings are placed above all other creatures. In terms of political and social inclinations, human beings are placed above all creatures. As nature has said it, humans are provided with plants and animals to improve their existential meaningfulness here on earth. This idea is clearly epitomized by Aristotle in his work *The Politics* book 1 ch 8 when he pointed out that: It is evident then that we may concluded of those things that are, plants are created for the sake of animals, and animals for the sake of man, the tame for our use and provision; a wild, at least the greater part, for over provision also, or for some other advantages purpose, as furnishing us with clothes, and the like (Aristotle, 1256b).

The above stance, points to anthropocentric justifications on why human beings should not be treated as non humans. Looking at the infrastructural development, technological and economical facets, humans are bound to use any resources around them to enhance his existence on earth. Therefore, the use of trees for the construction of modern buildings, electric poles, and the like, is justifiable in the sense of human-centered environmentalism. This view maintains that everything in nature except human beings exists solely for the materials benefit of human beings.

On the contrary, Naess offers the basis of a new ontology which posits "*humanity as inseparable from nature*" (Naess, 1989:2), meanwhile, if Naess' ontology is fully understood, it will no longer be possible for us to injure nature wantonly, as this would mean injuring an integral part of ourselves if we over exploit

nature. Seen in this light of reasoning, we call to Naess' idea that all life is fundamentally one, that this oneness of life is linked with our individual needs and desires. How? Human desires are geared towards self-realization. And the sole aim of self-realization in this modern time is at animal and human risk. We should mind the way we encroach on nature, and we ought to do so if we must achieve our desires for self-realization, if such is attainable. Naess's concern is on the environmental problem and degradation. Simply, he is concerned with the destruction of what surround us, the immediate which we are within. Not merely the physical "nature", but all that we live in, "all the gestalts we can identify ourselves within" (Naess, 1989:7).

This work therefore, seeks to evaluate Arne Naess' ethical environmentalism (deep ecology) and see the rationale of this idea in our modern time, especially the rapid growth in science and technology and the like. This research will not feel reluctant to address some of the environmental problems in Nigeria, arguing on the positive claim that environment and its contents should be destroyed conditionally, for certain developmental reasons, or for the benefit of human beings.

Arne Naess claims that all life fundamentally is inseparable from nature. That humanity is inseparable from nature is worrisome. This idea therefore comes to ponder in mind that this work seeks to address. However, the idea raises some questions like;

1. Does the right to develop imply a right to destroy?
2. Are there occasions when the values of protecting nature or the environment outweigh or supersede other human considerations?
3. Would Naess's ethical environmentalism provide a foundation for, or would it contain a law of progress in the society, precisely, the progress of human beings in each case arguing for the opposite answer to Naess's ideas?

This provides therefore, first occasion to evaluate precisely what is and what is not involved in the idea of nature-centered environmentalism of Arne Naess.

Furthermore, this problem raises some burning questions like; when do we see human life as the greatest among all forms of life, or do we consider human value most to other non human values? The meaningfulness of life, has it in any way placed hierarchy in its consideration? If yes. Why? Hence, Naess's idea places limitations on the modern developments. Thus, he denies the idea of human dominion over all living creatures. Many thinkers rejected his view by a mere wave of hand, while some hold unto his view as ideal without considering the biblical, scientific, technological and biological credits for human beings.

The main purpose of this research is to:

1. Evaluate Arne Naess ethical environmentalism with the aim of knowing what is and what is not involved in his idea of respect for life. That is, the idea that life is one.
2. Study the principles involved in his ethical environmentalism.
3. Weighing his deep ecology with environmental development (that is, studying the implications of Naess' ethical environmentalism for national development).
4. And also compare his deep ecology with other schools of thought.

More so, the work is to be considered in the same perspective with anthropocentric effort to appreciate the values of humans and proper role of living environment (other forms of life, for example, dog, cat, rats, goat, trees, etc) without necessarily confusing human values with non human values.

The Philosophical Debate on Nature and Human-centered Environmentalism

The field of environmental ethics is a new area in philosophy. As a sub-branch of philosophy residing in the domain of ethics, it concerns itself with human beings and ethical relationship with the natural environments. While some philosophers have currently written on this area of study, some ancient, medieval and modern philosophers in their various philosophical inquiries have unconsciously or consciously covered the range of human relationship with the natural phenomena (environmental contents). Some were more or less concerned about human beings, while some were very sympathetic to nature and future generation.

Socrates gave an enviable intellectual sophisticated description to human being. In his maxim "man known thyself", Socrates drew his conceptualization of fundamental art of good living or rather the way to inward-living in which he considered man as the centre-piece. At best, philosophy, ethics, science, etc, should focus on man for the realization of the best in human, knowing clearly what life is worth living for. The maxim could also mean gaining true knowledge of self first before others. In the Apology, Socrates drove the point home when he urged the necessity to '*care for oneself*' (Plato, 128a). By this he did not mean to care for other non-human beings, such as dogs, pigs, cats, fowls, etc, but to care for man. Most interestingly, Socrates

pointed that man himself is entirely different from other creatures, and that thing which differs men from nonhumans is the soul. Then, when *“the god commands us to know ourselves, he means that man should study his own soul”* (Grube, 1969).

The work of Aristotle (384-322B.C.) “The Politics book 1Ch.8” epitomizes this issue when he took into cognizance the hierarchies of things; starting from the fact that plants exist for animals and that animals exist for man’s use. In the traditional sense, Aristotle defended the anthropocentric ethics. In his book “The politics, book 1, Aristotle explained: Of all beasts, some live in herbs, others separate, as is most convenient for procuring themselves food; as some of them live upon flesh, others on fruit and others on whatsoever they light on, nature having so distinguished their course of life, that they can very easily procure themselves subsistence; and at the same things are not agreeable to all, but one animal likes one thing and another, it follows that the lives of those beasts who live upon flesh must be different from the lives of those who live on fruits; so is it with men, their life differ greatly from other.⁷

Aristotle had no sympathy to nature. He did not care whether nature has any feeling or not, what mattered for him, is the services of nature to man. For example, horse exists only for carrying loads that man could not, and all the birds of the air are for human meats. He drove this point home when he trenchantly argued that: It is evidence then we may conclude of those things that are, that plants are created for the sake of animals, and animals for the sake of men; the tame for our use and provision; the wild, at least the greater part, for our provision also, or for some other advantageous purpose, as furnishing us with clothes, and the like.⁸

Nature, therefore, makes nothing either imperfect or in vain; it necessarily follows that she has made all these things for men. Hence, these creatures as nature has designed them are for the human consumptions to meet with our basic needs. For example, animal skins are to be used for human clothes, the palm trees for oil and its kernel for other useful things; trees for building houses (sheltering); and water for drinking. Water itself is life, it is essentially given to men to enhance their living; man should hunt beasts and other forest animal, as this is not wrong.

This same light of reasoning runs in the vein of almost the anthropocentrists. The origin of this claim always bases itself on the biblical references. The later scholars do the same. For example, St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) furnishes this when he picked this issue and placed it in high theological context. For him, the issue of nature and human rights should be interpreted theologically. Hence, he refuted the mistake of those who claim that cutting trees or killing animals is a sin or irrational. In his famous literary work *Summa Contra Gentiles* he argued

We refute the error of those who claim that it is a sin for man to kill brute animals. For animals are ordered to man’s use in the natural course of things, according to divine providence. Consequently, man uses them without any injustice, either by killing them or employing them in any other way. For this reason, God said to Noah: “As the green herbs, I have delivered all flesh to you.”⁹

Thomas Aquinas and Aristotle precisely hold these positions because they strongly believed that only man has moral instinct. Human beings have moral standing because they have intellectual quality. Aquinas has pointed out somewhere that what distinguishes humans from non-humans is “intellect”. This is no different from what Aristotle had maintained before, that the principle of intellect sets humans apart from the lower animals (plants and goats etc).

During the Renaissance and the advent of the new sciences in the 14th to 17th centuries, especially 17th century, we find in emphasis on problem of mind-body dualism. Rene Descartes a French philosopher is the most influential philosopher of this era. In his *Discourse on Method and the Meditation* (1668), he said that, *“man is a conscious being; a thinking thing; what constitutes the essential nature of man is the mind. Hence, man is essentially a thinking being.”*¹⁰ He argued that only two realities are and outside this, there is nothing he could account for—the bodies and minds are only existing realities. Hence, the realm of mental (mind) included all thinking, sensation and consciousness while the realm of the body included all things physical and spatial.

Descartes committed himself to the belief that: While I decided thus to think that everything was false it followed necessarily that I who thought this must be something; and observing that this truth: I think, therefore I am, was so certain and so evident that all most extravagant suppositions of the skeptics were not capable of shaking it....¹¹

Descartes admitted that he only existed, and that he could not account for other existence. At this point, he was only aware of himself, leading to his commitment to the solipsism, the idea that one can only

be sure of one's own existence, that one cannot prove that anybody else exists apart from oneself. Similarly, man is only aware of himself as essentially existing being. Nature, that is, environmental contents do not count to him (man). The best description of such belief is egoism-selfishness, self-consciousness.

New hope is given to this stream of reasoning by Immanuel Kant in his work "Duties to Animals and Spirit: Lectures in Ethics". According to him, moral standing should be given duties and obligatory interpretations. He was very sympathetic to the duties to future generations. This made his categorical imperative seem relevant to the several environmental issues. According to him, "our duties regarding the nature are indirect; for example, duties to other humans."¹²

Kant maintains that, only humans have moral duties, other non humans have no moral standing, as it regards to rights and duties. The period of Kant received intellectual attention whereby man has mechanized the world. Hence, this however, tended to contribute to a kind of human euphoria. Hence, humans at this period could understand the world more than the ancient and the medieval Thomism. Kant's idea stings the minds of some philosophers because he spoke very sympathetic which made some people to suggest for extension of moral standing to include non-humans. He affirmed that: So long animals are concerned we have no direct duties. Animals are no self-conscious and are there merely as a means to an end. That end is men...Our duties toward animals are merely indirect duties towards humanity...If he is not to stifle his human feelings, he must practice kindness towards animals for he who is cruel to animal becomes hard also in his dealings with man....¹³

Although Kant spoke from anthropocentric dimension, but his claim that one who is cruel to animals becomes hard also in his dealings with man is not the case. That one is cruel to animals is not substantive enough to conclude that one would become hard in his dealings with human beings. Supposing I decided to kill my goat in order to provide food for myself and other people who are hungry, does this mean that I will become cruel to human beings? No. Because, what I did is to eradicate starvation of some kind. It is natural that man must use what nature has given him to enhance his life. So, killing animals in this sense is neither a cruel to animals nor a hard treat to human beings.

This trend of reasoning gave Jeremy Bentham the impetus to advocate for his utilitarian extensionism which differs from the mainstream of Western philosophy. Bentham's attitude towards the issue is suggestive; hence, his anthropocentric utilitarianism was considerate as regards to the extension of moral standing to include nonhumans. He suggested that: since animals can feel pains, and experience pleasure neither, but in entirety can suffer, they should be respected as such. To him, 'the question is not, can they reason? nor can they talk? but, can they suffer?'"¹⁴ Bentham's major concern is no more whether animals can reason, but, he instead affirmed, in so far they (animals) have the ability to feel sufferings; the moral standing should be extended to include them. Similar views were picked and elaborated by contemporary philosophers, precisely Peter Singer and Tom Regan.

Before Taylor, a German philosopher Albert Schweitzer had earlier version of a biocentric ethics in his write up "Reverence for life", (Ehrfurcht vor dem leben, in a German language). Ehrfurcht implies attitudes of awe and wonder. Etymologically, Ehrfurcht suggests a combined attitude of honor and fear. Schweitzer insisted that the most fundamental fact of human consciousness is the realization that "I am life which wills to live, in the midst of life which wills to life."¹⁵ Thus ethics begins when we are fully aware and fully in awe of the fact that: The man who has become a thinking being feels a compulsion to give to every will-to-live the same reverence for life that he gives to his own. He experiences that other life in his own. He accepts as being good: to preserve life to promote life, to raise to its highest value life which is capable of development; and as being evil: to destroy life, to injure life to repress life which is capable of development. This is the absolute fundamental principle of the moral¹⁶

To drive this point home, Schweitzer claims that all living things have an inherent worth, and this worth commands our awe and reverence. For example, the very reason that those trees standing on where you wanted to build a house or carry out other developmental project have some inherent worth which command your awe and reverence that you will honor them (trees). Life is not alone, value-free 'fact' of the universe. It (life) is good in itself without limitation.

Schweitzer urged that we should not kill a snake even when it may bite us; those mosquitoes in our bed-room which carry transmittable disease, we should carry them outside the room; we should not harm nor exert any injury on them no matter what the case may be. He encouraged our avoidance of the use of DDT because, he does not trust the way it kills indiscriminately. DDT is an organochlorine insecticide used on crops to kill mosquitoes. It is a white, crystalline solid, tasteless and almost odorless. DDT in a technical

sense includes almost every conceivable form of solution such as; xylene, or petroleum distillates, emulsifiable concentrates, water-wettable powders, smoke candles, etc.

In more systematic manner, Paul Taylor furnished this point and popularized his view as biocentric egalitarianism. Taylor embellishes Schweitzer's work "Reverence for Life". The intellectual beauty given to Schweitzer's write up lies in Taylor's view and his careful defense of why it is reasonable to adopt the attitude of respect for nature. As a biocentric theorist, Taylor seeks for a *"systematic and comprehensive account of the moral relations that exist between humans and other living things."*¹⁷ As an ethical deontologist, Taylor in his biocentric utilitarianism, argues that, each individual living thing in nature, whether it is an animal, a plant, or a micro-organism is a, *"teleological-centre-of-life having a good or well-being of its own which can be enhanced or damaged, and that all individuals who are teleological-centre-of-life have equal intrinsic value (or what he called "inherent worth")"*¹⁸ which entitles them to moral respect.

There should be no person who would at a point in time practice any moral injustice against them. Such practice will otherwise account for irrational acts of men. The philosopher mostly associated with the extension of philosophical ethics to include animals is Peter Singer (**born in 1946**). In his 1975 work 'The Animal Liberation', Singer "popularizes the phrase "specisism" to draw a parallel with racism and sexism."¹⁹ This view linked with the ideal of moral wrongness in the denial of equality on the basis of race or sex. Singer argues that it is wrong to deny equal moral standing on the basis of species membership.

To the question what characterizes qualities a being for equal moral standing? Singer draws his answers from Bentham's utilitarian extensionism: "the question is not, can they reason? Nor can they talk? But, can they suffer?" as has been noted already. He affirms that, *"the capacity for suffering and to experience pain and enjoyment is a prerequisite for having interests all at, a condition that must be satisfied before we can speak of interests, in the meaningful way...."*²⁰

In response to this, Leopold's view which stands influential in ecocentric ethic does not mean as such, Leopold (**1887-1948**) provoked many scholars then and now. In his 1989 essay "The Land Ethics", Leopold changes in his thinking about the predators. His work, "The Land Ethics" demands that we stop treating the land as a mere object or resource. This is why he condemns us for cultivating, hunting or digging on the land as this will cause harm to the land. More so, construction of road or infrastructural development is impeded by this command: 'do not harm the land'. In order to stop this, Leopold says that we have to move towards a "land ethics", thereby granting moral standing to the land community itself, not just its individual members as biocentrists would say.

Arne Naess radicalizes this ongoing issue in his works: "Life's Philosophy, and Ecology, Community and Lifestyle" when he affirms that deep ecological feeling for the unity of all forms of life should be adopted in our daily dealings. As an admirer of life, Naess posits that life is essentially one. Hence, his life's philosophy is deeply rooted in intuition. Additionally, life is a naturally phenomenon. Its nature possesses on us a philosophical problem on whether life per se is one as Naess opines, or, whether there are hierarchies of life vis-a-vis values on the earth?

An Exposition of Arne Naess' Environmental ethics

The history of man is an ongoing race which for sure has received tremendous intellectual and sophisticated interpretations. Man has been left with the greatest legacy which is intellectual richness. Arne Naess, as we are going to see in this part, has had a profound influence on Norwegian philosophy and social research. Arne Dekke Eide Naess was born in Holmenkollen on January 27, 1912, near the city of Oslo. *"He is a son of a banker and business man, Ragnar Naess, and the mother, Christine Dekke."*²¹ As a child he begun to feel a particular affinity with tiny creatures, such as flies, ants, flowers, etc, and he *"adopted a mountain, Hallingskarvet, as his surrogate father."*²² He studied philosophy, mathematics, and astronomy at the University of Oslo, in Paris and at the University of Vienna. He was profoundly influenced and inspired by Spinoza's ethics which he read at the age of 17 years a book recommended to him by a Norwegian Supreme Court judge and a mountaineer, Ferdinard Schelderup. Hence, Spinoza's view of human nature (essence) inspired Naess greatly. Arne Naess died at the age of 96 years old in 2008. His most influential works include; Life's Philosophy; Ecology, Community and Lifestyle, The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement; A summary, etc. Common to all Naess' works is his systematic clarification of terms. Thus, *"milieu or environments which are used interchangeable for the single Norwegian word Milj"*²³ has a wider and more familiar connotation than environment.

Thus, Naess' key concept is self realization, which he used throughout the book in various guises. Keeping with his belief in the power of 'T_o' formulations, Arne Stubbornly "*refuses to pin down this term to a rigid definition.*"²⁴ His self-realization is not self-centered, it means a larger concept which includes all other potential beings, considering its Norwegian root meaning; "selv-realisering"-self realizing. He trenchantly holds that 'identifisering' in Norwegian-identifying parts of nature as parts of ourselves, is only what will help us to achieve self-realization. Of which I know this is not attainable in human life. No man can ever reach self-realization. It is active condition for all to incorporate all forms of life if we can achieve it. Naess hangs his mission on the ambit of holistic moral orientation, preaching for inclusion of other beings (species) in our idea of 'Self' and human quests. It is from this limelight that he affirms that intrinsic worth (value) is not only human feature, that every other creatures in the community of life has such values independent of their social or economic benefits to humans.

The Development of the phrase "Deep Ecology"

The phrase "deep ecology" was coined by the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess in 1973 and he helped to give it philosophical foundation. It describes itself as deep because it persists in asking deeper questions concerning "why" and "how" and thus is concerned with the fundamental philosophical questions about the impacts of human life as one part of the ecosphere, rather than with a narrow view of ecology as a branch of biological science. Deep ecology tries to avoid merely anthropocentric environmentalism. Central to Naess' annoyance is that ecological science is concerned with facts and logic alone, and as such cannot answer ethical questions about how we should live in relation to our environments. Hence, he says that there is a need for ecological wisdom. Naess seeks to develop this by focusing on deep experiences, deep questioning and deep commitments especially on how we ought to relate with nature. Deep ecology seeks more holistic view of the world human lives in and seeks to apply to life the understanding that separate parts of the ecosystem, including humans function as a whole. The principle of the deep ecology includes the belief that like humanity, the living environment as a whole has the same right to live and flourish; that there is a sense of interconnection of life, that the planet earth and humans are a part of nature. Hence, life is fundamentally one. It is worth noting that deep ecology is rooted in a perception of reality that goes beyond the scientific framework to an intuitive awareness of the oneness of all life, the interdependence of its multiple manifestations and its cycles of changes and transformation.

Consequently, deep ecology is concerned with the metaphysics of nature, and of the self to nature. In cognizance of this, Naess adopted Spinoza's idea of God in his attempt to describe the nature of living creatures. Spinoza's God (Deus) is "*immanent-not something outside our world.*"²⁵ However, God is the creative force in nature. For Naess, the deep ecology movement seeks for a deeper interpretation and relation of humans and environmental life; it maintains that everything in life is interrelated. Furthermore, the shallow ecology movement as Naess fondly calls it is committed to the fight against pollution, resources depletion. Its central objective is to protect the health and affluence of the people in developed countries, precisely the western world. In contrast, "*deep ecology takes a relational, total-field perspective, rejecting the man-in-environment image in favour of a more holistic and non-anthropocentric approach.*"²⁶

In a nutshell, deep ecology is ethico-philosophy and socio-political movement which refused to accept the primitive and modern notion that humans by their natural inclinations are essentially most valuable beings on the earth, and that animals and plants are created for human use to enhance their lives. The deep ecological outlook is "*developed through an identification so deep that one's own self is no longer adequately delimited by the personal ego or the organism*"²⁷(nature-centered environmentalism). This is not the same as it were in the time of Descartes. Descartes' ego is the self ego which refuses to acknowledge other egos. Consciousness for Descartes is consciousness of self. The thinking self is the only existing reality. For Descartes, the ego is the credo of the ego-cogito. In Husserl's transcendental ego, it is also the credo of the phenomenology. There is a clear distinction in Descartes' ego and Husserl's phenomenological ego. To Husserl, he did not make ego as the only existing truth; however, he suspended the ego and bracketed everything in order to discover the phenomenological ego. So, Husserl doubted every existent including the ego. In practice, deep ecologists support selflessness and non-egotist tendency. They support decentralization, the creation of eco-regions, the breakdown of industrialism in its currents form, and an end to authoritarianism. What deep ecology seeks to do as pointed by Naess is that it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. He said that if human actions tend not to do this, such action is wrong. For him, the deep ecological point of view states "*the right of all forms of life to live as*

universal right which cannot be quantified. No single species of living being has more this particular right to live and unfold than any other species.”²⁸

Undoubtedly human beings are aspects of nature unfolding themselves as a single reality with degree of metaphysical differences. Human nature is unfathomable so much so that man wonders about his relationship with other beings. To this complexity of nature and humans, at best, the environmental contents, man is condemned to accept that his life by nature has iota of connectivity with nature (other forms of life). Then, the question is, what is it to assert that nature is a part of human life?

Naess on the meaning of Nature and feeling for Life

The anthropocentric environmentalism claims that “*the essence of nature to humans depends on the satisfaction we receive from it, that any attempt to deny man this satisfaction leads to alienation of man by himself.*”²⁹ In Greek, nature is physics. In contrast, Naess rejects this instrumental view, arguing that nature and human beings are inseparable. Harm to nature is at the same time harm to mankind. He then sees nature as essential part of human life (essence). To him, when we remove nature from human beings, their essences as beings have gone because human beings are not isolated beings by nature. Thus, the unity of things is life which is in turn the essence of human beings. Naess calls this essence nature. Naess’ nature is a metaphysical whole correlated with human life such that the two are the pure unity of things. It is more than the physical or environmental contents like the micro-organisms, plants or animals.

A feeling for nature in Naess’ view is not merely emotional passivism. Borrowing Spinoza’s maxim “active emotion (positive emotion), the kind that is driven by ‘ratio’-reason, Naess succinctly explains a feeling for nature in this sense (positive or active feeling for nature). He captures this point when he states that: Throughout history we in Norway have had a wide spectrum in our emotional attitudes to sea, mountain, forest. By and large, positive emotions have played a leading role in the choice of a home. Obviously the fear of landslides, avalanches, and other apparent dangers has also affected the location of buildings; we need to expand the subject of feeling for nature.³⁰

However, nature is seen in Norway as “untouched or unexploited nature. Naess therefore uses capital ‘N’ to distinguish his idea of nature from other ideas. For him, a feeling for nature is “a positive feeling for areas that are not obviously dominated by human activity.”³¹ Spinoza gave an exact meaning to Norwegian idea when he asserts that “the highest and to which humans could inspire consists in the knowledge of the union existing between the mind and the whole of nature.”³² Aristotle sees nature in term of purpose. The purpose of nature is to ensure human happiness. The specific happiness of humans as beings must be aimed at in the life society. For him, environment exists “for the sake of the citizens and not the citizens for the sake of the environment.”³³

In Naess principle of diversity and of symbiosis, he insists that diversity enhances potentialities of survival, the chances of new models of life, the richness of forms. Diversity of human life, he says, is in part due to (intended or unintended) exploitation and suppression on the part of certain groups. The exploiter lives differently from the exploited, but both are adversely affected in their potentialities of self-realization. Meanwhile, life emerges as we live it. Hence, life is a succession of different ones with varying aims and objectives. Life is one. Together with his colleague (friend) George Sessions, Naess in 1984 defined eight points which are based on the principle that every living creature has its own intrinsic worth, and the same applies to natural wealth and biological diversity. The points read thus:

All living beings have intrinsic value; The diversity and richness of life has intrinsic value; Except to satisfy vital needs, mankind does not have the right to reduce this diversity and this richness; it would be better for human beings if there were fewer of them and much better for other living creatures; Today the extent and nature of human interference in the various ecosystems are not sustainable, and the lack of sustainability is rising; Decisive improvement requires considerable changes; social, economic, technological and ideological; An ideological change would essentially entail seeking a better quality of life rather than a raised standard of living; and those who accept the aforementioned points are responsible for trying to contribute directly or indirectly to the realization of the necessary changes.³⁴

The above observations were motivated by a philosophy of life or religion. Speaking from Naess’ axiom, in the past, people have had, and many still have strong positive feelings for the place where they feel that they belong. Deep ecology movement and its members today try to stimulate a feeling for the district in which they are living. They also try to awaken such feelings among the future generation. This kind of feeling is what Naess calls bioregionalism. The preservation of forest is to unfold a deeper reality in human

existence. Hence, human beings can be of use in improving the conditions of life on earth. Consequently, Naess thoughts that we need not only to think differently about nature, but also to act and feel differently. Political changes, he contends, require emotional changes within us.

As an admirer of deep cultural differences, and a rich variety of sustainable ways of living within a culture, Naess feels that it is a little presumptuous to propound some ethico-ecological theories, even if they only attempt to describe his personal view of life.

In conformity with the possibilistic attitude to life, everything is possible. That is, anything can happen. This light of reasoning stems from Naess' conviction that nothing is absolutely conceivable to man especially, the future. We don't have mastery over the future he contends. Something happened in the past may be conceivably known to man, but nevertheless the future. The theory of possibilism claims that the future is imaginably related with the principle of surprises.

The theory of pluralism is central to the Naess' thinking about life. It stresses the importance of a subject or a situation in varying perspectives. These perspectives revolve around many possibilities in every situation, whether in the past, present or future, a drastic reminder is there to illuminate us on any circumstance. In short, "possibilism and pluralism are expressions of the fundamental way in which some of us feel life and the world around us."³⁵

Ecosophy-T, as the unity of all things

An ecosophy is a comprehensive view partly inspired by work on solving the ecological crisis. The word ecosophy is composed of the prefix eco, which comes from the Greek work 'Oikos', meaning "household". The root-sophy is from the Greek Sophia, stands for wisdom. Ecosophy therefore concerns with wisdom in relation to the foundation of life on earth. Used in another way, ecosophy could mean a technology of life. In short, ecosophy identifies itself with a biology which clearly states the biological peculiarities of human beings, as well as the differences, e.g. between human and animal communication. Hence, human beings consciously perceive the urge other living beings have for self-realization, for this, they must assume a kind of responsibility for our conduct towards other creatures. The ecosophy Naess sought to expound is ecosophy-T ('T' for Tvergastein, Naess' hut in the Hallingskarvet Mountain in Norway. Moreover, Naess' ecosophy-T arouse from strong feeling which he calls the intuitive root of ecosophy-T. In a traditional sense, it is a philosophy that found its start point on the tradition and culture of Norway where nature is seen as untouched and unexploited.

Deep Ecology and Environmental Schools

The development and the goal of deep ecology are to re-orient the world on the ongoing environmental crises. The exponents of deep ecology were not comfortable with the anthropocentric school which holds that human is the center and the pinnacle of everything of the world. In this section, we explore some similarities between some ecological schools at the same time compare their tenability in application in our human society.

Anthropocentrism is a school of thought that considers human being as the center of the universe and the pinnacle of all creation. The exponents of this school based their claims on the Judeo-Christian tradition. For example, Thomas Aquinas insisted that only humans have moral intellect to distinguish good from bad. Animals, for him, cannot do that. In contrast, Naess' philosophy of life embellishes the deep, ecological schools. They aim at stabilizing and reducing human population to a sustainable minimum number of human beings without revolution or dictatorship. According to Naess, all ecological schools are bounded by deep feelings. Hence, there is a core democracy in the biosphere according to him. Deep ecologies as a whole are inspired by intuitive feeling for the unity of life as a whole except in a wider development and in more personalized maxim as we saw in Naess' ecosophy T. This has a wider meaning, not merely an attack to human population.

The debate that human beings are not the pinnacles moral standing found expression across to animal right movement. Animals are valued by people for a variety purposes. To some people, animals possess their own intrinsic worth independent of their instrumental use by humans. Peter Singer embellished this point in his book "The Animal Liberation". Bentham and Singer unanimously asked whether animals other than man suffer. Most people quickly accepted that animals like dogs and pigs do suffer, and this seems also to be assumed by those laws that prohibit cruelty to such animals. For Descartes, animals lack linguistic capacity and therefore lack a mental or psychological life; hence, they should not be treated equitably to human

beings. For him, animals are not sentient. If so, of course, they (animals) cannot be caused pain. Because of this, Cartesians claim that “they are mere automate.”³⁶

Ecofeminism is a socio-political school of thought which emphasizes for the existence of considerable common ground between environmentalism and feminism. Ecological feminism was coined by a French philosopher Françoise d'Eaubonne in 1974. As a philosophical thought and ecological movement, it believes that “*the social mentality leads to the domination and oppression of women is directly connected to the social mentality that leads to the abuse of the natural environment.*”³⁷ Jan Clausen captures this view when he writes that: There is now a growing awareness that Western philosophical tradition which has identified, on the one hand, maleness with the sphere of rationality, and on the other hand, femaleness with the sphere of nature, has provided one of the main intellectual bases for the domination of women (and nature) in Western culture.³⁸

It is common in ecofeminism and deep ecology that a strong parallel should exist between the oppression and subordination of nature, degradation of nature land women in the ecosystem through construction of differences into conceptual binaries and ideological hierarchies among humans.

Theoretical Paradigm

In the quest to come up with mitigate approach that is capable to contribute in maintaining our environment at a steady level without exhausting our natural resources or causing some ecological damage, we adopted Sustainable Development concept approach for the study; so that the future environment and its people would not be put into jeopardy. This is because, the previous global sustainability of humankind is now threatened by the dynamics of technology, economy and population rise, which now accelerate the unsustainable environmental change. Sustainable development as an approach is of great essence in environmental resources management and preservation. That is why Bossel (1991:1) asserts that, the sustainability of the human society becomes an urgent concern.

Sustainable Development (SD) has broad definitions, and different perspectives. Sustainability is a dynamic concept. Bossel (1999:4) argues that:

Societies and their environments change, technologies and cultures change, values and aspirations change, and a sustainable society must allow and sustain such change that is, it must allow continuous, viable and vigorous (sustainable) development, which is what we mean by sustainable development.

Bossel (1994) added that sustainable development of human has environmental, material, ecological, social, economic, legal, cultural, political and psychological dimensions that require attention. Before the popularization of sustainable development by Brundtland Commission (1987), the modern emphasis on sustainable utilization of natural resources was traced by O'Riordan (1988) to a series of African based conferences in the 1960s, and discussions by the World Environment Conference in Stockholm in 1972. It was the World conservative strategy that first brought the concept-Sustainable Development into focus (IUCN, 1988 in Goddey, 2008:15). It was the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg resolutions that adopted Sustainable Development goals to carry forward a bold green development agenda to 2030 (Uwaegbulam, 2012:56, June 18). Earlier on, it was the Brundtland Commission's Report that highlighted the need to simultaneously address developmental and environmental imperatives (Onuoha and Ozor, 2010:45 in Anyadike et al (eds.) 2010). Therefore, it is the visionary of the World Commission on Environment and Development chaired by the former Prime Minister of Norway, Gro Brundtland in their “*Our Common Future*” published (1981) known as Brundtland Commission that defines sustainable development. It is development that seeks to meet the needs and aspirations of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own future needs (Bossel 1999; Goddey 2008; World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) 1987 in Abdullahi 2012:95 in Okpaga and Bako (eds.) 2012). It means prosperity that is globally shared and environmental sustainable (Sachs 2008:31). But, without better environment stewardship, development will be undermined and without accelerated development in poor countries (like Nigeria) environmental policies will fail (Onuoha, 2009:46, in Eboh, Ozor, Onuoha and Chukwu (eds.) 2009). In order to fast track development amongst the developing countries like Nigeria, Brundtland (2012) advised the use of science as key to the way forward to achieving a more sustainable planet (Ekah, 2012:21). Regrettably, sub-Saharan countries and other poor developing

countries have low scientific and technological capabilities to achieving the technical perspectives of sustainable development.

The key principles or characteristic features of sustainable development in this study are that:

- Humanity's well-being and improved quality of life of the people is at the epicentre of sustainable development.
- It incorporates the spirit of intra and inter-generation equity that endeavours to make both the present and future generation to be healthy and productive without exhausting the natural resources or cause some environmental or ecological damage.
- It requires effective participation of both the governments and the public in the implementation of sustainable development programmes.
- It is geared towards innovation and socio-economic prosperity in an efficient and environment friendly manner.
- It incorporates measures to contain, reduce, prevent, control or mitigate the environmental damage being caused by global warming and climate change adverse effects.
- It contains approaches that grow more goods and services, empower the citizenry and still preserve or protect the environment.
- In its precautionary feature, Québec (2002:1) aptly asserts that sustainable development offers alternative action to be taken "when there are threats of serious or irreversible damage (like the current climate change catastrophes being experienced globally), that the lack of full scientific certainty must not be used as a reason for postponing the adoption of effective measures (as being provided by sustainable development approach) to prevent environmental degradation. That is why sustainable development paradigm becomes imperative to this study.

Sustainable Development acknowledges the primacy of country's policy measures that incorporate the economy, ecology and the people's present and future needs. The magnitude of the adverse effects of climate change upon the planet Earth especially among those of the developing countries like Nigeria is getting worrisome. It needs both adaptive and mitigative approaches in order to reduce and stabilize the impact of global warming and to contain the atmospheric GHGs not to go beyond the 2^o centigrade set targets. This motivated the choice of sustainable development.

The Rio 1992 and Johannesburg 2002 put sustainable development on the map for its application amongst the countries of the world including Nigeria. To apply its tenets to Nigerian environment in order to contribute significantly in maintaining the environment at a steady level without exhausting the natural resource, Adebipe and Adeleke (2008) came up with some advisory comments. These include that, precautionary principle and recognition that each government is responsible for creating condition for sustainable development within its own boarders; that sustainable development encompasses a number of basic political challenges: democratization, respects for human rights, combating corruption and appropriate resources management.

This is because the tenets being applied would significantly make the Nigerian environment to continue to function indefinitely in its quest of producing more goods and services without endangering the welfare needs of the future generation, as it tends to avoid extreme sectoral imbalances that would damage agricultural and industrial sectors. Socially, the tenets would tend to support its people by empowering them with its all inclusive participation of all stakeholders in its socio-economic programmes that endeavour to achieve social mobility and distributional equity and provide adequate social services to its people without jeopardizing the planet Earth in the effort to reducing the adverse effects of climate change. Rather, it would endeavour to maintain the planet Earth through the above measures that tend to improve the ecosystem that conserve the environment in a sustainable manner. This would tend to avoid over exploitation via industrialization and urbanization. That is what the GWSNP and other renewable programme measures are meant to achieve. This would allow continuous, viable and rigorous sustainable environment in Nigeria.

The choice of sustainable development as the paradigm for this study is due to its relevance in the analysis of effects of climate change via mitigative programmes amongst developing countries like Nigeria. It is our contention, that the world (including Nigeria) can certainly save itself, from its current ecological, demographic, and economic trajectory; if the world (developed and poor developing countries) cooperate effectively. Sachs (2008:6) argued that this can be achieved through sustainable system of energy, land, and resource use that (can) avert the most dangerous trends of climate change and destruction of ecosystems.

Research Procedure

The design used for this study was documentary research method cross-sectional survey research. This was conducted through simple observation that reviewed documents and records on climate change and Nigerian Governments efforts up to 2011 and beyond, especially on mitigations more than adaptation strategy documents. This enabled us to assess and suggest that Nigeria, as a developing country, should adopt mitigative approach in tackling the adverse effects of climate change. The study being qualitative in nature used the descriptive method. This enabled us to collect, describe and interpret all the data collected in the course of this study. This enabled us to critically examine our hypotheses with the view to validate or state otherwise through the analysis of all information gathered about the phenomenon under study.

To generate data for this study we made extensive use of documentary research method otherwise referred to as secondary sources. This includes written material documents which have been produced for other purposes rather than the area under study. The sources from where we generated data for this study include official documents from the United Nations-United Nations Framework Conventions on Climate Change (UNFCCC), UNDP-Environment and Energy Group, and Official documents from Ministry of Environment and other government agencies like the Nigerian Meteorological Agency (NIMET). We made extensive use of relevant documents and data from journals, books, periodicals, seminars and conference papers, magazines, newspapers and internet materials that relate to the area under study.

What is more, we opted to use secondary data for this study because we agreed with Hyman (1987) in Nachmais and Nachmais (1992:292) which states that, in research on more contemporary issues (like climate change), the investigator researches through a wide range of materials covering different areas and eras which may result in greater scope and depth than is possible with a single primary data projects. Nachmais (1993:293) added that with such secondary analysis, we can better understand the historical context, and by analyzing data collected in different times on similar issues, we can also describe and explain change (like that of climate).

To achieve high validity and reliable work that is coherent, the data collected were thoroughly analyzed and synthesized. The research work being qualitative in nature, we processed the data through the inductive logical method. That made us to conduct our analysis and presentation of data to emanate from particular to general. As one of the functions of science is to establish via inductive explanation a particular or general impression or law about a given society like Nigeria and its environment, we therefore used the inductive logical method to convert our simple observations and secondary data in order to make a climate change statement in a scientific manner.

The secondary data collected were analyzed through qualitative descriptive statistics, by drawing out the relationship from the variables. This made us to make logical arguments. In the course of analyzing the data, we separated the data and grouped them hypothesis by hypothesis. The findings and discussions were done around the three hypotheses, which we have earlier on posited.

EVALUATION

With the clarification of Naess' ethical environmentalism, let us now present an interpretation, and evaluation of his concept of deep ecology. This critique diverges from the interpretation of most Naess' critics. we did this in order to cast more light on Naess' view of the relation between human beings and nature; that life as a whole is one; that we have the same intrinsic values with animals and all creatures including crawling organisms. Thus the notion that it is only at point of vital needs and functional needs that the value of humans outweigh or supersede animals, or, plants values call for critical reflection to know the tenability of Naess' claim. The central aim here is to know how Naess deep ecology will help to develop our environment/nation. In evaluating his environmental ethics, it becomes necessary to note that it is neither entirely bad nor entirely good. In short, its bad nature lies in its extreme disrespect for science and technology, it slows development by application. That is, in practice, deep ecology does not encourage massive industrialization and it rejects modern infrastructures. Concerning its positive side, ecosophy (deep ecology) could be said that it is morally oriented, passionate and it cares for the welfare of future generations. Naess' deepened concern about the future generations was not a miscalculated attempt. Meanwhile, it took Naess time to reflect on the future and the well-being of children in the society which he would like every other person in the community of life to do exactly the same. But, is there any circumstance

that the life of animals and wild plants is most meaningful to the human life? Naess' answer to this question is yes but only in terms of judging life as one.

Development involves increment of mental and physical state of a nation or group of person. It is a process of growth which undergoes certain changes in order to unfold new phase. Development is both abstract and concrete growths. The abstract growth includes internal development whereas the concrete development unfolds itself in external (physical) objects. The objects of development in this context are matter and form. By development, we mean both material and spiritual up to well doing which must be human-centered. Igwe Stanley C. captures this when he avers that "*development typically involves improvement in a variety of indicators such as literacy rates, life expectancy, and poverty rates.*"³⁹ It implies that development ameliorates poverty and improves the living standard of a nation. Development should be able to improve the educational level of its citizens. Thus, development is educative, and it is human centered. When we talk of education, it includes both the physiological and psychological education, not a mere acquisition of reading and writing skills. Walter Rodney defined development in a human society as "*a many sited process. At the level of the individual, it implies increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material well-being.*"⁴⁰

Development must be universally good, because it is the conditions leading to economic expansion. Joseph Nnaemeka Chukwuma. In his work, "Poverty Alleviation: The key to sustainable Development in Nigeria", opines that this kind of development is known. "When we talk of a situation where the nation will graduate from underdevelopment to a level of economic, political, social and infrastructural wellbeing that will last or stand the test of time...."⁴¹

This implies that development involves a holistic, and a purposeful change which must touch all the facets of human endeavour. Development turns to the diverse needs and desires of mankind, and pays attention to the social groups within which the abject poverty is ameliorated for a well perceived good living to come into place.

Technology and science says Naess are exploitative and destructive. Because of this, he has bad impression about modern industrialization which invites inevitably environmental problems such as pollution, depletion of ozone layer, manipulation of nature without mercy, destabilization of our rich environmental components including human beings. He therefore suggested that technology and science have to be life conscious and rejected the idea of massive industrialization, authoritarianity, (the belief that human are playing guidance over nature), and crucified centralization. Science and technology must not destroy lives wantonly he says. Naess categorically affirmed that "*the necessity of efforts to change mentality is closely associated with the necessity of organized efforts for enviable changes in the structure of society.*"⁴²

If a development is destructive on the side of nature, and such development is human centered, it is justifiable. When Aristotle averred that plants and animals directly and indirectly exist for the sake of man, he knew much well that without food and plants man's life is miserable. The same applies to the idea of modern building. Man must have a roof over his head in order to enjoy his existence. One has to imagine how his life would look like if we live indifferent from animals. Even animals have hooves or hidden places that serve as shades for them how much more us human beings. Some domestic animals desire for shelter. When it is raining for instance, dogs, cats, rats, some birds hasten to their shades. At times in the case of dogs and cats, they struggle with their owner whom to enter the house first. More so, for massive industrialization and urbanization to come into play, man must encroach on nature or the environment. Undoubtedly, deforestation paves way for industrialization and industrialization in turn brings social and economic development. Can there be good network of roads, commercial businesses, modern infrastructures as well as rich environmental structures (modern building like schools, hospitals, recreational centers, museum etc) for the advancement of human beings, if we do not tamper or destroy the environment? Apparently, it is not possible unless we want to live in a miserable society worse than polluted environment. We cannot because of environmental crises stop human advancement. Human advancement should take a phase of human interest.

Even if the deep ecological movements are indirectly advocating for human welfare even though, some deep ecologists like Naess refuses to pin down his concepts to anthropocentrism. The ancient philosophers like Plato and Socrates were not ignorant when they located development in the mind of human being. Development is a state of well-being of a human soul. Knowing too well that animals do not possess this distinctive part of human person (the soul), they maintained that development must take care of human soul and not another way round. The Thomistic traditions did the same, arguing for the development of the soul.

The later Cartesian scholars, for example, Descartes and Nicholas Malebranche insisted that man is the pinnacle of the universe and not animals. Since man is the center of thing who is composed of two elements the soul and the body, and that he is endowed with reason, development is human enterprise because, only a rational being know what is desirable for him. Animals do not know what is desirable for them.

Recently, human activity is effecting climatic and atmospheric change at a rate unprecedented in some parts of the world. In Nigeria for example, we have heard of Niger-Delta, or the Riverine areas (the oil states) that in many occasions have agitated for the rehabilitation of their environment, and cry for government to play a responsive role to ensure that life of people are secured. The environmental degradation, oil spillage, greenhouse effect, natural disaster, pollution of all kinds, air, water and land are witnessed in some parts of the world today. People of these areas were concerned about human life and not animal not plant. Even though, they may have pointed out that plants and animals are at risk, but the prima idea behind their movements is for human interests. The two related problems, example, greenhouse effect and depletion of the ozone layer are the most visible ones of these environmental challenges. However, “*a number of chemicals, especially a group of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) have the ability to react chemically with and breakdown ozone.*”⁴³ The call for environmental well-being is for human good. It is pertinent that among the consequences of an increased exposure to ultra-violet radiation would be an increase in a variety of cancers and damage to DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) molecules in human beings, plants and animals. This is accurately true, but it does not imply that these urgent quests for environmental revitalization are for the sake of environments (animals and wild animals).

However, men as philosophers, and common sense have confirmed to be rational being, and should be placed on top, and not nature (animals and wild plants). We don't agree with the idea that we should reverence nature on the ground that they will live and desire to live like humans. Conative characteristic is exclusively human quality. Apart from that, Naess did not draw a clear boundary between human beings and nature with regards to whether his suggestion implies that we should treat the life of pigs or bedbugs with as much respect as we treat human life? Does the life of a virus or of a bacterium worthy as that of human life? If not, does he offer any formula for resolving conflict between human life and the life of HIV virus? If Naess did not clear us from these points, we should not place human life on the same rank with other creatures. The implication then is that the metaphysical conceptions of Naess that life is one, that all forms of life are one is hereby dissolved as logical truth. It does not follow that HIV virus or some dangerous bacteria are valuable more than human life. However, there is a metaphysical hierarchy of beings, ranging from Supreme Being to the lowest beings, that is, animals and plantations. Thus human beings are discursive and rational beings, animals are not. Ecosophy is pure mythic and utopic, even he (Naess) cannot submissively give his life to such virus to mesmerize him. We don't agree to his extremism because of his attitude towards human health. However, man must encroach on nature to cure his disease by using herbs and other curable creature.

Conclusion

When the words of life say that human is essentially a living being endowed with unique features different from other classes of animals, it is not mistaking the truth. In the New Testament, “Christ enters the wilderness too fast for forty days only then to be tempted by Satan.”⁴⁴ In the same book of life, precisely in the Old Testament, Adam and Eve were banished from the Garden of Eden into an “accursed wilderness that will grow thorns and thistles for you and none but wild plants for you to eat.”⁴⁵ The first reference is the symbolism of which it is clear that wilderness which some environmental ethicists and Naess in particular are protecting not only is dangerous, but it is also a home of devil. The second instance is quite clear that nature is meant to serve man. In real sense, trees, and other natural resources supply us the opportunity for building good life. We agree with John Locke who sees the nature as God's gift to people in common. Hence, nature for him is a real estate and a commodity to be owned and used by man. Even when Jean Jack Rousseau was advocating for the education and politicization to be guided by principles derived from an understanding of the nature and intrinsic goodness of human beings, he knew the implication of what he said. Undoubtedly anthropocentrism or human centered view of the environment has more practicable influence over human's relationship with the environment than Naess' utopic intuitionism (deep ecology).

In conclusion, we want to observe that humans should not rely on the consciousness or rational (mental) quality of man to over exploit nature. We should also consider the fact that the argument of reason

is no longer holding strong conviction, as many higher animals can perform physiological behaviour as we have exemplified somewhere in this work.

Meanwhile, if Cartesians were right, that is, even if sentience is the most defensible criterion of moral standing, then non-human animals cannot have such standing. As for moderate (which we feel is the best) anthropocentrism, this is not right because it is not defensible. We are aware that recently most animals exhibit physiological and behavioral responses similar to those of human beings and possess developed central nervous systems whose presence is normally sufficient for us to infer the presence of pain and pressure, for example, dogs, bats, chimpanzees, etc share with human beings in that features. This skepticism by Cartesians is irrational as Darwin pointed. Additionally, criterion of sentience would not only include certain animals (those that are sentient) contrary to Descartes, we assume many are but excluded non sentient humans. Is there any human who is not sentient? Possibly, the irreversibly comatose or partly brainless, that is, anencephalic, first-trimester fetuses and those of the later fetal stages are not sentient. Then, if this is the case, the Cartesian argument, is indefensible. A stronger argument is that lack of linguistic capacity. Animals have no linguistic capacity, although, they can communicate in a way which is peculiar to animal world.

Admittedly, we never can tell what our attitudes towards nature will result. We should therefore, cultivate environmental education in our individual minds and inculcate these values to our younger ones. A new system of education to enlighten children and reorient sciences should be adopted. For example, there should be subject introduced in the primary, secondary down to universities and tertiary institutions, which would cover and unravel the etiquette of life in our environment. Naess eight points which are based on the principle that every living creature has its own intrinsic worth, and owe some moral obligations should not be frowned.

As we have pointed before, intuitions is a noble quality of morals, that is, moral which challenges us to play father role in our dealings with things around us including nature. Seen thus, the best and most beneficial environmental ethics is really, the moderate environmental ethics or what some philosophers may call inclusive environmental ethics. At best, Naess calls it philosophy of life (life ethics). Additionally, to identify with all life as Naess aptly suggests does not imply an abandonment of our cultural heritage, moral exhortation, non-punishment of eco-criminals, it rather implies our positive incorporation of our environments to unfold our potentials. Education comes into play and moral conduct embellishes it.

END NOTES

1. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Book III, Part II, Ch. III:12.
2. Aristotle, *The Politics*, Book I, Ch. VIII, 1256b.
3. Arne Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, Trans. David R., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 2.
4. Arne Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, 7.
5. Plato, Apology, 128a

6. Grube, G.M.A. *Plato's Thought* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 220.
7. Aristotle, *The Politics*, Book I, Ch. VIII, 1256a
8. Aristotle, *The Politics*, 1256b.
9. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Book III, Part II
10. Joseph Omoregbe, *Philosophy of Mind: An Introduction to Philosophical Psychology*, (Lagos: Joja publishing Company, 2001), 55.
11. Rene Descartes, *Discourse on Method and the Meditation*, Trans. F.E. Sutchiffe, (New York: Penguin Publishing Company, 1968), 53-54.
12. Joseph Desjardins, *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*, 112.
13. Immanuel Kant, *"Duties to Animals and Spirit: Lectures in Ethics"*, Trans. Louis Infield, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963), 239-241.
14. Joseph Desjardins, *Environmental Ethics: An introduction to Environmental Philosophy*, California: Wadsworth. Publishing company. 1993, 112.
15. Schweitzer, *Out of My life and Thought* Trans. A.B. Lemke. (New York: Holt Publishing Company, 1990), 130.
16. Schweitzer, *Out of My Life and Thought*.131.
17. Joseph Desjardins, *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*, 153.
18. Paul Taylor, *Respect for Nature*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 121.
19. Joseph Desjardins, *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*, 123.
20. Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation*, 2d, ed. (New York: New York Review of Books Press, 1990), 7.
21. Neal D. Barnard, et al. "Deep ecology", in *free encyclopedia* en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep-ecology.accessed on 25/04/2012.
22. Arne Naess, *Life's Philosophy*, Trans. Roland Huntford (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008), xxv.
23. Arne Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, Trans. David, R. (New York: Cambridge University press, 1989),7
24. Arne Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, 8.
25. Arne Naess, *Life's, Philosophy*, 8.
26. Joseph Desjardins, *Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*, 215.
27. Arne Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, 174.
28. Neal D. Barnard, et al. "Deep ecology", in *free encyclopedia* en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep-ecology.accessed on 25/04/2012.
29. Arne Naess. *The Shallow and the Deep long-rang Ecology movement: 'A Summary, Inquiry'*. Retrieved: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713393858>.
30. Arne Naess , *Life's Philosophy*, 103
31. Arne Naess, *Life's Philosophy*, 105.
32. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/spinoza>.
33. Renford B., *The Philosophy of Aristotle* (New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1963), 379.
34. Arne Naess, *Life's Philosophy*, 108-109.
35. Arne Naess, *Life's Philosophy*, 6.
36. Donald V and Christine P., *The Environmental and Policy Book: Philosophy, Ecology and Economic*, (California: Wadsworth publishing company, 1994),59.
37. "Ecofeminism" from the internet encyclopedia of Philosophy (online).
38. Igwe Stanley C., *How Africa underdeveloped Africa*, (Port Harcourt: Professional Publishing company, 2010), 37.
39. 40. Walter Rodney, *How Europe* Donald V. and Christine P., *The Environmental and Policy Book: Philosophy, Ecologist and Economic*, 246.
40. *underdeveloped Africa*, (Abuja: Panaf Publishing Inc. 1972), 1.
41. Joseph, N. Chukwuma, "Poverty Alleviation: The key to Sustainable Development in Nigeria" in Bassey Andah ed., *Journal of Cultural Studies* vol. 2 (Enugu: Rabboni Nigeria Ltd. 2009), 104
42. Arne, Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, 91-92.
43. Joseph Desjardin, *Environmental Ethnics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy*, 80.

44. Mathew 4:1(king James version).
45. Genesis 3:17-19 (king James version).

REFERENCES

- Abimboye, D. (2010). November 1. Sokoto Flood: The Day After. *Newswatch Magazine*, pp. 29-31.
- Abubakar, M (2013). April 8. Government Raises Panel on Framework for Climate Services. *The Guardian*, , P. 48-49.
- Adebimpe, I.A and Adeleke, G.O. (2008). Globalization, Sustainable Development and Responsible African Policy. *International Journal of Social and Policy Issues*. Vol. 5, No.2, pp 163-170.
- Adefule, A in Fodeke, E. (2012). October, 8. Afforestation: Contractos Abandons Govt's Tree Planting Project *The Guardian*, p.49.
- Adegboye, K. and Sessou, (2012). Flood: Experts Blame FG for Laxity.. Call for Mitigation, Adaptation Strategies. *Vanguard*, October 16, Pp 45 and 47.
- Adejuwon, S. in Uwaegbulam, C. (2013). December 16, Stakeholders Validate Nigeria' UNFCCC's Second National Communication Document *The Guardian*, p.48.
- Adiorbo, J. and Oyebade, W. (2009). December 11, Race to Lower Warming and Save the World Heats Up. *The Guardian*, pp 22-23.
- Aduba, O. (2012). July 18. Advancing Energy Reforms, through Renewable Sources, in Nigeria. *The Guardian*, p.44.
- Ajaero, C.K Akukwe, T.I and Asuoha, G.C. (2009). July, 2009. Climate Change: Concepts and Issues *in Anyadike R.N.C, Madu, I.A., and Ajaero, C.K (eds) (2010). Conference Proceeding on Climate Change and the Nigeria Environment*. Produced by the Department of Geography, University of Nigeria Nsukka. Held at Princess Alexandra Auditorum, University of Nigeria Nsukka. 29th June – 2nd Nigeria: Jamoe Publishers.
- Ajide, W. (2012). October 16. Environment Governance to Curtailing Flooding Menace. *The Guardian*, p. Backpage.
- Akaeze, A (2009), December 14. The Change Nobody Wants *Newswatch Magazine*, P.26-27.
- Akaeze, A and Abimboye, D. (2009). November 23. A Jinx Broken: The Dredging of the Lower Niger, a Project that has for over 40 years Remained on the Drawing Table, finally Kicks off: *Newswatch Magazine*, , P.10.
- Akanmu, J. (2012). Concerns Grows as Lake Chad Shrinks to an Oasis *The Guardian*, May 25, pp. 20-21.
- Akeaze, A. (2011). February 28. The Beginning of the Erosion Problem. *Newswatch Magazine*, p.18.
- Akindiya, A. (2011). August 8. Saving Planet Earth. *The Guardian*, p. 64.
- Akpodiogaga, P.A.O.O. (2010). 29th June – 2nd July, 2009. *Global and Regional Analysis of Causes and Rate of Climate Change in Anyadike R.N.C, Madu, I.A., and Ajaero, C.K (eds) (2010). Conference Proceeding on Climate Change and the Nigeria Environment*. Produced by the Department of Geography, University of Nigeria Nsukka. Held at Princess Alexandra Auditorium, University of Nigeria Nsukka.. Nigeria: Jamoe Publishers.

Alao, T. and Falaju, J (2014). March 24. Anxiety Mounts As Rainy Season Approach *The Guardian*, p. 11.

Aneke, A. (2012). *Technology and Corruption: The Missing and Morbid Links of Development in Africa*. USA-Bloomington: Author House.

Anyadike, R. N.C. (2009). *Climate Change, National Development and STI Policy Planning in Africa* STI Policy Planning in Africa. Paper Presented at the International Conference and Capacity Building Workshop on Africa's Response to Global Challenges Through Science, Technology and Innovation". Held at Abuja-Nigeria, 24-27 November, 2009.

Banire, M. in Adegboye and Sessou (2012). October 16. Flood Experts Blame FG for Laxity-Call for Mitigation, Adaptation Strategies" *Vanguard*, p.45.

Bassey, N. (2012). October 26. Of Floods, Dams and the Damned. *The Guardian*, p.51.

Bello in Akoni, O. (2013). January, 31. Lagos Assures Residents of Flood Control *Vanguard*, p.9.

Bossel, H (1999). *Indicators for Sustainable Development: Theory, Method, And Application* Canada-Manitoba: International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Bragdon, H.W and McCutchen, S.P. (1958). *History of a Free People United States of America: The Macmillan Company*.

Button, J. (1990). *How to be Green*, (2nd ed.), London: Random Century Ltd.

Chigbo, M (2009). Climate Change: The African Stand" *Newswatch Magazine* P.38.

Dempsey, M.W. (Ed.) (1969). Climate in JUNIOR WORLD ENCYCLOPEDIA (vol.3, pp. 198-194). London – Great Britain Purnell and sons Publishing Ltd

Deutz, P and Frostick, L. (2009), December 28. Reconciling Policy, Practice and Theorization of Waste Management". *The Geographical Journal of the Royal Geographical Society with the Institute of Geographers-London*, Vol. 175, No4, December 2009, pp 247-250.

Duru, P. (2012). October 25. We'll Ensure no Flood in Next 30 to 50 years *Vanguard*, p.8.

Eboh, E. (2009). in Eboh, E.C, Ozor, N., Onuoha, C. and Chukwu, A. (eds)(2009). *Implication of Climate Change for Economic Growth and Sustainable Development in Nigeria*. Enugu Forum Policy Paper 10. Enugu: African Institute for Applied Economics (AIAE).

Egonmwan, J. A. (1991). *Public Policy Analysis: Concepts and Applications*. Benin City: S.M.O Aka and Brothers Press.

Ekah, M (2012). July 25. Advocacy for Sustainable Development in Africa Gathers Momentum. *THISDAY*, p.21.

Enete, A.A and Amusa, T.T. (2012). Challenges of Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Nigeria. In Enete, A.A and Uguru, M.I (eds.) (2012). *Critical issues in Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Nigeria* -A Production of the Faculty of Agriculture University of Nigeria Nsukka. Enugu: Chenglo Limited.

Ezeaku, P.I. (2012). Soil Conservation and Management Options for Adaptation to Climate Change in the 21st Century. In Enete, A.A and Uguru, M.I (eds) (2012). *Critical issues in Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Nigeria* -A Production of the Faculty of Agriculture University of Nigeria Nsukka. Enugu: Chenglo Limited.

- Ezirim, G.E. and Onuoha, F.C. (2008). Climatic Change and National Security: Exploring the Theoretical and Empirical Connection in Nigeria, *Journal of International Politics and Development Studies*, Vol. 4, Nos 1 and 2, January/June-July December 2008. Pp 89-108.
- Fanim, D. and Olorunlome, A. (2013). August 1. Tackling Illegal Loggers to Preserve Forest. *The Guardian*, p. 10
- Federal Government of Nigeria-Nigeria Custom Service (NCS). (2013). Import Prohibition List From <https://www.customs.gov.ng/prohibitionList/import.pl>. Retrieved 2013/01/11.
- FGN/FME (Federal Government of Nigeria/Federal Ministry of Environment). 2009. Nigeria and Climate Change-Road to Cop 15: Achieving the Best Outcome for Nigeria. Nigeria: MRL Public Sector Consultants Limited.
- Folarin, S.F, (2012): in Okpaga, A. and Bako, E. (eds.). (2012). *Global Economic Crisis, Climate Change and Environment Development*. The Challenges for Nigeria. Makurdi-Nigeria: Fulbright Alumni Association of Nigeria (FAAN).
- Goddey, W. (2008). July 2008. *Niger Delta Development Commission and Sustainable Socio-Economic Development in Rivers State, 2000-2007*. A Ph.D Proposal Presented to the Department of Public Admin. and Local Government, University of Nigeria Nsukka,
- Gore, A (2009). *Our Choice: A Plan to Solve the Climate Crisis*. USA: RODALE
- Hudson, J. and Lowe, S. (2009). *Understanding the Policy Process: Analyzing Welfare Practices*. (2nd ed.). UK: Policy Press in association with social Policy Association *Encyclopedia*
- Huguet, L. (2011). May 2. Climate Change Measures Must be made Corruption Proof, *The Guardian*, p 40.
- Hulme, M. (2008). The Conquering of Climate: Discourses of Fear and their Dissolution. *The Geographical Journal of the Royal Geographical (with the Institute of British Geographers London*, Volume 174 No1, March 2008, pp.5-16.
- Igbokwe, E. M. (2012). Role of Government Policies in Shaping Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Nigeria. In Enete, A.A and Uguru, M.I (eds.) (2012). *Critical issues in Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Nigeria* -A Production of the Faculty of Agriculture University of Nigeria Nsukka. Enugu: Chenglo Limited.
- Ignacimuthu, S.J. (2010). *Environmental Spirituality*. Mumbai-Bandra: St Pauls Press Training School. January 2012, pp. 878 – 879. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S136403211100459x>
- Kukah, H.M. (2013), January 5. Every Government Promise Seems to Draw A Mere Yawn. *The Guardian*, pp 10 and 12.
- Lomborg, B. (2009). December 14. Beyond Copenhagen *TIME Magazine*, p. 42.
- Madlioni, S. (2012) November 5. in Uwerunonye, N. (2012). Flooding has Ruined Our Economy. *TELL Magazine*, p.38.
- Madunagu, B. (2012). June 30. Humans' Self-Destructive War on Plants. *THISDAY*, p.50.
- Monbiot, G. (2007). January. Avoiding an Apocalypse-Man's Greatest Challenge. *African Business Magazine*, p. 62.
- Muanya, C. (2012). October 4. How to Mitigate Climate Change Impacts in Nigeria..... *The Guardian*, p.30.

N.A; (2012). 16th June. The Melting North. *The Economist*, , pp 4 & 13.

NA. (2007). *Tell Me Everything*. London: Bounty Books-A Division of Octopus Publishing Group Ltd.

Nachmias, C.F. and Nachmias D. (1992). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (4th edn). New York: St. Martin's Press Inc.

Nigeria: 2005 MDGs Report. Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria: The National population Commission Abuja.

Nwajiuba (2011). July. How Nigeria's Climate Outlook is Inducing Extreme Rainfall. *The Guardian*, p. 4.

Obi, N.I. (2010). *Urbanization, Climate Change and Flood Risk: Addressing the Potential of Flood Risk Management in Nigerian Environment*. In Anyadike R.N.C, Madu, I.A., and Ajaero, C.K (eds.) (2010). "Conference Proceeding on Climate Change and the Nigeria Environment". Produced by the Department of Geography, University of Nigeria Nsukka. Held at Princess Alexandra Auditorium, University of Nigeria Nsukka. 29th June – 2nd July, 2009. Nigeria: Jamoe Publishers.

Obi, P. (2012). January 4. Climate Change: Nigeria's Mixed Bag of Challenges. *THISDAY*, pp 24-25.

Ofori-Ahenkora in Isaac N. (2013). January 8. Climate Change Concerns: Ghana Bans Second-Hands fridges. *Leadership*, p.2.

Oghifo, B. (2012). October, Great Green Wall Programme Starts' *THISDAY*, p.34.

Oghifo, B. (2013) June 4, F.G, WorldBank Implement \$500million Plan to Address Erosion. *THISDAY*, p.35.

Okali in Muanya, C. (2012). October 4, How to Mitigate Climate Change Impacts in Nigeria..... *The Guardian*, p.30.

Oliomogbe, Falaju and Nzeagwu. (2013). February 1, Flood-Ravaged States yet to get Jonathan's N17.6b donation. *The Guardian*, P.5.

Olorunsola, O. (2012). November 1. Nigeria May Shut Down Oil Fields to Curb Gas Flaring *The Guardian* P.15.

Onuoha, C.M. and Ozor, N.(2010:45). Climate Change and Sustainable Development in Nigeria: The Mitigating Greener Approach of Green Wall Sahara Nigeria Programme In Anyadike R.N.C, Madu, I.A., and Ajaero, C.K (eds.) (2010). *Conference Proceeding on Climate Change and the Nigeria Environment*. Produced by the Department of Geography, University of Nigeria Nsukka. Held at Princess Alexandra Auditorium, University of Nigeria Nsukka. 29th June – 2nd July, 2009. Nigeria: Jamoe Publishers.

Onuoha, C.M. (2009). *Climate Change and Sustainable Development: The Mitigating Role of Green Wall Sahara Nigeria Programme*. In Eboh, E.C, Ozor, N., Onuoha, C. and Chukwu, A. (eds) Implication of Climate Change for Economic Growth and Sustainable Development in Nigeria. Enugu Forum Policy Paper 10. Enugu: African Institute for Applied Economics (AIAE).

Onyeji, I. (2009). *On the Determinants of Energy Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa*. AIAE Research Paper 5 Enugu: African Institute for Applied Economics.

Oragwu, F. (2011), June 24. Science Policy and National Development. *The Guardian*, P. 52.

Pachauri, R. and Sokono, Y. (2014). World Must End 'Dirty' Fuel Use, UN Insists. *The*

Padgett, T. (2008). "Bharra Jagdeo-Guyana's President takes a Novel Approach to Defending his Nation's Pristine Rain Forest. *TIME Magazine*, October 6, p.69.

Pasachoff, J.M, Pasachoff, N. and Cooney, T.M (1986) *Earth Science*. United States of America-Illonis: Scott Foresman and Company.

Québec, Gouvernement du Québec (2002). The Principles of Sustainable Development: A Guide for Action. <File:///c:/Documents and settings/Administrators/my documents/Down....Retrieved> 13/5/2014

Randers, J. (2012). *A global Forecast for the Next Forty Years. 2052*. Vermont – USA: Chelsea Green Publishing

Roosevelt, M. (2002). The Winds of Change *TIME Magazine*, September 2, p.42.

Sachs, J.D. (2008). *Common Wealth: Economics for a Crowded Planet*. England London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Sheridan, B and Wehrfritz, G. (2008). "The New Green Leaders. *Newsweek Magazine*, May, pp.34-35.

Shualb, A.Y. (2013). January 21. Doha Paperless Conference on Climate Change. *The Guardian* , p. 73.

Somare, M.I and Sanchez, O.A in Stiglitz, J.E (2008). October 6. Heroes of the Environment: Leaders and Visionaries ... *TIME Magazine*, p.58.

The Amplified Bible. (1987) USA-Michigan: Zondervan.

The Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2008). The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and Fundamental Rights (Enforcement Procedures) rules 2008. Nigeria: Federal Government of Nigeria.

The Guardian Editorial (2012). October 22. Hosts Demand for Gas-Flaring Levy. *The Guardian*, p. 14.

The Guardian Editorial (2012). Dec. 21. Year 2012 and Climate Change. *The Guardian*, P.14.

Ubani, E. (2012). in Terhemba D. (2012). February 15. Government Must Urgently Respond to Climate Change. *The Guardian*, P.10.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) <http://ww.unep.org/climatechange/mitigation>

Uduagha in Oliomogbe, Falaju and Nzeagwu. (2013). February 1. Flood-Ravaged States yet to get Jonathan's N17.6b donation. *The Guardian*, P.5.

Uguru, M.I (2012). Genetic Manipulation Plant and Animal Breeds for Enhanced Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Nigeria. In Enete, A.A and Uguru, M.I (eds) (2012). *Critical issues in Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change in Nigeria* -A Production of the Faculty of Agriculture University of Nigeria Nsukka. Enugu: Chenglo Limited.

Ukuru, S. in Falaju, J. (2014). February 3. Stakeholders Express Concern Over Shrinking of Lake Chad *The Guardian*, n.p.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2007/2008. Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2011. Human Development Report 2011-Sustainability and Equity: A Better Future for All. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

UNDP- Environment and Energy Group. September (2008). Climate Change at UNDP: Scaling up to Meet the Challenge. New York.

UNDP-Nigeria (United Nations Development Programme-Nigeria). 2006. Niger Delta Human Development Report Ikeja- Lagos: Perfect Printers Ltd.

UNEP/GEMS United Nations Environment Programme/ Glaciers and the Environment (Monitoring System). 1992. Glacier and the Environment. Nairobi: UNEP.

Uwaegbulam, C. (2012). May 28. Government Plans Climate Change Fund, Adopts Integrated Ecosystem Approach. *The Guardian*, p.48.

Uwaegbulam, C. (2012). November 12. Reps Plan Inter-Parliamentary Committee on Climate change. *The Guardian*, p.49.

Uwaegbulam, C., OKere, R. and Oyebade, W. (2013). June 18. Badagry people Are Crying Out, Over Side Effects of Gas Flaring in the Environment. *The Guardian*, February 22, p. 21.

Uwaegbulam, C.. (2012). Nigeria Sets Rio + 20 Agenda as Summit Begins. *The Guardian*, P. 56.

VijayaVenkata Raman, S., Iniyan, S., and Goic, R. (2012). A review of Climate Change, Mitigation and adaptation. *E-journal of Renew and Sustainable Energy*. (Volume 16, Issue I,

Walsh , B (2012 April 9. (a). Oil on the Edge. Breakthroughs- and High prices-Have Opened Up New Frontiers for Petroleum *TIME Magazine*, p. 22.

Walsh, B (2012(b). "Endless Summer. The U.S's Record Heat is a Taste of How Climate Change can Play Out. *TIME Magazine*, July 23, P 12.

Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedias (2012). 18 July. *World Population*. From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/world_population. Retrieved on 2012.

Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia.(2012). *Climate Change Mitigation*. From en.wikipedia.org/wiki/climatic_change_mitigation (Accessed 7/16/12).

Yarett, I. (2011). October 24. The World's Green Giants *Newsweek Magazine*, pp.30-36.